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.* |
| 2B.21 | NO | YES | N/A | Recommend retaining 85th percentile speed as recommended practice. Most ‘expert systems’ software continues to use this as a significant factor in recommendations, and including it here increases transparency of the process. Recommend expanding or clarifying language regarding “urban areas” because the definition in this Manual uses speed as a criteria to define what is an urban area creating a circular definition which could be misinterpreted. |
| 2C.52 | YES | N/A | N/A | Support removal of ‘Share the Road’ sign; this sign is interpreted differently by different people and leads to confusion. |
| 3A.04 | NO | NO | YES | The requirement for 6” lines on roadways over 40 mph does not appear to be entirely supported by research, and further will effectively require 6” markings through many lower-speed zones as it is not practical to change line widths every time a rural highway passes through a village or other reduced speed zone. This will come at significant additional lifetime cost as the material usage will be much higher for each reapplication of markings. |
| 3G.01 | NO | NO | YES | Do not agree with inclusion of this section. Aesthetic crosswalk treatments are not as visible as block or ladder markings in white, and may be more difficult to detect for persons with limited vision. |
| 4C.02 | NO | NO | YES | Do not support. Existing language allows adequate flexibility for engineering judgement in signal installation; this change will only serve to increase confusion about what to do when signals are desired but not warranted. |
| 4D.01 | NO | YES | N/A | Consider revising to clarify that the signal needs to take into consideration all modes of traffic that might use the intersection. Current wording could be interpreted to require bicycle or pedestrian features at an intersection where pedestrian or bicycle traffic is prohibited by law. |
| 9B.15 | NO | YES | N/A | Consider clarifying reference to ‘shoulder usable by bicyclists’; this is not well defined and could lead to confusion or misunderstanding. |
| 9E.13 | NO | YES | N/A | Consider revising this from a ‘shall’ condition to a ‘should’ condition to allow for context-appropriate treatments of crossings, particularly with regard to speeds and volumes on the roadway being crossed. Consider clarifying whether ‘shared use paths’ is intended to include rail trails for this section. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**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**) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |