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.* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 3B.09  Page 309  Line 32 | N/A | YES | N/A | Consider revising text to say “Regardless of the normal width line used…” “Normal line” is not used in this chapter and the way it is used in this sentence, it sounds like a type of line.  Delete the word “normal”. |
| 3B.10  Page 348  Line 34 | N/A | YES | N/A | Consider revising the section title for 3B.10 to be “Warrants for Edge Lines” consistent with the title for section 3B.02 Warrants for Yellow Center Lines |
| 3B.24  Page 363  Line 9 | N/A | YES | N/A | Agree with option language, but with the recent industry focus on wrong way driving prevention, consider adding guidance to **recommend** using supplemental wrong way arrows where engineering judgment or study indicates a need. Also, consider providing guidance on where to place the supplemental wrong way arrow (center of the lane, adjacent to the wrong way signs). Future versions of the MUTCD may want to consider providing expanded guidance for wrong way prevention including considering identifying enhancements to deploy based on levels of compliance and safety concerns. Included enhancements could be retroreflective strips, LED flashing signs, ITS devices, Yellow Painted Median Nose, etc. The expansion could also provide guidance for wrong way prevention for various ramp/interchange configurations, single lane and multi-lane ramp configurations, and intersection configurations.  References include Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission “Interchange Signing Plan” Part 2 and “Drafting, Designing and Deploying Wrong Way Driving Countermeasures a Florida DOT Initiative” |
| 3B.31  Page 367  Line 18 | N/A | YES | N/A | Agree with this section, however adding a description of a transposed alignment crossroad or adding the term to the glossary and referencing the definition would be helpful. |
| 3C.02  Page 368  Line 44 | N/A | YES | N/A | Consider moving reference to Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon to Warning Beacon to Section 3C.01 as it is not clear why these devices are included in the Crosswalk Marking section. |
| 3C.05  Page 371  Line 1 | N/A | YES | N/A | Agree with the option concept, however perhaps High Visibility Markings should be reworded as recommended and included as guidance. |
| 3C.06  Page 371  Line 39  and Page 372 Line 9 | N/A | YES | N/A | Agree with the concept, however standard dimensions do not match the dimensions on the figure.  …Shall not be less than 24 inches… |
| 3C.08  Page 372  Line 20 | N/A | YES | N/A | Consider providing the reason why the longitudinal bar pair crosswalks would have the opportunity for less maintenance. This could be an important factor in the selection of a crosswalk type for municipalities and it may not be clear why these are easier to maintain. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**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 |
| N/A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |