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.* |
| 2A.04 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 45, line 10 has a reference to section 1A.13 (previous definitions section). Update to Section 1C.02. Also, Business Identification sign panel is not included in the definitions in 1C.02. Add definition. |
| 2A.04 | No | No | Yes | Page 45, lines 23 - 24 gives set dimensions for sign information such as year of manufacture and sign code. These dimensions are stated to be placed within the inset or border of a sign, which can be very small for most standard signs and vary greatly. This small of text would render the information somewhat useless if it cannot be visible to a DOT for maintenance/asset information and would likely require them to be within a few feet of the sign rather than viewed from the safety of a vehicle. It would be preferred if a set max dimension could be given and state for the information to be placed in a common location within the background. UDOT currently requires 1" letters for year of manufacture be placed on the lower left corner of signs and it has worked well without motorist confusion. |
| 2A.05 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 45, line 32. Table 2A-1 is currently shown in the proposed tables as Illumination of Sign Elements. Table 2A-4 in the proposed tables is for Use of Sign Shapes. Update Table names to correlate with the correct order in this section. Agree with the rest of Section 2A.05. |
| 2A.06 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 46, line 12 updated reference to table 2A-2 is incorrect. Table 2A-2 is for retroreflection, Table 2A-5 is for sign colors. |
| 2A.12 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2A-4, sheets 2 through 4, update Sign designation for Advanced Street Name Supplemental Plaque to W16-8P. |
| 2A.12 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 51, lines 5-7. References to Figures 2A-5A and 2A-5B should be removed. Figure 2A-5A and 2A-5B do not show signing for intersections or intersection approaches. |
| 2A.15 | No | Yes | N/A | Pg. 54, lines 25-28 and pg. 55, lines 7-11: these sections are not proposed to be revised, yet they compound the confusion and create a bit of a conflict with the information found in the Roadside Design Guide (RDG). While the reference point for an object is from the edge of shoulder or edge of pavement to the object, the distance should be measured from the edge of travel way to the object. In addition, the distance for lateral offset in the RDG has two parts: operational offset (no less than 1.5 ft from face of curb for predominantly urban, curbed facilities) and lateral offset to obstructions within the clear zone (4-6 ft). My recommendation here is that the MUTCD refer to the RDG, rather than over-simplify and complicate the collaboration between the two. |
| 2A.17 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 56 lines 6 through 8. By this standard, it is possible that solar panels cannot be placed adequately on signs to receive the necessary sunlight for power. Suggest rewording this standard to allow devices to be mounted above a sign but not block the sign face. Also remove the language regarding casting shadows upon signs. There are cases where shadows from other objects on/near a roadway will cast shadows upon signs which have not been a problem. This requirement seems unnecessary and would be hard to enforce. |
| 2A.19 | No | Yes | N/A | Can section 2A.19 as proposed be somehow combined with or, at a minimum, refer back to proposed section 2A.12, specifically pg. 51 lines 49-53 and pg. 52 lines 18? Section 2A.19 seems to provide some information that requires the Support and Guidance provided in section 2A.12 and the two overlap as currently written, providing some redundancy but also neglecting to provide the entire concept in one location. |
| 2A.22 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 59 line 48. Figure title does not match figure title in proposed figures. Agree with rest of section 2A.22. |
| 2B | No | Yes | N/A | "Passing, keep right and slow traffic signs" consider oxford comma - it's used in the "parking, standing, stopping, and emergency signs" header |
| 2B.04 - 2B.18 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 69, Line 14, "When two intersection roadways" should be "When two intersecting roadways" |
| 2B.04 - 2B.18 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 70-71: Section 2B.13, Bullet Point C should be deleted because the same point is made in Section 2B.14 in the first paragraph. |
| 2B.07 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 67, Line 4, "...for one of more..." should be "...for one or more..." |
| 2B.10 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 69, Line 13, Reference refers to (Section 2B-X3). We couldn't find that section -- it appears incorrect. |
| 2B.13 | No | Yes | N/A | The text on p. 70, Lines 46-47 looks like a larger font size then the rest of the section. |
| 2B.20 | Yes | Yes | N/A | The first paragraph in Section 2B.20 refers to In-Street Trail Crossing signs as R1-6b and R1-6c and refers to Figure 2B-2. However, in the PDF of proposed figures, there are no signs R1-6b and R1-6c; rather, we believe they are labeled as R1-6d and R1-6e. |
| 2B.21 | No | Yes | N/A | Pg 68 Line 16 reference should be see section 2C.40. Line 31 reference should be see section 2C.42. Line 48 reference should be See section 2C.13. Pg 69 line 1 reference school speeds limits should be 7B.06 Agree with changes including new organization of section, broad terms and inclusion of other factors that should be considered, and guidance for placement of speed limit signs |
| 2B.22 | No | Yes | N/A | Pg 69 line 13 reference should be 2B 24. Agree with change allowing flexibility in signing for all vehicle types |
| 2B.26 | No | Yes | N/A | Pg 71 Line 26 references Section 2B.19, 2B.20, 2B.21, and 2B.22 for lane control signs but should be updated to the reference for the new sections. (2B.27-2B.30) |
| 2B.29 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 84, lines 29-32: Where no previous guidance existed for this sign, we suggest adding more information about other applications for this sign. Also, we are unfamiliar with a situation that would exist as stated where a mandatory turn lane (which is a lane already) would cause drivers to enter the shoulder to get to the lane unless that lane was just added, in which case it would not be a mandatory turn lane, but a turn pocket or a turn lane. The term "mandatory" here seems to conflict with the application suggested. We suggest re-wording this to provide clarification or other applications as the existing example seems far too specific to be used or understood. |
| 2B.30 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 85, line 32: The reference to Fig. 2A-5 a and b may not be correct as that figure contains no advance intersection lane control signs. Was the reference supposed to be Figures 2A-4 a through e? |
| 2B.30 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 85, line 35: Was the intent to avoid placing the additional signs "at" the intersection? The words "along the approach" don't really convey that if it was the intent. As written, "along the approach" is redundant as "closer to the intersection" also describes where to place the sign. A possible re-wording could be "An Advance Intersection Lane Control sign may be repeated closer to the intersection, but not at the intersection, for additional emphasis." |
| 2B.30 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 85, lines 38-39: Suggest re-wording to "An Advance Intersection Lane Control (R3-8 series) sign shall not be mounted beyond an intersection to which it applies." as the "far side" could be any side of the intersection and we believe the intent was to eliminate signing that guides users after the event. |
| 2B.30 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 85, lines 43-44: Is there an example of what this would look like that can be provided? Is this statement requiring "LEFT LANE" (R3-5bp) and "RIGHT LANE" (R3-5fp) to be mounted above the R3-8 sign or above each lane? Is that in one direction or could that be two lanes of a 4 or 5 lane roadway? If the signs go above the R3-8 sign and not the lane, and there are 3 or more lanes on the entire roadway, would this require a sign per lane configuration above the arrows? We suggest re-wording to clarify the intent and the requirement. |
| 2B.30 | No | Yes | N/A | TAXI LANE, BUS LANE should follow HOV2+ for the supplemental plaques that can be added as they are listed in the () . We are not seeing figure 2A-5 a and b that is referenced in Paragraph 4. Paragraph 7 is stated backwards. If 3 or more approach lanes then it should be mounted overhead not post mounted. The section 2B.29 that is referenced is about mounting these overhead for 2 or more lanes. |
| 2B.38 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 90, Lines 20-26: While we agree with the clarification of using the R4-16 sign "on roadways where there are two lanes in one direction of travel" in line 21, there needs to be the same clarification that the two lanes are "in the same direction of travel" or retain the "multi-lane" text that currently exists in lines 24-26. By replacing "multi-lane" with "two-lane" in lines 24-26, the sign should only be installed on two lane roads, or one lane in each direction, which would negate the need to direct traffic to stay right as there is only one lane in each direction. |
| 2B.40 | No | No | Yes | P.91, Lines 39-41, 46-48: These two statements seem to contradict one another as one is an option and then below it is a standard to angle the Keep Right signs toward the applicable crossroad approach. Please clarify or remove the standard. UDOT does not currently use the angled sign for the crossroad approach. |
| 2B.45, Fig 2B-11 | No | N/A | N/A | P. 93, lines 10-11 state "The ALL TRAFFIC sign shall not be used to substitute for the Keep Right (R4-7 series) or Keep Left (R4-8 series) signs." yet Figure 2B-11 in the figure on the left shows a "KEEP RIGHT" or "ALL TRAFFIC" sign may be used as a substitute. Please clarify the intent or correct the figure. |
| 2B.46 | No | Yes | N/A | Should there be a "No E-Scooters" (or something like this) sign added to the 'Selective Exclusion Signs' list? These are becoming more and more prominent, and a standard sign to regulate them is needed. |
| 2B.47, Fig 2B-15 | No | Yes | N/A | On the two left details of Figure 2B-15, suggest showing the R5-1 signs as optional to notify any left or right turning traffic that may go against the flow of traffic (on the right side of the intersection details as shown) |
| 2B.47, Fig 2B-19 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 96, lines 6-8 state "The DO NOT ENTER (R5-1) sign shall be used where a two-way roadway becomes a one-way roadway as shown in Figure 2B-15,and near the downstream end of an interchange exit ramp as shown in Figure 2B-19 (see Section 2B.49)." yet Figure 2B-19 shows the R5-1 signs as optional. Please remove the optional text on the figure to match the text. |
| 2B.47 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2B-18 appears to have a stray sign symbol in the middle of the upper left leg of the intersection  Figure 2B-19 has a "Do Not Enter" sign next to two "One Way" signs in the lower middle of the graphic without a leader line showing where it should be placed |
| 2B.49 | No | Yes | N/A | It would be helpful to show optional signs indicated in items F. and G. (Page 97, Lines 42 and 43) in Figure 2B-19. |
| 2B.45 | No | Yes | N/A | Since the "All Traffic" sign is a supplemental sign that must go with another sign that indicates what all traffic should do, does this section need to specify a "shall" condition that the "All Traffic" sign shall not be used alone? Maybe it's so obvious that such a statement is not needed, but just asking the question. |
| 2B.60 | No | Yes | N/A | UDOT supports the recommendation made by the NCUTCD for the use of the yellow arrow symbol. Please include the yellow arrow symbol in Section 2B.60 and Figure 2B-27. |
| 2B.77 | No | N/A | N/A | Why was the offset information for the gates deleted? I've found it useful in designing these in the past, but wanted to see if there was a reason it is being removed. |
| 2C.01 | No | Yes | N/A | Nothing in the current proposal addresses *function -* should we remove function from the title?. |
| 2C.18 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.18 line 30 should reference figure 2C-7 (currently references 2C-6) ***OR*** Figure 2C-6 title and diagram should include the narrow bridge information ***OR*** no figure should be referenced. |
| 2C.18 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.18 line 20 and 2C.19 line 38 - allow for additional object markers.. should the section for object markers be referenced |
| 2C.18 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.18 line 26 - add " where there is adequate sight distance to bridge" like it is on line 42. Also, add “or structure” after bridge. |
| 2C.18 | No | Yes | N/A | Section 2C.18 line 17& 18 use the term "roadway clearance" BUT 2C.19 Line 32,33,35 - use term "clear roadway". does this mean the same thing and should the verbiage be the same. |
| 2C.24 | No | Yes | N/A | Line 14 change section 2C.XX to Section 2C.22 |
| 2C.25 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.25 line 18-19 missing context of when or where to use. Consider editing to include "Shall be used to warn users ***in advance of a bridge or structure*** with clearance less than the 12 inches......" |
| 2C.26 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.26 line 4 add (see figure 2C-8) |
| 2C.28 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.28 line 30 - add (see Figure 2C-9) |
| 2C.34 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.34 line 5 - add (see Figure 2C-7) |
