

previously referenced document had been incorporated by reference into the 2000 MUTCD as well as previous editions.

98. In Section 2D.17 ALTERNATE Auxiliary Signs (M4-1, M4-1a), the FHWA adds the qualifiers of time or distance to the word "shorter" in the GUIDANCE statement. This addition clarifies that the shorter (time or distance) or better-constructed route should retain the regular route number. The ability to define the shorter route in terms of either time or distance provides additional flexibility. The FHWA received one comment from the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of this change, and adopts this change.

99. In Section 2D.23 TEMPORARY Auxiliary Signs (M4-7, M4-7a), the FHWA changes the title to reflect the addition of the new TEMP (M4-7a) sign and adds the TEMP (M4-7a) sign to the OPTION and STANDARD statements. The FHWA received three comments from the NCUTCD, ATSSA, and the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of this change, and adopts this change.

100. In Section 2D.26 Directional Arrow Auxiliary Signs (M6 Series), the FHWA removes the M6-8 and M6-9 multiple direction advance arrow auxiliary signs. These specific arrow signs are not consistent in design concept with the other Directional Arrow Auxiliary Signs. The M6-6 and M6-4 signs or separate assemblies for each route direction should be used instead to provide enhanced clarity to road users. The FHWA received three comments from the NCUTCD, a State DOT, and the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of this change, and adopts this change.

101. In Section 2D.27 Route Sign Assemblies, the FHWA rennumbers Figure 2D-2 of the 2000 MUTCD to Figure 2D-6 and modifies all three sheets of the figure to make the sign assemblies illustrated in the figure consistent with requirements in Section 2D.15 Cardinal Direction Auxiliary Signs (M3-1 through M3-4) regarding the size of the initial letter of the Cardinal Direction Auxiliary Signs, and to illustrate directional assemblies that reflect the most recent practice. The FHWA received comments from the NCUTCD and the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of these changes, and a few editorial changes. In this final rule, the FHWA revises the numbers of the U.S. routes on all three sheets to conform to the convention of odd numbers for north-south routes and even numbers for east-west routes. The FHWA also revises the numbers for all the State routes on these three sheets, even though not all States adopt the

U.S. route numbering convention for their State routes.

102. In Section 2D.31 Confirming or Reassurance Assemblies, the FHWA removes from the STANDARD statement the requirement that, if used, the Confirming Assembly be installed just beyond intersections of numbered routes.

Additionally, in the first GUIDANCE statement, the FHWA recommends that a Confirming assembly should be installed just beyond intersections of numbered routes.

The FHWA also adds a SUPPORT statement that states that Confirming and Reassurance Assemblies are Directional Assemblies.

These changes are adopted because use of the Confirming assembly beyond intersections with numbered routes should be a recommended practice rather than completely optional. Confirming assemblies are an important safety and operational feature that lets the road user know that he/she is on the correct route just beyond the decision point. The Confirming assembly provides highly desirable information to road users. These changes allow flexibility in installing the signs to adjust to roadside conditions. The FHWA received one comment from the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of the changes to this section, and adopts these changes.

103. In Section 2D.34 Destination Signs (D1 Series), the FHWA changes the title to add sign number designations and changes the section text to clarify which signs are applicable to the material in the section. The FHWA received one comment from the City of Tucson, Arizona, in overall support to the changes in this section.

In the NPA, the FHWA proposed moving material concerning the use of a sloping arrow at an irregular intersection from the second GUIDANCE statement (of the 2000 MUTCD) to a new second OPTION statement. The FHWA received one comment from the Illinois DOT opposed to this change, suggesting that the term "irregular" is not appropriate. The FHWA agrees and, to address this issue, the FHWA combines the preceding GUIDANCE and the OPTION into one GUIDANCE statement that reads, "Unless a sloping arrow will convey a clearer indication of the direction to be followed, the directional arrows should be horizontal or vertical."

104. In Section 2D.36 Distance Signs (D2 Series), the FHWA changes the title to add sign number designations. The FHWA also changes the section text to clarify which signs are applicable to the material in the section, and adds the

D2-3 (three destination distance sign), to reflect all the signs included in the series.

In the NPA, the FHWA proposed adding a recommendation in the first GUIDANCE statement that the distance shown on the sign be the distance to the center of the central business district, or to the point where the major north/south and east/west routes serving the city intersect, or to some point near the center of the city. While two commenters representing the NCUTCD and the City of Tucson, Arizona, supported this change, commenters from the Illinois and Kansas DOTs opposed the wording. The Kansas DOT suggested that the distance on the sign should be to a point where the city limits either cross or abut the route. The FHWA disagrees because many cities have city limits that now encompass large geographic areas or the entire county, and using the city limit as a basis for distance would give misleading information to the driver. The Illinois DOT suggested that the distance be determined on a community-by-community basis, and that the layout of the community be considered in relation to the highway being signed. The FHWA agrees with this suggestion and revises the GUIDANCE accordingly because the FHWA believes it provides the flexibility to determine distances that will be better understood and accepted by road users.

105. In Section 2D.38 Street Name Sign (D3-1), the FHWA changes the title to reflect the appropriate sign designation. In the first GUIDANCE statement the FHWA adds a recommendation that on multi-lane streets with speed limits of 60 km/h (40 mph) or more the minimum letter size should be 200 mm (8 in). Larger letter sizes are needed to improve sign legibility and safety for older road users. In this same GUIDANCE statement, the FHWA deletes the recommendation that larger letter heights be used for Street Name signs mounted overhead because more specific guidance is added elsewhere in this section. The FHWA received comments from ATSSA and the Virginia DOT in support of these changes, while the NCUTCD suggested even larger letter sizes for lettering on multilane higher-speed streets.

The Oregon and Wisconsin DOTs, the Cities of Tucson, Arizona; and Plano, Texas; and Pierce County, Washington, opposed the change. The opposing commenters primarily indicated that this change creates a financial impact on agencies, and that the larger letter heights will create longer street name signs that cannot be mounted and maintained using post top mounts.