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 indicted 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  *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.* |
| 2B.03 | NO | YES | N/A | Agree with the Table 2B-1, table of Regulatory Sign and Plaque Sizes in general. Do not agree with the size of the R1-3P, ALL-WAY (Plaque) which is listed as 18 x 6 for Conventional Road.  The 18 x 6 size is small, compared with the sizes for the Stop sign at 30 x 30, 36 x 36 and 48 x 48.  ALL-WAY plaques should use the sizes 24 x 9 with the 30 x 30 Stop sign, 30 x 12 for the 36 x 36 Stop sign, and 36 x 15 for the 48 x 48 Stop sign. |
| 2B.03 | NO | NO | YES | Disagree with removal of Roundabout Directional Chevron signs R6-4. R6-4a, and R6-4b. |
| 2B.19 | YES | YES | NO | Agree with revisions to of Sign R1-9 to include words “IN CROSSWALK” |
| 2B.40 | NO | YES | N/A | Figure 2B-11 should be changed to use R4-7 in place of the R4-7a or R4-7b signs as shown in the example diagrams. |
| 2B.50 | NO | NO | YES | Disagree with Option in Section 2B.50. Large One Directional Arrows should not be used in central island of a roundabout.  Roundabout Directional Chevron signs R6-4. R6-4a, and R6-4b should be an option for use in place of a R6-1 sign. |
| 2B.51 | NO | NO | YES | Disagree with Option allowing divided highway sign on left side of approach, opposite one way sign as shown in Figure 2B-17.  One way signs should be opposite each other in this case. |
| 2C.25 | NO | YES | NO | W12-2B sign should be revised to have downward arrow beneath clearance measurement. The arrow should not be used between feet and inches. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2C.45 | NO | YES | NO | Figure 2C-14 has two separate example diagrams.  Top diagram shows an onramp merging with the mainline. Both the mainline and onramp display a W4-1 sign. This is not proper as the onramp should display a W4-5 sign to indicate that it is merging onto the mainline, giving the false impression to the motorist that a minor onramp is merging instead of them being on the minor approach merging onto the mainline.  The same issue is with the bottom diagram, but using a W4-3 sign for the onramp, it should also use a W4-6 sign as well. |
| 2E.22 | NO | YES | NO | Figure 2E-3 features examples of interchange exit numbering. I disagree with the fourth example where Exits 25A, 25B and 25C are shown. Specifically, with how from left to right, there are three exits going in order, 25A, 25B and 25C, this direction is proper. However, the opposite direction has Exit 25B sharing Exit 25C in the opposite direction. This should be Exit 25C in both directions. Exit 25B has no exit ramp for that direction and should then go to Exit 25A. |
| 2J.02 | NO | YES | NO | Figure 2J-2 shows the order of signs for service and guide signs.  Camping and Lodging are shown before the Exit 44 one mile guide sign. All service signs should be displayed between the first exit guide sign and ramp guide sign.  I do not like having service signs appear before the first guide sign for an exit. Spacing between service signs should be adjusted to facilitate this. |
| 3J.03 | NO | YES | NO | Figure 3J-2 example B shows a side road with a right in-right out painted island. The pained island for the side road turning onto the main road, with a stop sign, has a white double line. This should be a yellow double line. The yellow is still needed as this is still considered a side road. The white double line does not bring any added value to this common type of channelization. |

**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 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |