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.* |
| Part 1 | YES |  |  | Agree with removing the history of the MUTCD and posting this on the MUTCD website for those who are interested. |
| 1A.01 | YES |  |  | Agree with the support statement that makes up Section 1A.01 because this would be useful to explain the MUTCD to legislators, management, local agencies, or the public as to the purpose of the MUTCD. |
| 1A.03 | YES |  |  | Agree with defining the target users and the definitions as given. |
| 1A.04 |  | YES |  | Line 6, page 4, need to change “a” to “as” so it reads: “…would be referenced in writing as…” |
| 1B.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the added Standard in lines 14 – 16 on page 8 that states, “policies, directives, specifications, standard drawings, or similar documents related to traffic control devices that are issued by an agency shall be considered as supplements to the MUTCD and shall be in substantial conformance with the National MUTCD.” Every traffic control device on a public road open to public travel is required to be in substantial conformance with the MUTCD. By creating a Standard requiring all agency documents related to traffic control devices to be considered supplements to the MUTCD, are we now requiring every individual policy or change to a standard drawing to go through review by division FHWA offices? Per 23 CFR 655.603 (as referenced), “The FHWA Division Administrators shall approve the State MUTCDs and supplements that are in substantial conformance with the National MUTCD.” This would severely hinder updates to agency policies, directives, specifications, standard drawings, and similar documents, for something that should already be required (substantial conformance with the MUTCD) based on the existing language and CFR. |
| 1B.06 |  | YES |  | Line 17, page 12, need to change the first period to a space so “protected.by” becomes “protected by” |
| 1B.08 |  | YES |  | Lines 1 & 2 on page 14 – it appears the word “and” is missing. It should read “…and shall furnish this information to the State.” |
| 1C.02 |  | YES |  | Line 12, page 18, should there be an “and” before “crash cushions”? |
| 1C.02 |  | YES |  | Line 48, page 18, change the sentence from “Driving aisle provide a one-way or two-way travel” to “Driving aisles provide one-way or two-way travel.” |
| 1C.02 |  | YES |  | Lines 24 – 31 on page 23, should LRT and BRT be shown in parentheses next to the first time they are used in this definition? BRT is particularly difficult to determine in this sentence if one didn’t know the acronym. |
| 1C.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the change to definition 68 – Engineer in line 28 on page 19 to just refer to Professional Engineer. Also disagree with the changes to definition 69 – Engineering Judgment in line 33 on page 19 and definition 70 – Engineering Study in line 41 on page 19 to require a professional engineer. These changes should not be made. Professional Engineers should not be required by the MUTCD for all references to engineer, engineering judgment, and engineering study. It should be up to the individual states to determine when a professionally licensed engineer is required for certain work. There are often situations or decisions where engineering judgment by someone trained in the principles of engineering (without professional licensure) should be sufficient. For example, in order to use engineering judgment for temporary traffic control changes, DOTs should not need to only hire professional engineers to monitor construction projects.  This also could have the effect of getting less compliance with the manual from local agencies than even today. Many small communities do not have engineering staff and rely on their local DOT or LTAP office for assistance. Does this requirement discourage them further from attempting to conform to the manual? Now even these engineering support staff might not be licensed and able to assist them. |
| 1C.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with adding Definition 176 – Professional Engineer (P.E.). A PE should not be required for all engineering judgment or engineering study. The states make determinations on when a PE is required for different activities. Delete this definition from the manual. |
| 1D.01 |  | YES |  | Is the reference to Paragraph 5 of Section 1A.03 on line 32 of page 34 correct? There doesn’t appear to be five paragraphs in Section 1A.03. |
| 1D.04 |  | YES |  | The Standard in lines 43 – 46 on page 35 states:  “The responsibility for the design, placement, operation, maintenance, and uniformity of traffic control devices in compliance with the provisions of this Manual shall rest with the public agency or the official having jurisdiction, or, in the case of site roadways or private toll roads open to public travel, with the private owner or private official having jurisdiction.”  Agree with the Standard as written. Recommend adding a sentence to the Standard that states the following, to ensure that State entities are not solely responsible for enforcement of the MUTCD or any traffic control devices on roadways not within the jurisdiction of the state.  “Review of traffic control devices for compliance with and enforcement of the provisions in this Manual shall also rest with the public agency or the official having jurisdiction, or, in the case of site roadways or private toll roads open to public travel, with the private owner or private official having jurisdiction.” |
| 1D.05 |  |  | NO | Disagree with adding reference to the definition of professional engineer in line 33 on page 37. Should be deleted. |
| 1D.05 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the added Support statements in lines 14 – 29 on page 38. There is no need to include or go this in depth on the NCEES and OPM definitions of engineering.  In conjunction with the recommendation to delete these Support statements, the sentence, “The construction of the provisions of this Manual, therefore, are informed by bases referenced in Paragraphs 8 and 9 of this Section” should also be deleted. |
| 1D.06 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the Standard in Lines 4 – 7 on page 39. This has been our agency’s interpretation of Part 2, however, this has often still occurred in the field and can be problematic. A specific Standard addressing this situation will be beneficial in solving this issue. |
| ID.08 | YES |  |  | Agree with the content of this section based on the explanation provided by the FHWA in the Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Part 1, #25 of the docket. This proposal does support uniformity and cost-effectiveness of traffic control devices. For example, a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) device should have the same display characteristics to drivers – so that drivers see the same color, configuration, and flash rate at any RRFB encountered around the country. However, different manufacturers could still have patented controls and equipment within the device that allow the RRFB to function. This would allow manufacturers to protect their product/property, and still compete with other manufacturers to provide the most reliable, efficient, etc. device. |
| 2A.01 |  | YES |  | Change “private roads open to public travel” in line 5 on page 42 to “site roadways open to public travel” |
| 2A.02 | YES |  |  | Agree with defining Low-volume rural road in Section 1C.02 and incorporating the guidance from current Part 5 into the pertinent Parts of the manual, as is done in Section 2A.02 Paragraph 2. |
| 2A.02 |  | YES |  | Change “private road open to public travel” in line 11 on page 43 to “site roadway open to public travel” |
| 2A.04 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change in lines 41 & 42 on page 43 stating that “Simplicity and uniformity in design, position, and application are essential for a sign to be effective.” |
| 2A.04 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the support statement in lines 30 – 33 on page 44 explaining that the message conveyed by some special word legend signs might be unclear to the road user and that even though experimentation is not required, they might warrant an evaluation. |
| 2A.04 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revisions in the Standard on lines 34 – 41 on page 44 that adds hash-tags, QR codes, bar codes and other graphics for optical scanning to the elements that shall not be displayed on signs. |
| 2A.04 |  | YES |  | Agree with the concept of the Option statement in lines 46 – 53 on page 44; however, is the phrase “and not visible to operators of motor vehicles” too restrictive for this? |
| 2A.05 / 2A.08 |  | YES |  | The heading for Section 2A.08 Maintaining Minimum Retroreflectivity in line 29 on page 45 needs to be deleted. As the text highlighted in green indicates, this has been moved to Section 2A.21 and Section 2A.05 comes next here. |
| 2A.05 |  | YES |  | The yellow highlighted text in line 35 on page 45 references Table 2A-1 Use of Sign Shapes. This would be the correct numbering for the table because it is the first table in Chapter 2A, however, the document containing the tables for Part 2 lists the Use of Sign Shapes table as 2A-4. |
| 2A.06 |  | YES |  | Table 2A-2 Common Uses of Sign Colors is referenced, which is the correct table number. However, the document containing the tables for Part 2 labels the Common Uses of Sign Colors table as Table 2A-5. |
| 2A.08 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 30 on page 47 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| 2A.08 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the standard in lines 12 and 13 on page 48 to clarify that distances shall be displayed on signs using fractions of a mile rather than decimals. |
| 2A.12 |  | YES |  | Reference to Figure “2A-3, 2A-4, and 2-5A and B” in line 5 on page 51 should be changed to “2A-3 and 2A-4.” According to the document containing the Figures for Part 2, Figures 2A-3 and 2A-4 show the examples of locations for some typical signs at intersections. Figure 2A-5 in this document is Intersection Configuration at a Divided Highway Crossing, and does not show any sign installation locations. |
| 2A.12 |  | YES |  | Delete the added text referring to Figure 2A-5A and B in lines 6 and 7 on page 51. According to the document containing Figures for Part 2, only Figure 2A-4 shows examples of advance signing on an intersection approaches. Figure 2A-5 in this document is Intersection Configuration at a Divided Highway Crossing, and does not show any sign installation locations. |
| 2A.12 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Standard to Guidance in lines 11 – 15 on page 51, which states that one of the factors considered when determining the appropriate spacing of signs should be the posted or 85th-percentile speed. |
| 2A.12 |  | YES |  | “…Stop, Yield, Do Not Enter, and Wrong Way…” in line 35 on page 51 should be changed to “…STOP, YIELD, DO NOT ENTER, and WRONG WAY…” |
| 2A.17 |  | YES |  | Recommend a clarification for placement of solar power equipment in the new Standard on lines 3 – 8 on page 56. Do not believe mounting of solar powered equipment below a sign is functional for its purpose; mounting above should be allowed for this. |
| 2A.19 |  | YES |  | Agree with the statements in lines 33 – 38 on page 56 about vanity signs, however, this need to be better defined. It is not clear from this paragraph what all types of signs would constitute vanity signs. |
| 2A.20 |  | YES |  | In the document containing the tables for Part 2, Table 2A-1 Illumination of Sign Elements and Table 2A-2 Retroreflection of Sign Elements need to be renumbered to be Table 2A-3 and Table 2A-4, respectively to match the references to these tables in Section 2A.20 on pages 57 and 58. |
| 2A.21 |  | YES |  | In the document containing the tables for Part 2, Table 2A-3 Minimum Maintained Retroreflectivity Levels needs to be renumbered to be Table 2A-5 to match the references to this tables in Section 2A.21 on pages 58 and 59. |
| Chapter 2B |  | YES |  | Under the Subchapter and Section Organization, on line 7, page 61, remove the hyphen in “ONE-WAY” to match all other references to ONE WAY signs in this Chapter. Also in line 38 on page 61, change “CRASES” to “CRASHES” |
| 2B.03 |  | YES |  | Capitalize the “L” in “Multi-Lane” on line 34, page 63, to match the column heading in Table 2B-1. |
| 2B.06 |  | YES |  | The references to Section 2B.04 in lines 16 – 25 on page 65 are not correct. This information is in Section 2B.04 in the 2009 MUTCD, but is now located in Section 2B.06, which is the current section. The lettering references also won’t make sense unless a paragraph reference is added, since there are multiple paragraphs using A, B, C, etc. lettering within this section. |
| 2B.06 |  |  | NO | Disagree with deleting the sentence, “Engineering judgment should be used to establish intersection control” on line 27, page 65. Specific criteria are not given in A – G listed below this, so engineering judgment must be used to select a form of intersection control based on the factors for consideration. |
| 2B.08 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Option to Guidance in lines 17 – 52 on page 67 for considering alternative treatments listed before converting to a more restrictive form of right-of-way control at unsignalized intersections. |
| 2B.10 |  | YES |  | The reference, “*(See Section 2B-X3) for information to identify the minor road).*” in line 13 on page 69 should be changed to: “*See Section 2B.07* *for information to identify the minor road.*” Then “*intersection roadways*” should be changed to “*intersecting roadways*” in line 14 on page 69. |
| 2B.11 |  | YES |  | Need a period after “road” in line 41 on page 69. |
| 2B.12 | YES |  |  | Agree with deleting the support statements about multi-way stop control in lines 48 – 50 on page 69 and lines 1 – 4 on page 70. |
| 2B.13 |  | YES |  | Should item C (lines 49 and 50 on page 70) be eliminated from All-Way Stop Control Warrant A: Crash Experience, since this item is the entirety of All-Way Stop Control Warrant B: Sight Distance (Section 2B.14)? |
| 2B.15 | YES |  |  | Agree with the new section for All-Way Stop Control Warrant C: Transition to Signal Control or YIELD Control at a Roundabout. |
| 2B.19 | YES |  |  | Agree with prohibiting STATE LAW from being added to the R1-5 series signs in lines 11 and 12 on page 73. |
| 2B.19 |  | YES |  | Change “an multi-lane approach” to “a multi-lane approach” in line 26 on page 73. |
| 2B.19 |  | YES |  | The first sentence in the Standard on lines 7 – 13 on page 73 should be revised to eliminate reference to stop or yield lines, so:  “**Yield Here To (Stop Here For) Pedestrians (R1-5, R1-5a, R1-5b, or R1-5c) signs (see Figure 2B-2) shall only be used ~~if yield (stop) lines are used~~ in advance of a marked crosswalk that crosses an uncontrolled multi-lane approach.**”  The Option in lines 30 – 33 on page 73 allows the opposite of what is expressly required in the standard (Standard: R1-5 signs used only if yield or stop lines are used… vs. Option: R1-5 signs may be used even if no yield or stop lines are used).  If the R1-5 signs can be installed in either scenario (presence of yield (stop) line & no yield (stop) lines), then this should not be part of the standard. The standard follows the support statement which describes the intent of the R1-5 signs for use on multi-lane approaches only.  Therefore, the standard should state the R1-5 signs shall only be used on multi-lane approaches. The Option can state that yield (stop) lines may or may not be present for use with the R1-5 series signs. |
| 2B.20 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the Option in lines 37 and 38 on page 74 to allow back-to-back mounting of in-street pedestrian or trail crossing signs. |
| 2B.20 | YES |  |  | Agree with the Standard in lines 40 – 42 on page 74 prohibiting in-street and overhead pedestrian or trail crossing signs at signalized intersections, PHBs, or emergency vehicle hybrid beacons. |
| 2B.20 |  | YES |  | The Option in lines 1 – 3 on page 75 allowing in-street and overhead pedestrian and trail crossing signs at intersections or midblock pedestrian crossings with flashing beacons should be moved to immediately after the Standard in lines 40 – 42 on page 74. |
| 2B.21 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change to remove the requirement for an analysis of the current speed distribution of free-flowing vehicles from the Standard in lines 6 and 7 on page 76, and to move this to Guidance in lines 12 and 13 on page 76. |
| 2B.21 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Option to Guidance in lines 8 – 18 on page 76. These elements have always been examined as part of an engineering study for speed zones by the SDDOT. |
| 2B.21 |  | YES |  | The revisions in lines 19 – 23 on page 76 remove the Guidance for a speed limit to be within 5 mph of the 85th-percentile speed for urban roadways or “urbanized locations within rural regions.” While we understand the background and the push that came for making this change, what would be the starting point for setting appropriate speed limits in these areas? What we’ve always used in the past is within 5 mph of the 85th-percentile speed as a starting point, and then this could be further reduced if needed based on crash history, roadside geometry, roadside development, pedestrian and bicycle activity, etc. By removing this guidance for all urban roadways, is the starting point for determining the appropriate speed limit simply the speed requested by the public or the local agency? From our brief research into the “safe systems” approach, it appears you simply set the speed limit at a predetermined target speed or a safe speed for pedestrians, which is quite low. What is the research behind this? It’s understood that lower speeds will be more survivable for pedestrians and for vehicle occupants, but what about the research on whether speed limits posted at a “desired” speed actually affects driver behavior?  There should be some guidance in the manual for where to begin when looking at speed limits in urban areas. If new research indicates that something closer to the 50th-percentile speed is more appropriate than the 85th-percentile for these facilities, than this should be cited and included in the Guidance statements in the MUTCD. Right now, it is completely open ended, allowing local agencies to push for and set speed limits at whatever speed they deem desirable.  The text in Section 2B.21 should also define what “urbanized locations in rural areas” are. |
| 2B.21 |  |  | NO | In the preamble for docket item #67, FHWA requests comments on the following additional recommendations of the NTSB report:  (1) Removal of the 85th-percentile speed as a consideration in setting speed limits regardless of the type of roadway (this recommendation was based in part on the assumption that that the 85th-percentile speed can increase over time as a result of the posted speed limit);  From the NTSB report:  *Raising speed limits to match the 85th percentile speed can result in unintended consequences. It may lead to higher operating speeds, and thus a higher 85th percentile speed. In general, there is not strong evidence that the 85th percentile speed within a given traffic flow equates to the speed with the lowest crash involvement rate for all road types. Alternative approaches and expert systems for setting speed limits are available, which incorporate factors such as crash history and the presence of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians.*  Where is the research citation for the claim that raising speed limits to match the 85th-precentile speed can result in unintended consequences? There have been studies performed that found that 85th-percentile speeds increase by only a few miles per hour (1 – 3 mph) after raising posted speed limits. Unless there are studies that can be cited that show an increase in the posted speed limit to match the 85th-percentile speed results in a significant increase in the 85th-percentile speed, this claim would appear to merely be an assumption that isn’t based on research performed, and would, therefore, not be sound justification for throwing out the concept of the 85th-percentile speed.  Also, the most common scenario is for a reduction in the posted speed limit to be requested, but a speed study to determine the 85th-percentile speed of traffic shows the posted speed limit to be appropriate, so such reduction is denied. This is the situation that occurs most often and has local agencies or the public demanding that we ignore the 85th-percentile speed so that speed limits can be arbitrarily reduced even when other factors such as roadway geometry, roadside development, pedestrian and bicycle activity, and crash history don’t support a reduction below the 85th-percentile speed. |
| 2B.21 |  |  | NO | In the preamble for docket item #67, FHWA requests comments on the following additional recommendations of the NTSB report:  (2) the requirement to use an expert system to validate a speed limit that has been determined through engineering study.  Disagree that the requirement to use an expert system to validate a speed limit that has been determined through an engineering study should be a Standard in the MUTCD. We have used USLIMITS2 a handful of times to verify the results of our engineering study and the speed limit recommended by this program has matched what we were recommending. If an engineering study is properly carried out, examining the factors listed in the MUTCD (formerly as an Option, proposed as Guidance), then there is not a need for the use of an expert system.  Such expert systems are set up with nationwide default values that may not correspond to the values that should be used for all areas, and thus could recommend higher speed limits than the agency may determine appropriate based on local conditions. Such expert systems also only give a general example of roadside conditions that must be chosen from, where the practitioner performing the engineering study can take into account the actual conditions, including the specific number of driveways, proximity of pedestrian pathways, etc.  A software program to determine speed limits will never be as accurate as a well-trained traffic engineer performing an engineering study taking into account the real-world situation and factors present. |
| 2B.21 |  |  | NO | In the preamble for docket item #67, Commenters are also requested to address likely outcomes if one or more of the other recommendations in the report, such as increased automated enforcement, were not implemented in conjunction with the speed-setting recommendations outlined in the report.  The NTSB recommendations for all states to allow automated enforcement and to remove any restrictions on automated enforcement that is allowed is not a sufficient solution. It requires legislation to be enacted or amended in all states across the country. This hasn’t proved successful with the uniform vehicle code regulations, so it is hard to believe it would be successful for this. There are also many issues with these systems, including claims that the sensitivities and controls could be set to capture more “violators” as a way to increase revenues from these tickets. It seems unrealistic to expect all states, jurisdictions, and populations across the country to accept and adopt systems for automated speed enforcement.  In certain situations, if automated enforcement is the only way to get to the majority of drivers to travel at the posted speed limit, it may indicate that the posted speed limit is not appropriate.  The claim from the NTSB report that, *“Speed limits must be enforced to be effective,”* contradicts the rationale behind the use of the 85th-percentile speed in setting reasonable speed limits. If posted speed limits are within 5 mph of the 85th-percentile speed, then the majority of drivers would be in compliance with the law, and the use of law enforcement resources would not be necessary to get drivers to comply with the speed limit. |
| 2B.21 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Standard to Guidance in lines 1 and 2 on page 77 to install additional speed limit signs beyond major intersections and other locations where it is necessary to remind road users of the speed limit. |
| 2B.21 |  | YES |  | The existing Support statements in lines 5 – 10 on page 77 about maximum speed limits should be moved to the beginning of this Section (before the Standard on speed zones on line 3 on page 76).  The new Support statement on line 11 on page 77 should then remain following the Guidance statement on lines 1 and 2 about additional speed limit signs. |
| 2B.21 | YES |  |  | Agree with the Standard in lines 29 – 31 on page 77 for END TRUCK SPEED LIMIT signs. |
| 2B.21 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revisions and change from Support to Guidance in lines 1 – 4 on page 78 to not use speed limits to warn drivers of upcoming signalized intersection. |
| 2B.25 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Standard to Guidance in lines 30 – 32 on page 79 for the BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE sign and FINES HIGHER plaque. |
| 2B.26 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revision from changeable message sign to blank-out part-time display in line 48 on page 81. |
| 2B.27 |  | YES |  | Reference should be to Figure 2B-5 not 2B-1 in line 19 on page 83. |
| 2B.28 |  |  | NO | Disagree with deleting the phrase “Where the number of lanes available to through traffic on an approach is three or more,” as shown in line 38 on page 83.  This is the criteria for requiring the Mandatory Lane Control signs to be mounted overhead. There are some situations where post mounted Mandatory Lane Control signs would be an adequate installation, and where a sign bridge or cantilever support is not feasible in advance of the intersection.  If this phrase is deleted, lines 39 and 40 should be changed from a Standard to Guidance recommending overhead installation. |
| 2B.28 |  | YES |  | Delete the word “from” and add a comma after “allowed” in line 18 on page 84. |
| 2B.30 | YES |  |  | Agree with the added Option in lines 26 – 28 on page 85 to allow a white legend and black background for bike lanes between two general purpose lanes. |
| 2B.30 |  | YES |  | The revisions in lines 30 – 33 on page 85 should allow the R3-8 signs to be installed at the beginning of the taper as well as along the taper or at the beginning of the turn lane. |
| 2B.34 |  | YES |  | Should the reference in the Standard on lines 37 – 39 on page 86 be to Figure 2B-6 (not 2B-3)? |
| 2B.35 |  | YES |  | There should not be an added “5” at the end of line 28 on page 88. This makes the reference Figure 2B-95 when it should be Figure 2B-9. |
| 2B.40 |  | YES |  | Remove the hyphen between ONE WAY in line 44 on page 91 for consistency. |
| 2B.45 |  | YES |  | ONE WAY should be in all CAPS on lines 2 and 3 on page 93. |
| 2B.47 |  | YES |  | Need a space before the word “and” in line 7 on page 96. |
| Fig 2B-14 |  | YES |  | Where the figure refers to the sign legend, WRONG WAY and ONE WAY should be in all CAPS. |
| Fig 2B-16 |  | YES |  | Where the figure refers to the sign legend, DO NOT ENTER and WRONG WAY should be in all CAPS. There also should not be a hyphen in WRONG WAY. |
| 2B.49 |  | YES |  | Need to add the word “sign” after “(R4-7 or R4-7c)” in item G, line 43, page 97. |
| 2B.49 |  | YES |  | The period at the end of line 17 on page 98 should be a the end of line 18 on page 98. |
| 2B.50 |  | YES |  | In line 28 on page 98, “Figure 2B-16” needs to be changed to “Figure 2B-15.” |
| 2B.50 |  | YES |  | In lines 35 and 36 on page 98, change “(see Figures 2B-10 and 2B-11)” to “(see Figure 2B-18).” |
| 2B.50 |  | YES |  | In line 53 on page 98, change “(see Figure 2B-16)” to “(see Figure 2B-15).” |
| 2B.50 |  | YES |  | In line 6 on page 99, change “(see Figure 2B-16)” to “(see Figure 2B-15).” |
