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.* |
| All |  |  |  | See other file submitted to docket which shows detailed recommended changes to the draft MUTCD text, figures, and tables. |
| Chapter 2E | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with the organization and Section titles in Chapter 2E in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 11A-GMI-01, but recommends revisions as follows:   * Add the subchapter title "Installation" for Sections 2E.19 through 2E.44 * Add a new Section at the end of the Installation subchapter titled "Guide Signing in Tunnels" comprised of revised and relocated material from 2E.01 * Revise the titles of Section 2E.12, 2E.24, 2E.25, 2E.47, 2E.48; 2E.51, 2E.52 (details and specific revisions listed in the Section list and in each affected Section) |
| 2E.01 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.01 as follows:   * Delete all material in the Section after the end of the first Standard statement and relocate it to a new Section following 2E.44 addressing guide signs in tunnels * Minor editorial revisions as needed on the remaining content |
| 2E.02 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.02 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.03 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.03 as presented in the NPA, but recommends several editorial revisions to section and chapter references. |
| 2E.04 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.04 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.05 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.05 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.06 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.06 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.07 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.07 as follows:   * Minor editorial revisions in the first several paragraphs * Relocate the final Support and Guidance paragraph to Section 2E.21, because the content in the first part of this Section is oriented to guide signing on the freeway for destinations that are far downstream, whereas the content in the subsequent paragraphs relates to guide signing for a destination that can be reached by taking a certain exit, which are two very different concepts |
| Figure 2E-1 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-1 as follows:   * Revise the figure title from “Designation of Destinations for Interchanges in Destination Guide Signing for Opposing Directions of Travel” to “Designation of Destinations for Interchanges in Destination Guide Signing for Opposing Directions of Travel” * Delete the existing figure as presented in the NPA, as the guide signs at the intersection on the conventional roadway are superfluous to the purpose of this figure and add clutter and distraction, the Avandale Exit 241 guide sign image is placed on the opposite side of the freeway from its installed location, and the figure does not acknowledge that there is other Advance Guide signing and Exit Gore signing that would be required * Add a new Figure 2E-1 correctly depicting only the destination guide signing |
| 2E.08 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.08 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.09 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.09 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.10 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.10 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.11 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.10 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the word “alphabet” to “letter and numeral” to conform with terminology used in the titles of Tables 2E-2 and 2E-4, and delete the last sentence as unnecessary. |
| 2E.12 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.12 as follows. Note that paragraph numbers have been assigned to this section due to the complexity of the revisions.   * Revise the Section title from “Size and Style of Letters and Signs” to “Size of Signs and Size and Style of Letters”. * Delete the first part of Standard paragraph 4 and relocate to paragraph 6 in accordance with the 2009 MUTCD. The NPA does not give a justification for the relocation. Returning this paragraph to its original location allows the Section text to be presented in a more logical order; e.g how to determine message dimensions first and then determine outside sign dimensions. * Delete the second part of Standard paragraph 4 entirely so there is no confusion about the nominal loop height ratio when alternate alphabets are used, and nominal loop height is also specified in the Standard Highway Signs publication. * Delete material in the Standard paragraph 5 specifying minimum letter heights, and delete terms that are unclear or undefined. Tables 2E-2 through 2E-5 prescribe letter sizes and in all instances are 8 inches or greater. The term “component of sign legend” is unclear. * Add the Standard material relocated from paragraph 4 to paragraph 6 in accordance with the 2009 MUTCD, and revise to more specifically identify what types of legends are included in “Other word legends”, and revise section references. * Add a new Option Paragraph 8 comprising the Option statement from Appendix A1. This paragraph establishes a new “Series E(modified)-Alternate” designation for the sign alphabet commonly known as “Clearview 5-W”. * Add new Standard Paragraphs 9-11 comprising part of the Standard statement from Appendix A1. This incorporates Standards governing the use of Series E(modified)-Alternate lettering into the main body of the MUTCD in an appropriate location. * Add a new Standard paragraph 12 incorporating the prohibition on negative-contrast text in Interim Approval IA-5 into the MUTCD. * Add a new Option paragraph 13 allowing the use of Series E(modified)-Alternate numerals. Although the numerals in the Standard Alphabets avoid problems with size and fractions, the use of Series E(modified)-Alternate numerals should not be prohibited, as inefficiencies in sign design and manufacture could result. * Revise other paragraphs for section references as required.   NCUTCD also recommends that FHWA add Series E(modified)-Alternate lettering to the Standard Highway Signs publication, provide design and spacing for both what are commonly referred to as “Series 5-W” and “Series 5-W-R” (a condensed spacing of Series 5-W), and state that the Series 5-W-R spacing shall not be used except when replacing a sign on an existing sign structure that has structural constraints which preclude use of Series 5-W lettering, or when overlaying an existing sign panel that has width constraints which preclude use of Series 5-W lettering. |
| Table 2E-1 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Table 2E-1 as follows:   * Revise the title to state “or” instead of “and” * Delete all signs that do not have at least one dimension specified, as there is little reason to include them in a table intended to establish sign sizes * Add exit number plaques mentioned elsewhere in Chapter 2E * Revise “Weigh Station (with arrow)” to “Weigh Station Exit Direction” to be consistent with the sign name used elsewhere in the MUTCD |
| Table 2E-2 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Table 2E-2 as follows:   * Revise the title from “Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes for Expressway Guide Signs According to Interchange Classification” to “Expressway Guide Sign Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes According to Interchange Classification” to make it easier for a reader to select the appropriate table * Add a clarifying sentence at the top of the table to confirm which tables apply to freeways and which apply to expressways * Change “Type of Interchange” to “Interchange Classification” to be consistent with terminology used in MUTCD text, and correct the section reference from 2E.32 to 2E.11 * Add a “post-mounted” column heading to better differentiate from the “overhead” column * Add the word “Exit” before “Gore Signs” to be consistent with the name of the sign used elsewhere in the MUTCD * Refer to upper-case/lower-case text using only the height of the initial upper-case letter, and add to the Minimum Size value a footnote reference to Sec. 2A.08 and 2E.12, as this should reduce lower case text height errors during sign design (see NCUTCD comments on Chapter 2D), and because the lower-case letter heights shown are incorrect for Series E(modified)-Alternate * Remove the footnote that requires overhead signs to use letters larger than in the “overhead” column where a larger size is shown for the interchange classification |
| Table 2E-3 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Table 2E-3 as follows:   * Revise the title from “Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes for Expressway Guide Signs According to Sign Type” to “Expressway Guide Sign Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes According to Sign Type” to make it easier for a reader to select the appropriate table * Add a clarifying sentence at the top of the table to confirm which tables apply to freeways and which apply to expressways * Refer to upper-case/lower-case text using only the height of the initial upper-case letter, and add to the Minimum Size value a footnote reference to Sec. 2A.08 and 2E.12, as this should reduce lower case text height errors during sign design (see NCUTCD comments on Chapter 2D), and because the lower-case letter heights shown are incorrect for Series E(modified)-Alternate |
| Table 2E-4 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Table 2E-4 as follows:   * Revise the title from “Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes for Freeway Guide Signs According to Interchange Classification” to “Freeway Guide Sign Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes According to Interchange Classification” to make it easier for a reader to select the appropriate table * Add a clarifying sentence at the top of the table to confirm which tables apply to freeways and which apply to expressways * Change “Type of Interchange” to “Interchange Classification” to be consistent with terminology used in MUTCD text, and correct the section reference from 2E.32 to 2E.11 * Add a “post-mounted” column heading to better differentiate from the “overhead” column * Add the word “Exit” before “Gore Signs” to be consistent with the name of the sign used elsewhere in the MUTCD * Refer to upper-case/lower-case text using only the height of the initial upper-case letter, and add to the Minimum Size value a footnote reference to Sec. 2A.08 and 2E.12, as this should reduce lower case text height errors during sign design (see NCUTCD comments on Chapter 2D), and because the lower-case letter heights shown are incorrect for Series E(modified)-Alternate |
| Table 2E-5 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Table 2E-5 as follows:   * Revise the title from “Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes for Freeway Guide Signs According to Sign Type” to “Freeway Guide Sign Minimum Letter and Numeral Sizes According to Sign Type” to make it easier for a reader to select the appropriate table. * Add a clarifying sentence at the top of the table to confirm which tables apply to freeways and which apply to expressways. * Change “Type of Interchange” to “Interchange Classification” to be consistent with terminology used in MUTCD text, and correct the section reference from 2E.32 to 2E.11. * Add a “post-mounted” column heading to better differentiate from the “overhead” column * Add the word “Exit” before “Gore Signs” to be consistent with the name of the sign used elsewhere in the MUTCD. * Refer to upper-case/lower-case text using only the height of the initial upper-case letter, and add to the Minimum Size value a footnote reference to Sec. 2A.08 and 2E.12, as this should reduce lower case text height errors during sign design (see NCUTCD comments on Chapter 2D), and because the lower-case letter heights shown are incorrect for Series E(modified)-Alternate. * Adjust the order of the footnotes and correct the references (The table as presented in the NPAhas two footnotes both designated with a single asterisk). * Revise arrow-per-lane sign dimensions as follows. Arrow-per-Lane signs are significantly larger than other forms of guide signing, as the sign must provide an arrow over each lane, and because the through and option arrow heights occupy a large portion of the bottom of the sign panel. Increased sign width and height greatly multiplies both weight and wind load to a support structure and can require a new sign structure that can add costs of up to $500,000 per installation as compared to other types of signs. This is a serious issue for agencies who own and manage these highways. A human factors experiment conducted in 2014 concluded that the height of arrows on Arrow-per-Lane signs using the dimensions in the NPA may be much larger than is needed. Agencies have successfully used the revised dimensions for arrow-per-lane signs with good legibility at a notable cost savings.   + Revise the arrowhead width from 12” to 21.625”.   + Revise the shaft width from 7.75” to 8”.   + Revise the through and option arrow heights from 66” to 42”.   + Revise the left, right, and split arrow heights from 55” to 36”. |
| 2E.13 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.13 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.14 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.14 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.15 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.15 as presented in the NPA, with minor revisions for clarity. |
| 2E.16 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.16 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.17 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.17 as presented in the NPA with very minor editorial revisions. |
| 2E.18 | NO | NO | YES | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.18 as follows:   * Delete the new Standard material that calls for directional arrows on post-mounted Exit Direction signs to be at the bottom of the sign and centered under the legend. NCUTCD does not agree with this change. This is inconsistent with accepted signing practice in many states and contradicts the designs depicted in numerous figures in Part 2. Placing the arrow to the side of the legend on a sign is consistent with human factors guidelines and can reinforce the directionality of that arrow, similar to arrow placement on D1 and other signs. * Add a reference to post-mounted Exit Direction signs to the Option statement, to allow the arrow at the bottom at the discretion of the practitioner or agency. * Other editorial revisions as appropriate. |
| 2E.19 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.19 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| 2E.20 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.20 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Add a reference to new Section 1D.13 to the first Standard paragraph * Revise the third Guidance paragraph on sign supports, as the wording presented in the NPA could be read as contradicting itself |
| 2E.21 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.21 as presented in the NPA, but recommends inserting the two paragraphs relocated from 2E.07, and revising these paragraphs to add examples, improve readability, and delete unclear wording such as “the density of development on sections of the crossroads”. |
| Figure 2E-2 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-2 as follows:   * Revise the title to “Typical Sequence of Interchange Guide Signs” as used in the NPA text * Reduce the roadway to two lanes, since a four-lane freeway (as shown) would likely have very high traffic volumes and it would be unusual to use post-mounted signs for all the Advance Guide signs as depicted * Show the Exit Direction sign as post-mounted and relocate to the beginning of the taper, as depicting the Exit Direction sign as overhead might lead readers think that an overhead mounting is always required * Delete the advisory speed sign as unnecessary on this figure (covered in Chapter 2C) * Revise the first destination on the Post-Interchange Distance sign to “Elmdale 2”, as the top line of the sign shall identify the next meaningful interchange per 2E.47 * Delete all the Specific Service signs and include a note stating “See Section 2J.06 and Figure 2J-2 for locations for Specific Service signs”, as Chapter 2J better addresses these signs |
| 2E.22 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.22 as follows in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 18B-GMI-01:   * Replace the term “interchange number” with “interchange exit number” for clarity throughout this Section, because as the NPA guidance clarifies, an interchange can have a different exit number in opposing directions and as such, the interchange would not have a unique number * Revise the first Support statement by adding “assists road users in” reporting, and change “reporting” to “responding” as responders would not be “reporting” an incident or “reporting to” an incident * Revise the second Standard paragraph to add “departure point” to clarify the term “exit” as being the departure point from the mainline that is being numbered and not a downstream ramp split, and delete “EXIT or EXITS” as this could be misinterpreted to mean either could be used interchangeably * Revise “impracticable” to “impractical” in the third Standard paragraph * Revise the first Guidance statement for clarity, and delete line item 3 as it conflicts with the rest of the guidance in this Section, specifically regarding the use of suffixes * Revise the first two paragraphs in the third Standard statement to Guidance, as many states have exits numbered in ways that do not comply with this new Standard statement, which will result in those states not being in substantial conformance with a Standard, and revising to Guidance allows some latitude   + In the second Standard paragraph revised to Guidance, add an exception for collector-distributor roadways to eliminate confusion * Delete “directly” from the final two Standard paragraphs in the third Standard statement, because some readers might literally interpret “directly” to mean “centered over the right edge”, resulting in inappropriate plaque placement * Add or revise references to other figures as needed * Editorial revisions as needed |
| Figure 2E-3 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-3 as follows:   * Add an example of a ramp split between the first and second examples presented in the NPA * Label the examples A-E for reference, since the NPA makes reference to letter designations for these drawings |
| Figure 2E-4 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-4 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-5 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-5 as follows:   * Add “Exit” in the title * Delete interchanges that are not freeway-to-freeway interchanges, since they are not relevant to the figure, they detract from the intended purpose of the figure; and Figure 2E-3 depicts exit numbering for these interchanges * Add boxes surrounding exit numbers for consistency * Revise “INTERCHANGE NUMBER to INTERCHANGE EXIT NUMBER” in the note |
| Figure 2E-6 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-6 as follows:   * Add “Exit” in the title * Add “LOOP” to I-407 route shields and revise exit numbering consistent with loop routes, since I-407 as depicted would be a loop route * Delete interchanges that are not freeway-to-freeway interchanges, since they are not relevant to the figure, they detract from the intended purpose of the figure; and Figure 2E-3 depicts exit numbering for these interchanges * Add boxes surrounding exit numbers for consistency * Revise “INTERCHANGE NUMBER to INTERCHANGE EXIT NUMBER” in the note |
| Figure 2E-7 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-7 as follows:   * Add “Exit” in the title * Delete interchanges that are not freeway-to-freeway interchanges, since they are not relevant to the figure, they detract from the intended purpose of the figure; and Figure 2E-3 depicts exit numbering for these interchanges * Add “SPUR” to I-303 route shields since I-303 as depicted would be a spur route * Revise the depiction of the lowermost freeway-to-freeway interchange to match the highway geometrics (mirror on vertical axis) * Add boxes surrounding exit numbers for consistency * Revise “INTERCHANGE NUMBER to INTERCHANGE EXIT NUMBER” in the note |
| Figure 2E-8 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-8 as follows:   * Add “Exit” in the title * Delete interchanges that are not freeway-to-freeway interchanges, since they are not relevant to the figure, they detract from the intended purpose of the figure; and Figure 2E-3 depicts exit numbering for these interchanges * Add boxes surrounding exit numbers for consistency * Fix North arrow * Revise “INTERCHANGE NUMBER to INTERCHANGE EXIT NUMBER” in the note |
| 2E.23 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.23 as follows:   * Delete “less than” from the second Guidance paragraph, since Advance Guide signs should be located “well in advance of the exit point” and it is undesirable for an Advance Guide sign to be located less than 1/4 mile from the exit * Delete the entire second sentence from the second Guidance paragraph, since distances in units of feet are not recommended or required on any other freeway guide signs, this guidance introduces non-uniformity on distance units, and many road users may not be able to quickly assess whether (for example) ¼ mile is greater or less than 1000 feet * Delete “directly” from the Standard paragraphs on left exit number plaques, because some readers might literally interpret “directly” to mean “centered over the left edge”, resulting in inappropriate plaque placement * Add “at major interchanges” to the third Standard statement to be consistent with 2E.39 * Delete “series” in the first Option statement since Interchange Sequence signs do not necessarily occur in a series of two or more such signs, and there are instances in which one Interchange Sequence sign could stand alone * Revise the second Guidance statement to delete references to “800 feet” or any specific distance, and instead refer to “insufficient distance” - the 800 feet between gores criterion has no logical basis and is arbitrary, basing the criterion on ‘insufficient distance’ better describes the conditions where Interchange Sequence signs are warranted instead of Advance Guide Signs, and the language as proposed in the NPA could be interpreted to mean that every cloverleaf interchange should have Interchange Sequence signs * Add an Option paragraph allowing the W16-16P or W16-16aP plaque above or below the Advance Guide sign consistent with the 2009 MUTCD |
| Figure 2E-9 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-9 as presented in the NPA, but suggests adding Exit Number plaques mentioned elsewhere in Chapter 2E. |
| 2E.24 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.24 as follows:   * Delete “Series” from the title because there is only one sign in each series. * Revise the first Guidance statement to delete references to “800 feet” or any specific distance, and instead refer to “insufficient distance” - the 800 feet between gores criterion has no logical basis and is arbitrary, basing the criterion on ‘insufficient distance’ better describes the conditions where Interchange Sequence signs are warranted instead of Advance Guide Signs, and the language as proposed in the NPA could be interpreted to mean that every cloverleaf interchange should have Interchange Sequence signs. * Delete the final sentence in the first Guidance statement since the order of paragraphs was changed in the NPA and this sentence is now actually referring to Paragraph 2 and the way that paragraph 2 has been revised in the NPA and as shown, this sentence is no longer needed. * Delete the first sentence in the first Standard paragraph, since the order of paragraphs was changed in the NPA and the first sentence is probably actually referring to Paragraph 2. There are situations in which only one Interchange Sequence sign is used or required. There is no need to specifically “call out” the situations in which only one Interchange Sequence sign is used. * Add “When used in a series of two or more Interchange Sequence signs” to the second sentence in the first Standard paragraph, since there are instances in which there may be only one Interchange Sequence sign. The NPA language would apply only when there is a series of two or more Interchange Sequence signs. * Add “If used in a series of two or more Interchange Sequence signs” to the second Guidance statement, since there are instances in which there may be only one Interchange Sequence sign. The NPA language would apply only when there is a series of two or more Interchange Sequence signs. * Revise section references as needed. |
| Figure 2E-10 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-10 as presented in the NPA, but recommends using the figure title as presented in the figure reference. |
| Figure 2E-11 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-11 as presented in the NPA, but recommends using the figure title as presented in the figure reference. |
| 2E.25 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.25 as follows:   * Delete “E4 Series” from the title * Revise the second Guidance paragraph as follows:   + Revise “deceleration lane (see Figure 2E-14)” to “taper”   + Add “When mounted overhead, the Exit Direction sign should be installed over the exiting lane in the vicinity of the theoretical gore.” to make the language consistent with the illustrations in Figure 2E-14 * Revise the final two paragraphs in the second Standard statement from “to” to “above” to be consistent with NPA proposed language in other Sections * Delete “In the interest of sign spreading (see Section 2E.43), more than two signs on one structure should not be used” in the third Guidance statement, since it is inconsistent with Section 2E.43 which states “the Exit Direction sign should be the only guide sign used in the vicinity of the gore (other than the Exit Gore sign)” * Add an Option paragraph allowing the W16-16P or W16-16aP plaque above or below the Advance Guide sign consistent with the 2009 MUTCD * Revise numerous section references as needed |
| Figure 2E-12 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-12 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-13 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-13 as presented in the NPA, but recommends using the figure title as presented in the NPA text. |
| Figure 2E-14 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-14 as follows:   * Revise the order of the three drawings so that they are in a more logical order (shortest deceleration lane to longest) by switching the center and right drawings * Add a double asterisk for a double asterisk footnote at the bottom of the figure that reads “If mounted overhead, the Exit Direction sign should be installed over the exiting lane in the vicinity of the theoretical gore (see Section 2E.25)” * Fix typo in dimension |
| 2E.26 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.26 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Add “or departs from a collector-distributor roadway” to the second Standard sentence to add this situation to the Standard * Revise “interchange numbering” to “interchange exit numbering” |
| Figure 2E-15 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-15 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding the E5-1c sign to the figure. |
| 2E.27 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.27 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Verify sign designations, as they are not consistent with Figure 2E-16 * Add “full width” to Guidance to distinguish from “partial width” Overhead APL signs in 2E.42 * Add a new Standard paragraph requiring a route shield and cardinal direction for the through route * Add an Option statement allowing control cities and down arrows |
| Figure 2E-16 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-16 as presented in the NPA, but recommends verifying sign designations as they are not consistent with Section 2E.27, and adding an example of a sign with down arrows, such as the I-480 Hamilton sign in Figure 2E-20. |
| 2E.28 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.28 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Split the Standard and Option statements into two subsections for Advance Guide Signs and Exit Direction signs to make clear which material applies to each sign type * Delete prescriptive wording on Exit Direction sign format, as this is inconsistent with the rest of Part 2 and covered elsewhere * Delete reference to the W9-7 in the final Guidance paragraph, since the deleted Guidance is inconsistent with Section 2C.50 * Other minor editorial and reference revisions as needed |
| Figure 2E-17 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-17 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-18 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-18 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-19 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-19 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-20 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends replacing Figure 2E-20 with a new figure to correct the following problems:   * Signs display more than two destinations, which is discouraged by Section 2E.15 * Signs display both a city name and a street name, which is discouraged by Section 2E.15 * The Advance Guide sign at ¼ mile should be labeled as “Optional” * The Pull-Through sign should be labeled as “Optional” * The W4-3R and W13-2 signs are not needed on this figure (addressed in Chapter 2C) |
| Figure 2E-21 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-21 as follows:   * Revise the EXIT ONLY panel on the Exit Direction sign to place the arrow between the words EXIT and ONLY, as this is the “standard” application * Delete the “FOR” on the W9-7 in accordance with NCUTCD recommendations on Chapter 2C * Revise the lower panel on the ¼ mile advance guide sign to read “RIGHT LANE EXIT ONLY” to be consistent with the revised W9-7 legend |
| Figure 2E-22 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-22 as presented in the NPA, but recommends labeling the ¼ mile Advance Guide sign as optional. |
| Figure 2E-23 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends replacing Figure 2E-23 with a new figure revised as follows:   * Revise title to “Examples of Signing for Mainline Lane Terminations Downstream of an Exit Ramp” * Revise “At Exit Ramp” caption to “Immediately after exit ramp” * Revise “Within Interchange” caption to “Farther downstream from exit ramp” * Replace W9-2 with W9-1 for consistency with Chapter 2C * Revise overhead sign to read “LANE ENDS 500 FEET” and delete “MERGE LEFT” * Delete the overhead sign option with the arrow splitting the distance message * Revise the callout on the Exit Direction sign location in the right-hand example to reduce confusion * Show all signs and dimensions consistently with other Figures in other chapters of the MUTCD related to lane ends signing and markings |
| 2E.29 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.29 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-24 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends replacing Figure 2E-24 with a new figure revised as follows:   * Revise the basic signing condition to depict a standard through freeway and not a freeway termination * Remove signing for a second freeway, as it unnecessarily complicates the figure * Include exit numbering on the primary freeway * Revise and simplify leader lines so as not to be confused with roadway lines |
| Figure 2E-25 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-25 as presented in the NPA, but recommends labeling the gore signs as optional. |
| 2E.30 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.30 as presented in the NPA with a minor figure reference revision. |
| Figure 2E-26 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-26 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising “Examples” in the figure title to “Example” and correct the section reference to 2D.17. |
| 2E.31 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.31 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-27 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-27 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising “Examples” in the figure title to “Example” and correct the section reference to read “See Figures 2D-16 through 2D.18…”. |
| 2E.32 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.32 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-28 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-28 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising “Examples” in the figure title to “Example” and correct the section reference to read “See Figures 2D-16 through 2D.18…”. |
| 2E.33 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.33 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-29 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-29 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising “Examples” in the figure title to “Example” and correct the section reference to read “See Figure 2D-20…”. |
| 2E.34 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.34 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Revise the first Guidance sentence on collector-distributor road signing for clarity * Other minor editorial revisions as needed |
| Figure 2E-30 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-30 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising “Examples” in the figure title to “Example” and correct the section reference to read “See Figure 2D-20…”. |
| 2E.35 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.35 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-31 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-31 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising “Examples” in the figure title to “Example” and correct the section reference to read “See Figure 2D-19…”. |
| 2E.36 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.36 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Add a reference to 2J.09 for general and specific service signs * Delete the final Guidance paragraph referencing Chapter 2J, since adding the above reference is sufficient and more concise * Other minor editorial revisions |
| Figure 2E-32 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-32 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Revise “Example” in the figure titles to “Examples” * Delete the General Service signs and Specific Service signs from Sheet 2 because that signing is adequately illustrated in Figure 2J-4 |
| 2E.37 | NO | YES | N/A | * NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.37 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows: * Define “off-route movement” in the second Support paragraph, add figure references, and revise “expectancy” to “driver expectancy” * Delete exception callouts for Sections 2E-40 and 2E-41 in the second Standard paragraph, since it duplicates the content of the subsequent sentence. |
| Figure 2E-33 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-33 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding labels for I-17 on sheet 2 similar to sheet 1. |
| 2E.38 | NO | YES | N/A | Section 2E.38 Comments: NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.38 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 11A-GMI-02:   * Revise the first Standard paragraph to Guidance * Revise the fourth Standard paragraph to Support |
| Figure 2E-34 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-34 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.39 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.39 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 11A-GMI-02:   * Revise the first part of the Standard paragraph to Guidance, since there may be situations, such as urban areas with closely spaced interchanges, where it is impractical to use Overhead Arrow-per-Lane or diagrammatic signs * Revise the second (now first) Standard paragraph to add diagrammatic and arrow-per-lane alternatives for option splits * Revise the second Guidance paragraph to agree with Section 2E.42 |
| 2E.40 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.40 as follows:   * Revise the first Standard paragraph to delete “may be replaced” and add “continue to be used”, because the text as presented in the NPA could be misinterpreted as allowing an Arrow-per-Lane guide sign on the existing sign structure at the theoretical gore, which is not where an Overhead APL should be located * Revise the second Standard paragraph to agree with the preceding paragraphs and allow use of alternative signing as appropriate * Revise the second Option paragraph to delete references to “narrow lane marking tapers” as that term is unclear, and to better define when destination-by-lane signing should be used * Revise the third Standard statement as follows:   + Delete the requirement for one arrow per lane from the first sentence, as it is covered in list item A   + Add an exception referencing Section 2E.42 to list item A to address partial-width APL signs and note upward arrows can be straight or curved   + Split the last part of list item A on arrow position into a separate list item, so that the “Except as provided” clause does not affect “The shaft of the arrow…approximate center…” phrase   + Delete wording in list item B referencing degree of curvature, as the actual roadway curvature can be very gradual and all APL arrows use a standardized design   + Delete the sentence in list item C referencing E11-1 panels, since Section 2E.38 states “Where one roadway of the split carries the through route, the other roadway of the split shall be signed as an exit” and a split of two overlapping routes where neither of the diverging routes is designated as an exit could not exist, and there are no figures in the MUTCD which illustrate a split where neither of the routes is designated as an exit   + Delete wording in list item E referencing degree of curvature (see B above)   + Revise List item I to agree with wording in Section 2E.23 |
| Figure 2E-35 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-35 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-36 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-36 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-37 | NO | NO | YES | NCUTCD recommends deleting Figure 2E-37 as presented in the NPA, as using curved arrows for a geometrically straight movement and straight arrows for a geometrically curved movement contradicts driver expectations, violates guidance for arrows elsewhere in the MUTCD, violates Standards in 2E.40, and is inconsistent with other Chapter 2E figures.  NCUTCD recommends adding a new Figure 2E-37 based on Figure 2E-5 in the 2009 MUTCD, but revising the figure by deleting the TO auxiliary plaque and cardinal direction. |
| Figure 2E-38 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-38 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figures 2E-39 and 2E-40 | NO | NO | YES | NCUTCD recommends deleting Figures 2E-39 and 2E-40 as presented in the NPA and replacing with a single figure. There are very few differences in the roadway geometrics other than the fact that Figure 2E-40 has one more lane on the left than does Figure 2E-39. Both have narrow gores and the pavement markings for the option lane are virtually identical. Figure 2E-39 is labelled as a split with an option lane while Figure 2E-40 is labelled as a two lane exit with an option lane. “Split” is an undefined term in the MUTCD and the term is used inconsistently in Chapter 2E, such that the word “Split” appears to have different meanings in different passages. There do not seem to be sufficient differences in these two examples to justify two different figures and differences in signing for the two situations.  Specific problems with Figure 2E-39:   * The figure title is inconsistent between the NPA text and figure documents. * The multiple roadway segments with matchlines detracts from the illustration. The middle graphic is the essential graphic, which shows the APL sign as the Exit Direction sign and the overhead signs downstream as the additional signs for positive guidance. The middle graphic would be sufficient. * The Advance Arrow Per Lane signs violate the Standard in Section 2E.40 which states “Arrows for continuing through lanes shall be vertically upward pointing unless those lanes are on a significantly curved alignment beyond the theoretical gore”, since neither alignment is significantly curved beyond the theoretical gore. * The downstream sign for Camden/EXIT 30 should have an EXIT ONLY panel at the bottom. * The Exit Gore sign labelled E5-1c violates the Standard statement in Section 2E.26 which says, “An Exit Gore sign…shall display…an appropriate upward slanting arrow.” In Standard Highway Signs the E5-1c sign is shown with an upward slanting arrow. * “Theoretical Gore” is misspelled.   Specific problems with Figure 2E-40:   * The figure title is inconsistent between the NPA text and figure documents. * The multiple roadway segments with matchlines detracts from the illustration. The middle graphic is the essential graphic, which shows the APL sign as the Exit Direction sign and the overhead signs downstream as the additional signs for positive guidance. The middle graphic would be sufficient. * The downstream sign for Penniman/EXIT 9 should have an EXIT ONLY panel at the bottom. * The use of TO for a connection like this is inconsistent with general guide signing practice. * “Theoretical Gore” is misspelled. * Figure 2E-40 is not referenced in Chapter 2E as presented in the NPA.   NCUTCD recommends adding a new Figure 2E-39 without the problems inherent in the NPA figures. |
| 2E.41 | NO | YES | N/A | Section 2E.41 Comments: NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.41 as presented in the NPA, and recommends retaining the Section, revising as follows:   * Delete the second sentence in the first Support statement. Diagrammatic signs have not been shown to be less effective than conventional or Overhead Arrow-per-Lane guide signs. In NCHRP Project 20-7 (155) a sign configuration using diagrammatic signs performed best, and better than a partial width Overhead Arrow-per-Lane sign. A paper presented at the 2015 Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting (“Arrow-per-Lane Guide Sign Research, Revisited”) showed that in a human factors study a diagrammatic sign performed better than an Overhead Arrow-per-Lane sign when “correct lane choice” was the measure of effectiveness. * Revise the final sentence of the second Standard statement for clarity.   NCUTCD also recommends revising dimensions for two-headed diagrammatic arrows shown in the “Standard Highway Signs” publication. Increasing the width of each lane and increasing the width of the black lane marking images would more clearly show the number of lanes on the approach roadway, may result in longer legibility distances, and result in better understanding of which destination(s) can be reached by each lane. These larger dimensions were used in NCHRP Project 20-7 (155).  An example: |
