

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

1		ATTA	CHMENT NO. 4
2		Item	No. 16B-RW-03
3			
4	NCUTCD I	Proposal for Changes to the	
5	Manual on Un	niform Traffic Control Devices	
6 7	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE:	Regulatory/Warning Signs Technic	cal Committe e
8	ITEM NUMBER:	16B-RW-03	
9	TOPIC	Section 2C.04, Size of Warning Sig	-
10 11	ORIGIN OF REQUEST:	Gerard Gerhard letters of June 23, 2 November 2, 2015	2014 and
12		Task Force: Dan Paddick (Chair),	Tom Hevdel.
13		Andy Ramish, Erin Kissner, Herma	
14		Kennedy, Doug Bartlett, Bruce Iba	rguen, Jim Pline,
15		Robert Weber, Paul Carlson	
16	AFFECTED SECTIONS	a	
17	OF MUTCD:	Section 2C.04, Size of Warning si	igns
18 19	DEVELOPMENT HISTORY: T	ask Force: 5-6-16, revised 12-13-10	5
20	Approved by Technical C	ommittee: 06/09/2016	
21	 Approved by Technical Committee: 00/03/2010 Approved by RWSTC following sponsor comments: 01/04/2017 		
22	Approved by NCUTCD C	~ ·	
23 24 25	approved by the NCUTCD Cou the MUTCD and does not co	nmended changes to the MUTCD that ncil. This proposal does not represer onstitute official MUTCD standards, g	nt a revision of uidance, or
26		o FHWA for consideration for inclusio	
27 28	MUTCD revision. The MUTCD	can be revised only through the fede process.	ral rulemaking
29	SUMMARY:		
30 31 32 33 34	On June 23, 2014, Mr. Gerard Gerhard of Lexington, Kentucky wrote to the Director of Office of Transportation Operations of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The letter had 22 numbered sections recommending changes to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). He followed this up with a November 2, 2015 letter to Mr. William Lambert, Chair of the Regulatory and Warning Sign Technical		
	16B.RW.03	Size of Warning Signs	Page 1 of 5

35 36	Committee (RWSTC) of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD). This letter contained two more comments recommending changes.
37	The FHWA had transmitted the original letter to the NCUTCD for consideration. The
38	NCUTCD assigned the overview of these letters to the RWSTC because the majority of
39	the issues related to Regulatory and Warning Signs.
40	DISCUSSION:
41 42	Mr. Gerhard addresses two concerns (Gerhard item # 7) that he has with Section 2C.04, Size of Warning signs. He writes:
43	"Section 2C.04, Size of Warning Signs
44	A) Amend Section 2C.04, Size of Warning Signs (2009 MUTCD), Standard,
45	Paragraph 01, to add "and 2A.15." Upon amendment, Paragraph 01 of Section
46	2C. 04 would read:
47	Except as provided in Section 2A.11 and 2A.15, the sizes for warning signs
48	shall be as shown in Table 2C-2.
49	
50	B) Amend Section 2C.04, Size of Warning Signs (2009 MUTCD), Paragraph 05,
51	Option, so that, upon amendment, Paragraph 05 of Section 2C.04 will read:
52	Guidance:
53	If a diamond shaped warning sign is placed on the left-hand side of a highway to
54	supplement the installation of the same warning sign on the right-hand side of
55	the roadway, the sign placed on the left- hand side of the highway shall be the
56	same size as the sign on the right-hand side of the highway." (End of Quote)
57	Mr. Gerhard has two suggestions within this comment. The first is that he believes
58	that Paragraph 01 should be amended to also reference Section 2A.15 along with
59	Section 2A.11. Section 2A.15 allows, based on engineering judgment, the use of
60	larger size signs to increase conspicuity.
61	The RWSTC believes that Section 2A.15 should be referenced in Paragraph 06
62	rather in Paragraph 01. This Paragraph directly addresses the use of larger signs.
63	Mr. Gerhard's second comment is an amendment of Paragraph 05. This Paragraph
64	addresses the use of a smaller size sign for a supplemental sign on the left side of a
	16B.RW.03 Size of Warning Signs 2

65 66	multi-lane roadway. It does not address any other roadway types or roadway situations. Mr. Gerhard changes the title of the Paragraph from an Option to a
67	Guidance statement. However he writes it as a Standard by using "Shall". He also
68	changes the statement from relating to multi-lane roadways to all roadways.
69	Section 2A.15B already requires that the supplemental sign on the left side of a
70	roadway be identical to the sign on the right side. This change is not necessary. It
71	would be redundant with Section 2A.15B.
72	The RWSTC believes that there are situations where a smaller size sign may be
73	appropriate on the left side of multi-lane roadways. An example of this would be a
74	narrow median where the width of a wider sign might encroach on the shoulder.
75	RECOMMENDATION:
76	Section 2A.15 will be referenced in Paragraph 06. This Paragraph directly
77	addresses the use of larger signs.
78	We do not agree with Mr. Gerhard's comment that Paragraph 05 of Section 2C.04
79	needs to be amended.
80	RECOMMENDED WORDING:
81	The following present the proposed changes to the current MUTCD within the context of
82	the current MUTCD language. Proposed additions to the MUTCD are shown in <u>blue</u>
83	<u>underline</u> and proposed deletions from the MUTCD are shown in red strikethrough.
84	Changes previously approved by NCUTCD Council (but not yet adopted by FHWA) are
85	shown in green double underline for additions and green double strikethrough for
86	deletions. In some cases, background comments may be provided with the MUTCD text.
87	These comments are indicated by [highlighted light blue in brackets].
88	PART 2. SIGNS
89	CHAPTER 2C. WARNING SIGNS AND OBJECT MARKERS
90	Section 2C.04 Size of Warning Signs
91	Standard:
92	01 Except as provided in Section 2A.11 the The sizes for warning signs shall be as
93	shown in Table 2C-2.
94	Support:
95	o2 Section 2A.11 contains information regarding the applicability of the various columns
96	in Table 2C-2.
97	Standard:

- 98 03 Except as provided in Paragraph 5, the minimum size for all diamond-shaped
- 99 warning signs facing traffic on a multi-lane conventional road where the posted
- speed limit is higher than 35 mph shall be 36 x 36 inches.
- 101 04 The minimum size for supplemental warning plaques that are not included in
- 102 Table 2C-2 shall be as shown in Table 2C-3.
- 103 Option:
- 104 05 If a diamond-shaped warning sign is placed on the left-hand side of a multi-lane
- roadway to supplement the installation of the same warning sign on the right-hand side of
- the roadway, the minimum size identified in the Single Lane column in Table 2C-2 may
- be used.
- Signs and plaques larger than those shown in Tables 2C-2 and 2C-3 may be used (see
- 109 Section 2A.11 and Section 2A.15.
- 110 Guidance:
- 111 07 The minimum size for all diamond-shaped warning signs facing traffic on exit and
- entrance ramps should be the size identified in Table 2C-2 for the mainline roadway
- classification (Expressway or Freeway). If a minimum size is not provided in the Freeway
- 114 Column, the Expressway size should be used. If a minimum size is not provided in the
- 115 Freeway or the Expressway Column, the Oversized size should be used.

116 117

Section 2A.15 Enhanced Conspicuity for Standard Signs

- 118 Option:
- 119 01 Based upon engineering judgment, where the improvement of the conspicuity of a
- standard regulatory, warning, or guide sign is desired, any of the following methods may
- be used, as appropriate, to enhance the sign's conspicuity (see Figure 2A-1):
- 122 A. Increasing the size of a standard regulatory, warning, or guide sign.
- B. Doubling-up of a standard regulatory, warning, or guide sign by adding a second
- identical sign on the lefthand side of the roadway.
- 125 C. Adding a solid yellow or fluorescent yellow rectangular "header panel" above a
- standard regulatory sign, with the width of the panel corresponding to the width of the
- standard regulatory sign. A legend of "NOTICE," "STATE LAW," or other appropriate
- text may be added in black letters within the header panel for a period of time determined
- by engineering judgment. (And so forth.)

130 131

C:NCUTCD/January 2017/Size of Warning Signs, Section 2C.04 16B.RW.03, APPROVED BY COUNCIL 1-6-17