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 | Yes | N/A | N/A | In general, UDOT supports the changes to Part 9 - they provide a useful and needed update to the MUTCD. |
| 9A.01 | No | No | N/A | Suggest removing the sentence beginning on redline edition page 739 line 19 as it does not seem to support the purpose of the MUTCD and may not supply necessary information. |
| 9A.02 | No | No | N/A | P. 740, line 23: 8 ft vertical clearance is inconsistent with proposed AASHTO standard of 100 inches for operating height and 120 inches operating plus shy vertical clearance. We recommend increasing the vertical clearance to be consistent with AASHTO. |
| 9A.02 | No | Yes | N/A | Table 9A-1. Sign R4-19 size seems incorrect for the layout that is shown in Figure 9B-1. Looks to be a 24x30 instead of a 30x30. |
| 9A.03 | Yes | Yes | N/A | Redline edition page 741, lines 20-21, 29-30: Agree with re-wording and adding of specificity with regards to only requiring retroreflectivity of pavement markings if they must be visible at night. |
| 9A.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Redline edition page 742, line 3 should be two separate sentences. These are two separate topics. |
| 9B.10 | Yes | N/A | N/A | Figure 9B.03 should show the R7-10 sign placement. |
| 9B.11 | Yes | N/A | N/A | Redline edition page 747, lines 11 and 12: reference in support from 9B.20 to 9B.21. |
| 9B.14 | Yes | N/A | N/A | We like the sign name change to put it in the same category as other bicycle signs. The redlined MUTCD is not consistent with the NPA. The NPA uses “Allowed” and the redline edition uses “May”. UDOT prefers “Allowed” because it is a direction to the bicyclist, where as “may” sounds like a warning to drivers. |
| 9B.20 | No | Yes | N/A | MUTCD interchanges bicycle and bicyclist quite a bit. Consider making this consistent across the whole manual. |
| 9D.08 | No | No | Yes | Would have been helpful to have a figure demonstrating the concepts in this section.. There is a lot of information here that could be misunderstood. |
| 9D.12 | No | Yes | N/A | Please clarify the use of orange guide signs in construction zones. Is it allowed? |
| 9D.13 | No | Yes | N/A | In NPA it refers to 9D-6 but should be 9D-7. It is correct on the revised MUTCD. |
| 9E.01 | No | No | Yes | Two thoughts on redline page 767 line 35:  First - we like that lanes striped for bikes should be kept clear for bikes.  Second - we think the proposed language is overly broad. Specific shoulder widths are required on all roads - and we are required to process design exceptions where this is not met. We are uncertain if this would require a design exception to add a bike lane. The function of the shoulder (other than for regular and planned parking) is not significantly impaired by adding a bike lane and the bike lane is not impared if the use is in infrequent emergencies. The shoulder and bike lanes in most cases should be in the same space on our roadways. Please reword or define this such that the shoulder required for infrequent emergency use may also be used as a bicycle lane. |
| 9E.02 | No | No | Yes | The NPA mentions that the bike lane can be on the right of the turn lane only if the signs and signals eliminate potential conflicts. That conflict elimination is not stated or at least not clearly stated in the revised MUTCD - it does mention separate signal heads for the bike lane, but doesn’t indicate a separate bicycle signal phase. |
| 9E.03 | No | Yes | N/A | Redline text page 770 lines 24 and 25 require extensions for buffered or separated bike lanes. The pavement markings for bike lanes through intersections should be optional and not required and would add too much clutter to busy intersections. It would be too confusing for the multiple roadway users. However, we would still like the option to use this feature in less complicated intersections. |
| 9E.09 | No | Yes | N/A | UDOT recommends changing the maximum spacing to 500' instead of 250'. |
| Part 9 General | No | Yes | N/A | A reference to Part 5B.06 should be included somewhere in Part 9. 5B.06 has guidance on physical separation of facilities and it is not currently mentioned in Part 9. |