

MARKINGS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

FALL 2006 SPONSOR BALLOTS AND SPONSOR COMMENTS

THREE ITEMS

- #1: Section 3B.07, Clarification of Bike Lanes in the Travelway
- #2: Chapter 3C and Section 3F.01, Relocating Object Markers and Barricades to Part 2
- #3: Recommended Changes to Section 7C.03, Crosswalk Markings (Schools)

**MARKINGS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE SPONSOR BALLOT
CLARIFICATION OF BIKE LANES IN THE TRAVELWAY**

The Bicycles Technical Committee (BTC) requested that the Markings Technical Committee (MTC) revise Section 3B.07 by deleting the term “bicycle lane” to eliminate the potential interpretation of bike lanes being outside the traveled way. Definitions from 1A.14 are provided below. The MUTCD definition of roadway indicates that a bicycle lane is part of the “roadway” but bike lanes are defined as part of the travel way only by their definition as vehicles. The BTC believes that the current language creates inconsistencies between Chapters 1A, 3B, and 9C and could result in legal and operational complications.

PERTINENT MUTCD DEFINITIONS FROM 1A.14: [emphasis added]

6. Bicycle - a pedal-powered *vehicle* upon which the human operator sits.
7. Bicycle Lane - a portion of a *roadway* that has been designated by signs and pavement markings for preferential or exclusive use by bicyclists.
23. Edge Line Markings—white or yellow pavement marking lines that delineate the right or left edge(s) of a *traveled way*.
65. Roadway - that portion of a highway improved, designed, or ordinarily used for *vehicular travel* and parking lanes, but exclusive of the sidewalk, berm, or shoulder even though such sidewalk, berm, or shoulder is used by persons riding bicycles or other human-powered vehicles. In the event a highway includes two or more separate roadways, the term roadway as used herein shall refer to any such roadway separately, but not to all such roadways collectively.
91. Traveled Way - the portion of the roadway for the *movement of vehicles*, exclusive of the shoulders, berms, sidewalks, and parking lanes. [Note: the traveled way is not defined in the UVC.]
93. Vehicle - every device in, upon, or by which any person or property can be transported or drawn upon a highway, except trains and light rail transit operating in exclusive or semiexclusive alignments. Light rail transit operating in a mixed-use alignment, to which other traffic is not required to yield the right-of-way by law, is a vehicle.

RECOMMENDED MUTCD CHANGES

The following presents the Markings Technical Committee recommendations for changes to Section 3B.07. Additions to the current MUTCD language are shown in blue underline; deletions are shown in ~~red strikethrough~~.

Section 3B.07 Warrants for Use of Edge Lines

Standard:

Edge line markings shall be placed on paved streets or highways with the following characteristics:

- A. Freeways;**
- B. Expressways; and**
- C. Rural arterials with a traveled way of 6.1 m (20 ft) or more in width and an ADT of 6,000 vehicles per day or greater.**

Guidance:

Edge line markings should be placed on paved streets or highways with the following characteristics:

- A. Rural arterials and collectors with a traveled way of 6.1 m (20 ft) or more in width and an ADT of 3,000 vehicles per day or greater.
- B. At other paved streets and highways where an engineering study indicates a need for edge line markings.

Edge line markings should not be placed where an engineering study or engineering judgment indicates that providing them is likely to decrease safety.

Option:

Edge line markings may be placed on streets and highways with or without centerline markings.

Edge line markings may be excluded, based on engineering judgment, for reasons such as if the traveled way edges are delineated by curbs, parking, ~~bicycle lanes~~, or other markings.

Edge line markings may be used where edge delineation is desirable to minimize unnecessary driving on paved shoulders or on refuge areas that have lesser structural pavement strength than the adjacent roadway.

**MARKINGS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE SPONSOR BALLOT
RELOCATING OBJECT MARKERS AND BARRICADES TO PART 2**

At the June 2006 Markings Technical Committee (MTC) meeting, Scott Wainwright requested that the MTC consider whether the material in Part 3 related to object markers, delineators, and barricades should be relocated to Part 2. The MTC considered the related issues and recommends the following changes in the MUTCD:

RECOMMENDATION No. 1: Chapter 3C – Object Markers should be relocated to Part 2.

This material can be a stand alone chapter in Part 2 or Sections 3C.01 to 3C.04 could be incorporated into Chapter 2C. Reasons for this recommendation include:

- Object markers are created by placing retroreflective sheeting on a substrate that is then mounted to a post or other structure in the same manner that signs are created.
- Object markers are typically installed by the same personnel that install signs.
- Object markers have codes (i.e., OM1-1) that are similar to sign codes.
- Object markers are typically manufactured by and purchased from the same companies that manufacture and sell signs.

RECOMMENDATION No. 2: Section 3F.01 – Barricades should be relocated to Part 2.

This section should be included in the new Object Markers chapter or it could be incorporated into the existing Chapter 2B or 2C. Reasons for this recommendation include:

- Barricades are created by placing retroreflective sheeting on a substrate that is then mounted to a post or other structure in the same manner that signs are created.
- Barricades are typically installed by the same personnel that install signs.
- Barricades are typically manufactured by and purchased from the same companies that manufacture and sell signs.
- Placing the End-of-Roadway Object Marker in the same chapter as the end-of-roadway barricade, related material will be in closer proximity to one another.

The MTC considered moving Chapter 3D – Delineators to Part 2, but determined that delineators should remain in Part 3 because they are continuous devices that serve a delineation and guidance function similar to an edge line or other continuous longitudinal marking.

MARKINGS NO. 3

(Section 7C.03)

FALL 2006

**MARKINGS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE SPONSOR BALLOT
SECTION 7C.03 – CROSSWALK MARKINGS (SCHOOLS)**

The enactment of the recent “Safe Routes to Schools” legislation and funding led the Markings Technical Committee (MTC) to a review of the markings language in Part 7, Traffic Controls for School Areas.

The review resulted in an MTC recommendation to include additional Option language in Section 7C.03 that would provide more information on the use of high visibility crosswalks for schools, which could potentially encourage their use where traffic is not controlled by Stop signs or traffic signals. The MTC also recommends an addition to an existing Guidance statement regarding the recommended spacing of diagonal or longitudinal crosswalk lines, to mirror language that already exists in Part 3, Section 3B.17 Crosswalk Markings.

Additions to the current MUTCD language are shown in [blue underline](#).

**Markings Technical Committee
Recommended Changes to Section 7C.03, Crosswalk Markings (Schools)**

Section 7C.03 Crosswalk Markings

Support:

Crosswalk markings provide guidance for pedestrians who are crossing roadways by defining and delineating paths on approaches to and within signalized intersections, and on approaches to other intersections where traffic stops.

Crosswalk markings also serve to alert road users of a pedestrian crossing point across roadways not controlled by highway traffic signals or STOP signs.

At nonintersection locations, crosswalk markings legally establish the crosswalk.

Standard:

When transverse crosswalk lines are used, they shall be solid white, marking both edges of the crosswalk, except as noted in the Option. They shall be not less than 150 mm (6 in) nor greater than 600 mm (24 in) in width.

Guidance:

If transverse lines are used to mark a crosswalk, the gap between the lines should not be less than 1.8 m (6 ft). If diagonal or longitudinal lines are used without transverse lines to mark a crosswalk, the crosswalk should not be less than 1.8 m (6 ft) wide.

Crosswalk lines on both sides of the crosswalk should extend across the full width of pavement or to the edge of the intersecting crosswalk to discourage diagonal walking between crosswalks.

Crosswalks should be marked at all intersections on established routes to school where there is substantial conflict between motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrian movements, where students are encouraged to cross between intersections, or where students would not otherwise recognize the proper place to cross (see Figure 7A-1).

Crosswalk lines should not be used indiscriminately. An engineering study should be performed before they are installed at locations away from traffic control signals or STOP signs.

Option:

For added visibility, the area of the crosswalk may be marked with white diagonal lines at a 45-degree angle to the line of the crosswalk or with white longitudinal lines parallel to traffic flow. When diagonal or longitudinal lines are used to mark a crosswalk, the transverse crosswalk lines may be omitted. [This type of marking may be used at school crosswalk locations where traffic is not controlled by Stop signs or traffic signals \(e.g., midblock crosswalks, or on the through road of a two-way stop intersection\).](#)

Guidance:

[If used,](#) the diagonal or longitudinal lines should be 300 to 600 mm (12 to 24 in) wide and spaced 300 to 1500 mm (12 to 60 in) apart. The spacing design should avoid the wheel paths [and the spacing should not exceed 2.5 times the line width.](#)

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring

Organization: AASHTO

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1	24	3	1
Markings No.1	26	2	0
Markings No.2	25	1	2
Markings No.3	24	3	1
RW Signs No.1	16	9	3
RW Signs No.2	23	2	3
RW Signs No.3	28	0	0
RW Signs No.4	19	5	4
RW Signs No.5	26	2	0
RW Signs No.6	28	0	0
RW Signs No.7	25	2	1
Signals No.1	10	5	13
Signals No.2	27	1	0
Signals No.3	14	6	8
TTC No.1	23	5	0
TTC No.2	25	2	1
TTC No.3	20	6	2
TTC No.4	15	4	3
RRLRT No.1	17	3	2
RRLRT No.2	17	4	1

AASHTO COMMENTS

Markings Technical Committee—3 Items (Word) Markings Item 1

Deletion of "bicycle lanes", doesn't eliminate the potential interpretation of bike lanes being outside of the traveled way. The proposed change to delete those two words only lumps them into "other markings".

First, pertinent MUTCD definitions are Section 1A.13, not 1A.14 as stated. Second, Section 3B.07 Warrants for Use of Edge Lines While the inclusion of "bicycle lane" in paragraph 6 could be considered as being in conflict with the definition of "traveled way" its elimination could cause confusion. If the bicycle lane is at the far right of the traveled way then its right edge would be the edge of the traveled way. In the absence of curbs, parking or other markings it would then be necessary to have an edge line delineating the right edge of the bicycle lane/traveled way. Add the following to the end of Paragraph 6: "or if the far right portion of the traveled way is an exclusive bicycle lane."

Markings Technical Committee—3 Items (Word) Markings Item 2

move delineators (3D) also, because the justification reasons for all sections (3F, 3C, 3D) are identical.

Do not agree the reasoning is justified. This is not a sign, it is a channelizer.

Minnesota believes that the delineators in part 3D should be moved to part 2 because they are not continuous devices but discrete, post-mounted devices. Some are installed separately along the highway.

Concur

Concur

We recommend a minimum height of 24 inches from the bottom of the lower sign to the pavement, instead of 36 inches. If there are no obstructions, we have found this mounting height to be satisfactory.

Markings Technical Committee—3 Items (Word) Markings Item 3

Partial Concurrence: Do Not Concur with wording in option paragraph -- it is unnecessary, adds no value to the manual and only contributes to bulk. Concur with added wording in the guidance statement.

We concur in part with this proposal to revise paragraph 9 and 10 of Section 7C.03. The additional markings within a crosswalk are already an option for any crosswalk. The addition of this sentence in the 9th paragraph could lead some to interpret the intent as only using the additional markings at "school crosswalk locations where traffic is not controlled by Stop signs or traffic signals." If the intent is to really encourage their use at these locations, the statement should be added to the Guidance text.

Delete the added wording in the option statement. It should be allowed for any school crossing, including those controlled by traffic signals or all-way stop. This same restriction is not placed on similar crossings that are not school crosswalks.

Do not concur with the proposed additions in the option section starting with "This type of marking may..." this additional sentence is not needed and provides nothing to the manual. We do concur with the additions to the Guidance section.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: American Public Transportation Association

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1		√	
Markings No.1	√		
Markings No.2	√		
Markings No.3	√		
RW Signs No.1	√		
RW Signs No.2	√		
RW Signs No.3	√		
RW Signs No.4	√		
RW Signs No.5	√		
RW Signs No.6	√		
RW Signs No.7	√		
Signals No.1	√		
Signals No.2	√		
Signals No.3	√		
TTC No.1	√		
TTC No.2	√		
TTC No.3	√		
TTC No.4	√		
RRLRT No.1	√		
RRLRT No.2		√	

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: APWA

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1		X	
Markings No.1	X		
Markings No.2	X		
Markings No.3	X		
RW Signs No.1		X	
RW Signs No.2	X		
RW Signs No.3		X	
RW Signs No.4		X	
RW Signs No.5	X		
RW Signs No.6		X	
RW Signs No.7		X	
Signals No.1			X
Signals No.2		X	
Signals No.3	X		
TTC No.1		X	
TTC No.2	X		
TTC No.3		X	
TTC No.4	X		
RRLRT No.1		X	
RRLRT No.2	X		

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: American Traffic Safety Services Association

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1	X		
Markings No.1	X		
Markings No.2	X		
Markings No.3			X
RW Signs No.1	X		
RW Signs No.2	X		
RW Signs No.3	X		
RW Signs No.4		X	
RW Signs No.5			X
RW Signs No.6			X
RW Signs No.7			X
Signals No.1	X		
Signals No.2	X		
Signals No.3	X		
TTC No.1	X		
TTC No.2		X	
TTC No.3		X	
TTC No.4	X		
RRLRT No.1	X		
RRLRT No.2	X		