| Figure 2E-41 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-41 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-42 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-42 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-43 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-43 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-44 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-44 as presented in the NPA, but recommends correcting the leader lines from the topmost sign bridge to the topmost sign. |
| 2E.42 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.42 as follows to provide greater clarity and a logical progression of text:   * Use the term “partial-width” instead of “modified” to describe these APL signs in accordance with Figure 2E-45 * Extensively revise the first Guidance paragraph to describe where a partial-width APL is appropriate and clarify arrows as vertical or curved, since the text as presented in the NPA is unclear and easily subject to misinterpretation * Delete the “to avoid the implication that the through route is restricted to the option lane” text in the first Standard statement, as it is a Support statement in a Standard, and may not be supported by past NCHRP research and current Pooled Fund research * Add an Option paragraph immediately following the Standard allowing conventional signing where APL signs are not practical * Revise the following Option statement to allow the use of existing signs (similar to 2E.40) * Delete the first paragraph in the second Guidance statement, and add “When conventional signing is used” to the following paragraph to simplify the text * Delete “Where the modified Overhead Arrow-per-Lane guide signs are not used” from the final Guidance paragraph to allow more general use of R3-8 signs |
| Figure 2E-45 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-45 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-46 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-46 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the alternative for “existing sign structure retained” to use an inset box instead of depicting on the same figure as the APL sign to improve clarity and reduce confusion. |
| Figure 2E-47 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-47 as presented in the NPA, but recommends deleting the city name on the signs to agree with Section 2E.15 regarding mixing of street names and city names. |
| Figure 2E-48 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-48 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the figure title to “Example of Conventional Signing for a Two-Lane Intermediate or minor Interchange Exit with an Option Lane and a Dropped Lane.” |
| Figure 2E-49 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-49 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the title to “Example of Conventional Signing for a Two-Lane Intermediate or Minor Interchange Exit with an Option Lane and an Auxiliary Lane” and deleting the city name on the signs to agree with Section 2E.15 regarding mixing of street names and city names. |
| 2E.43 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.43 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Delete “Except as provided otherwise for cloverleaf interchanges (see Section 2E.33)” from Guidance list item A, as other content in the Section addresses conditions at a cloverleaf interchange, and calling out only cloverleaf interchanges could add confusion * Other editorial revisions as needed |
| Figure 2E-50 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-50 as presented in the NPA, but recommends reducing the width of the full-width exit number plaques and revising the distance on one sign. |
| 2E.44 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.44 as presented in the NPA. |
| Section 2E.XX (new) | N/A | N/A | N/A | New Section 2E.XX Comments: NCUTCD recommends creating a new Section titled “Guide Signing in Tunnels” at the end of the “Installation” subchapter comprised of material relocated from Section 2E.01 and revised as follows:   * Revise the first Support paragraph as follows:   + Relocate the wording “in tunnels” for clarity   + Delete text that references signs other than guide signs   + Replace “standardized” with “typical”, as sign layouts are generally illustrative figures   + Other editorial revisions for clarity * Revise Option list item B as follows:   + Clarify placement of right-hand and left-hand exit number plaques   + Add “not less than” in front of letter heights to allow taller text if it can be accommodated   + Delete “while maintaining the standard vertical layout” as there is no standard for this * Revise Option list item C as follows:   + List only a 10.67” minimum letter height to allow taller text if it can be accommodated   + Delete “fewer visual distractions”, as it isn’t a controlling factor * Revise the second Support statement to clarify the specific issue of dirt and residue in a tunnel * Revise the first Guidance paragraph to list both external and internal sign illumination * Revise “exit from” to “end of” in the second Guidance paragraph, as the term “exit” is associated with an offramp, not a portal |
| 2E.45 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.45 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-51 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-51 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.46 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.46 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| 2E.47 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.47 as presented in the NPA, but recommends minor revisions in the title and section references. |
| Figure 2E-52 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-52 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.48 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2E.48 as presented in the NPA, with minor editorial revisions to the title and text and reordering some of the content to present the information more logically. |
| Figure 2E-53 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-53 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.49 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.49 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-54 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2E-54 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Revise title to “Travel Time Signs” * Revise the label for the upper signs to “Distance and Travel Time” * Add sign designations |
