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. |
| 6B.01 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 6B.01, but recommends deleting the first Guidance paragraph recommending a TTC plan for “any activity”. This could be interpreted as requiring a TTC plan for every possible planned or unplanned activity, which may be impractical and impact agency risk exposure. |
| 6B.02 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 6B.02 as presented in the NPA. |
| 6B.03 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 6B.03 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 6B-1 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 6B-1 as presented in the NPA. |
| 6B.04 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 6B.04 as presented in the NPA. |
| Table 6B-1 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 6B-1 as presented in the NPA. |
| 6B.05 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 6B.05, but recommends editing the Standard for clarity. The reference to "short-term" is inappropriate in this section as the Option statement provides an exception for mobile operations. In addition, the traffic control devices listed in the Standard do not include all the devices that may be used to direct road users out of their normal path. |
| 6B.06 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 6B.06 as presented in the NPA. |
| Table 6B-2 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 6B-2 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 6B-2 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 6B-2 as presented in the NPA. |
| 6B.07 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 6B.07 as presented in the NPA. |
| 6B.08 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 6B.08 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 6B-3 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 6B-3 as presented in the NPA. |
| Table 6B-3 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 6B-3 as presented in the NPA. |
| Table 6B-4 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Table 6B-4 as presented in the NPA. |
| 6B.09 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 6B.09 as presented in the NPA; however, the two Support statements seem to be definitions, and if so should be relocated appropriately and reassigned to Standard status. |

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