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Copy this form and use separate form for each Recommendation Number

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence

Sponsoring Organization: American Traffic Safety Services Association (ATSSA)

Name of Responder David McKee, Director of Member Services

Recommendation Number Marking No. 3

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):

The American Traffic Safety Services Association concurs that crosswalk lines should not be used indiscriminately, such as at intersections where neither sidewalks, designated pathways nor refuge area are present for the exclusive use of school children, pedestrians, cyclists or other special users. However, there are many circumstances when a drivers' attention, upon approaching a signed or a signalized intersection, must be focused on the likely presence of school children, pedestrians, cyclists or other special users. This is even more so around inner-city schools and suburban area schools' neighborhoods where a number of our American children are now being encouraged to walk to school thanks to the federally funded Safe Routes to School Program. The American Traffic Safety Services Association is a firm supporter of this program and of its goals:

1. Encourage children to walk and bike to school.
2. Make it safe for children to do so.
3. Help with planning projects that will improve safety.

The American Traffic Safety Services Association believes high visibility markings will help abate possible Stop sign and red light non-compliance at intersections where high visibility crosswalks would otherwise not be allowed.

Consequently, ATSSA does not concur to limit the use of high visibility markings only at crosswalks where traffic is not controlled by Stop signs or traffic signals.

ATSSA recommends that the Option language remains unchanged.
ATSSA concurs with the proposed Guidance statement.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

**Sponsoring Organization: Governors Highway Safety Association
October 2006**

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

Reasons for non-concurrence are given on individual Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence forms.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1		X	
Markings No.1	X		
Markings No.2	X		
Markings No.3	X		
RRLRT No.1		X	
RRLRT No.2	X		
RW Signs No.1	X		
RW Signs No.2	X		
RW Signs No.3	X		
RW Signs No.4	X		
RW Signs No.5	X		
RW Signs No.6	X		
RW Signs No.7	X		
Signals No.1		X	
Signals No.2	X		
Signals No.3			
TTC No.1	X		
TTC No.2	X		
TTC No.3		X	
TTC No.4	X		

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: _____ HFR _____

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1			
Markings No.1			
Markings No.2			
Markings No.3			
RW Signs No.1			
RW Signs No.2			
RW Signs No.3			
RW Signs No.4			
RW Signs No.5		1	
RW Signs No.6			
RW Signs No.7			
Signals No.1			
Signals No.2			
Signals No.3			
TTC No.1			
TTC No.2		1	
TTC No.3		1	
TTC No. 4			1

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: IBTTA _____

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1		X	
Markings No.1	X		
Markings No.2	X		
Markings No.3		X	
RW Signs No.1		X	
RW Signs No.2	X		
RW Signs No.3		X	
RW Signs No.4	X		
RW Signs No.5	X		
RW Signs No.6		X	
RW Signs No.7			
Signals No.1		X	
Signals No.2	X		
Signals No.3	X		
TTC No.1	X		
TTC No.2		X	
TTC No.3		X	
TTC No.4		X	
RRLRT No.1		X	
RRLRT No.2	X		

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Copy this form and use separate form for each Recommendation Number

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence

Sponsoring Organization: **Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District**

Name of Responder: Maurice Palumbo

Recommendation Number: Markings No. 3 (partial concurrence)

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):

1. Section 7C.03, eight paragraph, line 4. Since Part 7 of the MUTCD is concerned with schools, it should be apparent to the practitioner that the crosswalks in question in Section 7C.03 also are concerned with crosswalks pertaining to schools.

Suggest removal of word “school” from sentence “This type of marking may be used at school crosswalk locations...” since for consistency, there is no other location in this section where the term “school crosswalk” is used, simply “crosswalk” or “crosswalks.”

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: International Municipal Signal Association (IMSA)

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1			
Markings No.1			
Markings No.2			
Markings No.3			
RW Signs No.1	Yes		
RW Signs No.2	Yes		
RW Signs No.3	Yes		
RW Signs No.4	Yes		
RW Signs No.5	Yes		
RW Signs No.6	Yes		
RW Signs No.7	Yes		
Signals No.1	Yes		
Signals No.2	Yes		
Signals No.3	Yes		
TTC No.1	Yes		
TTC No.2	Yes		
TTC No.3			No
TTC No.4	Yes		
RRLRT No.1			
RRLRT No.2			

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: **Institute of Transportation Engineers**

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1	9		
Markings No.1	8	1	
Markings No.2	8		1
Markings No.3	7	1	
RW Signs No.1	7	1	1
RW Signs No.2	6	3	
RW Signs No.3	7	1	1
RW Signs No.4	7	1	1
RW Signs No.5	7	1	1
RW Signs No.6	7	2	
RW Signs No.7	7	1	1
Signals No.1	5	2	1
Signals No.2	8		
Signals No.3	7		
TTC No.1	7	1	
TTC No.2	8	1	
TTC No.3	5	3	
TTC No. 4	4		
RRLRT No. 1	1	3	2
RRLRT No. 2	3	2	1

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence
ITE

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	Name	Comment
Markings No.1	James Pline	The revised definitions are acceptable and should be added to the proposal.
Markings No.2	John LaPlante	I concur wholly, assuming the RW Signs Technical Committee also concurs.
Markings No.3	Ronnie Bell	<p><u>Recommended Changes to Section 7C.03, Crosswalk Markings (Schools)</u></p> <p><i>Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):</i></p> <p>The proposed new Option text for the makes it sound as if the listed circumstances are the only circumstances in which the diagonal or longitudinal lines may be used to mark a crosswalk although there is no other text that would limit the use to those circumstances. I recommend including the “locations where physical conditions are such that added visibility of the crosswalk is desired” phrase that is included in the related item in Part 3. Following is my recommended alternative addition to the Section 7C.03 Option:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">This type of marking may be used at school crosswalk locations where traffic is not controlled by Stop signs or traffic signals (e.g., midblock crosswalks, or on the through road of a two-way stop intersection), or at locations where physical conditions are such that added visibility of the crosswalk is desired.</p> <p>This text would then include an option to use a crosswalk marked with diagonal or longitudinal lines at a location where the approaching traffic is controlled by a Stop sign or traffic signal but increased visibility over a typical parallel line crosswalk is desired.</p>

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: League of American Bicyclists

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1	5		
Markings No.1	4	1	
Markings No.2	4		
Markings No.3	3	1	
RW Signs No.1		4	
RW Signs No.2	1	3	
RW Signs No.3	1	1	1
RW Signs No.4		4	
RW Signs No.5	4		1
RW Signs No.6	3	1	
RW Signs No.7	2	1	
Signals No.1	2	2	
Signals No.2	3	1	
Signals No.3		1	1
TTC No.1	3		
TTC No.2	1	1	
TTC No.3		2	
TTC No.4		2	
RRLRT No. 1			4
RRLRT No. 2	3	1	

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Individual Response Form

Copy this form and use separate form for each Recommendation Number

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence

Sponsoring Organization: **Massachusetts Bicycle Coalition**

Name of Responder: **John S. Allen**

Recommendation Number: **Markings #1 - Bike Lanes & Traveled Way**

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):

Words “travel way” and “traveled way” are used interchangeably in introductory discussion. The wording should always be “traveled way.”

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Individual Response Form

Copy this form and use separate form for each Recommendation Number

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence

Sponsoring Organization: **League of American Bicyclists**

Name of Responder Dwight Kingsbury

Recommendation Number Markings #3

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):

The new sentence appended to the Option for 7C.03 would allow nothing that is not already allowed and, by referring only to uncontrolled applications, implies that applications of diagonal or longitudinal line markings at controlled intersections are not permitted. The sentence should either be adapted as a Support statement or, if left in Guidance, reworded to clarify that the mentioned applications are not exclusive, e.g., “Applications may include (but are not limited to) school crosswalk locations where traffic is not controlled by...”

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Sponsor Response Form

Sponsoring

Organization: _____ NACE _____

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part, indicate the reasons for the partial concurrence.

If you do not concur, indicate the reasons.

<u>Recommendation Number</u>	<u>Concur</u>	<u>Concur in Part</u>	<u>Do Not Concur</u>
Bicycle No.1		X	
Markings No.1	X		
Markings No.2	X		
Markings No.3	X		
RW Signs No.1	X		
RW Signs No.2	X		
RW Signs No.3	X		
RW Signs No.4	X		
RW Signs No.5	X		
RW Signs No.6	X		
RW Signs No.7	X		
Signals No.1		X	
Signals No.2	X		
Signals No.3	X		
TTC No.1	X		
TTC No.2	X		
TTC No.3	X		
TTC No.4	X		
RRLRT No.1	X		
RRLRT No.2	X		