RW No. 4, January 2012



National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

12615 West Keystone Drive * Sun City West, AZ, 85375 Telephone (623)680-9592 * e-mail: ncutcd@aol.com

National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices RWSTC RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWING SPONSOR COMMENTS

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE: NCUTCD Regulatory/Warning Signs Technical Committee

- DATE OF ACTION: (TASK FORCE): March 9, 2011
- 14 TASK FORCE: Dan Paddick (chair), Tom Heydel, Ron Lipps, Jim Pline, Andy
- 15 Ramisch, Roger Wentz, Mark Bott, Scott Kuznicki, Fred Ranck
- 16 RWSTC APPROVAL DATE: 6-22-11
- 17 TRANSMITTAL TO SPONSORS DATE: Fall 2011
- 18 RWSTC APPROVAL DATE FOLLOWING SPONSOR COMMENTS: 1-18-12
 - COUNCIL APPROVAL DATE: 1-19-12

TOPIC: Section 2C.47 Two-Direction Large Arrow Sign (W1-7)

AFFECTED PORTIONS OF MUTCD: Section 2C.47

BACKGROUND:

Section 1A.13 of the 2009 MUTCD revised the definition of a "Standard" by adding a sentence that stated "Standard statements shall not be modified or compromised based on engineering judgment or engineering study."

Because of the strong opposition to this change in the definition, FHWA MUTCD Team Leader Hari Kalla and NCUTCD Chairperson Lee Billingsley, requested that each of the Technical Committees review all of the Standard statements in their sections to see if modifications are necessary in light of the revised definition.

DISCUSSION:

In its review of Section 2C, the Regulatory and Warning Sign Technical Committee (RWSTC) identified two Standard statements that may need modification. One of these was the elimination of paragraph 04 in Section 2C.47 which prohibited the use of the Two-Direction Large Arrow Sign in the center island of a roundabout. This proposed

deletion is not directly related to revision of the definition of a Standard in Section 1A.13 but it is a question of whether the Standard is actually needed.

There is no question that this sign should not be used in the center island of a roundabout. But, use of the sign would be contrary to the definition of a roundabout given in Section 1A.13 which is that a roundabout is "a circular intersection with yield control at the entry, which permits a vehicle on the circulatory roadway to proceed, and with a deflection of the approaching vehicle counter-clockwise around the central island." The RWSTC does not believe that the MUTCD should have to state "do not use a W1-7 sign in the central island of a roundabout.

The MUTCD provides considerable guidance and numerous examples of proper signing at roundabouts. See Sections 2B.43, 2B.44, 2B.45, 2C.46 and 2D.38 along with Figures 2B-20, 2B-21, 2B-22, 2B-23, 2C-9, 2D-8 and 2D-9 for the proper signing at roundabouts.

The RWSTC recognizes the need to include some Standard statements to prohibit the misuse of signs. But the RWSTC does not feel that there is a need to include a Standard statement for the use of a sign that is so contrary to the definition of a roundabout and all of the guidance and examples contained in the MUTCD.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend Section 2C.47 to delete paragraph 04.

Note: Proposed changes to the MUTCD are shown in <u>underline red</u> and removed text are shown in <u>strikethrough red.</u>

RECOMMENDED WORDING:

Section 2C.47 Two-Direction Large Arrow Sign (W1-7)

Standard:

- 01 The Two-Direction Large Arrow (W1-7) sign (see Figure 2C-9) shall be a horizontal rectangle.
- 73 02 If used, it shall be installed on the far side of a T-intersection in line with, and at approximately a right angle to, traffic approaching from the stem of the T-

75 intersection.

- 76 03 The Two-Direction Large Arrow sign shall not be used where there is no change 77 in the direction of travel such as at the beginnings and ends of medians or at center 78 piers.
- 79 04 The Two-Direction Large Arrow sign directing traffic to the left and right shall 80 not be used in the central island of a roundabout.

Guidance:

82 05 The Two-Direction Large Arrow sign should be visible for a sufficient distance to provide the road user with adequate time to react to the intersection configuration.

85 RWSTC VOTE:

86 For: 18

87	Opposed: 2
88	Abstentions: 0
89	
90	COUNCIL VOTE: Unanimous 37-0-0
91	
92	C:NCUTCD/January 2012/agendaItemIV4RWNo4TwoDirectionLargeArrowSection2C47 Revised 1-18-
93	12, approved by council 1-19-12
94	