| 2B.50 (existing Section 2B.43) |  |  | NO | Disagree with eliminating the Roundabout Directional Arrow and replacing it with a One Direction Large Arrow sign. According to the docket summary for item 90, FHWA proposes to add a Standard statement to Section 2B.50 specifying that when a One-Direction Large Arrow sign is used without a ONE WAY sign, the R6–5P plaque shall be mounted below the Yield sign on the approach to a roundabout. FHWA proposes this to ensure that when only the One-Direction Large Arrow is used that a regulatory message indicating the direction of movements is provided.  The Roundabout Directional Arrow sign had provided the regulatory message indicating the direction of movement in a roundabout with one sign. Now we would need to use two signs for this – a One Direction Large Arrow and a ONE WAY sign or a One Direction Large Arrow and an R6-5P plaque mounted with the YIELD sign. It does not seem to make sense to require variations of signing to accomplish what this one sign did before. Would it also take away from the warning message given at horizontal curves where these are installed? |
| 2B.52 |  | YES |  | Recommend revising the Guidance statement in lines 22 and 23 on page 100 to say: “Where the central island of a roundabout does not provide a reasonable place to install One Direction Large Arrow and/or ONE WAY signs…” The way this guidance is written now and following the new text in Section 2B.50, it sounds like the R6-5P sign is supposed to be installed in the central island, unless there isn’t room then it should go under the YIELD sign.  Change “and/or” to “and” in the Option statement on line 25 on page 100. The R6-5P sign is **required** to be installed under the YIELD sign if the One Direction Large Arrow sign is installed without a ONE WAY sign in the central island. |
| 2B.53 |  | YES |  | The distinction between the R7 and R8 series of signs is not clear. Lines 44 and 45 on page 100 state that these are “categorized as either parking (R7 series) signs or emergency parking (R8 series) signs.” However, the signs shown in Figures 2B-24 and 2B-25 don’t seem to agree with this statement. The R8-3 No Parking symbol sign is not an emergency parking sign.  Recommend the sentence explaining the difference between the R7 and R8 series in lines 44 and 45 on page 100 be deleted and the parking signs combined into one Figure.  The titles for Figures 2B-24 and 2B-25 also don’t seem to line up with the rest of the proposed text in this section. |
| 2B.53 | YES |  |  | Agree with the clarification in lines 43 and 44 on page 100 that “Parking signs are categorized as either (1) prohibiting parking or (2) permitting parking with restrictions on how parking is allowed.”  Also agree with the revisions to list the types of parking prohibitions and permissive parking in lines 46 and 47 on page 100 and lines 1 – 12 on page 101. This is a much-needed clarification/clean up for this section. |
| 2B.54 |  | YES |  | The reference to just Figure 2B-24 for common examples of prohibitive parking signs in lines 41 and 42 on page 101 does not fully align with the actual signs shown in the figure. Figure 2B-25 contains the R8-3 No Parking sign which prohibits parking at all times. The difference between these two series of signs (R7 and R8) and the two figures (2B-24 and 2B-25) is not clear. Recommend one figure showing both the R7 and R8 series signs. |
| 2B.54 |  | YES |  | The added option statement in line 35 on page 102 can be deleted because this is already stated in the Guidance statement on lines 15 and 16 on page 102. |
| 2B.54 |  | YES |  | Change “a” to “an” before “R7-113” in line 36 on page 103. |
| 2B.54 |  | YES |  | The new text in line 9 on page 104 should say “R7-201P” to match the sign designation shown in Figure 2B-24.  Change the reference in line 41 on page 104 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| 2B.60 |  | YES |  | Need to add the word “sign” after “12a)” in line 16 on page 108. |
| 2B.61 |  | YES |  | The sign designations for the R10-11, R10-11a, and R10-11b signs in Figure 2B-27 does not match the text in lines 19 – 22 on page 109. |
| 2B.62 |  | YES |  | Need an end parenthesis after “(R10-18a” in line 23 on page 110. |
| 2B.66 |  | YES |  | The new Guidance statement in lines 29 and 30 on page 112 says the “R12-5 and R12-6 Weight Limit sign should not show more than 3 symbols so as to not decrease comprehension of the sign by drivers.” But then the new Standard in lines 1 and 2 on page 113 says the Emergency Vehicle Weight Limit plaque (R12-7ap) shall be used when mounted below a primary weight limit sign. This adds 5 lines of text including 3 additional weight restrictions to assembly where no more than 3 symbols could be used for driver comprehension. Should the R12-7 sign always be mounted separately to avoid having too much information on one sign? |
| 2B.67 |  |  | NO | South Dakota DOT uses mainly the white on black design for these. If there was to be only one option for consistency, we would prefer the white on black to stand out from other regulatory signing at state entrances/ports of entry.  Figure 2D-24 includes a note next to the R13-1 sign that says “black-on-white or white-on-black” |
| 2C.05 |  | YES |  | Delete the period at the end of items F and H (lines 29 and 31, page 122).  Delete the comma at the end of line 45 on page 122 (in item C).  Be consistent with use of periods or not at the end of items A – I in lines 43 – 53 on page 122. |
| Fig. 2C-2 |  | YES |  | The Notes on Figure 2C-2 have incorrect Table references. Note 1 should refer to Table 2C-3, Note 2 should refer to Table 2C-4b, and Note 3 should refer to Table 2C-5. |
| 2C.08 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the new Standard in line 33 on page 124. The safety benefit of this device was studied with the sequential flashing chevrons. The summary for docket item #118 gives no explanation for this change. More research should be done before sequential flashing chevrons are prohibited in the manual. |
| 2C.10 |  |  | NO | Disagree with deleting existing Section 2C.10 combination Supplemental Horizontal Alignment/Advisory Speed Signs. In South Dakota, we place this sign immediately at the curve like it is recommended. It seems there just needs to be more emphasis put on the proper location to mount the sign. The replacement for this sign (W13-1aP) only allows it when there is a one-directional arrow. Most curves here have chevrons rather than the arrow sign so the W13-1aP would not be applicable at most curves. |
| 2C.12 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the Guidance statement (lines 51 and 52 page 126 and line 1 page 127) recommending SPEED LIMIT signs not be located in the vicinity of exit ramps particularly where the speed limit could conflict with advisory speeds. This does cause confusion for drivers and should be avoided. |
| 2C.13 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the Vehicle Speed Feedback Sign not being required to have the advisory speed limit posted with the assembly per the new Standard in lines 45 – 47 on page 127. We currently mount the advisory speed with the Vehicle Speed Feedback Plaque. The driver needs an immediate reminder of what the advisory speed is when their speed is displayed.  The Vehicle Speed Feedback plaque designation in line 43 on page 127 does not match the designation shown in Figure 2C-4.  The Guidance in lines 6 – 9 on page 128 does not take into account the height, width, and stroke of the changeable portion of the Vehicle Speed Feedback legend when not mounted with a Speed Limit sign. Need to recommend the legend size when mounted independently for an advisory speed. |
| 2C.14 |  |  | NO | Disagree with deleting the Guidance statement in lines 20 – 22 on page 129, unless Section 2C.57 is going to be referenced somewhere in Section 2C.14 to direct the practitioner to that Section. |
| 2C.24 |  | YES |  | Change “2C.XX” in line 19 on page 133 to “2C.22” |
| 2C.36 |  | YES |  | The figure references in line 11 on page 137 are not correct. Advance Traffic Control signs are shown in Figure 2A-4a – 2A-4d, but no Advance Traffic Control signs are shown in Figure 2A-5. |
| 2C.36 |  |  | NO | The added text, “or sign border LEDs are” in line 42 on page 137 should be deleted. Sign border LEDs should not be used to indicate the traffic control is in effect with the WHEN FLASHING legend. Only the warning beacons should be used for this. |
| 2C.41 |  | YES |  | The summary of docket item #138 says FHWA proposes this change based on Synthesis of Non-MUTCD Signing, which found that at least 20 State agencies currently use a sign that warns of the possibility of stopped or almost stopped traffic due to turns or other unexpected conditions, and therefore recommends adding the sign to the MUTCD. However, the Option in lines 6 – 8 on page 139 that makes up Section 2C.41 only mentions use of the new WATCH FOR STOPPED TRAFFIC sign for recurring or expected congested conditions. No mention is made for using the sign due to turns or other unexpected conditions. These uses as recommended in the Synthesis should be added to proposed new Section 2C.41. |
| 2C.45 |  | YES |  | The Guidance in lines 14 – 17 on page 141 is incorrect with respect to which portion of the sign pertains to which roadway. The curved stem should represent the entering roadway, with the arrow representing the major roadway. |
| 2C.45 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Guidance to Standard in lines 28 – 31 on page 141 to prohibit the Merge sign from being used in place of a Lane Ends sign. |
| 2C.46 |  | YES |  | The added Guidance statement (lines 49 and 50 page 141 and lines 1 and 2 page 142) are incorrect on which roadway is represented on the Added Lane sign. The curved arrow represents the entering roadway and the straight arrow represents the major roadway. |
| 2C.47 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the changes to require a W4-2 and a W9-1 sign when a lane is ending and merging is required. Our current practice is to install the W4-2 sign at the advance warning distance “d” upstream of the taper. The proposed changes would require every location to have the existing sign relocated and an additional sign installed. The docket summary for item #144 states that FHWA is adding the new Support and Guidance statements to clarify the use of the W4-2 and W9-1 signs, “including how to use them together, where applicable,” but the proposed changes do not make the use of these signs together applicable to certain situations – they now would be used together for all locations.  Using Table 2C-3 for placement of the W9-1 sign can be confusing, since Note 2 says typical signs for Condition A are Merge and Right Lane Ends, but Condition A specifically states “lane changing in heavy traffic.” We have many locations where a lane ends and there is merging, but very few would constitute “heavy traffic.” Also, all of our locations are signed as currently allowed in the manual and as depicted in Figure 3B-14, and we have not had any issues with only the W4-2 sign placed in advance of the lane reduction taper. It should be an Option for locations with heavy traffic to add the W9-1 signs in advance of these transitions.  Figure 3B-14 has not been updated to reflect the changes proposed in Section 2C.47. Figure 3B-14 shows the pavement markings for lane-reduction transitions, with reference to the location of the W4-2 sign upstream a distance “d” from the taper. |
| 2C.47 / Fig. 2C-13 |  |  | NO | Sheet 1 of Figure 2C-13 shows two W9-1R signs, neither of which is labeled “optional” for Freeways and Expressways. Sheet 2 of Figure 2C-13 shows two W9-1R signs with the upstream most one labeled “optional” for Conventional Roads. However, the text in Section 2C.47 does not require the upstream W9-1R & W16-2P assembly for freeways and expressways. The Option on lines 27 and 28 on page 142 states that “Supplemental RIGHT (LEFT) LANE ENDS (W9-1) signs may be installed upstream of the W9-1 that is installed at the advanced placement distance.” There is no qualifier for facility type in the Guidance or Option statements, so the supplemental W9-1 would be optional for all roadways. There should not be requirements on Figures that are not reflected in the text. |
| 2C.50 |  | YES |  | Change “an” to “a” so it reads “…on a ramp at the…” in line 20 on page 143. |
| 2C.59 |  |  | NO | The Option statement in lines 26 – 28 on page 148 allows the Confirmation Advisory speed (W13-1P) to supplement a One-Direction Large Arrow sign. There should also be an Option to allow a W13-1P Advisory Speed plaque to be mounted with the first chevron that is placed at a curve, especially if the W1-1a and W1-2a signs are eliminated from the manual. |
| 2C.59 |  | YES |  | Insert the word “plaque” after “(W13-1aP)” in line 26 on page 148. |
| 2C.71 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the change to recommend a Type 3 object marker for the approach ends of guardrail or crash cushions in the Guidance statement on lines 25 – 31 on page 153. The South Dakota DOT uses Type 2 object markers to mark the ends of crashworthy treatments such as guardrail and crash cushions adjacent to the roadway and reserves Type 3 object markers for bridge abutments and other objects that are not crashworthy adjacent to the roadway.  The Option and Guidance statements just before this on lines 20 and 22 allow a Type 2 or Type 3 object marker to mark an obstruction adjacent to the roadway. |
| Chapter 2D |  | YES |  | In the Subchapter list, the heading in line 8 on page 155 does not match the heading in lines 1 and 2 on page 183. |
| 2D.05 |  | YES |  | Change “guides” to “guide” in line 5 on page 159. The letter sizes shown in the Standard and Option statements in lines 1 – 7 on page 159 do not match the letter sizes and speed limits shown in Table 2D-2 B. |
| Fig. 2D-3 |  | YES |  | For consistency in the manual, the notes on Figure 2D-3 should use the headings Standard, Guidance, and Option and use the font styles appropriate to these. This would be similar to the notes for the Typical Applications in Chapter 6P. |
| 2D.07 |  | YES |  | Missing an end parenthesis at the end of line 40 on page 159. |
| Fig. 2D-4 |  | YES |  | Need to update the reference on this Figure to the “Standard Highway Signs” publication. |
