Checklist – CAC092M  
Vulnerable Road User (VRU\*) Management (MRTS02, MUTCD Part 3 and QGTTM)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contractor |  | Date |  | Review No. |  |
| Contract No. |  | Project No. |  | Project Name |  |

| Reference | Requirements | Addressed | Comments/Observations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Traffic management plan**: Have the effects of the works areas / traffic detours on all vulnerable road users\* (VRUs) been considered? |  |  |
| **Traffic management plan**: does the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for VRUs address all the requirements as outlined in MRTS02 Clause 5.4 *Scope of traffic management plan*? |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Conflict with work site activities**: Are VRUs led into direct conflict with the works including construction plant and movement of materials? (that is, are site accesses across VRU infrastructure appropriately monitored / managed to prevent conflicts?) |  |  |
| **Conflict with adjacent traffic**: Are VRUs led into direct conflict with traffic moving through, past or around the work site? (that is, are they being directed to informal crossing points that create conflict?) |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Altered / alternative path / route standards**: Is the alternative route for VRUs of the appropriate standard and scale as the pre‑existing facilities or the standard? |  |  |
| **Altered / alternative path / route standards**: Is the alternative route for VRUs of the appropriate surface standard and free of obstruction? (that is, have pavement steps been managed and surface texture is appropriate?) |
| **Altered / alternative path / route standards**: Are detoured routes for VRUs an acceptable length and free from significant grades? (that is, if a 20 m crossing has been replaced by an 800 m detour, this is likely to be unaccepted to VRUs). |
| **Altered / alternative path / route standards**: Has community engagement occurred if unacceptable detours are proposed? |
| **Altered / alternative path / route standards**: Has the temporary traffic management (TTM) design been reviewed by the district cycling champion? |
| **Altered / alternative path / route standards**: Has sufficient lighting been provided for VRU routes? |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Temporary traffic management design**: Have appropriate measures been taken to ensure that VRUs navigate through the work site, or follow a defined route through / past the work site? |  |  |
| **Temporary traffic management design**: Is the type of separation / delineation suitable for VRUs? |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Existing crossings:** Are existing pedestrian crossings closed due to the works? |  |  |
| **Temporary crossings**: Are temporary crossings located and designed to ensure safe use by VRUs? |  |  |
| **Temporary crossings**: Has sufficient lighting been provided for VRU conflict points? |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Other crossing issues**: Are appropriate sight distances (see QGTTM Part 3, Section 2.5.4) maintained between pathways and intersections, driveways and site access points? |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Other crossing issues**: Have the particular requirements (see QGTTM Part 3, Section 3.8.3) relating to pedestrian needs when a contraflow is in operation been incorporated? |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **School crossings**: Are school crossings affected by the works either in location or in operation? |  |  |
| **School crossings**: Have school zones been assessed and communicated to regional Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) groups for roadworks? Do the speed zones conflict with this signage? |  |  |
| **Children crossing points**: Is there adequate sight distance to all locations where children may be crossing the road, considering the difference in eye height and visibility compared to adult people walking? |  |  |
| **Children's facilities**: Has there been specific consideration of the needs of children in locations where there may be large numbers of children walking? |  |  |
| **Elderly**: Have the specific needs of elderly people walking been considered in locations where they may be expected? |  |  |
| **Persons with a disability**: Have the specific needs of persons with a disability been considered in locations where they may be expected?? |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Planning for people riding bikes**: Have all needs for people riding bikes been separately identified and appropriate options selected for maintaining cycling routes? |  |  |
| **People riding bikes**: Is the cycle route listed as a priority in the Principal Cycle Network Program (PCNP)? |
| **Ability of people riding bikes**: Have the types of people riding bikes using the route being considered? |
| **Volumes of people riding bikes**: Have peak periods of people riding bikes been identified? |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Cycling route standards**: Is the route available for bicycles continuous and free of squeeze points or gaps? |  |  |
| **Cycling route standards**: Do asphalt tapers or edge ramps meet the Transport and Main Roads Technical Specifications requirements in bicycle shoulder and is this listed on the VRU Management Plan? |
| **Cycling route standards**: Is the pavement surface suitable for use by people riding bikes? |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Cycling signage**: Are relevant signs in place to warn people riding bikes? |  |  |
| **People riding bikes in the shoulder**: Is sufficient width provided on the shoulder for safe passage of people riding bikes or is a relaxation required in accordance with existing shoulder width? |
| **People riding bikes in the shoulder**: Are TTM warning signs and devices located so that they do not increase the risk to people riding bikes using the road corridors? |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Planning for equestrian activities**: Have potential routes for roadside horse riding activities been separately identified and appropriate options selected for maintaining horse riding routes and adequately separating horse riders from traffic? |  |  |
| **Planning for equestrian activities**: Have local interest groups and local authorities been consulted with, regarding requirements? |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Signs and devices for motorcyclists**: Are signs and devices placed where they:   * may destabilise a motorcyclist? * may obstruct visibility of motorcyclists at intersections? * may prevent a motorcyclist from leaning into a curve? |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.7.7 | **Road surface conditions for motorcyclists**: Have features of the temporary road surface considered the needs of motorcyclists? (that is, pavement steps, sudden changes in surface friction, unexpected / obscured grade changes, compound curves and so on) |  |  |
| MRTS02  Clause 5.4 | **Speed management**: Is the speed appropriate for the works and in accordance with the Traffic Guidance Scheme (TGS)? |  |  |
| **Speed management**: Is there speed compliance with the speed limit and is this being monitored? |  |  |

Note:  
MRTS02 and MRTS02.1 contain references to other technical documents published by the department. Ensure that the TMD has referenced these documents in the preparation of the TMP and associated TGS.

Delete below section if not required

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewed by: |  | |  | |  | |
| Name |  | Signature |  | Date |  |

\* Vulnerable road users include pedestrians (children, elderly and persons with a disability), equestrians, cyclists (on and off road) and motorcyclists.