| 2C.37 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.37 line 44 - remove the "a" between or and watch |
| 2C.52 | No | Yes | N/A | 2C.52 line 37 - Add (see figure 2C-12) |
| 2C.45 | No | No | Yes | P. 141, lines 14-17: Suggest removing the added text as the curved stem on the W4-1 sign should represent the incoming, smaller volume/size roadway and the larger, straight stem should represent the larger, major roadway and reflect the geometry of the roadways merging. As shown in Fig. 2C-14, the signs are not only conflicting and confusing, but would often be redundant as both merging movements can easily view a single sign in most cases. In addition, this added statement would most often directly conflict with lines 22-25 and no order of precedence is provided, thus creating even more confusion. |
| 2C.45, Fig 2C-12 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 141, line 33: the text states the NO MERGE AREA sign is a W4-5P, yet the figure states the sign is a W4-5aP. Please clarify and use the same number for each sign in both locations. |
| 2C.45 | No | Yes | N/A | Please clarify which sign is the Merge sign (W4-1?) and which sign is the Lane Ends sign (W9-1 or W4-2?). |
| 2C.46 | No | No | Yes | P. 141, lines 49-50, p. 142, line 1: suggest removing the following text, "When an Added Lane (W4-3) sign is installed on an entering roadway, the symbol should be oriented right or left as appropriate to depict the side from which the major roadway converges, with the straight arrow representing the entering roadway and the curved arrow representing the major roadway." As has already been stated in a previous comment, this sentence conflicts with P. 142 lines 3-6, and no order of precedence is provided, creating confusion. UDOT's experience is that the larger stem on the merge arrows represents the major movement to users and helps provide a sense of who has the right of way. |
| 2C.47 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 142, line 45: Propose re-wording the first and second sentences to "The W4-2 and W9-1 signs shall not be used in mandatory turn lane situations. In mandatory turn lane situations..." for consistency with terminology throughout the MUTCD. |
| 2C.48 | No | No | Yes | Is there a situation where one lane cannot merge into another, rather than allowing a free-for-all lane merging? We plan to prohibit the use of this sign if it is accepted as it creates a situation that eliminates the right of way for each lane and also confuses users as to what lane is required to merge into the other. Also, if it is accepted, please stripe the DWL to the end of the BWL as shown in Part 3. |
| 2C.48 | No | Yes | N/A | P. 143, line 4: revise sentence to add the word "to" between "used" and "warn" (i.e. "...used to warn...") |
| 2C.50 | No | Yes | N/A | Text says specifically "depart the roadway on a ramp" but then later on text is edited to include an intersection; not all intersections have ramps so should the word ramp be more generalized? like lane? Also, The NPA says the option statement is allowing for the addition of a third line of legend to display distance, but the new sign in the MUTCD is already showing three lines as-is. NPA also says "more than 1 mile" while MUTCD says "1 mile or greater". Which is it? |
| 2C.59 | No | Yes | N/A | Line 32 "advisory plaque shall also be used where an engineering study indicates a need" and line 37 "shall not be installed until the advisory speed has been determined by an engineering study"... are these sentences saying the same thing but backwards? What about what instances where you can put the advisory speed inside the arrow sign? This section says this plaque cannot be used without an advanced warning sign... would there ever be a situation where there would be a large arrow and no advanced curve sign? (ie is this being too restrictive?) |
| 2C.67 | No | Yes | N/A | Line 23... is this redundant with everything in the manual? Should this just be generalized to say "match sign it's used with"? |
| 2D.02 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 157 line 19, references to sections 2A.07, 2A.08 and 2A.10 need to be updated to 2A.06, 2A.20 and 2A.21. |
| 2D.10 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 162 line 43, update reference from 2H.07 to 2D.58 to reference the correct section for scenic byways, historic trails and auto tour routes. |
| 2D.12 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 164 line 46, spelling correction. Change signal to single. Agree with updates. |
| 2D.36 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 174 line 10, update references to sections 2E.33 and 2E.35 to 2E.23 and 2E.50 respectively. This aligns with new section numbering for Advanced Guide signs and Supplemental Guide signs. |
