**Chapter 1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| 1A.04 | 3 | 1-2 | Should “conduct traffic control device activities” really be “determine traffic control device uses?” |
| 1A.04 | 3 | 3-5 | We have concerns that the language may limit the number of staff currently making decisions on projects during construction. |
| 1A.05 |  | 781 | Should AASHTO Low-Volume Roads be included in list? |
|  | | | |
| 1C.02 | 19 | 29-36 | We have concerns with the definition and the phrase “traffic engineering expertise.” Not all personnel making decisions during construction may have “traffic” engineering experience, but they have significant engineering experience and expertise. Language is restrictive and could limit the number of personnel making decisions and therefore causing project delays.  Definition 176 should be referenced. |
| 1C.02 | 21 | 36 | Should side roadway really be site roadway? |
| 1C.02 | 22 |  | Should there be a definition for low speed? |
| 1C.02 | 22 | 36-38 | Low Volume Roads policy covers AADT of less than 2000 but has a definition of very-low volume for less than 400. |
| 1C.02 | 22 | 54 | New language allows argument that a yellow line is a median. |
| 1C.02 | 23 | 1 | With median excludes turn lanes, it is confusing on how the median width is to be measured. |
| 1C.02 | 25 | 7-10 | Removing colleges will put us in a tough situation with universities and their requests. |
| 1C.02 | 27 | 7-10 | Should trails be included? |
| 1C.02 | 29 | 36-46 | Should low speed be defined here? |

**Chapter 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| 2B.19 | 73 | 8-12 | Clarify if this applies to single lane approach also. |
| 2B.21 | 78 | 3-4 | Thank you for the sentence. |
| 2B.27 | 83 | 19 | Figure 2B-1 does not match. |
|  | | | |
| 2C.37 | 138 | 12-14 | We suggest that the “WATCH FOR ENTERING TRAFFIC” (W2-11) not be part of the standard statement. We do not see the need for the sign to be supplemented with an actuated warning system in many cases. We would like to have the option to use the sign without actuated warning. |
|  | | | |
| 2D.11 | 163 | 29-30 | We would like for this to remain for contrast. |
| 2D.11 | 164 | 15-16 | We would like for this to remain for contrast. |
| 2D.58 | 194 | 7-8 | Agree |
| 2D.58 | 195 | 34-35 | Agree |
|  | | | |
| 2E.18 | 206 | 48-49 | Concerned that signs will now be bigger. Not sure why change is needed. |
| 2E.18 | 207 | 1-2 | Concerned that signs will now be bigger. Not sure why change is needed. |
| 2E.23 | 212 | 20-25 | What are signs E1-5 cP to mP? Confusing. |
| 2E.47 | 231 | 37 | We would like the E7-1, E7-2, E7-3 Series further defined. We would like clarification on what these signs are. |
| 2E.50 | 234 | 22-24 | We would like to keep this as an option. We have universities that would take issue with not being allowed. |
| 2E.53 | 235 | 41 | Figure 2E-61 should be referenced in place of 2E-59. |
| 2E.57 | 238 | 40-41 | Should reference 2E.65 |
| Figure 2E-48 |  |  | We do not believe R3-8 will be effective on freeway. We suggest consideration for option. |
|  | | | |
| 2H.12 | 286 | 20 | We would like to have blue continue to be allowed. |

**Chapter 3**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| 3B.12 | 350 | 31 | Clarification is needed between figure 2C.13 and figure 3B.14 on where to install the W4-2R. |
| 3B-31 | 367 | 35 & 37 | No figure 3B-29 shown. |
|  | | | |
| 3C.08 | 372 | 17 | Not sure what is a longitudinal bar pair. Is it the double paired shown in figure 3C-1? |
|  | | | |
| 3D.04 | 375 | 44 | If for multi-lane roundabouts, yield line should be shown in figures 3D-5 and 3D-6 |

**Chapter 4**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| 4C.01 | 412 | 4 | Temporary signals that are not part of work zones should have an engineering study to determine its installation or not. |

**Chapter 5**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| All |  |  | We would like clarification on purpose of the chapter. We have heard the chapter is to apply for routes selected as an automated/connected vehicle corridor, but the text suggests the chapter applies to all roadways and affects all chapters of the manual. Is the chapter for all roadways or just routes selected for automated/connected vehicles? |
|  | | | |
| 5B.02 | 513 | 18-44 | We appreciate the thought and guidance offered in this section. |

**Chapter 6**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| 6A.02 | 520 | 6-7 & 12-13 | Maintenance is a concern regarding devices for pedestrians with visual disabilities. Also, are the devices required if sidewalk is not existing? |
|  | | | |
| 6B.01 | 524 | 24 | Broad statement. Locals may be affected significantly. |
|  | | | |
| 6C.05 | 536 | 33-34 | Suggest striking “are exposed … equipment.” |
|  | | | |
| 6D.06 | 541 | 14 | Believe “shall” is needed. |
|  | | | |
| 6M.02 | 586 | 14-15 | Do not believe a traffic study is needed to use positive protection devices. Seems heavy handed. |
|  | | | |
| 6N.05 | 596 | 37 | We suggest keeping “may”; work can be done off the shoulder and roadway. |
| 6N.19 | 605 | 14 | Late or Zipper Merge are used on high speed roadways as part of work zones. Please revisit wording on line 14. |
|  | | | |
| Notes | 662 | 5-6 | Same width seems extreme for temporary cases. |
|  | | | |
| Notes | 665 | 10 | Reference should be 6P-52. |
|  | | | |
| Notes | 666 | 29-33 | Clarify 96 flagger, 98 horizontal, flagger 99. |

**Chapter 7**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| Figure 7B-5 |  |  | Note should reference 7B.03 |

**Chapters 8**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| 8A.12 | 687 | 16-20 | We support Standard remaining in place and keeping the shall condition. |
| 8A.14 | 688 | 49-51 | We would like the law enforcement officer to be a may condition. |
|  | | | |
| 8B.16 | 698 | 20 | Not sure Section 2B.52 is correct. |
|  | | | |
| 8E.02 | 729 | 32-34 | Diagnostic Team to “determine” not design and develop. |
| 8E.05 | 733 | 12 | Was 0 feet for sidewalks really intended? |

**Chapter 9**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Section No** | **Page** | **Lines** | **Comment** |
| 9A.03 | 741 | 43 | What does “around bicycle facilities” mean? |
|  | | | |
| Figure 9B-2 Sheet 1,2 |  |  | Please show intersection control. |
| 9B.03 | 744 | 40-41 | Remove wording after” … on the sign face.” |
| Figure 9B-3 |  |  | Please label signs on figure. |
| 9B.18 | 749 | 26-26 | Language reads more like an Option. |
| 9B.19 | 749 | 34 | Where are these signs? |
|  | | | |
| 9D.04 | 758 | 4-5 | Would prefer this be Guidance in place of a Standard. We fear a Standard will discourage states from numbering routes. |
| 9D.06 | 759 | 23 | Could not find M1-8b, M1-8 signs. |
| 9D.08 | 762 | 26 | What is Figure 9B-x? |
|  | | | |
| 9F.08 | 774 | 22-23 | We believe the situation described currently exists and is working. Suggest making it a should condition. |