

December 20, 2003

Older Driver Task Force Final recommendations.

Task Force members: John Bemelen, Chair, **Art Breneman**, ~~Tim Cox~~, Neil Hodson, Carlton Robinson, Richard Schupp, Burt Sutker, Tim Taylor, Duane Thomas, **Bill Wilshire**, and **Dan Centa**.

C.1 - Recommend **DO NOTHING**.

Physical curbing may interfere with drainage, and snowplow operation. **MTC concurred.**

C.2 - Recommend **DO NOTHING**.

We concur that retroreflective surfaces will benefit drivers; Section 3G.04 already allows the use of these types of markings. **MTC concurred.**

E.1, 2, 3 - Recommend **DO NOTHING**.

This should be addressed in Design manual, not the MUTCD. **MTC concurred.**

Issue #1:

E.4c - Recommend adding the words "lane-use arrows for off-set left turn lanes" to the 4th option statement in Section 3B.19. Placing both lane-use arrows and wrong-way arrows near the lane terminus will lead to confusion.

Recommended change; add following to 4th option in Section 3B.19, page 3B-43.

Option:

Where opposing offset channelized left turn lanes exists, lane use arrows may be placed near the downstream terminus of the offset left turn lanes to ~~help~~ reduce wrong-way movements.

Issue #2:

E.4d - recommend adding offset left turn lanes to the guidance in 3B.08.

Recommended change:

Guidance:

*...or where multiple turn lanes are used, **or where offset left turn lanes cause driver confusion**, dotted line markings should be ...*

E.4d - Recommend **DO NOTHING**.

Lane use arrows already allowed in 3rd option Section 3B.19. **MTC concurred.**

F.1 - Recommend **DO NOTHING**.

Wait for research results on "contrast" ratios. **MTC concurred.**

Issue #3:

F.2 - Recommend adding that RPMs may be used to delineate noses of curbed islands in Section 3B.21. We do not need to do anything to Section 3B.11 as it already allows RPMs to supplement or substitute for standard pavement markings whether on the pavement or the top of curbs. We do not recommend putting delineators in the noses of islands.

Recommended change; adding new option to Section 3B.21:

Option:

Retoreflexive or internally illuminated RPMs may be used in lieu of retroreflective white and yellow markings placed on the noses of raised median and curbs of islands.

P.b2 - recommend adding to first option statement. **Taken care of by other MTC action regarding staggered lines.**

Q.4 - Recommend **DO NOTHING.**

Section 3G.04 already allows this. **MTC concurred.**

A.4a - Recommend **DO NOTHING.**

First support statement in 3B.11 already allows RPMs to supplement all markings, including gore markings. **MTC concurred.**

Issue #4:

Recommended change in Section 3B.05 on page 3B-15 add to 2nd option:

Option:

White chevron markings may be placed in the neutral area for special emphasis as shown in Figure 3B-8. For exit ramps, both the channelizing lines and the optional chevron markings may be supplemented with retroreflective or internally illuminated RPMs for added visibility.

A.4b - Recommend **DO NOTHING.**

Type 3 object markers already allowed in option Section 3C.03. **MTC concurred.**

B.3 - Recommend **DO NOTHING.**

Use of delineators is already an option, allowing for their use on curves, whether on mainline or ramps. **MTC concurred.**

D.3 - Recommend **DO NOTHING.**

Use of yellow RPMs already guidance in Section 3B.11.

Painting of noses of islands already option in 3G.01.

Setback of median/island nose is design detail; should not be in MUTCD. **MTC concurred.**

D.5 - Recommend **DO NOTHING.**

Conflict with placing lane use arrows and wrong-way arrows at ramp terminus. **MTC concurred.**

A.1 - Recommend **DO NOTHING.**

Wait for research results on contrast ratio. If results are available can be added to minimum standards of retroreflectivity for pavement markings. **MTC concurred.**

Issue #5:

A.2 - Add option statement.

Recommended change add option in Section 3B.14 on page 3B-31:

Option:

For curves with radii less than 1,000 m (3,280 ft) centerlines may be supplemented with retroreflective or internally illuminated RPMs for ~~thru~~ the entire curved section as well as for a 5 second travel time **distance** in advance of the curve.

A.3a, 3b - Recommend **DO NOTHING**.

D.1 - Request to increase minimum passing zone distances in Table 3B-1 to match those shown in the AASHTO 1994 Green Book. The AASHTO distances have not changed in the latest Green Book. **Since there is on-going research addressing this matter, the MTC recommends waiting for research results before addressing the table values.**