| 2D.36 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 174 line 36. Reference to Figure 2E-3 is incorrect. |
| 2D.37 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 174 lines 44-46 and page 175 lines 4-5 are duplicating information. Agree with the rest of the additions for APL signs on conventional roads. |
| 2D.38 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 175 line 31 has a reference to 2A-5 for an example of a D15-1. This figure does not show a D15-1 sign. |
| 2D.40 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 176 line 37, update section reference for regulatory signs at jughandle to 2B.35 instead of 2B.36. Agree with other updates. |
| 2D.41 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2D-14 Sheet 1. East / West directions are in the wrong spot for the arrow indications on the top sign. Also add Route labels for the roadway to clarify figure. |
| 2D.41 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2D-14 Sheet 2. Are the signs with the vertical lines drawn beneath them representing ground mount signs? If so, another figure may be needed to show where these are located rather showing them as an option from the overhead signs. |
| 2D.53 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 187 line 33, spelling error. Change singing to signing. Agree with rest of the updates. |
| 2D.53 | No | Yes | N/A | UDOT currently uses climbing lane when a lane is developed for a long grade, regardless of which side it is developed. A passing lane sign is used for all other cases without a grade, regardless of which side the lane is developed. UDOT wishes to continue this practice to distinguish when lanes are developed for long grades versus passing opportunities. Suggest allowing the option for alternate legends, such as the current language on pg 186 lines 29-31. |
| 2D.59 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2D.38 has a sign symbol shown on the bottom of the figure that does not have a sign specified for it. Add sign for this symbol or remove the symbol. |
| 2E.01 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 199 lines 8 and 12 have references to Sections 1A.13 and 1A.11 which no longer exist. Update references to appropriate sections. Agree with the rest of the updates of this section. |
| 2E.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 200 line 47, update reference from 2E.56 to 2E.57 to refer to the correction section. |
| 2E.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 200 line 48, update reference from 2H.04 to Chapter 2H. Old reference was for miscellaneous signs, but with the updated text referring to General Information sign, Chapter 2H as a whole is more appropriate. |
| 2E.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 200 line 49, update reference for reference location signs to 2H.11. |
| 2E.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 201 line 4, update reference for ride share and carpooling to 2I.14 |
| 2E.07 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 202 line 18, update reference for Destination signs to 2D.36 to match updated section layout. |
| 2E.07 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 202 line 35, update reference for 1A.11 to 1A.05. |
| 2E.12 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 204 line 12, update reference for 1A.11 to 1A.05. |
| 2E.12 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 204 lines 22 through 24, proposed updates to table references are incorrect. Previous table references are correct. |
| 2E.12 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 204 line 44, update reference for 1A.11 to 1A.05. |
| 2E.14 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 205 line 35, add reference to section 1A.05 for the Standard Highway Signs publication. Agree with the rest of the updates. |
| 2E.18 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 206 line 43, update reference 2D-2 to 2D-4 which is the new figure number for arrows for use on guide signs. |
| 2E.18 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 207 line 4. Requiring overhead signs to have the arrows on the side of the panel will likely create wide signs that may be difficult to place on overhead structures. This option statement does help in cases where an arrow under the legend is needed, but it restricts this for signs at the theoretical gore. We suggest this location requirement be removed to help with flexibility of arrow placement at locations other than theoretical gore. |
