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Streets Are Changing
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If we don’t adapt, risks will only increase.
Guidance for 21st Century Streets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Network</th>
<th>Example Product</th>
<th>Year Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Design &amp; Public Space</td>
<td>Urban Street Design Guide</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Transit Street Design Guide; Better Bus series</td>
<td>2016, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Vision Zero</td>
<td>Urban Speed Limit Setting</td>
<td><em>Expected Spring 2019</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeshare Cities</td>
<td>Station Siting Guide; Shared Active Transport Guidelines</td>
<td>2015, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>Blueprint for Autonomous Urbanism</td>
<td>2017, <em>Part 2 Expected 2019</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidance Approach
Guidance simply wasn’t meeting goals
Aiming for just the right level of detail
Basis in Guidance

New York City Street Design Manual, 2nd Ed. 2013

Boston Complete Streets Guidelines, 2012
Basis in Practice
Aims & Characteristics

• Spread best practices through peer exchange

• Enable cities to implement key policy goals

• Descriptive and enabling, rather than primarily prescriptive, regulatory, or exculpatory

• Intended for practitioner and public alike

• Flexible enough to allow practice to change again.
Typical Guidance Development Process

1. Identify guidance need
2. Draft by Working Group + NACTO staff
3. Working Group review
4. Partner Org Input
5. Peer Network
6. Production by NACTO staff
7. Policy Committee (as applicable)
8. Publication
9. Feedback

Flowchart:
- Identify guidance need → Draft by Working Group + NACTO staff → Working Group review → Partner Org Input → Peer Network → Production by NACTO staff → Policy Committee (as applicable) → Publication → Feedback
Guidance Inclusion Criteria

• Active-Practitioner Reviewed – the committee members as representatives of their cities have to accept it
• Practice-tested – it has to have worked in real life, well enough to use again
• Available research indicates value
• Emphasis on closing gaps
Relationship to Other National Guidance
Guidance and Practice Change Together

Design Practice Changes

Guidance need/gap emerges

Cities apply guidance

NACTO publishes guidance

Cities agree on best practice solutions
Urban Bikeway Design Guide Topics Now Covered by FHWA Interim Approvals

- Green Color Pavement
- Bicycle Symbol Signals
- Bike Boxes
- Two-stage Turn Boxes
Traffic control decisions are often decisions about who goes first.
Guidance has always supported policy.
Potential Ways Forward

• Consider high-speed and low-speed roads differently
  – Where is uniformity in signs/markings critical to safety?

• Emphasize meaning of signs and markings rather than geometric design.

• Take jurisdictional variation as a parameter, not a problem.

• Scale up experiments, and add transparent criteria.
Flexibility: Not a New Idea

1B–10 Speed Limit Sign (R2–1)

The standard Speed Limit sign shall be 24 inches by 30 inches in size, with a minimum size for minor roadways (sec. 1B–3) of 18 inches by 24 inches. On expressways the sign should be at least 36 inches by 48 inches.

Interstate.—For the Interstate System a size of 48 inches by 60 inches is prescribed for this sign.

The numerical speed limit displayed on this sign shall be the limit established by law, or by regulation after an appropriate engineering and traffic investigation according to law. The speed limits shown should be in multiples of 5 miles. A suitable model for speed-limit legislation is to be found in the Uniform Vehicle Code (secs. 11–801 to 806).
Let’s Move Forward