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.* |
| Tables 2B-1, 2C-1, and 2D-1 | NO | YES | N/A | Define in footnotes on all sign size tables where Minimum sizes can be used. Remember this Manual is used by highway maintenance crews who are not going to read through hundreds of pages. They will print out and reference a table though, so please add a superscript note to the Minimum column on all tables where it is used and define that note there under the table. |
| 2B.06, Line 27 | NO | YES | N/A | The guidance for engineering judgment to establish intersection control should be kept in that location. I know it’s redundant if one reads the entire section, but I can tell you that does not happen in practice, and it’s important enough to repeat. |
| Section 2C.05 and related subsequent sections | NO | YES | N/A | With the removal of the advisory speed section from this part, there is no reference that I saw to the new section under advisory plaques (2C.59), yet there are many mentions of advisory speed in 2C.05 and related curve sections. I think it would easier to use if the curve advisory section is left with the curve signs, but at a minimum you really need to reference the user to the new section. |
| Section 2C.05 | NO | NO | YES | Horizontal Alignment signs for local roads should not be optional for all volumes. Keep the threshold at 1000 vpd. These signs do improve safety on our local roads. |
| 3A.04, Line 30 | NO | NO | YES | Rural roads should still have the option to use 4” for all speed limits. Many of our locally-owned rural roads (default 55 mph) with markings are barely wide enough to have markings at all but can still benefit from edge lines to keep vehicles on the road or center lines to keep vehicles in their lanes when approaching curves or hills. Requiring 6” on rural, narrow roads would be impossible on some roads where 4” can be used now, and would also be a financial hardship to local agencies. Requiring this because of future AVs on rural local roads is unnecessary since those roads typically lack the proper infrastructure to support AVs in general anyway. |
| Section 2C |  |  |  | There is real need for the following new signs in this update: “GPS Routing Not Advised” (agencies are making up their own signs due to need and there is no uniformity at all);  “Left Turn Yield to Oncoming Traffic” (at non-signalized intersections that operate as curves); and  “Narrow Road - Keep Right” (for use on blind hills and curves where the road is too narrow for centerlines). |

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