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. |
| 3C.01 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3C.01, but recommends revising the Standard statement on non-intersection crosswalks to a Support statement noting the markings establish such a crosswalk. Also, NCUTCD would like FHWA to clarify if “non-intersection” refers to a mid-block crossing. |
| 3C.02 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3C.02 as presented in the NPA with a minor editorial revision to Guidance bullet “E”. |
| 3C.03 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3C.03 as presented in the NPA with a minor editorial revision to the paragraph number in the second Standard statement. |
| 3C.04 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3C.04 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 3C-1 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 3C-1, but recommends revising to show a minimum 6 foot crosswalk width in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 11A-MRK-01. NCUTCD also recommends renaming “perpendicular” crosswalks as “ladder” crosswalks, as this is the more commonly-used term for this crosswalk marking pattern. |
| 3C.05 | NO | YES | N/A | Section 3C.05 Comments: NCUTCD generally agrees with 3C.05 as presented in the NPA with a minor editorial revision, but recommends renaming “perpendicular” crosswalks as “ladder” crosswalks, as this is the more commonly-used term for this crosswalk marking pattern. |
| 3C.06 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3C.06 as presented in the NPA, with a minor editorial correction to reference Figure 3C-1. |
| 3C.07 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3C.07 as presented in the NPA, but recommends renaming “perpendicular” crosswalks as “ladder” crosswalks, as this is the more commonly-used term for this crosswalk marking pattern. |
| 3C.08 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3C.08 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding a figure reference and revising the Standard statement to an Option statement to allow transverse lines with longitudinal bar pair crosswalks. |
| 3C.09 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3C.09 as presented in the NPA. |
| 3C.10 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3C.10 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the Guidance statement discouraging high-visibility markings for diagonal crosswalks to an Option statement allowing this treatment. |
| Figure 3C-2 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3C-2 as presented in the NPA. |
| 3C.11 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3C.11 as presented in the NPA, but recommends changing the term “Diamond Interchanges with a Transposed Alignment Crossroad” to the commonly-used “Diverging Diamond Interchanges”. |
| 3C.12 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3C.12 as presented in the NPA. |

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