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. |
| 8A.01 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 8A.01 as presented in the NPA, but offers an editorial change to add “pathways or sidewalks” in the Standard statement about private at grade crossings because not all private at grade crossings are roadways. |
| 8A.02 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 8A.02 as presented in the NPA, but offers editorial corrections to change “all types of road users” to “road users” because “road users” is already defined in Section 1C.02. |
| 8A.03 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.03 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.04 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.04 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.05 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.05 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.06 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.06 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.07 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.07 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.08 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.08 as presented in the NPA, but offers editorial changes to change “distance” to “shortest distance” to clarify the proper measurements if grade crossings are not parallel to each other, and to clarify the property measurement between adjacent grade crossing is between the inside rails. |
| 8A.09 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.09 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.10 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.10 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.11 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.11 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.12 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends restoring the Standard statements from the 2009 MUTCD to require an engineering study of a circular intersection within 200 feet of a grade crossing. NCUTCD also recommends adding a Guidance statement so that the Diagnostic Team is involved in reviewing the findings of the engineering study to determining the measures to clear queues from the grade crossing. |
| 8A.13 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 8A.13 as presented in the NPA. |
| 8A.14 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends deleting the Guidance statement about temporary traffic control near a grade crossing because it duplicates an existing Standard statement in Section 6N.17, deleting the Guidance statement about prolonging the closure of a grade crossing because it is ambiguous, and deleting the Guidance statement about the grade crossing surface because it does not deal with traffic control devices. NCUTCD also recommends revising Guidance statements to clarify the situations at an active grade crossing when a uniformed law enforcement offer should be used and to involve the railroad company or transit agency in the traffic control planning process. |

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