(23) Request II–241(C)—Overhead Guide NCUTCD have requested a change to Sign Arrows NCUTCD have requested a change to section 3B–18 of the MUTCD. The las

The FHWA received a request from a citizen in Hartsdale, New York, concerning improving overhead guide signs by using consistent directional arrows which point upwards and which indicate if the roadway turns to the left or to the right. This suggestion is based on the belief that the current downward pointing arrows are misleading and confusing to the motorist. In MUTCD sections 2D-8 and 2E-15 downward pointing arrows are currently classified as pull-through arrows for the purpose of assigning proper lanes for traffic continuing along a specified route. However, the citizen sugggests that this intended message is neither helpful nor even understood by many motorists.

The FHWA is considering this request for change, since it has the potential to provide more consistent, timely, and useful information to the motorist. The FHWA is soliciting comments on the feasibility and effect of implementing this proposed change to the MUTCD.

(24) Request II–246(C)—Adopt-A-Highway Signs

The Adopt-A-Highway Program provides free litter removal to the jurisdiction responsible for roadway maintenance in exchange for the right to display a small sign recognizing the group removing the litter. Since the program's inception in the fall of 1985, at least 34 States now have implemented Adopt-A-Highway Programs. Some of the States using the program limit participation to civic groups, while others allow display of commercial messages. There is also a wide variance in the size of the recognition signs allowed to be displayed within the highway right-ofway, varying from 2 feet by 4 feet to 6 feet by 12 feet. In addition, the background and letter color of these signs varies from State to State. There is also variance in the lateral placement and the frequency of placement of these

The FHWA proposes to include standards for the Adopt-A-Highway sign in MUTCD section 2D–48, General Information Signs. We are interested in recommendations regarding maximum and minimum sizes, background and message colors, and sign placement criteria, including lateral placement and frequency of placement.

Markings (Part III)

(25) Request III–54(C)—Variation of Line Width and Spacing for Crosswalks

The Kansas Department of Transportation (KSDOT) and the

NCUTCD have requested a change to section 3B–18 of the MUTCD. The last paragraph of this section of the MUTCD currently states that the longitudinal crosswalk lines should be spaced 12 to 24 inches apart. This proposed change would increase the maximum spacing from 24 to 48 inches with a maximum spacing not to exceed twice the line width.

Presently, we have no statistical data to show that the proposed maximum spacing of 48 inches will not adversely affect visibility. The possibility exists that a crosswalk area could end up with only one longitudinal marking on a 12foot roadway. The FHWA agrees that from an installation and maintenance standpoint the use of wider spacings is more economical. However, the FHWA does not wish to see pedestrian safety compromised. The current maximum longitudinal spacing of 24 inches is so the crossing area will be highly visible and recognizable both for the motorist and for the pedestrian.

The FHWA hesitates to change the MUTCD without evaluation data which supports the design safety of the proposed crosswalk configuration. Since there are no operational problems relative to the standard 24-inch maximum spacing, the FHWA intends to deny this request for change.

(26) Request III–68(C)—Lane Drop Marking Pattern.

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation in Rockville, Maryland, has requested that MUTCD section 3A-6 be modified to include the lane drop marking pattern since this section of the MUTCD contains descriptions for various widths and patterns of longitudinal lines. Lane drop marking patterns are currently described in the fourth paragraph of MUTCD section 3B-11. Since section 3A-6 describes widths and patterns of longitudinal lines, the FHWA agrees that the lane drop marking pattern should also be included in this section of the MUTCD.

Additionally, Montgomery County suggested that the term "special marking" as used in the fourth paragraph of section 3B–11 should be changed to "lane drop marking" and that the use of this marking pattern should not be restricted to interchange ramps, but should also be available for use with mandatory lane drops on arterial streets and highways.

In order to further consistency and clarity in traffic operation messages, the FHWA proposes to adopt the above changes to the MUTCD. These amendments would impose no

additional requirements or costs on highway agencies.

Signals (Part IV)

(27) Request IV-47(C)—Use of Steady and Flashing Yellow Arrows in Lane Control Signals

The Minnesota and Texas
Departments of Transportation (MNDOT
and TXDOT) have proposed MUTCD
changes to the YELLOW lane-use
control signal indication used on
freeways. The MNDOT also proposed
changing the MUTCD to allow
darkening of lane control signals that
are used for non-reversible freeway lane
operation.

MUTCD Section 4E–9 provides the following meanings for YELLOW laneuse control signal indications:

- 1. A steady YELLOW X means that a driver should prepare to vacate, in a safe manner, the lane over which the signal is located because a lane control change is being made. The driver should avoid occupying that lane when a steady RED X is displayed.
- 2. A flashing YELLOW X over a lane means that a driver is permitted to use that lane for a left turn. The driver is cautioned that he may be sharing that lane with opposite flow left-turning vehicles.

The MNDOT identified a need to provide an additional signal message when incidents, maintenance activities, or congestion require drivers using these reversible lanes to exercise caution. MNDOT conducted an experimentation with two new lane use control signal indications:

- 1. A steady Downward YELLOW ARROW meaning the same as a steady YELLOW X.
- 2. A Flashing Downward YELLOW ARROW meaning that a driver is permitted to cautiously use the freeway lane over which the signal is located.

The research showed that 84% of the respondents interpreted the proposed steady YELLOW ARROW as meaning the driver may use this lane, but should use extra caution. The intended meaning should have been the same as the steady YELLOW X definition above. The understanding rate for the proposed Flashing Downward YELLOW ARROW was 50% which means that one-half of the respondents incorrectly interpreted its meaning.

In order to not mislead drivers, the MNDOT also proposed darkening the lane control signals when they were not in operation.

The TXDOT provided an alternate proposal to keep the MUTCD meanings for lane-use control signals and add a new lane control indication—a steady