

Comments on Docket No. FHWA-2020-0001 National Standards for Traffic Control Devices; the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways*; Revision

Please use this form to provide comments on the Notice of Proposed Amendments for the MUTCD.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Add your name or organization name where indicated in the footer of this form.
2. Use Table 1 to provide your original comments.
3. Use Table 2 to indicate your agreement with a comment that another commenter has submitted to the docket.
4. Do not adjust formatting of the rows and columns; text will automatically wrap and expand the row height as you type.
5. To add rows to this form, use the "Insert Rows" function, or hover just outside the left edge of the row below which you would like to add a row and click the encircled "+" that appears.
6. If you choose to provide a letter to accompany this comment form, please **print the document as a PDF**; **please do not scan a hard copy**. This will assist FHWA with cataloging your comments.

TABLE 1. ORIGINAL COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES. Please indicate the applicable proposed Section numbers in the far-left column. In the next three columns, please indicate your agreement, disagreement, or whether the column is applicable to your response by placing a, "YES," "NO," or "N/A" in the appropriate column of the row. If you agree with a proposed change, then there is no need to fill out the additional columns beyond the first two. However, it can be helpful to explain why you agree with a proposed change based on your objective experience as a roadway operator and/or empirical data. If you disagree in part or in whole, then please provide additional information that FHWA may find helpful.

Proposed Section Number(s)	Agree with concept and text as proposed	Agree with concept; suggested rewording of text in Comments	Disagree with concept	Comments <i>Please include justification for your position based on objective experience and empirical data. If there is a specific statement with which you take exception, please provide the Page and Line numbers from the mark-up version of the proposed MUTCD text.</i>
All				See other file submitted to docket which shows detailed recommended changes to the draft MUTCD text, figures, and tables.
9E.01	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.01 as presented in the NPA, but recommends deleting a redundant Option statement, revising the Standard statement to note that installing bike lane symbols on a shoulder converts the shoulder into a bike lane, and revising Support statement to reference Bikes Use Shoulder Only signs in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 11A-BIK-01.
Figure 9E-1	NO	YES	N/A	NCTUCD recommends replacing Figure 9E-1 in the NPA with Figure 9C-3 from the 2009 MUTCD to include the bike lane pavement marking option depicting a helmeted bicyclist.
Figure 9E-2	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-2 as presented in the NPA, but recommends including R10-15b signs and additional notes in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 18B-BIK-01.
9E.02	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.02 as presented in the NPA, as it is consistent with NCUTCD recommendation 17A-BIK-01, but recommends the following revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editorial changes to be consistent with current definitions • Adding a Standard statement to clarify conditions for accommodating bicyclists in turn lanes at signalized intersections • Delete Guidance on shifting separated bicycle lanes at intersections • Revising Standard material on mixing zones to Guidance and Option for flexibility • Other editorial changes.
Figure 9E-3	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-3 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revisions on Sheet 3 of 3 to correct a Left Turn Only Lane marking.

**Comments on Docket No. FHWA-2020-0001 National Standards for Traffic Control Devices;
the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways*; Revision**

Figure 9E-4	YES	N/A	N/A	NCUTCD agrees with Figure 9E-4 as presented in the NPA.
Figure 9E-5	YES	N/A	N/A	NCUTCD agrees with Figure 9E-5 as presented in the NPA.
9E.03	NO	YES	N/A	<p>Section 9E.03 Comments: NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.03 as presented in the NPA, as it is consistent with NCUTCD recommendation 14B-BIK-03, but recommends revisions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove unneeded wording in Support. • Relocate material to improve organization of the section. • Revise the first Standard to allow chevron markings in bike lanes and bike lane extensions. NCUTCD supports the use of chevrons where appropriate in bike lanes and bike lane extensions, such as through intersections. • Revise Standard material on bike lane extensions for buffered or separated bike lanes to Guidance. • Revise Standard material on bike lane extensions adjacent to a marked crosswalk to Guidance.
9E.04	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.04 as presented in the NPA, with one minor change to delete “rotated” in the Option statement.
9E.05	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.05 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding new Support material addressing the use of separated lanes at circular intersections, revising the Standard prohibition on bike lanes to apply only to roundabouts, and add a new Guidance statement to specify minimum offset of bicycle crossings at circular intersections.
9E.06	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.06 as presented in the NPA, as it is consistent with NCUTCD recommendation 18B-BIK-05, but recommends revising some Standard statements to Guidance, revising an Option statement, and adding two Guidance statements in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 18B-BIK-05 to allow greater flexibility for marking the buffer space.
Figure 9E-6	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD recommends replacing Figure 9E-6 as presented in the NPA with Figure 9C-xx from NCUTCD recommendation 18B-BIK-05 to better depict commonly-used markings for buffer-separated bicycle lanes.
9E.07	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.07 as presented in the NPA, but recommends editorial revisions to be consistent with current definitions, adding a new Support statement to address left-side facilities, revise the Standard addressing two-way bicycle lanes at intersections to eliminate a conflict with Section 4H.01, revise a Standard on directional arrows to Guidance to allow greater flexibility for marking separated bicycle lanes, and delete Guidance on traffic conflicts addressed in Chapter 4H.
Figure 9E-7	YES	N/A	N/A	NCUTCD agrees with Figure 9E-7 as presented in the NPA.
9E.08	NO	YES	N/A	<p>NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.08 as presented in the NPA, as it is consistent with NCUTCD recommendation 14A-BIK-06, but recommends revisions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise all instances of “counter-flow” to “contra-flow” • Revise Standard on placement between general purpose lanes and on-street parking to Guidance for greater flexibility for marking contra-flow bicycle lanes • Revise Standard on signing at intersections to Guidance for greater flexibility for signing contra-flow bicycle lanes • Other editorial revisions as needed

