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.* |
| Part 8 | Yes | N/A | N/A | UDOT in general finds the updates to part 8 to be useful except as noted below. |
| 8A.09 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 686, Line 27, Line 29, Line 37 (redlined version), UDOT would prefer that these should condition be a shall – we often deal with local jurisdictions who are resource constrained and won’t do things that are not absolutely required. Also, on line 37, the allowance to close a crossing where the rail lines are covered, but not removed is conflict with the *FRA Guide for Preparing U.S. DOT Crossing Inventory Forms.* Page 5 of that document states “Closed – A location where a previous crossing no longer exists because either the railroad tracks have been physically removed, or each pathway or roadway approach to the crossing has been physically removed, leaving behind no intersection of railroad tracks with either a pathway or roadway. A grade separated highway-rail or pathway crossing that has been physically removed is also considered a closed crossing.” |
| 8B.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 691, lines 10-12 (Redlined version) states lateral offsets as a “shall” condition. UDOT would prefer a “should” condition because of the need for flexibility due to different types of terrain present in Utah. |
| 8B.08 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 696 – lines 12 and 14-16 See comments on 8A.09 above regarding covered or paved over crossings. Covered or paved over crossings are easy to restore to function, and this is not consistent with FRA forms. |
| 8B.16 | No | No | Yes | Page 698, lines 35-36 – While UDOT sees the value of detour signing in certain cases, the guidance of signed detours for low ground clearance crossings is excessive in many cases. For instance not knowing the destination of vehicles using the crossing may make it impossible to determine a detour. |
| 8B.25 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 701, line 31 – After parallel, add “angled, or perpendicular”. Emergency Notification System signs should be able to be parallel, angled, or perpendicular to a roadway or pathway as long as they are visible to roadway user and pathway user. Utah has hundreds of ENS signs that are perpendicular to the roadway or pathway user |
| 8D.10 | No | Yes | N/A | Page 716, line 11 – Annual inspections of the preemption operation and interconnected highway traffic signals is too frequent and would have a major time and fiscal impact. We recommend that the return frequency not be specified, but could accept replacing “at least once per year” with “as needed, but not less than once per three years.” |

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