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.* |
| 2L.01 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2L.01 as follows:   * NCUTCD recommends rearranging some text for clarity. * NCUTCD does not agree with the Support statement defining a changeable message sign to be a traffic control device at all times. There are situations where CMSs, especially portable CMSs, may be used for informative messages not strictly involving traffic control. * Revise the Standard statement on the display of names or logos of manufacturers, brands, or model numbers to only prohibit display of this type of information on the front of a CMS, and allow the display of names or logos of manufacturers, brands, or model numbers on the back side (away from traffic) of CMSs. Some roadway agencies own a number of portable CMSs and it may be helpful to have the manufacturer’s name and/or model number visible to roadway agency personnel as they manage their CMS fleet. * Other edits in accordance with NCUTCD recommendations 14B-GMI-09 and 20B-RW-03. |
| 2L.02 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2L.02, but recommends the following changes:   * Allow exceptions for other types of alerts (Silver and Blue Alerts) required by state statute or executive order. * Add more examples of CMS messages in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 20B-RW-03. * Allow vehicle and license plate information to be displayed as part of AMBER or other alerts. These alerts are less effective or do not make sense if vehicle and license plate information are not displayed. * Delete the text in the Guidance statement regarding unconventional or obscure messages and focus on the types of messages that are expected. * Other editorial changes.   NCUTCD recommends FHWA research the use of a “+” symbol to determine if an alternative legend should be used. |
| 2L.03 | YES | NO | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2L.03 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2L.04 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2L.04 as follows, including some revisions in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 20B-RW-03:   * The specifications proposed in the NPA would produce the required character height (Table 2L-1) only for signs with a particular pixel size and density. NCUTCD recommends removing the content referencing width to height ratio and stroke width to height ratio. NCUTCD instead recommends a reference to NEMA standards that describe letter shape so users can choose the appropriate font to reach the character size requirements in Table 2L-1 for their particular sign. * Delete references to luminance, as this is not measurable from a maintenance and operational standpoint. If this is for the manufactured condition at time of installation, that should be stated, or otherwise delete. * Correct errors in color references. * Supplement the Standard statement to specify that no fixed border other than LED pixels shall be used to make up the border. * Various editorial changes. * FHWA should consider adding a 20 mm (0.79”) pixel pitch font library for alphabet and symbols in the Standard Highway Signs publication. |
| Table 2L-1 | YES | NO | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 2L-1 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2L-1 | NO | YES | N/A | Figure 2L-1, while satisfactorily portraying the differences between full-matrix color and monochrome CMS displays with different pixel densities, should be examined for the appropriateness of the color schemes chosen for the example sign message(s) (“CLOSED, USE ALT ROUTE” See 6I.01 and 6I.03). |
| 2L.05 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2L.05 with minor editorial changes |
| Table 2L-2 | YES | NO | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 2L-2 as presented in the NPA. |
| Table 2L-3 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 2L-3 as presented in the NPA, except that typographic errors should be corrected |
| Table 2L-4 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 2L-4 as presented in the NPA except as follows:   * Line 6: the Improved Message appears to need some formatting work. For example, “Roadwork” should be shown on one line. Also, it appears the balance of the message is missing after the word “Next”. Otherwise, the Potential Message appears to be the better option. * Correct the typographic error in the bottom callout. |
| 2L.06 | NO | NO | YES | NCUTCD recommends deletion of 2L.06 as presented in the NPA, because it is too vague to provide any useful information. |
| 2L.07 | YES | NO | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2L.07 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2L.08 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2L.08 as presented in the NPA with minor editorial changes. |
| 2L.09 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2L.09 in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 20B-RW-03 by adding Support to address active traffic management and editing the item list for clarity. |

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