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. |
| 3D | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends changing the Chapter 3D title to “Roundabout Markings” |
| 3D.01 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3C.09 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 3D-1 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-1 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 3D-2 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-2 but recommends changing the title from Circular Intersection to Roundabout. |
| Figure 3D-3 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-3 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 3D-4 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-4 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 3D-5 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-5 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 3D-6 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-6 but recommends changing the title from Circular Intersection to Roundabout. |
| Figure 3D-7 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-7 but recommends changing the title from Circular Intersection to Roundabout. |
| Figure 3D-8 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 3D-8 but recommends changing the title from Circular Intersection to Roundabout. |
| 3D.02 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3D.02 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising broken lane line length and gap spacing to 6-9 foot line segments with 3 foot gaps to match what practitioners and agencies are installing at roundabouts, and recommends an editorial change to remove garbled text. |
| 3D.03 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3D.03 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding an Option statement to define dimensions for wide dotted edge line markings installed at roundabouts. |
| 3D.04 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3D.04 as presented in the NPA, but recommends removing the Standard statement requiring yield lines at roundabout entries, as research has not shown the yield lines as effective for multilane roundabouts. NCUTCD recommends revising the Option statement to allow yield lines at all roundabouts, and add references to appropriate figures. |
| 3D.05 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3D.05 as presented in the NPA. |
| 3D.06 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 3D.06 as presented in the NPA, but recommends removing the Guidance statement discouraging lane use arrows in the right lane for two-lane approaches, as research does not support this position. NCUTCD recommends removing the oval symbol from lane use arrows within the circulatory roadway as it is not common practice, and recommends an editorial change to the reference to the Standard Highway Signs publication. |
| 3D.07 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 3D.07 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 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |