



# 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

## ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Item No.: 15B-RW-02

### NCUTCD Proposal for Changes to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE:** Regulatory & Warning Signs  
**ITEM NUMBER:** 15B-RW-02  
**TOPIC:** Selecting Type of Traffic Control for Unsignalized Intersections  
**ORIGIN OF REQUEST:** RW Task Force: Tom Heydel (chair), Bob Seyfried, Robert Weber, Jim Pline, Fred Ranck, Lee Roadifer, Paul Carlson  
Results from NCHRP Web-Only Document 213, Potential MUTCD Criteria for Selecting the Type of Control at Unsignalized Intersections

**AFFECTED SECTIONS OF MUTCD:** Sections 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07, 2B.09

#### DEVELOPMENT HISTORY:

- 8  
9
- 10 • Approved by Technical Committee: 06/17/2015
  - 11 • Approved by RWSTC Technical committee following sponsor comments: 01/06/2016
  - 12 • Approved by NCUTCD Council: 01/08/2016

13  
14 *This is a proposal for recommended changes to the MUTCD that has been approved by*  
15 *the NCUTCD Council. This proposal does not represent a revision of the MUTCD and*  
16 *does not constitute official MUTCD standards, guidance, or options. It will be submitted to*  
17 *FHWA for consideration for inclusion in a future MUTCD revision. The MUTCD can be*  
18 *revised only through the federal rulemaking process.*  
19

#### SUMMARY:

20  
21 The MUTCD related to selection of traffic control in Part 2B has seen some but not significant  
22 changes since 1971. The volume and crash numbers contained within Section 2B.04, 2B.06,  
23 2B.07 and 2B.09 have not been evaluated based on research since that time. Research was  
24 needed to look at the warrants (criteria) for determining whether an intersection should have no  
25 control, yield control or stop control. Signal control warrants are already provided for in Part 4.  
26 Accordingly, an NCHRP research project was awarded. This research project results was used to  
27 develop this language. Research: NCHRP Project 03-109, Criteria for selecting type of control  
28 for unsignalized intersections  
29

#### DISCUSSION

30  
31 Updating or developing new warrants (criteria) is the focus of the NCHRP 03-109 report. The  
32 report has been finalized and is dated March 2015. Prior to this there was much discussion  
33 regarding whether or not to go directly to Council under the exception in June or go out to

34 sponsors. RWSTC voted to go to sponsors in the fall 2014 to then take action at the January 2015  
35 meeting in Arlington, Virginia. The following is the recommended language as presented by the  
36 report and includes changes made as a result of sponsor comments in the fall of 2014 and as  
37 approved by RWSTC January 7, 2015. **Council tabled the proposal on January 9, 2015.**  
38 This proposal makes significant changes to 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09. Therefore, rather  
39 than showing changes with crossouts and new text to the impacted sections, it was decided to  
40 show only the new text and existing retained 2009 MUTCD text in the proposal. We did this in  
41 hopes that it would provide less confusion by starting with a clean slate for these 4 sections of  
42 the existing MUTCD given the almost complete rewrite.

43  
44 **At the end of the proposal, we have included the present language from sections 2B.04,**  
45 **2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09 to show what portions we retained and what is not retained by ~~red~~**  
46 **~~striketrough.~~**

## 47 48 **RECOMMENDED MUTCD CHANGES**

49  
50 The following present the proposed changes to the current MUTCD within the context of the  
51 current MUTCD language. Proposed additions to the MUTCD are shown in blue underline and  
52 proposed deletions from the MUTCD are shown in ~~red striketrough~~. Changes previously  
53 approved by NCUTCD Council (but not yet adopted by FHWA) are shown in green double  
54 underline for additions and ~~green double striketrough~~ for deletions. In some cases, background  
55 comments may be provided with the MUTCD text. These comments are indicated by  
56 [highlighted light blue in brackets].

57  
58 **Note: Existing MUTCD text is shown in black text. 2009 MUTCD deleted text is not shown**  
59 **for sections 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09 within the new clean sections (2B.X1 to 2B.X14)**  
60 **proposal but rather for clarity is shown at the end of the proposal. We are deleting these**  
61 **sections and replacing them with the following:**

## 62 63 **PART 2. SIGNS**

### 64 65 **CHAPTER 2B. REGULATORY SIGNS, BARRICADES, AND GATES**

66  
67 **The section numbers shown are for the structure of the 2009 Chapter 2B. If FHWA splits**  
68 **the current regulatory sign chapter into multiple chapters, this proposal would be a stand-**  
69 **alone chapter.**

70  
71 **NOTE: Sections 2B.05 (STOP sign and ALL WAY plaque) and 2B.08 (YIELD sign) and**  
72 **2B.10 (STOP sign and YIELD sign placement) in the existing 2009 manual do not change.**  
73 **They would be inserted either before, after or somewhere between these proposed sections**  
74 **as deemed appropriate by FHWA.**

75  
76  
77 **Sections 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09 are deleted and replaced with the following:**

78  
79 **Section 2B.04 General Considerations at Intersections**

80 Support:  
81 01 Unsignalized intersections represent the most common forms of intersection right-of-way  
82 control. Selection of unsignalized control might be affected by specific requirements of state law  
83 or local ordinances.

84 02 Roundabouts, traffic circles and other circular intersections are types of intersections and  
85 are not traffic control devices. The YIELD sign at the roundabout is the traffic control device.  
86 The decision to convert an intersection from a traditional intersection to a roundabout is an  
87 engineering design, traffic operations, and/or safety decision and not a traffic control device  
88 decision. As such, criteria for conversion from a traditional intersection to a roundabout are not  
89 included in the MUTCD.

90 Guidance:

91 03 The type of traffic control used at an unsignalized intersection should be the least restrictive  
92 that provides appropriate levels of safety and efficiency.

93 Support:

94 04 Some types of right-of-way control that can exist at an unsignalized intersection are listed  
95 below in order from the least restrictive to the most restrictive.

- 96 A. No intersection control: There are no right-of-way traffic control devices on any of the  
97 approaches to the intersection. (See Section 2B.04c for guidance).
- 98 B. Yield control: YIELD signs are placed on all approaches (for a roundabout), on  
99 opposing approaches for a 4-leg intersection, on a single approach for a 3-leg  
100 intersection, or in the median of a divided highway. The YIELD signs are placed on the  
101 minor road. (See Section 2B.04d for guidance)
- 102 C. Minor road stop control: STOP signs are typically placed on opposing approaches (for a  
103 4-leg intersection) or on a single approach (for a 3-leg intersection). The STOP signs  
104 are normally placed on the minor road. (See Section 2B.04a for guidance on selecting  
105 the minor road.)
- 106 D. All-way stop control: STOP signs are placed on all approaches to the intersection. (See  
107 Section 2B.04f for guidance).

108 Guidance:

109 05 When selecting a form of unsignalized intersection control, the following factors should be  
110 considered:

- 111 A. Vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic volumes on all approaches. (From 2009  
112 MUTCD Section 2B.04 Paragraph 02) Where the term units/day or units/hour is  
113 indicated, it should be the total of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian volumes
- 114 B. Driver yielding behavior with regard to all modes of conflicting traffic including  
115 bicyclists and pedestrians.
- 116 C. Number and angle of approaches.
- 117 D. Approach speeds.
- 118 E. Sight distance available on each approach.
- 119 F. Reported crash experience. (From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04 Paragraph 02)
- 120 G. The presence of a grade crossing near the intersection for queue back up from the  
121 grade crossing.

122 06 Yield or Stop signs should not be used for speed control. (From 2009 MUTCD Section  
123 2B.04 Paragraph 05)

124 **Standard:**

125 07 Because the potential for conflicting commands could create driver confusion, Yield or  
126 Stop signs shall not be used in conjunction with any traffic control signal operation, except  
127 in the following cases:

- 128 A. If the signal indication for an approach is a flashing red at all times;
- 129 B. If a minor street or driveway is located within or adjacent to the area controlled by  
130 the traffic control signal, but does not require separate traffic signal control  
131 because an **extremely** low potential for conflict exists; or
- 132 C. If a channelized turn lane is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island  
133 and the channelized turn lane is not controlled by a traffic control signal. **[From**  
134 **2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 10]**

135 08 Except as provided in Section 2B.04d, Stop signs and Yield signs shall not be installed  
136 on different approaches to the same unsignalized intersection if those approaches conflict  
137 with or oppose each other. **[From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 11]**

138 09 Portable or part-time Stop or Yield signs shall not be used except for emergency and  
139 temporary traffic control zone purposes. **[From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 12]**

140 10 A portable or part-time (folding) Stop sign that is manually placed into view and  
141 manually removed from view shall not be used during a power outage to control a  
142 signalized approach unless the maintaining agency establishes that the signal indication  
143 that will first be displayed to that approach upon restoration of power is a flashing red  
144 signal indication and that the portable Stop sign will be manually removed from view prior  
145 to stop-and-go operation of the traffic control signal. **[From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04,**  
146 **paragraph 13]**

147 Option:

148 11 A portable or part-time (folding) Stop sign that is electrically or mechanically operated such  
149 that it only displays the Stop message during a power outage and ceases to display the Stop  
150 message upon restoration of power may be used during a power outage to control a signalized  
151 approach. **[From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 14]**

152

### 153 **Section 2B.04a Determining the Minor Road for Unsignalized Intersections**

154 **Guidance:**

155 01 **The selection of the minor road to be controlled by Yield or Stop signs should be based on**  
156 **one or more of the following criteria:**

- 157 A. **A roadway intersecting a designated through or numbered highway.**
- 158 B. **A roadway with the lower functional classification.**
- 159 C. **A roadway with the lower traffic volume.**
- 160 D. **A roadway with the lower speed limit.**
- 161 E. **A roadway that intersects with a roadway that has a higher priority for one or more**  
162 **modes of travel.**

163 02 **When two roadways that have relatively equal volumes, speeds, and/or other characteristics**  
164 **intersect, the following factors should be considered in selecting the minor road for installation**  
165 **of YIELD or STOP signs:**

166 **(above is similar to 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 09)**

- 167 A. **Controlling the direction that conflicts the most with established pedestrian crossing**  
168 **activity or school walking routes;**
- 169 B. **Controlling the direction that has obscured vision, dips, or bumps that already require**  
170 **drivers to use lower operating speeds; and**

- 171 C. *Controlling the direction that has the best sight distance from a controlled position to*  
172 *observe conflicting traffic.*

173  
174 **Section 2B.04b Alternatives to Changing Intersection Right-of-Way Control**

175 Guidance:

176 01 Before converting to a more restrictive form of right-of-way control at an unsignalized  
177 intersection, consideration should be given to alternative treatments that address safety,  
178 operational, or other concerns.

179 Option:

180 02 Alternatives that may be considered include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 181 A. Where Yield or Stop controlled, installing YIELD AHEAD or STOP AHEAD signs on  
182 the appropriate approaches to the intersection;  
183 B. Removing parking on one or more approaches;  
184 C. Improving intersection sight distance;  
185 D. Installing warning signs along the major street to warn road users approaching the  
186 intersection;  
187 E. Relocating the stop line(s) and/or yield line to improve the sight distance at the  
188 intersection;  
189 F. Installing transverse rumble strips or other traffic calming measures designed to reduce  
190 speeds on the approaches;  
191 G. Installing a red flashing beacon at the intersection to supplement Stop control;  
192 H. Installing yellow flashing beacons on warning signs in advance of a STOP or YIELD  
193 sign controlled intersection on major- and/or minor-street approaches;  
194 I. Adding one or more lanes on a minor-street approach to reduce the number of vehicles  
195 per lane on the approach;  
196 J. Revising intersection geometrics by adding pedestrian refuge islands and or curb  
197 extensions at the intersection to channelize vehicular movements and reduce the time  
198 required for a vehicle to complete a movement;  
199 K. Revising the geometrics at the intersection to add pedestrian median refuge islands  
200 and/or curb extensions;  
201 L. Installing roadway lighting if a disproportionate number of crashes occur at night;  
202 M. Restricting one or more turning movements, perhaps on a time-of-day basis, if alternate  
203 routes are available;  
204 N. Installing a pedestrian hybrid beacon (see Chapter 4F), Rectangular Rapid Flash  
205 Beacons (Interim approval 1A.11) or In-Roadway Warning Lights (see Chapter 4N) if  
206 pedestrian safety is the major concern;  
207 O. Converting to a roundabout; and  
208 P. Employing other proven alternatives, depending on conditions at the intersection.

209 **NOTE: Items D-P noted above were taken from Part 4B.04**

210  
211 **Section 2B.04c No Intersection Control**

212 Guidance:

213 01 The decision to use no intersection control should be based on engineering judgment.

214 Option:

215 02 The following factors may be considered:

- 216 A. Intersection sight distance is adequate on all approaches.

- 217 B. All approaches to the intersection are a single lane approaches and there are no separate
- 218 turn lanes.
- 219 C. The combined vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian volume (existing or projected) entering
- 220 the intersection from all approaches averages less than 1,000 units per day or 80 units in
- 221 the peak hour.
- 222 D. None of the approaches to the intersection are for a through highway.
- 223 E. The angle of intersection is between 90 and 75 degrees.
- 224 F. The functional classification of the intersecting streets is either the intersection of two
- 225 local streets or the intersection of a local street with a collector street.

#### 226 **Section 2B.04d Yield Control**

##### 227 Guidance:

229 *01 At intersections where a full stop is not necessary at all times, consideration should first be*

230 *given to using less restrictive measures such as Yield signs. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.06,*

231 *Paragraph 01]*

232 *02 Yield control should be considered when engineering judgment indicates that all of the*

233 *following conditions apply:*

- 234 A. Intersection sight distance is adequate on the approaches to be controlled by YIELD
- 235 signs.
- 236 B. Each approach to be controlled is a single lane.
- 237 C. One of the following crash-related criteria applies:
  - 238 a. For changing from no intersection control to yield control, there have been two or
  - 239 more reported crashes in a 12 month period that are susceptible to correction by
  - 240 installation of a YIELD sign.
  - 241 b. For changing from minor road stop control to yield control, there have been two or
  - 242 fewer reported crashes in a 12 month period.
- 243 D. Entering intersection volume of less than 1800 units per day or 140 units in the peak
- 244 hour.
- 245 E. The angle of intersection is between 90 and 75 degrees.
- 246 F. The functional classification of the intersecting streets is either the intersection of two
- 247 local streets or the intersection of a local street with a collector street.

##### 248 Option:

249 *03 Yield control may be established at an intersection when any of the following conditions*

250 *apply:*

- 251 A. At the second crossroad of a divided highway, where the median width at the
- 252 intersection is 30 feet or greater. (see Figure 2B-15) In this case, a YIELD sign may be
- 253 installed at the entrance to the second roadway. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09,
- 254 Paragraph 1, item B]
- 255 B. For a channelized turn lane that is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island,
- 256 even if the adjacent lanes at the intersection are controlled by a highway traffic control
- 257 signal or by a STOP sign. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 1, item C]
- 258 C. At an intersection where a special problem exists and where engineering judgment
- 259 indicates the problem to be susceptible to correction by the use of the YIELD sign,
- 260 [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 1, item D]
- 261 D. Facing the entering and exiting roadway for a merge-type movement if engineering
- 262 judgment indicates that control is needed because acceleration or deceleration geometry

and/or sight distance is not adequate for merging traffic operation. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 01, item E]

- E. On an approach to an intersection where the only permissible movement is a right turn movement with an intersection geometry similar to a channelized right turn lane or an approach to a roundabout.

Guidance:

*04 The Yield signs should be installed on opposing minor- road approaches (for a 4-leg intersection) or on the minor-road approach for a 3-leg intersection. (See Section 2B-X3) for information to identify the minor road. When two intersecting roadways have relatively equal volumes, speeds and other characteristics, yield control should be established on the approach that conflicts most with established pedestrian crossing activity or school walking routes or bicycle crossing activity*

**Standard:**

**05 A Yield sign shall be used to assign right-of-way at the entrance to a roundabout. Yield signs at roundabouts shall be used to control the approach roadways and shall not be used to control the circulatory roadway. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 02]**

~~06—Other than for all of the approaches to a roundabout,~~ Yield signs shall not be placed on all of the approaches to an intersection, except at roundabouts. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 03]

**Section 2B.04e Minor Road Stop Control**

Guidance:

*01 Stop control on the minor road approach or approaches to an intersection should be considered when engineering judgment indicates that one or more of the following conditions exist:*

- A. *A restricted view exists that requires road users to stop in order to adequately observe conflicting traffic on the through street or highway. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.06 Paragraph 2B]*
- B. *Crash records indicate:*
  - 1. *For a four-leg intersection, there are three or more reported crashes in a 12-month period or six or more reported crashes in a 36-month period, were of a type susceptible to correction by installation of minor- road stop control.*
  - 2. *For a three-leg intersection, there are three or more reported crashes in a 12-month period or five or more reported crashes in a 36-month period, were of a type susceptible to correction by installation of minor- road stop control.*
- C. *The intersection is of a lower functional classification road with a higher functional classification road. [similar thought as in 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04 Paragraph 03.A]*
- D. *Conditions that previously supported installation of an all-way stop control under all-way stop control criteria no longer exist.*

**Section 2B.04f All-Way Stop Control**

Guidance:

*01 The decision to ~~install~~ establish all-way stop control at an unsignalized intersection should be based on an engineering study. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 Paragraph 03] All-Way stop control sh*

308 *02 The evaluation of the need for all-way stop control should include an analysis of factors*  
 309 *related to the existing operation and crash experience at the study intersection and the potential*  
 310 *to improve these conditions and the applicable factors contained in the following all-way stop*  
 311 *control-criteria:*

- 312 A. *All-Way Stop Control Criteria A: Crash Experience (Section 2B.04g)*
- 313 B. *All-Way Stop Control Criteria B: Sight Distance (Section 2B.04h)*
- 314 C. *All-Way Stop Control Criteria C: Transition to Signal Control or YIELD control at*  
 315 *Roundabout (Section 2B.04i)*
- 316 D. *All-Way Stop Control Criteria D: 8-Hour Volume (Vehicle, Pedestrians, Bicycles)*  
 317 *(Section 2B.04j).*
- 318 E. *All-Way Stop Control Criteria E: Other Factors (Section 2B.04k)*

319 **Standard:**

320 **03 The satisfaction of one or more all-way stop control criteria shall not in itself require**  
 321 **the installation of all-way stop control.**

322  
 323 **The following table from NCHRP Web-Only Document 213, “Potential MUTCD Criteria**  
 324 **for Selecting the Type of Control at Unsignalized Intersections,” is shown for information**  
 325 **only and is not part of the MUTCD proposal. It is shown to recap what is in the MUTCD**  
 326 **proposed text.**

327 **Table 51. Recommended criteria for unsignalized intersection control.**

Criteria	No Control	Yield Control	Minor-Road Stop	All-Way Stop
Number of Crashes susceptible to correction by intersection control	No crash criteria	Two or fewer reported crashes in a year <sup>1</sup>	4-leg: 3 or more within 12 months, 6 or more within 36 months <sup>2</sup> 3-leg: 3 or more within 12 months, 5 or more within 36 months <sup>2</sup>	4-leg: 5 or more within 12 months, 6 or more within 36 months <sup>2</sup> 3-leg: 4 or more within 12 months, 5 or more within 36 months <sup>2</sup>
Peak Hour Entering Volume	Maximum 80 units/hr <sup>3</sup>	Maximum 140 units/hr <sup>3</sup>	No volume criteria	No volume criteria
Entering Volume per day	Maximum 1000 units / day <sup>4</sup>	Maximum 1800 units / day <sup>5</sup>	No volume criteria	No volume criteria
8-hrs	No volume criteria	No volume criteria	No volume criteria	1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 units per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and 2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours; but 3. If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2. <sup>6</sup>
Delay	No delay criteria	No delay criteria	No delay criteria	35 sec/veh <sup>7</sup>
Other	Adequate sight	Adequate sight	Sight distance	Sight distance



	distance One-lane approaches Angle of intersection <sup>8</sup>	distance One-lane approaches Angle of intersection <sup>8</sup>		Engineering study
<sup>1</sup> Maryland MUTCD Table 2B-1a (10) provides guidelines for conversion from stop to yield control. <sup>2</sup> Selected with consideration of the proposed crash warrant criteria for signals, NCHRP Project 07-18 (48). <sup>3</sup> Rounded calculation from the 1000 and 1800 units/day value using 7.8 percent which is the peak hour factor used in the economic analysis. <sup>4</sup> Value selected because (a) 1983 study in rural Michigan (40) found no statistical difference for stop-controlled and no-control intersections with major street volumes less than 1000 vpd and (b) the 1000 value is less than the value selected for YIELD sign control (1800). <sup>5</sup> From NCHRP Report 320 (35). <sup>6</sup> Values currently in 2009 MUTCD with changes of vehicular volume to units. <sup>7</sup> Selected based on <i>Highway Capacity Manual</i> (22) Exhibit 19-1, lowest control delay (sec/veh) for Level of Service E (when v/c <=1.0). <sup>8</sup> As recommended in the <i>Handbook for Designing Roadways for the Aging Population</i> (72).				

328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358

**Section 2B.04g All-Way Stop Control Criteria A: Crash Experience**

Option:

01 All-way stop control may be established at an intersection where an engineering study indicates that:

- A. For a four-leg intersection, there are five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period or six or more reported crashes in a 36-month period, were of a type susceptible to correction by installation of all-way stop control.
- B. For a three-leg intersection, there are four or more reported crashes in a 12-month period or five or more reported crashes in a 36-month period. The crashes were of a type susceptible to correction by installation of all-way stop control

**Section 2B.04h All-Way Stop Control Criteria B: Sight Distance**

Option:

01 All-way stop control may be established at an intersection where an engineering study indicates that sight distance on the minor road approaches controlled by a STOP sign is not adequate for a vehicle to turn onto or cross the major (uncontrolled) road. At such a location, a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 Paragraph 05C]

**Section 2B.04i All-Way Stop Control Criteria C: Transition to Signal Control or YIELD Control at a Roundabouts**

Option:

01 All-way stop control may be established at locations where all-way stop control is an interim measure that may be installed to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signals at the intersection or YIELD control at a roundabout. [similar to 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 Paragraph 04A]

359 **Section 2B.04j All-Way Stop Control Criteria D: 8 Hour Volume-(Vehicle, Pedestrians,**  
360 **Bicycles)**

361 Option:

362 01 All-way stop control may be established at an intersection where an engineering study  
363 indicates:

- 364 A. The volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both  
365 approaches) averages at least 300 units per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and  
366 B. The volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both  
367 approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours; but  
368 C. If the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the  
369 minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values in Items A and B.

370 **(Note: similar to 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 , Paragraph 04C)**

371

372 **Section 2B.04k All-Way Stop Control Criteria E: Other Factors**

373 Option:

374 01 If no other criteria is met, an all-way stop control may be established at an intersection  
375 where an engineering study indicates that all-way stop control is needed due to other factors not  
376 addressed in the other all-way stop control criteria. These factors may include, but are not limited  
377 to, the following:

- 378 A. The need to control left-turn conflicts. **[From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 Paragraph**  
379 **05A]**
- 380 B. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector ~~(through)~~ streets of similar  
381 design and operating characteristics where all-way stop control would improve traffic  
382 operational characteristics of the intersection. **[From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07**  
383 **Paragraph 05D]**
- 384 C. Where pedestrian and/or bicycle crossings of the major street justify the installation of  
385 all-way stop control.

386 **(similar to 2009 MUTCD section 2B.07 Paragraph 05B)**

387

388 **NOTE: Sections 2B.05 (STOP sign and ALL WAY plaque) and 2B.08 (YIELD sign) and**  
389 **2B.10 (STOP sign and YIELD sign placement) in the existing 2009 manual do not change.**  
390 **They would be inserted either before, after or somewhere between these sections as deemed**  
391 **appropriate by FHWA.**

392

393 **~~Section 2B.06 STOP Sign Applications~~**

394 This section is deleted

395 **~~Section 2B.07 Multi-Way Stop Applications~~**

396 This section is deleted

397 **~~Section 2B.09 YIELD Sign Applications~~**

398 This section is deleted

399

400 **The following is present 2009 MUTCD language in the sections impacted, which are 2B.04,**  
401 **2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09:**

402

403 **~~Strikethrough-Red~~ is MUTCD text being deleted.**

404 The location or section of the 2009 MUTCD provided in square brackets [ ] shows where  
405 text is being moved to.

406  
407 2009 MUTCD:

408 **Section 2B.04 Right-of-Way at Intersections**

409 **Support:**

410 ~~01—State or local laws written in accordance with the “Uniform Vehicle Code” (see Section~~  
411 ~~1A.11) establish the right-of-way rule at intersections having no regulatory traffic control signs~~  
412 ~~such that the driver of a vehicle approaching an intersection must yield the right-of-way to any~~  
413 ~~vehicle or pedestrian already in the intersection. When two vehicles approach an intersection~~  
414 ~~from different streets or highways at approximately the same time, the right-of-way rule requires~~  
415 ~~the driver of the vehicle on the left to yield the right-of-way to the vehicle on the right. The right-~~  
416 ~~of-way can be modified at through streets or highways by placing YIELD (R1-2) signs (see~~  
417 ~~Sections 2B.08 and 2B.09) or STOP (R1-1) signs (see Sections 2B.05 through 2B.07) on one or~~  
418 ~~more approaches.~~

419  
420  
421 **Guidance:** (Moved to Section 2B.04)

422 ~~02~~ *Engineering judgment should be used to establish intersection control. The following factors*  
423 *should be considered:*

- 424 A. *Vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic volumes on all approaches;*
- 425 B. *Number and angle of approaches;*
- 426 C. *Approach speeds;*
- 427 D. *Sight distance available on each approach; and*
- 428 E. *Reported crash experience.* (Moved to Section 2B.04)

429 ~~03—YIELD or STOP signs should be used at an intersection if one or more of the following~~  
430 ~~conditions exist:~~

- 431 A. ~~An intersection of a less important road with a main road where application of the~~  
432 ~~normal right-of-way rule would not be expected to provide reasonable compliance with~~  
433 ~~the law; (similar thought was included in 2B.04a)~~
- 434 B. ~~A street entering a designated through highway or street; and/or (similar thought in~~  
435 ~~2B.04a)~~
- 436 C. ~~An unsignalized intersection in a signalized area.~~

437 ~~04~~ *In addition, the use of YIELD or STOP signs should be considered at the intersection of two*  
438 *minor streets or local roads where the intersection has more than three approaches and where one*  
439 *or more of the following conditions exist:*

- 440 A. ~~The combined vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian volume entering the intersection from~~  
441 ~~all approaches averages more than 2,000 units per day;~~
- 442 B. ~~The ability to see conflicting traffic on an approach is not sufficient to allow a road user~~  
443 ~~to stop or yield in compliance with the normal right-of-way rule if such stopping or~~  
444 ~~yielding is necessary; and/or~~
- 445 C. ~~Crash records indicate that five or more crashes that involve the failure to yield the~~  
446 ~~right-of-way at the intersection under the normal right-of-way rule have been reported~~  
447 ~~within a 3-year period, or that three or more such crashes have been reported within a 2-~~  
448 ~~year period.~~

449 ~~05~~ *YIELD or STOP signs should not be used for speed control.* (Moved to section 2B.04)

450 **Support:**  
451 ~~06—Section 2B.07 contains provisions regarding the application of multi-way STOP control at~~  
452 ~~an intersection.~~

453 **Guidance:**  
454 ~~07—Once the decision has been made to control an intersection, the decision regarding the~~  
455 ~~appropriate roadway to control should be based on engineering judgment. In most cases, the~~  
456 ~~roadway carrying the lowest volume of traffic should be controlled.~~  
457 ~~08—A YIELD or STOP sign should not be installed on the higher volume roadway unless~~  
458 ~~justified by an engineering study.~~

459 **Support:**  
460 09 The following are considerations that might influence the decision regarding the appropriate  
461 roadway upon which to install a YIELD or STOP sign where two roadways with relatively equal  
462 volumes and/or characteristics intersect:  
463 A. Controlling the direction that conflicts the most with established pedestrian crossing  
464 activity or school walking routes; (moved to section 2B.04a)  
465 B. Controlling the direction that has obscured vision, dips, or bumps that already require  
466 drivers to use lower operating speeds; and (moved to section 2B.04a)  
467 C. Controlling the direction that has the best sight distance from a controlled position to  
468 observe conflicting traffic. (moved to section 2B.04a)

469 **Standard:**  
470 10 **Because the potential for conflicting commands could create driver confusion, YIELD**  
471 **or STOP signs shall not be used in conjunction with any traffic control signal operation,**  
472 **except in the following cases: (Moved to section 2B.04)**  
473 A. **If the signal indication for an approach is a flashing red at all times; (moved to**  
474 **section 2B.04)**  
475 B. **If a minor street or driveway is located within or adjacent to the area controlled by**  
476 **the traffic control signal, but does not require separate traffic signal control**  
477 **because an extremely low potential for conflict exists; or (moved to section 2B.04)**  
478 C. **If a channelized turn lane is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island**  
479 **and the channelized turn lane is not controlled by a traffic control signal. (moved**  
480 **to section 2B.04)**

481 11 **Except as provided in Section 2B.09, STOP signs and YIELD signs shall not be**  
482 **installed on different approaches to the same unsignalized intersection if those approaches**  
483 **conflict with or oppose each other. (moved to Section 2B.04)**

484 12 **Portable or part-time STOP or YIELD signs shall not be used except for emergency**  
485 **and temporary traffic control zone purposes. (moved to Section 2B.04)**

486 13 **A portable or part-time (folding) STOP sign that is manually placed into view and**  
487 **manually removed from view shall not be used during a power outage to control a**  
488 **signalized approach unless the maintaining agency establishes that the signal indication**  
489 **that will first be displayed to that approach upon restoration of power is a flashing red**  
490 **signal indication and that the portable STOP sign will be manually removed from view**  
491 **prior to stop-and-go operation of the traffic control signal. (Moved to Section 2B.04)**

492 **Option:**  
493 14 **A portable or part-time (folding) STOP sign that is electrically or mechanically operated**  
494 **such that it only displays the STOP message during a power outage and ceases to display the**

495 STOP message upon restoration of power may be used during a power outage to control a  
496 signalized approach. [moved to Section 2B.04]

497 **Support:**

498 ~~15—Section 9B.03 contains provisions regarding the assignment of priority at a shared use~~  
499 ~~path/roadway intersection.~~

500

### 501 ~~Section 2B.06 STOP Sign Applications~~

502 **Guidance:**

503 ~~01 At intersections where a full stop is not necessary at all times, consideration should first be~~  
504 ~~given to using less restrictive measures such as YIELD signs (moved to section 2B.04d)~~

505 ~~02 The use of STOP signs on the minor street approaches should be considered if engineering~~  
506 ~~judgment indicates that a stop is always required because of one or more of the following~~  
507 ~~conditions:~~

508 ~~A. The vehicular traffic volumes on the through street or highway exceed 6,000 vehicles~~  
509 ~~per day;~~

510 ~~B. A restricted view exists that requires road users to stop in order to adequately~~  
511 ~~observe conflicting traffic on the through street or highway; and/or [moved to Section~~  
512 ~~2B.04e]~~

513 ~~C. Crash records indicate that three or more crashes that are susceptible to correction by~~  
514 ~~the installation of a STOP sign have been reported within a 12-month period, or that~~  
515 ~~five or more such crashes have been reported within a 2-year period. Such crashes~~  
516 ~~include right-angle collisions involving road users on the minor street approach failing~~  
517 ~~to yield the right-of-way to traffic on the through street or highway.~~

518 **Support:**

519 ~~03—The use of STOP signs at grade crossings is described in Sections 8B.04 and 8B.05.~~

### 520 ~~Section 2B.07 Multi-Way Stop Applications~~

521 **Support:**

522 ~~01—Multi-way stop control can be useful as a safety measure at intersections if certain traffic~~  
523 ~~conditions exist. Safety concerns associated with multi-way stops include pedestrians, bicyclists,~~  
524 ~~and all road users expecting other road users to stop. Multi-way stop control is used where the~~  
525 ~~volume of traffic on the intersecting roads is approximately equal~~

526 ~~02 The restrictions on the use of STOP signs described in Section 2B.04 also apply to multi-way~~  
527 ~~stop applications.~~

528 **Guidance:**

529 ~~03 The decision to install multi-way stop control should be based on an engineering study.~~  
530 ~~[Moved to Section 2B.04f]~~

531 ~~04—The following criteria should be considered in the engineering study for a multi-way STOP~~  
532 ~~sign installation:~~

533 ~~A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that~~  
534 ~~can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the~~  
535 ~~installation of the traffic control signal. (Moved to Section 2B.04i)~~

536 ~~B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by~~  
537 ~~a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as~~  
538 ~~well as right-angle collisions.~~

539 ~~C. Minimum volumes: (Moved to Section 2B.04j with some changes)~~

- 540 1. *The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches*  
 541 *(total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours*  
 542 *of an average day; and*  
 543 2. *The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection*  
 544 *from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200*  
 545 *units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street*  
 546 *vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but*  
 547 3. *If the 85<sup>th</sup> -percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph,*  
 548 *the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in*  
 549 *Items 1 and 2.*

550 ~~D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.1, and C.2 are all satisfied~~  
 551 ~~to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C.3 is excluded from this condition.~~

552 Option:

553 05 Other criteria that may be considered in an engineering study include:

- 554 A. The need to control left-turn conflicts; (Section 2B.04k)  
 555 B. ~~The need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high~~  
 556 ~~pedestrian volumes; (similar to section 2B.04k)~~  
 557 C. Locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able  
 558 to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop; and  
 559 (moved to section 2B.04h)  
 560 D. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar  
 561 design and operating characteristics where multi-way stop control would improve  
 562 traffic operational characteristics of the intersection. (Moved to Section 2B.04k)  
 563

### 564 ~~Section 2B.09 YIELD Sign Applications~~

565 Option:

566 01 ~~YIELD signs may be installed:~~

- 567 A. ~~On the approaches to a through street or highway where conditions are such that a full~~  
 568 ~~stop is not always required.~~  
 569 B. At the second crossroad of a divided highway, where the median width at the  
 570 intersection is 30 feet or greater. In this case, a STOP or YIELD sign may be installed at  
 571 the entrance to the first roadway of a divided highway, and a YIELD sign may be  
 572 installed at the entrance to the second roadway. (Moved to Section 2B.04d)  
 573 C. For a channelized turn lane that is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island,  
 574 even if the adjacent lanes at the intersection are controlled by a highway traffic control  
 575 signal or by a STOP sign. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]  
 576 D. At an intersection where a special problem exists and where engineering judgment  
 577 indicates the problem to be susceptible to correction by the use of the YIELD sign.  
 578 [Moved to Section 2B.04d]  
 579 E. Facing the entering roadway for a merge-type movement if engineering judgment  
 580 indicates that control is needed because acceleration geometry and/or sight distance is  
 581 not adequate for merging traffic operation. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]

582 Standard:

583 02 A YIELD (R1-2) sign shall be used to assign right-of-way at the entrance to a  
 584 roundabout. YIELD signs at roundabouts shall be used to control the approach roadways  
 585 and shall not be used to control the circulatory roadway. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]

586 03 **Other than for all of the approaches to a roundabout, YIELD signs shall not be placed**  
587 **on all of the approaches to an intersection. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]**  
588 **END OF PROPOSAL**

589  
590 C:NCUTCD/January 2016/Heydel/15B-RW-02 unsignalized intersections approved by Council 1-8-16