| 2E.18 | No | No | Yes | Page 206 line 49. Requiring arrows on ground mount exit direction signs to be centered under the legend instead of to the side as the previous language required will cause an unnecessary cost to update signs to this new standard for little to no benefit. We suggest adding an option statement to allow ground mounts to have arrows to the side of the exiting movement. |
| 2E.18 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 207 line 24, update reference for 1A.11 to 1A.05. |
| 2E.19 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 208 lines 9 and 10. Update references to 2A.17 and 2A.18 to 2A.13 and 2A.14. |
| 2E.22 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 209 line 39, reference to section 2E.10 seems incorrect. |
| 2E.22 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 210 line 42. Reference to detail D of Figure 2E-3 is incorrect. Figure 2E-3 does not have detail labels for each detail. Remove reference to detail or add detail labels to the figure. |
| 2E.24 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 213 line 28 and 38, references to paragraph 3 are incorrect due to changing the order of paragraphs 2 and 3. Update reference to be paragraph 2. |
| 2E.24 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 213 line 43. Update the reference for figure 2E.18 (Guide signs for a single lane exit to the left with a dropped lane) to 2E.17 (Exit Only and Left Sign panels). |
| 2E.25 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 214 line 39, Figure 2E.26 does not have a drop lane in the figure, which contradicts the statement. Remove reference. Agree with the rest of the updates. |
| 2E.26 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 216 line 38, reference to see Figure 2E-15 for narrow exit gore sign, E5-1c, is incorrect, Figure 2E-15 does not show E5-1c sign. |
| 2E.26 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 217 line 3. Reference to Figure 2E-9 is incorrect. Update to Figure 2E-15. Agree with the rest of the updates. |
| 2E.27 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 217 lines 18 and 20, Pull through sign designation has been updated to E6-1 and E6-2 but Figure 2E-16 and Table 2E-1 still indicate sign designations as E6-2 and E6-2a. Correct this discrepancy. |
| 2E.28 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 218 lines 40 and 41 and Page 219 line 8. References to Sections 2B.23 and 2C.43 are incorrect. Update to 2B.31 and 2C.50. |
| 2E.29 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 218 line 17. Update reference 2D.45 to 2D.49 to reflect new organization of MUTCD. Agree with the rest of the updates. |
| 2E.31 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 220 lines 24 and 35. Update reference to 2C.14 to 2C.12 to reflect new organization of MUTCD. Agree with the rest of the updates. |
| 2E.37 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 223 line 38, Update reference to 2C.14 to 2C.12 to reflect new organization of MUTCD. Agree with the rest of the updates. |
| 2E.40 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2E-37, arrows for the exit/through movements are backwards. |
| 2E.40 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 226 line 29, update reference for 1A.11 to 1A.05. |
| 2E.41 |  |  |  | UDOT does not use the diagrammatic sign design anymore. We do not have a preference whether it is maintained or removed. |
| 2E.42 | No | Yes | N/A | UDOT has been using the partial width design for all interchanges except freeway to freeway interchanges where full width APL signs have been used. Consider allowing major interchanges to use the partial width design instead of requiring the full width .It should also be noted that major interchanges have the geometry that necessitates APL signs where most minor or intermediate interchanges don’t. Therefore the distinction between partial and full width is most natural at the break between a major interchange and a system-to-system interchange.  UDOT has had great success in implementing this type of guide sign for our major interchanges. It reduces the cost of the sign and sign structure compared to the full width. Also, UDOT has centered the legend in the sign panel instead of over the exit only arrow without confusion. This practice of centering over the exit only arrow may cause unusually wide signs, likely resulting in larger signs structures that are more expensive. Consider allowing an option to center the legend in the sign panel to avoid unusually wide signs. |
| 2E.42 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2E.47, What is the reason for leaving off the exit only panels on a short aux lane vs a lane drop situation? UDOT has always treated any aux lane/dropped lane as an exit only situation. For consistency, exit only panels should be included on Figure 2E.47 for the APL signs as well as the exit direction sign. Or, an alternative would be add an option statement to this section allowing exit only panels for these situations. Also, a definition for the length of aux lane for each case should be defined. The 2009 MUTCD showed a length of less than 1/2 mile for this case. |
| 2E.43 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 229 line 40, update reference for 2A.17 to 2A.13. |
| 2E.48 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 232 line 28, update the reference to Paragraph 1 of Section 2E.48 to Section 2E.47. Agree with rest of the section. |
| 2E.50 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 234 line 18, Reference for Recreational and Cultural Interest signs is incorrect. Change reference from Section 2K to Section 2M. |
| 2E.53 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 236 line 2. Update reference from Section 2B.60 to 2B.67 to match updated numbering. |
| 2E.53 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 236 lines 21 and 40, update reference to 1A.11 to 1A.05. |
| 2E.53 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 236 line 48, update reference for Auto Tour signs from 2H.07 and 2D.58. |
| 2E.56 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 238 line 26. Update reference to figure 2E-62 to 2E-64. Agree with rest of section |
| 2E.57 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 238 lines 40 and 41. Update reference to figure 2E-63 to 2E-65. Agree with the rest of the new section. |
| 2E.58 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 239 line 4, update reference for 2D.45 to 2D.49. |
| 2E.59 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 239 line 8, update reference for 2B.41 to 2B.49. |
| 2E.59 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 239 line 11, update reference for 2D.46 to 2D.50. |
| 2G.01 | No | Yes | N/A | In paragraph one under support there is reference to bike lanes that may not be needed in consideration of the change proposed. |
| 2G.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Will increasing the vertical distance possibly create visible obstructions for other signs, like median mounted guide signs? |
| 2G.04 | No | Yes | N/A | Figure 2G-1 and 2G-2 seem to indicate that the 1/2 mile spacing for R3-10 and R3-11a is still required and not an options. |
| 2G.05 | No | Yes | N/A | Did not see figures representing R3-14d, R3-14f, R3-11d, R3-11f mentioned on line 50 of page 261 |
| 2G.18 | No | Yes | N/A | If registration in a local program or ETC account is required for HOV traffic to travel in a priced managed lane without being charged a toll, can this information be displayed below the R3-48 sign, similar to the legend on the bottom line of the R3-48a? |
| 2G.18 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 273, lines 49-51, states, “Where registration in a local program or ETC account is required for HOV traffic to travel in a priced managed lane without being charged a toll or by being charged a discounted toll, such information may be displayed on a separate sign within the sequence of the required regulatory and guide signs.” This is becoming a more common scenario on priced managed lanes nationwide. An example of this sign should be provided on Figure 2G-21. The “EXPRESS LANE – HOV 2+ NO TOLL WITH Toll Pass” sign shown on Figure 2G-20 seems to be an appropriate example of this type of supplemental signing and should be shown on this figure |
| 2G.19 | No | Yes | N/A | Could the purple ETC sign be used with the yellow warning? Do not think the post mounted signs are noticeable enough for travelers |
| 2H.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 281 line 38, update the airport sign designation from I-5 to I3-5 to match updated numbering. Agree with the rest of the updates. |
| 2H.10 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 284 lines 22 through 35 refer to these signs as I2-43 and I2-43a where table 2H-1 and figure 2H-4 refer to them as I2-3 and I2-3a. Correct the discrepancy. Agree with rest of updates. |
| 2H.11 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 285 line 23, Update reference to 2A.18 to 2A.14. Page 285 lines 25 and 30, update reference to 2E.31 to 2E.22. Agree with rest of updates. |
| 2H.12 | No | No | Yes | Page 286 line 20. UDOT has used a white on blue enhanced reference location sign design for freeway ramps to help distinguish a ramp mileposting vs a mainline mileposting. These signs aid in emergency dispatch efforts for when a motorist has a hard time describing their location. Consider the use of white on blue designs for ramp locations. |