**Comments on Docket No. FHWA-2020-0001 National Standards for Traffic Control Devices;
the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways*; Revision**

Figure 9E-8	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-8 as presented in the NPA, but recommends replacing “Counter-Flow” with “Contra-Flow” in the title and replacing R3-7aP EXCEPT BICYCLES plaque with the symbol version in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 09A-BIK-01.
9E.09	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD recommends revising 9E.09 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add mixing zones to the list of appropriate situations • Delete the Standard statement prohibiting green-colored pavement behind the shared lane marking and add an Option statement permitting this treatment - NCUTCD supports the use of green-colored pavement behind the shared lane marking in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 16B-BIK-01 • Revise the Guidance statement on lateral positioning to Option • Other editorial revisions as needed
Figure 9E-9	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-5 as presented in the NPA, but recommends replacing R3-7aP EXCEPT BICYCLES plaques with the symbol version in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 09A-BIK-01.
Figure 9C-9 (from 2009 MUTCD)	N/A	N/A	N/A	NCUTCD recommends restoring Figure 9C-9 from the 2009 MUTCD for the shared lane marking symbol in Chapter 2E.
9E.10	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.10 as presented in the NPA, as it is consistent with NCUTCD recommendation 16B-BIK-01, but recommends adding a Guidance statement to provide improved guidance for positioning of the shared lane marking in the lane in a circular intersection.
9E.11	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.11 as presented in the NPA, as it is consistent with NCUTCD recommendation 14A-BIK-01, but recommends deleting a redundant Standard statement and adding a Guidance statement regarding position of the turn box relative to the stop line and crosswalk.
Figure 9E-10	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-10 as presented in the NPA, but recommends deleting misplaced lane arrow markings in example A.
Figure 9E-11	YES	N/A	N/A	NCUTCD agrees with Figure 9E-11 as presented in the NPA.
9E.12	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.12 in the NPA, as it is consistent with NCUTCD recommendation 13B-BIK-01 but recommends adding two Option statements regarding left-side bicycle lanes and extension of the box across multiple lanes.
Figure 9E-12	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-12 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding titles to figures and on sheet 2 of 2 replacing R3-7aP EXCEPT BICYCLES plaques with the symbol version in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 09A-BIK-01.
9E.13	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.13 in the NPA but recommends changing the Standard statement regarding markings for paths at crossings of unpaved roads to Guidance and the Guidance statement on colored pavement at intersections to Option.
Figure 9E-13	YES	N/A	N/A	NCUTCD agrees with Figure 9E-13 as presented in the NPA.
Figure 9E-14	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-14 as presented in the NPA, but notes the width of the crosswalk appears to be too narrow in the figure when compared to other markings.

**Comments on Docket No. FHWA-2020-0001 National Standards for Traffic Control Devices;
the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways*; Revision**

9E.14	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with 9E.14 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising one Standard statement to a Guidance statement to allow use of bicycle route pavement markings in separated bicycle facilities to provide route connectivity and continuity. NCUTCD also recommends deleting the Standard statement prohibiting markings from substituting for signs as it conflicts with the adjacent Guidance statement, and other editorial changes as needed.
Figure 9E-15	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-15 as presented in the NPA, but notes that the pavement marking graphics appear elongated, which is not consistent with provisions in Section 9E-14. The figure is also unclear as to whether the cardinal direction marking is required or optional.
9E.15	YES	N/A	N/A	NCUTCD agrees with 9E.15 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions.
Figure 9E-16	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 9E-16 so the word legend under the bicycle symbol reads in standard word legend marking order; e.g. first words farthest upstream, in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 18B-BIK-06.
9E.16	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Section 9E.16 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding an Option statement to allow yellow diagonal markings to provide added conspicuity to the obstruction markings.
Figure 9E-17	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 9E-17 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding longitudinal dimensions for the marking taper for the in-path obstruction.
9E.17	NO	YES	N/A	NCUTCD recommends revising 9E.17 in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 17A-BIK-01: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the first Support statement to include tubular marker deleted from Guidance below, delete text that conflicts with the definition of a buffer-separated bicycle lane in Section 9E.06, and edit to illustrate hazards posed by raised devices to all road users • Add Guidance on lateral offset of channelizing devices • Add a Support statement to include measures to mitigate the potential hazards of raised devices drawn from research findings • Revise the Standard statement on device color to Guidance to allow agencies to use different device colors where contrast is needed for device visibility, such as tubular markers in snow conditions • Delete Guidance that conflicts with the definition of a buffer-separated bicycle lane in Section 9E.06

TABLE 2. AGREE WITH ANOTHER COMMENTER. If you agree with another commenter, please indicate the commenter with whom you agree with and note any additional information FHWA may find helpful or any exceptions.

Docket Comment Number and/or Commenter Name	Agree with commenter's comments as written	Agree with commenter; with exception(s)	Additional information helpful to FHWA, or exceptions to commenter's comments
(EXAMPLE) FHWA-2020-0001-59	YES	N/A	