Please use this form to provide comments on the Notice of Proposed Amendments for the MUTCD.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. Add your name or organization name where indicted in the footer of this form.
2. Use Table 1 to provide your original comments.
3. Use Table 2 to indicate your agreement with a comment that another commenter has submitted to the docket.
4. Do not adjust formatting of the rows and columns; text will automatically wrap and expand the row height as you type.
5. To add rows to this form, use the “Insert Rows” function, or hover just outside the left edge of the row below which you would like to add a row and click the encircled “+” that appears.
6. If you choose to provide a letter to accompany this comment form, please **print the document as a PDF**; **please do not scan a hard copy**. This will assist FHWA with cataloging your comments.

**TABLE 1. ORIGINAL COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES.** Please indicate the applicable proposed Section numbers in the far-left column. In the next three columns, please indicate your agreement, disagreement, or whether the column is applicable to your response by placing a, “YES,” “NO,” or “N/A” in the appropriate column of the row. If you agree with a proposed change, then there is no need to fill out the additional columns beyond the first two. However, it can be helpful to explain why you agree with a proposed change based on your objective experience as a roadway operator and/or empirical data. If you disagree in part or in whole, then please provide additional information that FHWA may find helpful.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed  Section Number(s) | Agree with concept and text as proposed | Agree with concept; suggested rewording of text in Comments | Disagree with concept | Comments  *Please include justification for your position based on objective experience and empirical data. If there is a specific statement with which you take exception, please provide the Page and Line numbers from the mark-up version of the proposed MUTCD text.* |
| All |  |  |  | See other file submitted to docket which shows detailed recommended changes to the draft MUTCD text, figures, and tables. |
| 2D.01 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.01 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-1 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-1 as presented in the NPA, but notes the figure title is different in the NPA text as compared to the NPA figures. NCUTCD recommends selecting one of these titles as the final figure title. |
| 2D.02 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.02 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-2 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-2 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.03 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.02 as presented in the NPA. |
| Table 2D-1 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Table 2D-1 as presented in the NPA, but notes the table title is different in the NPA text as compared to the NPA tables. NCUTCD recommends selecting one of these titles as the final table title. |
| 2D.04 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.04 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.05 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2D.05 by removing all references to lower-case letter height and instead refer solely to upper case or mixed case letter height. Although Section 2D.04 discusses the concept of loop height and its relationship to upper case height, and sign fabricators decades ago specified lower case letters by loop height, current electronic sign design practice uses only the upper case letter height to correctly select the letter size for all text, similar to nearly all other instances of text selection in computer software (including the one being used to type this comment). Also, the MUTCD specifies shorter upper case letter heights for letters following the initial letter in cardinal direction legends, which may be conditioning some sign designers to also think that the text size must be changed in a similar manner for mixed case text. Retaining the obsolete practice of specifying lower-case text height separately results in some sign designers thinking they need to change the text height for lower case text in the sign software during layout similar as to what is expected for cardinal directions, apparently not understanding the lower case height is a loop height. This then creates a sign with lower case legend that is too small, which greatly reduces legibility and no longer meets MUTCD Standards. |
| Table 2D-2 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Table 2D-2 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Revise the title to add “Recommended” at the beginning and change “by Roadway Type” to “According to Speed”, as speed is now a primary criterion used for selecting letter height * Delete all rows and references to “Following Lower Case Letters or Ordinals”, as this has been misinterpreted as specifying a smaller ascender height for lower case text, not as a loop height, regardless of the footnote (see comments on Section 2D.05) * On Sheet 2, section A, for names of destinations or roads, revise the upper case letter height for overhead signs from 13.33” to 10.67” in accordance with Section 2D.05 * Delete the footnote on lower case loop height, as the rows it references for lower case height are deleted |
| 2D.06 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.06 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.07 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.07 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising “apparent complexity” to “reading time” for clarity, and revising table references (see comments on Table 2D-3). |
| Figure 2D-3 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-3 as presented in the NPA, but notes the figure title is different in the NPA text as compared to the NPA figures. NCUTCD recommends selecting one of these titles as the final figure title. |
| Table 2D-3 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends deleting Table 2D-3, combining its content with Table 1D-1, and changing all references to Table 1D-1. As part of this consolidation, NCUTCD recommends adding “Cr” to Table 1D-1 for Crossing. |
| Table 2D-4 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends deleting Table 2D-4, combining its content with Table 1D-3, and changing all references to Table 1D-3. |
| 2D.08 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.08 as presented in the NPA, but recommends the term “circular intersection” be changed to “roundabout” to clarify the appropriate use of the Type E arrow. |
| Figure 2D-4 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-4 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the note to refer to the “Standard Highway Signs publication”. |
| 2D.09 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.09 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.10 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.10 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.11 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.11 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding two instances of “Except as otherwise provided in this Manual” to minimum sign size Standard text, since there are a number of route signs (such as for county highways and bicycle routes) that use sizes smaller than 24”. |
| 2D.12 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.12 as presented in the NPA, with minor editorial revisions. |
| 2D.13 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.13 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-6 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-6 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the title from “Route Sign Auxiliaries” to “Route Sign Auxiliary Plaques”. |
| 2D.14 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.14 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.15 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.15 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.16 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.16 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.17 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.17 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.18 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.18 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.19 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.19 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.20 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.20 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.21 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.21 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.22 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.22 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.23 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.23 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.24 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.24 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.25 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.25 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.26 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.26 as presented in the NPA, but recommends the term “circular intersection” be changed to “roundabout” to clarify the appropriate use of the M5-3 plaque. |
| Figure 2D-7 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-7 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.27 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.27 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.28 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.28 as presented in the NPA, but recommends the term “circular intersection” be changed to “roundabout” to clarify double-headed arrows are prohibited specifically at roundabouts. |
| 2D.29 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.29 as presented in the NPA, but recommends moving Guidance language and the reference to Figure 2D-8 to the end of this section since it makes sense to first present the standard case of route sign assemblies in full before presenting the consolidation of such assemblies thereof. NCUTCD also recommends the term “circular intersection” be changed to “roundabout” to clarify the appropriate use of D1-5 and D1-5a signs. |
| Figure 2D-8 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-8 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-9 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-9 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.30 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.30 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.31 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.31 as presented in the NPA, with minor editorial revisions. |
| 2D.32 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.32 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.33 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.33 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.34 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.34 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.35 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.35 as presented in the NPA, with minor editorial revisions. |
| 2D.36 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.36 as presented in the NPA, with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2D-10 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-10 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.37 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2D.37 to clearly distinguish between overhead Arrow-Per-Lane signs on freeways and expressways versus signs on conventional roadways and to note that not all lanes will have arrows, add a reference to Figure 2A-4, and revise “option lane” to “optional movement lane” in the Guidance statement. |
| Figure 2D-11 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2D-11 as follows:   * Sign #1: remove the black on yellow ONLY plaque, since this is not typically used for the through movement * Use the figure title as presented in the NPA figures document |
| 2D.38 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.38 as presented in the NPA, but recommends deleting the reference to Figure 2A-5 for the usage of the D15-1 sign. Figure 2A-5 does not provide an example of the usage of D15-1 signs, and there currently is not a Figure for this anywhere in the NPA. |
| 2D.39 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2D.39 to change multiple references of “circular intersection” to “roundabout” since these signs are intended specifically for roundabouts, and revise “Chapter 3C” to “Chapter 3D” in the last Support statement. |
| Figure 2D-12 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-12 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the title from “Destination Signs for Circular Intersections” to “Destination Signs for Roundabouts” since these signs are intended specifically for roundabouts. |
| Figure 2D-13 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-13 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the “Water St NEXT CIRCLE” sign on sheet 2 to use either a NEXT INTERSECTION OR NEXT ROUNDABOUT message. |
| 2D.40 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2D.40 to restore the Option statement from the 2009 MUTCD referencing engineering judgment on guide signing at jughandles. There are many areas of the US where jughandles are not common, and diagrammatic signs have been used to help educate drivers and help them turn at the correct location. NCUTCD also recommends correcting the figure reference from 2B-5 to 2B-9. |
| 2D.41 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.12 as presented in the NPA, with minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2D-14 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-14 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Select either the title in the NPA text or the title in the figures document as the final table title * Add leader lines between the U AND LEFT TURN signs and sign locations on sheet 1 |
| 2D.42 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.42 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.43 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.43 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.44 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.44 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.45 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.45 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Delete text specifying legend heights and replace with references to Table 2D-5) * Revise the reference for “Section 2A.13” to “Section 2A.08” * Revise Guidance in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 14A-GMI-02 recommending display of street name signs front and back, as street name signs are also viewed by pedestrians traveling both directions on one-way streets |
| Figure 2D-15 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-15 as presented in the NPA. |
| Table 2D-5 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Table 2D-5 as presented in the NPA, but recommends deleting all columns and references to lower case letter height, as this has been misinterpreted as specifying a smaller ascender height for lower case text, not as a loop height (see comments on Section 2D.05) |
| 2D.46 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.46 as presented in the NPA, but recommends a minor editorial revision and revising the term “circular intersection” to “roundabout” to clarify appropriate use of curved-stem arrows. |
| 2D.47 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.47 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.48 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.48 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.49 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends renaming of the text of Transposed Alignment Crossroads for a Diamond Interchange to the text of Diverging Diamond Interchange to match the text in Section 2D.37 and the proposed text in Part 3. |
| Figure 2D-16 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-16 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-17 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-17 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-18 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-18 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-19 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-19 as presented in the NPA, but recommends increasing the size of the FREEWAY ENTRANCE signs on the figure to be more readable. NCUTCD also recommends adding a note on Figure 2D-19 that reads: “Regulatory signs to deter wrong way movements are not shown. See Figure 2B-19 for examples of regulatory signing and pavement markings to deter wrong-way entry” to address measures deterring wrong-way movements at partial cloverleaf interchanges because the entrance and exit ramps are adjacent. |
| Figure 2D-20 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-20 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-21 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-21 as presented in the NPA, but recommends switching the cardinal directions on the guide sign at the ramp, as it is inconsistent with the other signs. |
| Figure 2D-22 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-22 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Revise the title from “Guide Signs for Transposed-Alignment Crossroads at a Diamond Interchange” to the commonly-used “Guide Signs for a Diverging Diamond Interchange” * Add “TO” as sign legend adjacent to or above the NORTH cardinal direction on both of the dual diagonal arrow advanced direction guide signs to be consistent with the route assembly |
| Figure 2D-23 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-23 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Revise the first part of the title from “Example of Traffic Control Devices” to “Guide Signs” to convey that guide signs are the primary focus of this figure * Delete all traffic signal items * Rotate the pavement marking arrow on the top right of the detail 90 degrees clockwise to show the correct orientation |
| 2D.50 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.50 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.51 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising 2D.51 as follows:   * Delete the second sentence of the first Support paragraph because permanent signing is generally not installed for a temporary facility * Add “or Inspection” to the second Support paragraph because many of these facilities are now designated as inspection stations * Revise the sign in list item A in the first Standard statement to a new “WEIGH STATION AHEAD (D8-1a)” sign * Add an Option paragraph allowing omitting the weigh station exit gore sign where overhead signing is provided * Revise the Option statement to allow alternate sign legends to better identify the purpose of the station * Revise the Guidance statement to improve wording on placement of open/closed messages * Revise the final Standard statement to simplify wording |
| Figure 2D-24 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends Figure 2D.24 be revised as follows:   * Revise the note referencing placement of open/closed messages * Add a note stating “an alternative legend may be substituted for WEIGH STATION on all D8 series signs” to be consistent with Section 2E.53 * Delete the note adjacent to the R13-1 sign that allows white on black to be consistent with Section 2B.67 |
| 2D.52 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.52 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-25 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-25 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.53 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.53 as presented in the NPA, but recommends adding an Option statement to allow adjustment of the location and distance of the D17-2 and D17-4 signs, plus minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2D-26 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-26 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-27 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-27 as presented in the NPA, but recommends showing all signs and dimensions consistently with other Figures in other chapters of the MUTCD related to lane ends signing and markings. |
| Figure 2D-28 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-28 as presented in the NPA, but recommends showing all signs and dimensions consistently with other Figures in other chapters of the MUTCD related to lane ends signing and markings. |
| 2D.54 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.54 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the Guidance statement to also allow for emergency turn-out signing in locations where there is part-time shoulder use consistent with Section 2G.23. |
| Figure 2D-29 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-29 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-30 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-30 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising the far left edge line to white (not yellow). NCUTCD notes the figure title is different in the NPA text as compared to the NPA figures. NCUTCD recommends selecting one of these titles as the final figure title. |
| 2D.55 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.55 as presented in the NPA, but recommends using the term “scanning graphics” to agree with NCUTCD recommendations for Section 2A.04 and Section 2H.07, plus minor editorial revisions. |
| Figure 2D-31 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-31 as presented in the NPA, but recommends restoring sign details as seen in the 2009 MUTCD depicting color coding for destinations, as the NPA content allows this option. |
| Figure 2D-32 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-32 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-33 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with Figure 2D-33 as presented in the NPA, but recommends restoring sign details as seen in the 2009 MUTCD depicting color coding for destinations, as the NPA content allows this option. |
| 2D.56 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with 2D.56 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.57 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.57 as presented in the NPA, but recommends deleting the second Support paragraph as it does not support the content in this Section, and a proper system of signing routes and sites allows a driver to navigate without taking their eyes off the road. |
| Figure 2D-34 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-34 as presented in the NPA. |
| Figure 2D-35 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-35 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.58 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD generally agrees with 2D.58 as presented in the NPA, but recommends revising as follows:   * Delete the second Support paragraph as it does not support the content in this Section, and a proper system of signing routes and sites allows a driver to navigate without taking their eyes off the road * Revise the Standard statement to clarify that scenic byway, historic trail and auto tour route signs do not appear similar to highway route markers, so that the trail or byway is not mistaken to be a route of equal importance * Delete the final Support sentence because Figure 2D-36 does not provide directions from a freeway or expressway interchange |
| Figure 2D-36 | YES | N/A | N/A | NCUTCD agrees with Figure 2D-36 as presented in the NPA. |
| 2D.59 | NO | YES | N/A | The intent of this signing is to bypass incidents on the main route rather than be a bypass for emergencies. Use of the term EMERGENCY for signing as described in this proposal conflicts with the public’s more common understanding of the word EMERGENCY, such as for medical, fire or evacuation. In some states, activation of a signed emergency route would require an emergency declaration such as for regulations related to snow emergency routes. The marking of emergency routes is also typically done as a response to a declaration of an emergency (hurricane, snow emergency, etc.) Based on this, NCUTCD recommends revising 2D.59 as follows in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 18A-GMI-01:   * Revise the section title from “EMERGENCY ROUTE and EMERGENCY ROUTE TO Signs and Plaques” to “INCIDENT BYPASS Signs and Plaques” * Change all instances of “EMERGENCY ROUTE and EMERGENCY ROUTE TO” to “INCIDENT BYPASS” * Other editorial revisions as needed |
| Figure 2D-37 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2D-37 in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 18A-GMI-01 as follows:   * Select one of these titles as the final figure title * Revise all instances of “EMERGENCY ROUTE” and “EMERGENCY ROUTE TO” to “INCIDENT BYPASS” |
| Figure 2D-38 | NO | YES | N/A | NCUTCD recommends revising Figure 2D-38 in accordance with NCUTCD recommendation 18A-GMI-01 as follows:   * Select one of these titles as the final figure title * Revise all instances of “EMERGENCY ROUTE” and “EMERGENCY ROUTE TO” to “INCIDENT BYPASS” * Remove the contour and river/stream lines as they provide no value to the reader |

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