| 2D.29 |  |  | NO | The new Guidance statement in lines 20 – 22 on page 169 recommends “Where more than four Route signs would be needed in a single Advance Route Turn or Directional assembly, the Route signs should instead be mounted in a Guide sign to minimize the need for repetition of the same information on multiple Cardinal Direction and Directional Arrow auxiliary plaques” and then references Figure 2D-8. However, in Figure 2D-9, a route sign assembly with five route signs is shown, which contradicts this new Guidance statement.  Looking at the Figures, preference would be to have a route marker assembly as shown in Figure 2D-9 and avoid having large guide sign for this. Therefore, disagree with this proposed change. |
| 2D.31 |  | YES |  | In lines 19 and 20 on page 170, change “…provide advance notice so that turning vehicles in the correct lanes from which to make their turn” to “…provide advance notice so turning vehicles use the correct lanes from which to make their turn.” |
| 2D.36 |  | YES |  | Change “use” to “used” in line 16 on page 175. |
| 2D.41 |  | YES |  | Change “Figures” to “Figure” in line 44 on page 176. |
| Fig. 2D-14 |  | YES |  | On Sheet 1 of Figure 2D-14, Drawing A, the top-most sign on the left side of the figure has EAST and WEST mixed up. EAST is the movement that is turning in this example. Also, on Drawing A, where are the U AND LEFT TURNS signs supposed to be located? The sign is shown with no symbol or callout arrow to the roadway drawing. |
| 2D.46 |  | YES |  | Line 39 on page 181 should say “(see Figure 2D-15)” not Figure 2D-16. |
| 2D.51 |  | YES |  | In concert with the revised text in line 8 on page 186, “Weigh Station” needs to be changed to “Weigh Stations.”  Delete the word “signing” in line 11 on page 186 so it the sentence reads “The standard sequence of signs for a Weigh Station on a conventional…” |
| 2D.53 |  | YES |  | The word “signing” is misspelled in line 33 on page 187. |
| 2D.55 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the added Guidance in lines 39 – 43 on page 189 recommending the evaluation of the entire existing system of signs for serviceability and general conformance with the Manual when a community wayfinding guide sign system is being considered. FHWA proposes this new Guidance because the condition and serviceability of existing higher priority signs, such as regulatory, warning, and major Designation signs, should have priority over the installation of the new community wayfinding signs; however, the higher priority signs are the often the responsibility of the DOT or other roadway authority, and should already be in general conformance with the manual and in serviceable condition. These requests generally come from communities and organizations without any authority over the roadway or idea of the manual requirements. Does this just put another burden on the DOT during an already burdensome request? Understand the intent, but not helpful for the State agency in dealing with these requests. |
| 2D.55 |  | YES |  | The “2D-” got deleted in line 26 on page 190.  The Figure reference in line 29 on page 192 is incorrect. This should be Figure 2D-31. |
| 2D.55 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Guidance to Standard for the requirement for community wayfinding signs to be rectangular in lines 14 and 15 on page 191. |
| 2D.57 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the Support statement in lines 21 and 22 on page 193 that says, “Direction along routes and to sites relies primarily on touring maps rather than directional signing and route marking for the byway itself.” |
| Fig. 2D-35 |  | YES |  | Use of the word “pictograph” on Figure 3D-35 is not consistent with the Definition of the word in Section 1C.02. What is shown is just a graphic, or a picture. Pictograph is defined as “a pictorial representation used to identify a governmental jurisdiction, an area of jurisdiction, a governmental or other public transportation agency or provider, a military base or branch of service, a governmental-approved university or college, or a toll payment system.” |
| 2D.59 |  | YES |  | In line 13 on page 196, change “points” to “point” so it reads, “…shall be placed at each turning decision point…” |
| 2E.03 |  | YES |  | Item I in line 48 on page 200 refers to Section 2H.04 for General Information signs but Section 2H.04 is specifically for the Traffic Signal Speed sign. This should refer to Chapter 2H for General Information signs. |
| 2E.12 |  | YES |  | Lines 22 and 23 on page 204 reference Tables 2E-3 and 2E-4 for minimum numeral and letter sizes for expressway guide signs according to interchange classification, type of sign, and component of sign legend; however, Table 2E-4 is for freeways. This should be Tables 2E-2 and 2E-3.  Line 24 on page 204 references Tables 2E-5 and 2E-6 for minimum numeral and letter sizes for freeway guide signs according to interchange classification, type of sign, and component of sign legend; however, there is no Table 2E-6 in the PDF document containing the Tables for Part 2. This should be Tables 2E-4 and 2E-5. |
| Table 2E-5 |  | YES |  | Make “Signs” plural in the \* note on Table 2E-5 referencing the “Standard Highway Signs” publication. |
| 2E.14 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the Support statement (lines 46 – 48 page 205 & lines 1 – 3 page 206) to explain the use of either the city or the street on the Advance guide or Exit Direction signs. |
| 2E.18 |  | YES |  | Somewhat frustrating for the MUTCD language to change what was an Option only for when a directional arrow to the side of the legend might create an unusually wide sign into a Standard that would now be required for arrows to be below the legend on all Exit Direction signs. We have plenty of Exit Direction signs with the arrow on the bottom, but had been using the current requirement for the arrow to be on the side for all Exit Direction signs needing replacement. These new signs would all be in violation of a Standard once the new manual comes out.  Was there a reason for this change? The docket summary for item #195 calls these “editorial changes” to attain consistency in the placement of arrows on Exit Direction signs, but this is much more than editorial or clarification – it changes the requirement. |
| 2E.22 & Fig. 2E-3 |  | YES |  | “Drawing D of Figure 2E-3” is referenced in line 42 on page 210, but the drawings are not lettered in Figure 2E-3.  In lines 45 and 46 on page 210, it says to see Drawings A and D of Figure 2E-3 to see how Exit numbers and suffix letters shall not be used for designating ramp splits into two ramps after leaving the mainline, however, ramp splits are not shown in Figure 2E-3. |
| 2E.23 & Fig. 2E-9 |  | YES |  | The Standards in lines 20 – 25 on page 212 refer to Right Exit Number plaques E1-5P – E1-5eP, Left Exit Number plaques E1-5fP – E1-5kP, and a LEFT plaque E1-5mP, all with references to see Figure 2E-9. However, Figure 2E-9 only shows an E1-5P, E1-5aP, and E1-5bP plaque, and the E1-5aP and E1-5bP plaques show LEFT and a Left with Exit Number. Therefore, the Figure and the text do not seem to correspond. |
| 2E.23 |  | YES |  | Change “Section 2E-22” to “Section 2E.22” in line 29 on page 212. |
| 2E.24 |  | YES |  | Delete “(See Section 2E.24)” in line 25 on page 213. This is Section 2E.24.  For consistency with Paragraph references throughout the manual, delete the added text “of this Section” in line 28 on page 213.  Delete the second comma in line 38 on page 213 so the Standard reads “Except as provided in Paragraph 3, Interchange Sequence signs shall be installed in a series.” |
| 2E.24 & Fig. 2E-18 |  | YES |  | The Standard in lines 43 and 44 on page 213 does not match what is depicted in the Figure referenced. Figure 2E-18 shows a LEFT message above an Exit Number on a plaque above the Advance guide sign, whereas the text refers to a LEFT (E11-2) sign panel displayed on the same line immediately to the right of the interchange name or route number. |
| 2E.26 & Fig. 2E-15 |  | YES |  | The text in line 38 on page 216 says “The Narrow Exit Gore (E5-1c) sign (see Figure 2E-15)…” However, Figure 2E-15 does not show the E5-1c sign. |
| 2E.28 |  | YES |  | Delete one instance of “on all” in line 44 on page 217 as it appears twice in a row now with the revisions. |
| 2E.50 |  | YES |  | The new Standard in lines 11 – 13 on page 234 needs more clarification on what is meant by “signed from a single interchange along the main roadway.” First reading this, many interpret this to mean there can be four traffic generator destinations signed at each interchange, which would conflict with the Guidance statement in lines 43 – 47 on page 233 that limits supplemental guide signs to no more than two destinations. But then the Standard goes on to refer to Paragraphs 3 and 4 regarding the number of Supplemental guide signs at an interchange and the number destinations displayed on a Supplemental guide sign. This must mean that two additional supplemental traffic generator destinations can be signed on the crossroad at each interchange? What is meant and how this would be accomplished is really not clear. |
| 2E.53 |  | YES |  | Missing an end parenthesis in line 45 on page 235. |
| 2E.56 |  | YES |  | Change reference to Figure 2E-62 to Figure 2E-64 in line 26 on page 238. |
| 2E.57 |  | YES |  | Change reference to Figure 2E-63 to Figure 2E-65 in line 40 on page 238. |
| 2H.07 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the Optional text in lines 18 – 20 on page 283 listing items that may be included on a State Welcome Sign. It would lead one to believe these are the only items that are allowed on these signs. Every state has a State Welcome Sign, though almost none would meet the criteria in this section.  With the new Standards in this section, the signs should not be a distraction to drivers, and that is where this section should leave things. We are unaware of any studies indicating State Welcome Signs pose an issue to road users today. It is most often not the departments of transportation that get to design the State Welcome Sign, and this new language in the MUTCD is not something that seems worth creating issues between departments of tourism and/or other political entities involved in these. |
| 2H.07 | YES |  |  | Agree with the first sentence of the Standard in lines 22 and 23 on page 283. This is appropriate to ensure State Welcome Signs are not interfering with the placement of necessary traffic control signs.  Agree with the Standard statement in lines 25 – 32 on page 283. This is appropriate to ensure State Welcome Signs are not difficult for road users to read and comprehend. Other than that, design criteria are not needed in the manual. State Welcome Signs are not used as traffic control devices. |
| 2H.07 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the second sentence of the Standard statement in lines 23 and 24 on page 283. To require State Welcome Signs to be post mounted seems unnecessary. |
| 2H.07 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the Guidance statements in lines 34 – 37 on page 283 regarding size and lateral placement of State Welcome Signs. These seem to be unnecessary requirements since these signs are already required to be located where they won’t interfere with or detract from other traffic control devices in the Standard on lines 22 – 24. |
| 2H.08 |  | YES |  | It appears the sign reference in line 46 on page 283 should be “I2-4a” as this is the sign that shows a specific interstate route number. |
| 2H.09 |  |  | NO | Disagree with including the Project Identification sign in the manual, as it may encourage more use of such signs. These are not a necessary temporary traffic control device. To quote the CFR in the docket summary for item #265 is slightly misleading. There is mention that such signs should be included in the PS&E packet for a project if included, but they are not required to be included for any project according to the language in 23 CFR 635.309(o).  The docket summary for item #265 states FHWA proposes this section to standardize the design and use of these signs, but it provides zero guidance on design of these signs. There are no Standard, Guidance, or Option statements regarding the design of these signs. There are no statements indicating such signs are not required and should be limited in use to whatever projects the USDOT thinks these may be appropriate for.  If included in the manual, this sign should be in Part 6 as it is a temporary sign applicable only during highway construction. |
| Fig. 2H-3 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the sign shown as an example of a project information sign in Figure 2H-3. This would be the only design information presented in the manual for this sign, but it does not appear to be an acceptable design. There is far too much information on the sign with three lines of text devoted to the two different funding sources. Is this the design that all project identification signs should follow? |
| 2H.10 |  | YES |  | All references to I2-43 and I2-43a signs in Section 2H.10 on page 284 need to be changed to I2-3 and I2-3a to match Figure 2H-4 and Table 2H-1. |
| 2H.13 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the Option in lines 20 – 23 on page 287. There should be no need to place the acknowledgment sign for the sponsor of a rest area on the highway mainline. These should be limited to the rest area itself. Why would road users on highway mainline that do not use the rest area need to know the sponsor of the rest area? |
| 2H.14 |  | YES |  | Change “motorist” to “motorists” in line 13 on page 289.  The sign designation “D18-1” in line 17 on page 289 does not match Figure 2H-9, which shows the ALTERNATIVE FUELS CORRIDOR sign as D9-19. Neither D18-1 nor D9-19 appear in Table 6H-1.  Change reference to “Figure 2H-9” in line 47 on page 289 to “Figure 2H-10” to match the Figure that shows the W16-19P LAST IN CORRIDOR sign.  Change “discontinues” to “discontinued” in line 2 on page 290. |
| 2I.02 |  | YES |  | Delete “for the Handicapped” in line 8 on page 293 and just refer to this as the International Symbol of Accessibility. In lines 9 and 10, change “the physically handicapped” to “persons with disabilities.” |
| 2I.03 |  | YES |  | The text for the new Guidance statement in line 24 and the revised Option statement in lines 30 – 32 (both on page 294) appear to have a mistake in one of these. The Guidance statement recommends the same signing given in the Option statement. There is no mention of the D9-18b and D9-18c signs shown in Figure 2I-3. From the docket summary for item 273, it would appear the intent was to recommend the D9-18 and D9-18a signs for numbered exits, in which case the Guidance is correct, but the Option should be changed to allow the exit number to be incorporated into the sign legend as shown for the D9-18b and D9-18c signs for numbered exits. If the intent is to eliminate the exit number in the legend, then the D9-18b and D9-18c signs showing this should be deleted from the Figure. |
| 2I.03 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Standard to Guidance for sign space left blank in lines 41 – 48 on page 295. |
| 2I.03 |  | YES |  | Delete “for the handicapped” in line 2 on page 296 so it just refers to the “International Symbol of Accessibility.”  Change gas to all caps in LP-GAS on line 18 on page 296 to match the change made in line 1 on this page. |
| Fig. 2I-4 |  | YES |  | The docket summary for item #274 states FHWA proposes to delete the Interstate Oasis symbol panel, along with the related Standard, based on poor comprehension of the symbol and the fact that no State currently uses the symbol. However, Figure 2I-4 shows the Interstate Oasis symbol on the D5-12 sign. |
| Fig. 2J-1 |  | YES |  | The docket summary for #285 states that FHWA proposes to add a new Figure 2J–1 to illustrate an example of General Service Signs in Conjunction with Specific Service Signs, but this example does not appear to be included in this Figure. |
| 2J.06 |  | YES |  | Docket item #287 mentions a proposed new Figure 2J-6 to illustrate an example of Specific Services Signing for a Conventional Road Accessed within a Freeway-to-Freeway Interchange, but this figure is not included in the document containing the figures for Part 2. |
| 2J.09 |  | YES |  | Missing the Paragraph number for the reference in line 36 on page 309. |
| 2J.11 |  | YES |  | Change “an” to “and” between “warning” and “regulatory signs” in line 36 on page 310. |
| 2K.01 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the new Standard in line 2 on page 313 requiring recreational and cultural interest area symbols to be white on brown when used on Tourist-Oriented Directional Sign (TODS). Such symbols, when used within TODS should be a white legend on a blue background to match the type of signing being used – these signs direct road users to tourist-oriented businesses and activities, not recreational and cultural interest areas.  Figure 2K-1 still shows the recreational and cultural interest area symbols as white on blue on the TODS. |
| 2L.01 |  | YES |  | Change “displayed” to “display” in line 15 on page 316. |
| 2L.02 |  | YES |  | Change reference to Figure 2G-17 in line 12 on page 317 to Figure 2G-18. |
| 2L.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the Guidance statement in lines 23 and 24 on page 318 that states slogan-type messages should not be used. Would CLICK IT OR TICKET be considered a slogan-type message? What about other safety slogans that might be developed for national or statewide safety campaigns? |
| 2L.02 |  |  | NO | The Guidance statement in lines 35 and 36 on page 318 states, “Traffic safety campaigns using CMS should include coordinated enforcement efforts where penalties or enforcement type warnings are part of the message displayed on the CMS.” Does this mean that even a safety message that is coordinated with a statewide campaign by the Department of Public Safety to raise awareness to impaired driving could not include a CMS message that says OVER THE LIMIT UNDER ARREST unless it was in combination with extra DUI enforcement efforts in the areas of the CMS? Disagree with this stance. Awareness of fines or potential enforcement of traffic safety violations should be able to be part of the message without requiring a specially coordinated enforcement effort. |
| 2L.05 |  | YES |  | Reference to Table 2L-1 in line 39 on page 321 should be changed to 2L-2. |
| Table 2L-3 |  | YES |  | Adjust the columns so words are not cut off, such as the heading “Example” and the text in the Comments column.  The Note underneath the table also includes an incomplete sentence. |
| Table 2L-3 |  |  | NO | Strongly disagree with the last two examples in this table.  Example 8: Why is “STATE LAW” considered an improvement? Disagree that this adds meaning to the message or is the best statement to get people to buckle up. Drivers are aware of seat belt laws.  What is the issue with using a SEAT BELTS SAVE LIVES message as part of a statewide campaign in conjunction with our Department of Public Safety’s educational outreach efforts to increase seat belt usage? A message like that is more likely to be remembered by drivers and send the message we want for why wearing a seat belt is safer than saying it’s a state law or giving the fines and penalties for not wearing a seat belt. The educational campaigns for things like seat belt use, impaired driving, and distracted driving include memorable slogans to try to become a part of the cultural and change people’s thoughts and behaviors. If PSAs are allowed that align with these public education campaigns, then these messages should be allowed.  Example 9: If part of “*an active, coordinated safety campaign that uses other media forms as the primary means of outreach*,” why wouldn’t the DON’T TEXT JUST DRIVE IT CAN WAIT message be acceptable? The message stating the fines and penalties for using a phone while driving shouldn’t even be used without “*coordinated enforcement efforts*.”  FHWA gave justification for the prohibition of messages with obscure or secondary meanings, but no explanation is given for the prohibition on slogan-type messages or statistical information. Where is the research to support that stating the fines and penalties is a more effective message? |
| Table 2L-4 |  |  | NO | This table seems riddled with errors. The first two examples are exactly the same as in Table 2L-3 so nothing is gained by including them in a table specific to portable changeable message signs.  The comments for Example 3 should include the use of the LN abbreviation and reference Table 1D-2.  The table to reference in Example 4 is Table 1D-2.  The table to reference in Example 5 is Table 1D-1.  What is shown as the “Improved Message” for Example 6 is much worse. I assume some content was cut off but where in the manual is it allowed to combine two words into one to save space? I don’t see an issue with 2 phases for this with ROAD WORK / NEXT 3 MILES but the suggestion below would be better than creating one large word, ROADWORK that drivers have to try and comprehend.  ROAD  WORK FOR  3 MILES  Disagree that the STATE LAW message is an improvement over a “slogan-type” message like SEAT BELTS SAVE LIVES in Example 7.  Disagree with the Improved Message in Example 8. BY DRIVER in the second phase is not able to stand on it’s own and be understood, thus violating the MUTCD requirements. |
| Table 2L-4 |  | YES |  | Misspelling of “characters” in the note underneath the table. |
| 2M.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree that all symbols in Table 2M-1 are for use only within recreational and cultural interest areas as stated in the new Support statement in line 35 on page 325. For example, the Boat Ramp symbol is often used below a recreational and cultural interest area destination sign here to indicate access to the boat ramp is found at the destination indicated. This would be on the highway before road users turn onto the recreation area roadway leading to the boat ramp. This type of example applies to many of the symbols found in this Table. This type of example is also shown in Figure 2M-2 on the Blue Springs and Cedar Creek illustrations.  The added Support statement in line 35 should be deleted from the manual text. |
| 2M.08 / Fig. 2M-2 |  | YES |  | It appears the Option that was deleted in lines 11 – 13 on page 327 regarding Wildlife Viewing Area signs with the RS-076 symbol is still shown in Figure 2M-2. |
| 2M.10 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the Support statement in lines 48 – 50 on page 328 stating memorial and dedication signing is not essential to providing navigational guidance. |
| 2M.10 |  | YES |  | Reference to “Miscellaneous Information signs (Section 2H.04)” in line 13 on page 329 is incorrect. Section 2H.04 used to Miscellaneous Information signs but is now Traffic Signal Speed signs and does not contain information on appropriate letter heights. There is no longer a section on Miscellaneous Information signs. Chapter 2A should apply to memorial and dedication signs same as all other sign designs. |
| 2M.10 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the revisions made to the Standard in lines 26 – 34 on page 329 that remove the ability to include text following the name of the person or entity being recognized, such as “Memorial Parkway.” While understanding the intent behind the changes, there are thousands of these “memorial highways” across the nation, many of which have the text on the sign written into legislation. Departments of Transportation have little power over legislation created for these. At the very least it should be a Guidance statement to avoid using text following the name of the person or entity being recognized, such as Memorial Highway, and instead use text preceding such as Dedicated To, though we disagree that one is better than the other and recommend this be left as it was in the 2009 manual. |
| 2M.10 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the new Standard in line 35 on page 329 stating memorial or dedication signs shall not imply that a highway has been officially renamed. Departments of Transportation do not include these memorial/dedication names on official maps or guide signs, ensuring these facilities are not treated like officially named highways. But it would be difficult at this point to change previously dedicated memorial designations to adhere to the appropriate naming standards provided in revised Section 2M.10. A Guidance statement would at least allow DOTs to try and lobby for signs with text in conformance with this section without creating issues for all existing signs. However, FHWA should present justification for these changes by citing the issues created by such designations that end in “Memorial Highway” where it may be implied to some road users that the highway has been renamed, despite the use of official highway route signs, maps with the official numbered routes, and use of the official routes only on guide signs. |
| 2N.03 |  | YES |  | Reference to “EM2-2 series signs” in line 11 on page 331 should be changed to “EM1-2 series signs” for white arrows and borders on a blue background.  The EM1-2 signs in Figure 2N-1 show an arrow within the sign instead of the advance turn arrow or directional arrow auxiliary plaques required by the Standard in lines 5 – 11 on page 331. The Option allowing this was deleted in lines 14 – 17 on page 331, so Figure 2N-1 should be revised to reflect this.  The Option allowing arrows within the blue circular symbol was deleted in lines 14 – 17 on page 331, so the Standard regarding the design of such an arrow within the blue circular symbol in lines 24 – 26 on page 331 should also be deleted. Also, there is no EM1-1 sign shown in Figure 2N-1 (as referenced in this Standard). |
| 3A.04 |  | YES |  | The SDDOT recognizes that the move from 4” to 6” normal width lines is coming one way or another, especially as driven by CAV. It does have a safety benefit for human drivers and not just machine vision, so despite the significant cost impact and the fact that it affects the majority of our routes, we are submitting agreement with this item.  We would like to note, however, that the quality and retroreflectivity of the line is more important than the width and recommend the rulemaking for pavement marking retroreflectivity be completed. |
| 3A.04 |  |  |  | In the Assessment of Economic Impacts of Notice of Proposed Amendment, FHWA seeks comment on the current extent of longitudinal markings less than 6” wide on freeways, expressways, ramps, and roadways with speed limits greater than 40 mph.  SDDOT Comments:  Virtually all markings on freeways, expressways, ramps, and roadways with speed limits greater than 40 mph in South Dakota have 4” wide longitudinal markings. Exceptions to this would be for gore area markings on freeways/ramps which are 12” wide. All of our markings on freeways are grooved in, which adds additional cost |
| 3A.04 |  |  |  | In the Assessment of Economic Impacts of Notice of Proposed Amendment, FHWA seeks comment on the conclusion that the 6-inch width for longitudinal lines for these roadway types increases the visibility of longitudinal lines which increases the safety of these roadways as users are better able to maintain lanes.  SDDOT Comments:  From what we understand, the CMF for going from a 4” edge line marking to a 6” is based on one study which was done on primarily rural 2 lane principal arterials with shoulders. Recommend that more extensive research be done on lower volume rural 2 lanes with minimal to no shoulders. |
| 3A.04 |  |  |  | In the Assessment of Economic Impacts of Notice of Proposed Amendment, FHWA requests comments on the extent of wide longitudinal pavement markings by width and by roadway characteristics.  SDDOT Comments:  The only wide longitudinal lines installed on freeways, expressways, and ramps in South Dakota are 12” markings for gore areas. We have just a handful of roadways with speed limits greater than 40 mph that have a wide edge line of 8”, because past guidelines recommended a wide edge line where less than 2’ shoulders existed. We also use 8” lines around islands or neutral areas. |
| 3A.04 |  |  |  | In the Assessment of Economic Impacts of Notice of Proposed Amendment, FHWA requests comments on the potential safety benefits associated with increasing wide longitudinal lines from 8” to 10” and the potential safety implications of decreasing wide longitudinal lines from 12” to 10”.  SDDOT Comments:  Have only ever found one research project where wider edge lines were being studied. Seems the benefits here are anecdotal and based on being visibly wider. Recommend more research is done on use of wide lines as these changes are implemented.  Where we have 12” lines for gore areas on freeways/ramps, we do not anticipate reducing these to 10”. |
| 3B.01 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revisions in lines 27 – 31 on page 339 to explicitly state the exceptions for reversible lanes and two-way left turn lanes. |
| Fig. 3B-2 |  | YES |  | Figure 3B-2 no longer calls out the optional dotted line extension. |
| 3B.03 |  |  | NO | Disagree with deleting the text in the Support statement on lines 8 – 10 on page 341. It has been questioned why the manual values are different from the green book and this information is beneficial for explaining this. |
| Fig. 3B-5 |  | YES |  | Figure 3B-5 still uses the word “crosshatch” in calling out the recommended yellow diagonal markings. “Crosshatch” should be deleted |
| 3B.05 |  | YES |  | The Support statement in line 11 and 12 on page 343 actually reads more like an Option statement. The word “can” in line 11 should be changed to “may” and this changed to an Option statement. |
| Fig. 3B-13 |  | YES |  | Sheet 1 of 2 of Figure 3B-13 is missing from the PDF with Figures for Part 3. |
| 3B.08 |  | YES |  | In line 40 on page 346, change one of the words “entrance” to “exit” |
| 3B.09 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the added Guidance statement in lines 8 – 10 on page 348 recommending 6” wide edge lines on two-lane roadways regardless of the width of the normal line. The proposed change in Section 3A.04 for all normal width lines on roadways with posted speed limits greater than 40 mph would capture all two-lane roadways where a 6” edge line would be beneficial. We have plenty of two-lane roadways through communities that have speed limits of 40 mph or less that have an edge line. Run off the road crashes are not a significant issue through these low speed sections and there would be a significant cost to add 2” of edge line marking on all of these routes (which have 4” markings). The safety benefit of the wider edge line would be more applicable to rural two-lane highways and this is captured through the changes in Section 3A.04.  Quality and retroreflectivity of pavement markings would be more important than width for these low speed applications. Recommend the rulemaking for pavement marking retroreflectivity be completed. |
| 3B.11 |  | YES |  | In line 21 on page 349, there is reference to Definition 101 in Section 1C.02. However, definition 101 is Inherently Low Emission Vehicle (ILEV). Change to reference the intended definition. |
| 3B.12 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the revisions to the Option statement in lines 42 – 45 on page 350. Edge lines should be able to be omitted for roadways with posted speed limits of 40 MPH or less where curb and gutter clearly defines the roadway edge in the lane reduction transition. This was allowed by the current manual with the language, “low speed roadway.” An operating speed of 25 MPH or less seems too low to require an edge line in these situations for every speed above this. |
| 3B.12 |  | YES |  | In line 17 on page 351, add the word “reduction” between “lane” and “transition” |
| 3B.19 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Option to Standard in lines 21 – 29 on page 357 to clarify that if used, yield line markings must be installed with an appropriate sign. |
| 3B.20 |  |  | NO | Disagree with deleting the Standard in lines 36 and 37 on page 359. It should be stated that word, symbol, and arrow markings are required to be white and not just shown in the Standard Highway Signs publication. It should continue to be stated and required in the manual that these markings be white.  Change the reference in lines 39 and 40 on page 359 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| 3B.20 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revisions in lines 1 – 6 on page 360. There has been some misinterpretation/confusion with the existing text that the maximum distance between arrows in turn lanes can only be ten times the height of the arrow, so this is a necessary clarification. |
| 3B.23 |  | YES |  | The reference to Figure 2B-11 in lines 19 and 20 on page 362 needs to be changed to a Figure that shows lane use arrow markings near the terminus of offset channelized left turn lanes. Figure 2B-11 is Examples of Keep Right and Keep Left Sign Placement which does not show the end of any left turn lane. |
| 3B.25 |  | YES |  | Each item A – G in lines 27 – 37 on page 363 and items A – C in lines 7 – 9 on page 364 should end with “and” instead of “or” since all of these are locations where these markings should be placed. |
| 3B.28 |  | YES |  | The Support statement in lines 39 – 44 on page 365 actually contains an Option statement: “These [speed reduction markings] might [may] be placed in advance of unexpected severe horizontal or vertical curve or other roadway feature where drivers need to decelerate prior to reaching the feature and where the desired reduction in speeds has not been achieved by the installation of warning signs and/or other traffic control devices.” This should be separated out as a new Option statement as part of the revisions to this section. |
| Fig. 3B-28 |  | YES |  | Figure 3B-28 is not included in the PDF containing the Figures for Part 3. |
| Fig. 3B-29 |  | YES |  | Figure 3B-29 is not included in PDF containing the Figures for Part 3. |
| Fig. 3C-1 |  | YES |  | Should add “inches” for the dimensions of d in the Double Paired drawing. |
| 3C.02 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revisions to the Guidance in lines 4 – 24 on page 369 for criteria to be considered for installation of a marked crosswalk. |
| 3C.05 |  | YES |  | The Support statement in lines 4 and 5 on page 371 reads more like a Standard. Would support this being changed to: “**High-visibility crosswalk markings shall be limited to the Longitudinal Bar, Perpendicular, and Double Paired designs (See Figure 3C-1).**” This would eliminate any ambiguity or attempts at other configurations without requests for experimentation. |
| 3C.05 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the statements in lines 20 – 25 on page 371 being Standards. These should be Guidance statements. Sometimes adjustments are made in the spacing between longitudinal elements to avoid vehicle wheel paths, making them not all exactly the same. It is possible to achieve longitudinal crosswalk markings that avoid vehicle wheel paths with equal spacing, but if placement in the field is off or there are existing grooves in the pavement, this may not be the case. |
| 3C.10 |  | YES |  | There should be an Option statement in Section 3C.10 to correspond with the option listed at the bottom of Figure 3C-2. The text on the Figure and in Section 3C.10 should state: “High-Visibility Crosswalks may be used for the crosswalks on the perimeter.” |
| 3C.11 |  | YES |  | The NPA text mentions a new Figure 3C-3 but the text in lines 32 and 33 on page 373 refers to Figure 3B-29. This is likely meant to be Figure 3B-28, but this is missing from the PDF document containing the figures for Part 3. |
| 3D.01 |  | YES |  | In line 14 on page 374, should “roundabout” be changed to “circular roadway”? |
| 3D.01 | YES |  |  | Agree with adding rectangular rapid flashing beacons in the Support statement on lines 22 and 23 on page 374, however, not sure if this is technically allowable per the proposed PROWAG. There is an AASHTO CTE Subcommittee working on recommended clarifications to PROWAG guidance that plans to ask FHWA and the US Access Board for rectangular rapid flashing beacons to be allowable for use at roundabouts. |
| Fig. 3D-3 and 3D-4 |  | YES |  | The word “crosshatch” on Figures 3D-3 and 3D-4 should be deleted to be consistent with the proposed text regarding diagonal markings. |
| Figures 3D-1 through 3D-8 |  | YES |  | The title of Figure 3D-6 uses “Circular Roadway” instead of “Roadabout” as shown in line 37 on page 374. Should all of the titles for the Figures for Chapter 3D be changed to say “Circular Roadway”? |
| 3D.02 |  | YES |  | Should the title of Section 3D.02 in line 43 on page 374 should refer to “Circular Intresections” instead of “Roundabouts” to match other changes in Part 3? Should the text for Section 3D.02 in lines 1 – 19 on page 375 use “circular roadway” instead of “roundabout”?  Delete line 19 on page 375. |
| 3D.06 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 5 on page 377 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| Fig. 3E-2 |  | YES |  | The \*\* Note on Sheet 1 of Figure 3E-2 refers to Section 3E.01, but HOV only lane symbol markings are not discussed in Section 3E.01. Need to refer to the correct section. |
| Fig. 3E-3 |  | YES |  | The \*\* Note on Figure 3E-3 refers to Section 3E.01, but HOV only lane symbol markings are not discussed in Section 3E.01. Need to refer to the correct section. |
| Table 3E-1 |  | YES |  | Note 3 at the bottom of Table 3E-1 states that this information is also described in Paragraph 3 of Section 3E.02, but Paragraph 3 in lines 25 – 27 on page 378 on refers to the Table. All other information is proposed to be deleted. Note 3 should be removed from Table 3E-1. |
| Fig. 3E-4 |  | YES |  | The word “crosshatch” should be removed from Figure 3E-4 to be consistent with the proposed changes to the text of the manual. |
| 3H.01 |  | YES |  | The Standard in line 37 on page 389 is not needed since this is already stated in the Standard on lines 12 – 16 on page 389. |
| 3H.03 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of proposed Section 3H.03 Aesthetic Treatments in Crosswalks and the standard, guidance, and option statements within. Requests for artistic treatments within crosswalks are made by different entities, but are contrary to the safety treatment intent of marking the crosswalk. |
| Fig. 3H-2 |  | YES |  | Can Figure 3H-2 also show the more common application of yellow colored pavement at the bullnose end of a median where a raised median becomes a painted median to allow for truck turning movements? |
| 3I.01 |  | YES |  | Revise lines 6 and 7 on page 395 to say: “…cones, tubular markers, vertical panels, drums, and barricades…” |
| Fig. 3J-5 |  | YES |  | The title of Figure 3J-5 does not at all match the title/description given in lines 28 and 29 on page 399. |
| 4A.10 |  | YES |  | Need to keep the word “agency” in line 35 on page 407. The sentence does not make sense without this word. |
| 4C.05 |  | YES |  | Unclear on the intent of the new Option in lines 14 and 15 on page 417, "Where there is a divided street having a median of sufficient width for pedestrians to wait, the criteria in Items A and B of Paragraph 2 may be applied separately to each direction of vehicular traffic." It seems the new language could result in a ped crossing with a signal on one crossing but not the other. Perhaps the intent is that the criteria may be applied separately and then if one direction of traffic meets the thresholds for this warrant, a signal may be installed. If this is the case, this should be clarified in the manual. |
| 4E.01 |  | YES |  | The way the phrase “shall be permitted” is used in line 20 on page 431, is indicating an Option that may be allowed for signal displays. The new Standard in lines 18 – 20 should be rewritten to an Option statement with a corresponding Standard as follows:  Option:  A dual-arrow signal section that is capable of alternating between the display of a GREEN ARROW signal indication and the display of a YELLOW ARROW signal indication, both pointing in the same direction, may be permitted.  **Standard:**  **If a dual-arrow signal section that is capable of alternating between the display of a GREEN ARROW signal indication and the display of a YELLOW ARROW signal indication, both pointing in the same direction, is used, both colors shall not be displayed simultaneously.** |
| 4H.06 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 32 on page 466 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| 4S.04 | YES |  |  | Agree with the new Standard on lines 32 – 34 on page 503 prohibiting flashing LED units in the legend or border of the SPEED LIMIT sign from being used to indicate the speed limit displayed is in effect. |
| 4L.03 |  | YES |  | The new Guidance statement in lines 43 and 44 on page 489 should allow audible information devices used in conjunction with RRFBs to use more than just the one speech message recommended, “Yellow lights are flashing.” Messages such as “Warning lights are flashing, cross with caution when traffic is stopped,” or similar messages should be allowed for this. |
| Part 5 | YES |  |  | Agree with eliminating existing Part 5 for Low Volume Roads and incorporating all this information into the relevant sections of the manual. Part 5 as a separate document containing just a little information but otherwise references to other sections of the manual did not work as well as intended. |
| 5A.01 |  | YES |  | Recommend more clarification in the Purpose and Scope for Part 5, to let practitioners know how to use it or when to apply the recommendations within Part 5 where they might differ from or conflict with other Parts of the manual. It is difficult to understand the intent. From the Support statements in Section 5A.01, it would seem that all of Part 5 is an Option for roadways where agencies want to incorporate devices or considerations for AV technologies. However, the content in Chapter 5B is all Guidance. |
| 5A.02 |  | YES |  | Should add “(AVs)” at the end of the title for this section (line 19, page 510) to define the abbreviation used throughout the text. |
| 5A.04 |  | YES |  | Missing a semicolon at the end of item D (line 2, page 512).  Change “and” to “and/or” in line 12 on page 512. |
| 5B.01 |  | YES |  | Put quotation marks around “Standard Highway Signs” in line 13 on page 513 to match other references in the manual for this publication. |
| 5B.04 |  | YES |  | The Standards in lines 25 – 36 should be Guidance to match the level of all other content in Chapter 5B. |
| 5B.04 |  |  | NO | Should be more specific as to what channelizing devices are meant for the recommendation to be at least 8” wide in the Guidance statement in lines 38 – 40 on page 514. For example, this would obviously not be possible for tubular markers, so are pavement markings used in conjunction with channelizing devices less than 8” wide acceptable for machine vision?  Where is the 8” intended to be measured? The bottom of a 42” grabber cone might meet this requirement, but the top would not; is this sufficient? |
| 6A.02 |  | YES |  | Change “the” to “to” in line 36 on page 519 so the sentence reads “When the roadway capacity is reduced due to lane closures…” |
| 6A.02 |  | YES |  | The first sentence should either state “When the roadway capacity is reduced due to lane closures AND demand will exceed the available capacity…” or “When the roadway capacity is reduced due to lane closures, the demand MAY exceed the available capacity…”  The way it is currently written, this sentence implies that any time a lane closure is used the demand will exceed the available capacity, which is not always the case. |
| 6A.03 |  | YES |  | Change “roadways” to “roadway” in lines 26 and 30 on page 521 to be consistent with other references in these sentences. |
| 6B.01 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change in line 16 on page 525 to say, “If reduced speed limits are used…” |
| 6B.05 |  |  | NO | The added text in the Standard in lines 23 and 24 on page 527 is incorrect. Short term stationary operations are not allowed the same exceptions as a mobile operation. The Option following this Standard on lines 26 – 29 gives the exception for mobile operation making reference to this in the Standard unnecessary. Recommend revising the Standard to read: “When redirection of the road users’ normal path is required, they shall be directed from the normal path to a new path with appropriate traffic control devices as prescribed in this manual.” |
| 6B.06 |  | YES |  | Change “It is comprised of…” in line 32 on page 527 to “It comprises…” |
| Table 6B-2 |  | YES |  | Recommend adding a line with the appropriate distances to Table 6B-2 for 80 mph. |
| 6C.02 | YES |  |  | Agree with the added Option in lines 28 – 32 on page 531 for pedestrian routes impacted by short duration and short-term work. |
| 6C.02 | YES |  |  | Agree with the proposed edits in lines 45 – 48 on page 533 to say tape, rope, or plastic chain are not accessible to or usable by individuals with disabilities. |
| 6C.03 | YES |  |  | Agree with the edit in line 16 on page 534 to remove the text, “Where pedestrians with visual disabilities normally use the closed sidewalk.” |
| 6D.02 | YES |  |  | Agree with the added Option in lines 28 – 30 on page 538 for a STOP/STOP or SLOW/SLOW paddle. |
| 6D.06 | YES |  |  | Agree with change from Standard to Guidance in 13 – 15 on page 541 for location of the flagger station. |
| 6E.04 |  |  | NO | The way the revised Standard in lines 6 – 8 on page 543 is written would allow pilot car operation with traffic control signals on either end without flaggers. Agree with allowing this operation, however, there needs to be other guidance for this method of pilot car operation. Pilot cars are used for work areas several miles in length. There should be additional signing posted with temporary traffic control signals that might display a red to drivers for ten minutes or more so that the traveling public doesn’t think the signals are malfunctioning and disregard the red indication. The requirement to have flaggers at either end of a pilot car operation was the only requirement that kept unmanned traffic control signals from being used with a pilot car operation. |
| 6F.01 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 44 on page 544 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| 6G.02 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 12 on page 547 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| Table 6G-1 |  | YES |  | Change the title of Table 6G-1 to match the text on line 18 on page 547. Right now, tables 6G-1, 6H-1, and 6I-1 all have the same title. |
| Fig. 6G-1 |  | YES |  | Change the title of Figure 6G-1 to match the text on line 19 on page 547. The word “other” does not seem appropriate since there is not a figure before this with regulatory sign examples. |
| 6G.07 | YES |  |  | Agree with the added STAY IN LANE TO MERGE POINT sign to help with late merge operations (lines 22 – 24, page 548). |
| 6G.12 |  | YES |  | In line 38 on page 549, change “book” to “publication” for consistency with Parts 1 and 2. |
| Table 6H-1 |  | YES |  | Change the title of Table 6H-1 to match the text on line 6 on page 550. Right now, tables 6G-1, 6H-1, and 6I-1 all have the same title. |
| Fig. 6H-1 |  | YES |  | Change the title of Figure 6H-1 to match the text on line 7 on page 550. |
| 6H.01 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 10 on page 550 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| 6H.01 |  | YES |  | The end parenthesis in line 13 on page 550 is in the wrong location. It should come after “(W10-1)” with the word “sign” outside the parentheses. |
| 6H.12 |  | YES |  | Section 6H.12 should all be moved to Chapter 6I TTC Zone Guide Signs. The E5-2 and E5-2a signs are shown in Table 6I-1 and Figure 6I-1. These are the only signs discussed in Section 6H.12. |
| 6H.13 |  | YES |  | Section 6H.13 should be moved to Chapter 6I TTC Zone Guide Signs. The 5-3 sign is shown in Table 6I-1 and Figure 6I-1. This is the only sign discussed in Section 6H.13. |
| 6H.32 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of the Support statement in lines 44 – 46 on page 557 and lines 1 and 2 on page 558. This information on advisory speeds is needed to help explain the use of these in work zones. |
| 6H.38 |  | YES |  | In line 12 on page 559, change “book” to “publication” for consistency with Parts 1 and 2. |
| 6H.38 |  | YES |  | The word “Special” in line 22 on page 559 should be changed to “Other” for consistency with the revision made in line 11 on page 559. |
| Table 6I-1 |  | YES |  | Change the title of Table 6I-1 to match the text on line 23 on page 560. Right now, tables 6G-1, 6H-1, and 6I-1 all have the same title. |
| 6J.01 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Standard to Guidance in lines 19 – 23 on page 562 for obliterating pavement markings in long term stationary operations. |
| 6J.03 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revisions to give specific distances for spacing of temporary raised pavement markers in lines 26 – 33 on page 563. |
| 6K.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the last part of the new Guidance statement in lines 9 and 10 on page 567 that says, “…and should have alternating, contrasting sheeting positioned 32 inches above the walkway.” This is for a continuous wall being used as a pedestrian channelizing device. The assumption is that this refers to an existing continuous wall like a retaining wall or the wall of a building that is adjacent to the pedestrian route. Such surfaces would be detectable and would channelize the pedestrian route, but would not have sheeting adhered to it. There should not be a requirement to attach contrasting sheeting for use of such continuous walls for pedestrian channelization. |
| 6K.02 |  | YES |  | Recommend revising the Option statement in lines 29 and 30 on page 567 to “The sheeting on the pedestrian side of the Pedestrian Channelizing device may have sheeting with a vertical orientation,” for clarity. |
| Fig. 6K-2 |  | YES |  | Agree with adding a figure to illustrate an example of a pedestrian channelizing device.  Disagree with requiring a 2-inch gap between the hand trailing edge and its support. There are several acceptable pedestrian channelizing devices where the hand trailing edge and the top of the support are one in the same. What is shown on the drawing resembles a handrail, which is not required for level pathways or curb ramps. |
| 6K.07 | YES |  |  | Agree with changing from a Standard to Guidance in lines 6 and 7 on page 571 for adequate visibility of barricades from both sides. |
| 6K.11 |  | YES |  | Revise the sentence that begins on line 32 on page 572 to delete the extra “of” so it reads: “One or more types of channelizing devices…” |
| 6L.01 |  | YES |  | Recommend a condition be added to the revised Guidance in lines 15 – 17 on page 574 that APS should provided if pedestrians are detoured from an existing signal with APS to one without APS. To add APS at a signalized intersection for a temporary condition is difficult, however, less accessibility should not be provided. |
| 6L.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the Guidance statement in line 39 on page 575 that says, “*AFADs should not be used for long-term stationary work.*” If a flagger operation can be used for long term stationary operations, why wouldn’t it be appropriate and safer to allow flaggers to be off the roadway operating an AFAD? |
| 6L.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the existing Standard in line 44 on page 575 that says, “AFADs shall meet the crashworthy performance criteria contained in Section 6A.04.” There are currently no trailer-mounted devices that have been tested and approved as MASH crashworthy. Trailer-mounted AFADs have been used successfully, and this would be similar to the current status of other trailer-mounted devices such as arrow boards and portable changeable message signs. |
| 6L.03 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the added text in lines 14 and 18 on page 577. Strobe lights should not be allowed in conjunction with an AFAD. This is not allowed with vehicle speed feedback signs. Warning beacons or a Type B warning light should be sufficient. |
| 6M.02 |  | YES |  | The new Standard in lines 13 – 17 on page 586 should be changed to Guidance. There is ambiguity in when positive protection should be used, but the statement, “At a minimum, positive protection devices shall be considered in work zone situations that place workers at increased risk from motorized traffic, and where positive protection devices offer the highest potential for increased safety for workers and road users,” could essentially require positive protection in all work zones adjacent to motorized traffic. There is only the Support statement below for circumstances to consider positive protection, not requirements for when and where to use it. |
| 6M.02 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the use of “Long-term stationary” in item B in line 24 on page 586, as this item goes on to describe this as work zones of 2 weeks or more. While this may be the language in 23 CFR Part 630.1108(a), it conflicts with the long-term stationary work duration defined in Section 6N.01 as work that occupies a location more than 3 days. Item B should be revised to delete “Long-term stationary” and simply state: “Work zones of two weeks or more resulting in substantial worker exposure to motorized traffic;” |
| 6M.02 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revisions in lines 23 – 37 on page 587 to broaden the description of movable barrier. |
| 6M.04 | YES |  |  | Agree with the revision in lines 21 and 22 on page 588 to delete, “When it is determined that a facility should be accessible and detectable by pedestrians with visual disabilities. |
| 6M.08 | YES |  |  | Agree with the change from Standard to Guidance in lines 22 and 23 on page 591 to say, “When used, floodlighting should be installed in a manner that minimizes glare…”  Agree with the additional text on lines 27 – 29 on page 591 that states, “Lighting should be sufficient so as to clearly identify a worker as a person. Care should be taken to minimize the potential for shadows to conceal workers within the work area.” |
| 6N.01 |  |  | NO | Disagree with changing work durations from Standard to Guidance. |
| 6N.01 |  | YES |  | There does not seem to be a need to give the acronym “(TTCD)” in line 43 on page 593. |
| 6N.04 |  | YES |  | Change the reference to “Figures 6P-49 through 6P-53” in line 14 on page 596 to “Figures 6P-47 through 6P-51.” |
| 6N.04 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the 17’ threshold for using the R4-11 sign. The Option in lines 17 – 19 on page 596 should list 14 feet as the lane width under which the BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE signs may be used. SDDOT uses 14’ lanes to allow vehicles an 11’ lane with 3’ for bicycles. This would also match what is shown on the new typical applications in Figures 6P-47 and 6P-48. |
| 6N.05 | YES |  |  | Agree with change from Option to Guidance in line 37 on page 596 for using the SHOULDER WORK sign. |
| 6N.13 |  | YES |  | Change “the” to “to” in line 28 on page 602. |
| 6N.13 |  |  | NO | The words “should” and “may” are used in the Support statements on lines 28 – 36 on page 602, which is not appropriate. |
| 6N.19 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the Guidance statement in line 14 on page 605 that recommends against using the late merge on high speed facilities. Where congestion is an issue or traffic queues result from lane closures increasing the potential for crashes in work zones is often on interstate or expressways which would have posted speed limits of 45 MPH or greater (i.e. high speed). This would preclude the late merge from being used on facilities with the greatest need for such merging. Late Merge operations are also beneficial for congested situations, so stating that this should not be used on low volume roadways is unnecessary. This Guidance statement should be deleted. |
| 6P.01 |  | YES |  | The reference in line 13 on page 611 needs to change “6P-5” to “6P-3” as this is the table that is a reproduction of Table 6B-1. |
| 6P.01 |  | YES |  | Need to update the total number of typical applications in line 29 on page 611.  Also, should the second sentence in the paragraph beginning on line 29 on page 611 also be revised to refer to the notes for each typical application being on the page previous to the Figure instead of saying right-hand page and left-hand page since this document is used extensively online versus printed and bound copy? |
| Table 6P-2 |  |  |  | Table 6P-2 is not included in the document containing the Tables for Part 6. |
| 6P.01 |  | YES |  | Appears the second reference to Table 6P-4 in line 33 on page 611 should be changed to Table 6P-3. |
| Table 6P-5 |  |  |  | Table 6P-5 in the document containing the Tables for Part 6 appears to be a duplicate of Table 6P-3 but with a different title. This does not seem necessary. |
| Figures & Notes for the TAs in Part 6 | YES |  |  | Agree with the addition of all the new Option notes regarding the use of positive protection devices. |
| Fig. 6P-7 |  |  | NO | Disagree with the change from Option to Guidance to use delineators or channelizing devices along a diversion. |
| Notes for Fig. 6P-22 |  | YES |  | Change “left-hand” to “right-hand” Note 8, line 23 on page 633 because Figure 6P-22 shows a right lane closure, not a left lane closure. |
| Notes for Fig. 6P-28 |  | YES |  | Because the text in Note 2 (lines 13 – 15 on page 639) is a Standard, should the maximum slope in parentheses be shown as 8.3% instead of 8%? |
| Notes for Fig. 6P-28 |  |  | NO | The Standards in Notes 5 and 6 (lines 19 – 24 on page 639) for Figure 6P-28 should be Guidance statements instead of standards. Current audible information devices available are easily tampered with and the correct and useful information may not be available at all times due to such issues until project staff are able to fix them. |
| Notes for Fig. 6P-29 |  |  | NO | The Standards in Notes 3 and 4 (lines 8 – 13 on page 641) for Figure 6P-29 should be Guidance statements instead of standards. Current audible information devices available are easily tampered with and the correct and useful information may not be available at all times due to such issues until project staff are able to fix them. |
| Fig. 6P-38 & Associated Notes | YES |  |  | Agree with the changes regarding arrow boards in the Notes and as shown on Figure 6P-38. Per the Standard in Section 6L.06 (lines 30 and 31 on page 583), arrow boards shall not be used to indicate a lane shift. Using one in the center lane closure may seem better for capturing drivers’ attention, but then a driver may assume they need to merge out of their lane and make a maneuver inappropriate to the situation and devices installed. Other means of conspicuity enhancements should be used on the W12-1 sign. |
| Fig. 6P-38 & Associated Notes |  | YES |  | The Interior Lane Shift Ahead (W9-4) symbol sign is mentioned in Note 8 in line 26 on page 651 but is not shown on Figure 6P-38. This sign should be added to the Figure. |
| Fig. 6P-47 & Associated Notes |  |  | NO | Disagree with the 17’ threshold for using the BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE. While still just an Option, 14’ should be lane width referenced in lines 9 – 13 for when these signs may be used. 14’ lanes are used currently to allow vehicles an 11’ lane with 3’ for bicycles. This would also match what is actually shown on the new typical applications in Figures 6P-47 and 6P-48.  Figure 6P-47 shows the SHARE THE ROAD plaque which is being eliminated from the manual. The sign in the Figure should be replaced with an IN ROAD plaque. Also, the plaques referenced in Note 3 in line 13 on page 660 are incorrect. “ON STREET” and “ON ROADWAY” should be changed to “IN STREET” and “IN ROAD.”  Disagree with showing a taper length L for the closure of the bicycle lane. A taper length of 1/3 L should be sufficient or guidance should be given on appropriate bicycle lane speeds to use for determining L (without requiring agencies to attempt to determine 85th-percentile bicycle speeds). |
| Fig. 6P-48 |  |  | NO | Figure 6P-48 shows the SHARE THE ROAD plaque which is being eliminated from the manual. The sign in the Figure should be replaced with an IN ROAD plaque. |
| Fig. 6P-49 |  | YES |  | The references on Figure 6P-49 to Tables 6P-2 and 6P-3 should be verified. Table 6P-2 was not included in the document containing the Tables for Part 6, so cannot verify if the dashed orange symbol on here would indicated pedestrian channelizing devices, since shared use paths are not used exclusively by bicycles and pedestrian accommodations need to be included. Table 6P-3 would give the meaning of letter codes for sign spacing but these letter codes are not used on this Figure. |
| Fig. 6P-50 & Associated Notes |  |  | NO | Shared use paths are not exclusively used by bicycles. They are also used by pedestrians. There should be notes associated with this application that indicate that a detour or routing onto the roadway may not be appropriate for pedestrians and that signing and devices are needed to direct pedestrian traffic to a separate detour as shown on a different typical application.  Figure 6P-50 shows the SHARE THE ROAD plaque which is being eliminated from the manual. The sign in the Figure should be replaced with an IN ROAD plaque. |
| Notes for Fig. 6P-52 |  | YES |  | Reference to “Figure 6P-47” needs to be changed to “Figure 6P-52” in Note 3 (line 10, page 665). |
| Fig. 6P-52 & Notes for Fig. 6P-53 |  | YES |  | Note 8 (lines 25 – 28, page 666) on Figure 6P-53 addresses changes for short-term or intermediate-term work, however, Figure 6P-52 (TA-52) is specifically for short duration or short-term work. Would appear that Figure 6P-52 could be deleted.  Delete “98” and “99” in Note 10 (lines 31 – 33, page 666) on Figure 6P-53. |
| Fig. 6P-54 |  |  | NO | Disagree with a 4th sign being shown in the advance warning sign series. Delete the LANE ENDS MERGE LEFT sign from Figure 6P-54. This sign is proposed to be removed from the manual and is not necessary here.  Change the text at the bottom of the Figure to refer to Typical Application 54, not 55.  Show all dimension lines for L and Buffer Length separately as shown on the bottom of the Figure. |
| Notes for Fig. 6P-54 |  | YES |  | Revise Note 2 (lines 12 and 13) so it reads: “…when establishing the limits of the work zone to ensure adequate sight distance…” to match Note 11 for Figure 6P-53. |
| 7B.01 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 36 on page 670 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |
| 7B.02 | YES |  |  | Agree with change from Standard to Guidance in lines 1 – 5 on page 671 to identify the beginning point of the higher fines zone with BEGIN HIGHER FINES ZONE signs. |
| 7B.05 |  |  | NO | Disagree strongly with the addition of a sign in the manual for STOP FOR SCHOOL BUS WHEN RED LIGHTS FLASH. There is no state in the country that does not have a law requiring drivers to stop for a school bus when red lights flash. A sign stating this requirement just adds to sign clutter and goes against the provisions of the manual in Part 1 for the fundamentals of traffic control devices. If a driver doesn’t stop for a school bus with red flashing lights in the roadway, the sign will not make them do so. There is already a School Bus Stop Ahead sign that can be used when there is not adequate sight distance to the bus stop. The School Bus Stop Ahead sign is one of the most requested signs we get, mostly in areas with much greater than adequate sight distance. Now, we would be installing this sign in these areas. Section 7B.05 should be deleted.  In line with this recommendation, regulatory signing for common state laws (such as FENDER BENDER MOVE OVER signs) or any other additions to the manual for similar types of signing (like seat belt use required, etc.) should also not be included in the manual. |
| 7D.02 |  | YES |  | The reference to the ANSI standard for high visibility apparel in line 34 on page 678 should be changed to ANSI/ISEA 107–2015. |
| 8A.03 |  | YES |  | Need to add a comma after “jurisdiction” in line 28 on page 682. |
| 8A.08 |  | YES |  | Insert the word “of” between “operation” and “active” in line 10 on page 686. |
| 8A.14 |  | YES |  | Reference to Figure 6H-46 in line 25 on page 689 needs to be changed to 6P-46. |
| 8B.01 |  | YES |  | The Support statement in lines 11 – 14 on page 690 should only say “Unless otherwise provided in this Chapter, the provisions of Part 2 are applicable to the design and location of signs at grade crossings.” Reference to markings and Part 3 should be deleted and included as a support statement in Chapter 8C. Chapter 8B is only signs now. |
| 8B.03 |  | YES |  | Line 3 on page 691 should be revised to say “On the crossbuck assembly at all passive rail-grade crossings…” The Standard in lines 31 and 32 on page 690 requires at least one crossbuck assembly on each highway approach to every highway rail-grade crossing, so to say “At passive rail-grade crossings where a crossbuck assembly is installed” is confusing because it implies there could be rail-grade crossings where the crossbuck assembly is not installed. This was a confusing point in the 2009 manual as well that should be corrected with the new edition. |
| 8B.26 |  | YES |  | The Standard in lines 6 – 8 on page 701 should be revised to say “Emergency Notification System signs at highway-rail grade crossings shall, at a minimum, include…” The Standard in lines 1 – 4 on page 701 requires Emergency Notification System signs to be installed on each approach to all highway-rail grade crossings, so to say “When Emergency Notification System signs are used at a highway-rail grade crossing, they shall be…” implies that there are highway-rail grade crossings where these signs are not installed, which would be in violation of the first standard (lines 1 – 4). This could cause confusion. There may have been situations where Emergency Notification System signs were not used at highway-rail grade crossings before when lines 1 – 4 were Guidance but the proposed change to a Standard should prompt a revision to the Standard in lines 6 – 8. |
| Fig. 8C-1 |  | YES |  | The note on Figure 8C-1 about transverse bands on multi-lane roads needs each “should” changed to “shall” to match the Standard statement level in lines 32 and 33 on page 702. |
| 8D.02 |  | YES |  | The reference to Figure 8C-1 in lines 24 and 46 on page 707 should be changed to Figure 8D-1. Figure 8C-1 shows pavement markings and no flashing light assembly. |
| 8D.03 |  | YES |  | Change “down” to “up” in line 25 on page 709 (the width becomes the height when the gate is up, not down). |
| 8D.07 |  | YES |  | Should “Diagnostic Team” be first letter capitalized in the Guidance statement in lines 5 – 8 on page 712? |
| 8D.11 |  | YES |  | The Support statements in lines 8 – 15 on page 719 should be rewritten as Option statements using the word may to allow use of the word TRAIN as part of the blank-out turn prohibition sign and to allow use of activated blank-out turn prohibition signs at unsignalized highway-highway intersections in the vicinity of grade crossings. |
| 8D.12 |  | YES |  | Change “towards” to “toward” in line 7 on page 720. |
| 8D.16 |  | YES |  | Reference to Figure 8D-4 in lines 29 and 30 on page 727 needs to be changed to Figure 8D-3. |
| 8E.03 | YES |  |  | Agree with repeating the Standards for overhead mounting height and lateral offset for signs above or adjacent to sidewalks in this Section to avoid confusion with the Standards for mounting heights and lateral offsets for pathways (lines 42 and 43, page 730 & lines 49, 50, 1, and 2 on pages 730 and 731). |
| Fig. 8E-6 (& Sec. 8E.04) |  | YES |  | Figures 8E-5 and 8E-6 need to be switched in number. Figure 8E-5 is referenced in line 12 on page 732 and is intended to follow Section 8E.04. This is supposed to be the Example of a Refuge Area and Detectable Warnings at a Sidewalk Grade Crossing, but in the Figures for Part 8 document, this is Figure 8E-6. |
| 8E.05 |  | YES |  | Reference to Figure 8E-6 in line 21 on page 732 needs to be changed to Figure 8E-4. Figure 8E-4 shows the crossbuck assembly.  Reference to Figure 8E-2 in line 25 on page 732 should also be changed to Figure 8E-4 because Figure 8E-4 shows the dimension to the crossbuck assembly. Figure 8E-2 just shows the 25-foot dimension from the sidewalk to the traffic control device for the grade crossing. |
| 8E.05 |  | YES |  | All references to Figure 8E-6 in lines 7 – 15 on page 733 need to be changed to 8E-7. |
| 8E.06 |  | YES |  | Change “Figure 8E-7” in line 29 on page 733 and line 4 on page 734 to “Figure 8E-8” to correct which figure shows these features.  Need to correct the highlighted Figure references to match the actual Figures and their titles. Should also rearrange the figures in the document containing the Figures for Part 8 to match the order they appear in Chapter 8E. |
| 8E.09 |  | YES |  | Line 33 on page 736 should reference Figures 8E-10, 8E-11, 8E-13, and 8E-14 for automatic pedestrian gates.  In line 39 on page 736, change “Figure 8E-7” to “Figure 8E-11”  In line 44 on page 736, change “Figure 8E-7” to “Figure 8E-6”  In line 7 on page 737, not sure Figure 8E-13 is the correct figure to reference since no dimensions are shown on this figure. |
| Table 9A-1 |  | YES |  | The order of the W9-5 and W9-5a signs in Table 9A-1 need to be switched.  Table 9A-1 appears to contain all types of bicycles signs, despite the docket summary for item #586 stating that signs will be split into three tables, 9B-1, 9C-1, and 9D-1. None of these tables appear in the document containing the Tables for Part 9, which only contains Table 9A-1. |
| 9B.02 |  | YES |  | Everywhere the “Except Bicycles plaque” is referenced in Section 9B.02 (pages 743 and 744), it should be shown in all caps as EXCEPT BICYCLES for consistency with references to signs with a word legend in the manual.  “Stop” and “Yield” need to be changed to “STOP” and “YIELD” in lines 2 and 4 on page 744 for consistent reference to these signs in the manual and this section. |
| 9D.04 |  | YES |  | The word “route” in line 44 on page 757 should be changed to “routes” so the sentence reads, “Overlapping numbered routes should be kept to a minimum.” |
| 9D.12 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in lines 19 and 20 on page 765 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual.  Change the comma at the end of line 1 on page 766 to a period. |
| 9E.07 |  |  | NO | Doesn’t seem appropriate to reference the Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) in lines 12 and 13 on page 773 since PROWAG is still in draft form and has not been adopted as rule yet and thus is subject to change. |
| 9E.15 |  | YES |  | Change the reference in line 30 on page 779 to say “Standard Highway Signs” publication to be consistent with this revision throughout the manual. |

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