| 2E.50 | NO | YES | N/A | General comments:   * Roadway agencies have placed pictographs on guide signs for decades. If this option is prohibited, agencies will likely be in nonconformance with the MUTCD because it is unlikely that agencies using pictographs will remove them. The political pressures by governmental bodies and institutions to retain their identities on these signs will be high. * Research on pictographs revealed very little negative impact when one pictograph was added to a guide sign, but distraction increased significantly when three pictographs were displayed.   NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.50 as follows. Note that paragraph numbers have been assigned to this section due to the complexity of the revisions.   * Delete Guidance paragraph 2, as supplemental guide signs are commonly used at many interchanges. * Change “information” to “names” in Guidance paragraph 5 to be consistent with other text in the statement. * Delete Standard paragraph 8, as it conflicts with Guidance elsewhere in the Section and could result in political pressure to accommodate four destinations on most or all supplemental signs. * Add an Option statement as paragraph 11A consistent with Option text in the 2009 MUTCD describing pictographs. * Add a Guidance statement as paragraph 11B recommending only one pictograph per sign based on research findings. * Delete Standard paragraph 12 prohibiting pictographs on supplemental guide signs. * Revise a section reference in paragraph 13. * Add a new Standard paragraph 13A consistent with Standard text in the 2009 MUTCD defining dimensions for pictographs. * Delete the second sentence in Standard paragraph 14, as it is addressed in new Standard paragraph 13A. * Add a new Standard paragraph 14A requiring compliance with Section 1A.04. |
| Figure 2E-55 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-55 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-56 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-56 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.51 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.51 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-57 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-57 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-58 | NO | NO | YES | NCUTCD recommends deleting Figure 2E-58 as presented in the NPA and replacing with a new figure.  Problems with Figure 2E-58 as presented in the NPA:   * Some signs have three destinations or mix street names and city names, which violates Section 2E.15. * Showing “Third Ave” may be misinterpreted as a recommendation or requirement to use words instead of numbers for numbered streets, roads, or avenues.   NCUTCD recommends adding a new Figure 2E-58 titled “Examples of Use of a Community Interchanges Sign and a Next Exit Sign” depicting the use of either a Community Interchanges or Next Exis sign without (some of) the problems inherent in the NPA figure. |
| 2E.52 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.52 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2E-59 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-59 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding the E9-3 designation to the sign. |
| Figure 2E-60 | NO | NO | YES | NCUTCD recommends deleting Figure 2E-60 as presented in the NPA.  Problems with Figure 2E-60:   * The likelihood of incorrect use of Next Exits signs seems low. The NCUTCD-recommended new version of Figure 2E-58 could address both Next Exits and Community Interchanges signs. * Some signs have three destinations or mix street names and city names, which violates Section 2E.15. * Showing “Third Ave” may be misinterpreted as a recommendation or requirement to use words instead of numbers for numbered streets, roads, or avenues. * The figure depicts cardinal directions, but is missing a north arrow. * Although the MUTCD has no provisions specifying the location of the cardinal direction on a guide sign, the Main St EAST Exit Direction sign is inconsistent with Exit Direction signs throughout this Chapter. * Signing Exit 147 B only as “Downtown” is questionable because some road users may not realize that this is also Main Street West. |
| 2E.53 | NO | YES | N/A | Section 2E.53 Comments: NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.53 as follows:   * Delete the second sentence of the first Support paragraph because permanent signing is generally not installed for a temporary facility * Add “or Inspection” to the second Support paragraph because many of these facilities are now designated as inspection stations * Add the WEIGH STATION NEXT RIGHT sign to list item B in the first Standard statement * Add an Option paragraph allowing omitting the weigh station exit gore sign where overhead signing is provided * Revise the Option and second Standard statement to allow alternate sign legends to better identify the purpose of the station * Add a specific reference to the D8-1 or D8-2 sign for placement of open/closed messages * Revise the final Guidance statement for placement of open/closed messages to be consistent with Section 2D.51 |
| Figure 2E-61 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2E-61 as follows:   * Add a D8-1 with ½ MILE distance next to the D8-2 as an acceptable alternate * Delete the note adjacent to the R13-1 sign that allows white on black to be consistent with Section 2B.67 * Revise the first note as follows:   + Delete the words “within the sign border” and replace with “on the sign”   + Revise the word “should” to “shall” to conform with the text   + Revise “changeable message element” to “sign or plaque with a changeable legend display” to conform with the text * Revise the second note to read “An alternative legend may be substituted for WEIGH STATION on all the D8 series signs” * Delete the final note |
| 2E.54 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.54 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-62 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-62 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.55 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.55 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-63 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-63 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.56 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.56 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2E-64 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2E-64 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.57 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2E.57 to delete the Option statement, because exit numbers are not appropriate for an at-grade intersection with conventional turning movements, the use of the term EXIT violates driver expectancy, and this signing may be infeasible where there are numerous intersections. |
| Figure 2E-65 | NO | NO | YES | NCUTCD recommends deleting Figure 2E-65 as presented in the NPA, because exit numbers are not appropriate for an at-grade intersection with conventional turning movements, the use of the term EXIT violates driver expectancy, and this signing may be infeasible where there are numerous intersections. |
| 2E.58 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.58 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2E.59 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2E.59 as presented in the NPA. |

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