| 2H.01 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 280, line 11 deletes the reference section 2M, Cultural and Recreational Interest signs. Because they are closely related with General Information Signs, we think this text should be kept as a reference to help clarify for the user. |
| 2H.04 | No | Yes | N/A | Can we use amber color also? It can be more visible to drivers. |
| 2H.13 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 287 line 49, update reference for 1A.13 to 1C.02. Page 288 lines 5 and 14, update reference for 1A.11 to 1A.05. |
| 2H.13 | No | No | Yes | Page 288 lines 35 and 36, this shall condition would require UDOT to update all of their adopt a highway signs to a new design for no benefit. While UDOT would comply with the new requirement, we recommend changing this statement to an option rather than a shall condition to preserve our current designs/process. |
| 2I.15 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 301, line 47. Consider allowing the message LOW as well as FULL to be used when parking spaces reach the lower threshold. |
| 2J.01 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 303, Lines 29-32. All of the references of 24-hour pharmacies are being redacted found in lines 6-7, 23-24 and 26 also on page 304 lines 11-15,23 and 33 . On line 29 of page 303 pharmacies are mentioned even though they have been removed from the list of eligible service. We propose that the reference of pharmacies be removed from line 29. |
| 2J.09 | Yes | No | N/A | NPA # 289 of the Federal Register in the first sentence of the second paragraph says that there is a new figure that is Figure 2J-7. When you look up the new figures it is nowhere to be found. In the revised MUTCD section 2J.09 line 29, it talks about a figure 2J-4. Update to correct reference or include figure. |
| 2J.09 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 309 line 36. The sentence refers to a paragraph in the section, but it doesn't include a paragraph number. Update to the intended paragraph number. |
| 2K.07 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 315 lines 1 and 2. List needs updated since C was deleted, but sentences were not reorganized. |
| 2L.01 | No | Yes | N/A | Support all lines in this proposed change EXCEPT lines 34-47. This language proposes that 'no names or logos of manufacturers, brand or model etc shall be displayed...'; the problem we see with this language is that the majority of, if not all, of the CMS devices currently in use at UDOT have names, logos, brands and models etc on display on the devices. Language should be added to allow legacy devices that already have logos, brands etc to continue to be used. |
| 2L.01 | No | Yes | N/A | Line 52 p316: Advertising, political messages, or other messages not related.. etc  line 43-47: change 'shall' to 'should'. states of emergency are not always made in tandem with a need for wide scale emergency related messaging. an emergency declaration takes time; real time messaging demands for emergencies might be more time sensitive; further some emergency situations could exist where a state of emergency is not declared and messaging should still be allowable in that circumstance |
| 2L.02 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 318 lines 35-37, safety campaign messages should be part of a coordinated effort. This should likelyreference new section 2L.08 as this is duplicated. |
| 2L.02 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 318 lines 43-47, emergency/security messages shouldn't be promotional or advisory in nature. Wouldn’t most messages be "advisory" in nature? We feel the word advisory is confusing here. |
| 2L.02 | Yes | N/A | N/A | Page 319 line 5, Driver Speed Feedback Sign vs Driver Feedback Sign what is conventional? Should we change how we describe these signs. |
| 2L. 08 | No | Yes | N/A | Lines 30-31: language requiring dependency on a calendar outside of agency control should be removed; not practical. Individual states have localized needs for traffic safety campaigns that may or may not be on this calendar. |
| Fig. 2B-10 | No | Yes | N/A | As the figure includes Keep Left signs as well could the title of the Figure be re-worded to state "Passing, Keep Right, Keep Left, and Slow Traffic Signs"? |
| Fig 2B-16 and 2B-17 | Yes | N/A | N/A | Is there a way to combine figures 2B-16 and 2B-17? The issue we run into is some only look at the first figure and not the second. It seems like the signs on 2B-16 could all be added to simplify the application. |