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.* |
| 3A.04 | NO | N/A | N/A | The definition of “normal width line” should be 6” for roads with ADT >= 6000. For roads with less than 6000 ADT, a 4” line should be allowed. If 6” wide lines are required for all roads >40 mph, then some agencies will decide not to have any pavement markings on roads <6000 ADT (typically collector roads) due to the increased material costs of the wider lines. This would result in reduced safety on lower trafficked roads. |
| 3B.09 | NO | N/A | N/A | The Guidance statement on lines 9 & 10 should instead be converted to a Support statement about the desirability of 6” wide edge lines. While I agree with the concept of 6” wide edge lines, and the Guidance statement is not a mandate, I fear that some agencies will elect to forgo edge lines for roads <6000 ADT due to the increased material costs. This would negatively impact safety on lower trafficked roads by eliminating the guidance provided by edge lines. |
| 8B.24 | YES | N/A | N/A | I like the option of mounting a ROUGH CROSSING plaque below the grade crossing advance warning signs |
| 2B.21 | YES | N/A | N/A | I like that a speed distribution study is now recommended in a Guidance statement rather than mandated. |
| 6D.06 | NO | N/A | YES | In Line 14 regarding flagger stations, this should remain a “shall” condition |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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