

FHWA ITEMS FOR THE MARKINGS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
January 2003

Urbanization Survey Issues: MTC is requested to review the responses and comments on Questions #6 thru 10 of the “MUTCD Urbanization Needs Survey Results”. The FHWA has identified the following as issues from the survey for consideration of development of material for the next revision of the MUTCD, and we would like the MTC to take the lead in developing recommendations:

- Lane drop markings for non-freeway “trap lane” applications
- “Don’t Block the Box” and/or other markings to indicate “keep clear”
- Transverse lines to mark start and end of school zones
- Guidance for location and placement of blue RPMs for hydrants

The survey also identified a desire/need for a low-cost marking pattern to identify the center of low-speed residential roadways, without implying whether or not passing is prohibited. MTC is requested to give serious consideration to this issue. **Dan Centa**

Older Driver Handbook Issues: The Older Driver/Pedestrian Design Handbook contain a variety of recommendations related to markings and delineation. FHWA’s review of those recommendations (see attached Excel spreadsheet) indicates there are some areas where Part 3 could be enhanced by adding some additional Support and/or Option text, or by clarifying some existing text. FHWA would like the MTC’s older driver task force to consider the comments in the far right column of the spreadsheet as they develop recommendations. **Johan Bemelen**

Chip Seal “Tabs”: These “pop-up” tabs, typically used as temporary markings during and after a resurfacing operation, are considered raised pavement markers substituting for centerline (and sometimes also lane line) markings. Thus, Sections 6F.67 and 3B.14 would apply regarding spacing of these tabs, but in the vast majority of cases jurisdictions are actually spacing them much further apart. The TTC Committee has been asked to consider whether different spacings for these tabs would be appropriate under certain conditions. The MTC may wish to review, coordinate with TTC, and provide input also. **Jim Kalchbrenner**

Staggered Stop Lines: There is increasing use of “staggered” stop lines, with the stop line for the right-most lane being set as far forward as possible and the stop line for the other lanes set further back. This provides improved sight distance for right turning drivers to be able to see pedestrians and vehicular traffic when making a right turn on red after stop movement. This practice is not specifically mentioned or illustrated in the MUTCD, but is featured in the ITE “Traffic Safety Toolbox”. FHWA believes that Section 3B.16 should be modified to include specific information and/or guidance about this practice. Does MTC have specific recommendations for text? **Ross Aiomloo**

Yield Line Use for Left Turn Lane on Divided Highway: In some areas, yield lines are being used at the front end of a left turn bay, at unsignalized intersections, to remind left turn drivers to yield before turning across oncoming thru traffic. The left turn movement

does not have a yield sign, but is required by the normal “rules of the road” to yield to oncoming thru traffic. In some cases, the yield line has been supplemented by a word legend “YIELD” on the pavement in the left turn lane, just in back of the yield line. FHWA believes this application is consistent with the intended meaning of the yield line and would not be confusing. Should Section 3B.16 be modified to specifically allow this practice? **Duane Thomas**

Measurement of Crosswalk Width: Section 3B.17 specifies a minimum width of a crosswalk, but it does not indicate whether the width is measured as the space inside of the crosswalk lines or center-to-center of the crosswalk lines. The most common practice seems to be the former. Should text be added to this section to clearly indicate how the minimum crosswalk width is to be measured? **Gene Hawkins and Dave Woodin**

Diagonal Markings on Shoulder at Road Width Transition: The MUTCD is silent on the width and spacing of these markings, and has been since the 1971 edition. Back in the 1961 edition, these lines were shown in a figure and the text indicated they should be 12" wide and spaced from 20' apart in low speed areas to 100' apart where operating speeds are 50 mph or over. Does the MTC know why this material was dropped from the 1971 and later editions of the MUTCD? Many State DOTs have developed their own policies and "typicals" drawings for these types of markings, and there is variation from State to State. Should some guidance on these dimensions be considered for adding back into Part 3? Also, is guidance needed for width and spacing of other types of diagonal “cross-hatching” markings (painted medians, safety zones, etc.)? **Gene Hawkins**

“LOOK BOTH WAYS” Legend with Eyeballs: These markings, which originated in England, are increasingly being used in the U.S. where pedestrians step off the curb into the crosswalk, to remind them to look both ways. The MUTCD allows use of word message pavement markings without being specifically identified, but does the incorporation of “eyeballs” into the words constitute a symbol that should be considered for specific inclusion in the MUTCD? **Jon DeFresne – draft language why we do not need to respond**

Speed Hump Markings: Figure 3B-28 Example C, as printed in the Millennium Edition, is slightly different from what the MTC originally recommended. It is thought that this was an error that needs to be corrected. Dan Centa has suggested some further changes in the dimensions. Does the MTC have specific recommendations on this? **Paul Carlson – respond directly to FHWA (Scott Wainwright) that we addressed this in our comments to the NPA for Revision 2**

Object Marker Issues: In Section 3C.01, the Standard for Type 3 marker specifies a minimum width of the yellow stripe, but not a maximum, and does not require the black and yellow stripe widths to be equal, nor does it contain any dimensions for the black stripes. In the Support statement, it encourages black stripes to be wider than yellow “for a better appearance”. Should there be minimum and maximum dimensions for the black stripes? Also in this section, does the MTC believe it is appropriate for the color orange to be substituted for yellow when object markers are placed in TTC zones? (Part 6 is

silent on this except for 6F.58 Vertical Panels.) Dave Woodin – to coordinate with TTC on second element discussed

End-of Roadway Marker Mounting Height: Section 3C.04 specifies minimum mounting height of this marker as 4 feet. It does not indicate whether this is measured to the top or bottom of the marker, nor whether it is measured above the ground level, shoulder, or edge of pavement. There is no definition of the term “mounting height” in the MUTCD. Does the MTC have recommendations for this specific issue? Jim Ellison

Colored Pavements: FHWA’s official interpretation and the proposed Revision No. 2 text have hopefully clarified this issue somewhat, but questions remain, such as: What specific colors are OK to use in the area between the white crosswalk lines, and which are not? What color pavements should be used for a bike lane or a bus lane? A new product called “Rippleprint” simulates rumble strips but colors the pavement red throughout the length of the longitudinal area treated with the “undulations” in pavement surface---is this a traffic control device? This subject of colored pavements and use of colored pavement marking materials (thermoplastic) to simulate colored pavement needs more investigation and MTC recommendations. Steve Bolt – color issues, Gary Wurdack – transverse rumble strips/rippleprint

Rumble Strips: Revision No. 2 has proposed text concerning rumble strips as temporary TCDs in Part 6 of the MUTCD (6F.80). Has MTC reviewed that specific proposal? Does MTC believe that similar text is needed in Part 3 for rumble strips used as permanent TCDs? Gary Wurdack – rumble strips/rippleprint