

for information about the use and design of a TRAVEL INFO CALL 511 (D12-5) sign. In the NPA, the FHWA proposed the addition of OPTION and STANDARD statements mirroring text in Section 2D.45, however, the FHWA believes that a cross-reference to Section 2D.45 is sufficient in this section.

128. In Section 2E.57 Carpool and Ridesharing Signing (titled "Carpool Information Signing" in the NPA), the FHWA adds to the OPTION statement that Carpool Information signs may include Internet addresses or telephone numbers within the legend. This exception to a general prohibition against Internet addresses or telephone numbers with more than four characters in Section 2A.06 Design of Signs, reflects long-standing and common current practice and provides for additional information to road users. The FHWA received two comments from the Virginia DOT and the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of this change, and one from the NCUTCD opposed to it, stating the inconsistency with Section 2A.06. The FHWA adopts this change, as proposed in the NPA. Section 2A.06 allows the use of telephone numbers and Internet addresses when specifically authorized for certain signs in the MUTCD. A specific exemption is intended to be authorized by Section 2E.57 for carpool signs. However, to encourage use of shorter numbers, the FHWA changes the illustration of the Carpool sign (D12-2) in Figure 2D-12 to show "*CAR" rather than a 10-digit number.

Additionally, the FHWA changes the size of the maximum vertical dimension of the logo or symbol in the STANDARD statement from 900 mm (36 in) to 450 mm (18 in) to enhance the legibility of the primary message. The FHWA received no comments regarding this change, and adopts it in this final rule.

129. The FHWA adds a new section numbered and titled "Section 2E.59 Preferential Only Lane Signs." This section was titled "High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Signs" in the NPA. In the NPA, the FHWA proposed to include STANDARD, GUIDANCE, OPTION, and SUPPORT statements regarding the use and placement of signs for HOV lanes and facilities and five figures illustrating examples of HOV signing applications. The FHWA received several comments from Caltrans, the Minnesota DOT, and private citizens regarding this new section, ranging from editorial comments to opposition regarding specific statements, to a suggestion not to include the new section or figures until the section is reviewed in more detail by the Guide and Motorist Information Sign Technical Committee

of the NCUTCD. The FHWA disagrees with the commenter suggesting that additional time is needed for review. There was ample time for individuals to review and provide comments on this proposed section. Also, prior to preparing the NPA, the FHWA considered available information about the state of the practice of HOV signing. The FHWA reviewed the docket comments and conducted a thorough revision of the proposed language to address comments, remove inconsistencies, and clarify the text as it relates to signing for specific situations for barrier-separated, buffer-separated, concurrent flow, and direct access ramps.

One of the private citizens suggested that the section provide guidance that differentiates between an HOV lane physically ending and an HOV lane designation ending with the lane continuing as a mixed-flow lane. The FHWA agrees and clarifies the text and figures to provide examples of these conditions and guidance for proper signing.

Caltrans suggested that additional information and examples be provided regarding the use of changeable message signs (CMS), so that States do not inadvertently implement CMS signs for static, rather than dynamic signing purposes. The FHWA agrees and includes references to new Sections 2B.26 Preferential Only Lane Signs and 2B.28 Preferential Only Lane Sign Application and Placement (numbered Sections 2B.48 and 2B.50 in the 2000 MUTCD) at the beginning of this section and repeats pertinent information regarding the use of CMS signs in this section.

Caltrans also suggested that the proposed size of ground mounted/barrier mounted HOV signs was too small to contain all of the necessary information at the appropriate text size. The FHWA agrees and, in concert with Section 2B.26, the FHWA modifies the size and layout of the text that appears in the legend of the R3-10 through R3-14 signs to be consistent with the other sections in Part 2 regarding size of text associated with the type of facility.

The FHWA also received several comments from a private citizen regarding the use of the diamond symbol on the HOV signs. In some cases, the diamond was inadvertently shown incorrectly and/or inappropriately on signs in the figures in the NPA. The FHWA clarifies the use of the diamond symbol and the word "HOV" on signs to correspond with the option that agencies have to use either the diamond symbol or "HOV" that is included in Sections 2B.26 and 2B.28.

The FHWA clarifies the use of the diamond symbol and includes a diamond in the top left corner of the legend of the guide sign for all guide signs that appear in the gore areas for exits onto HOV lanes. These guide signs in gore areas appear in the figures for this section to respond to comments from a private citizen suggesting additional information on the gore signs.

The FHWA establishes a phase-in target compliance date of 10 years from the effective date of this final rule for this new section, for existing signs in good condition.

130. In Section 2F.01 Eligibility, the FHWA changes from three to two the number of meals per day for which a food establishment should have a continuous operation to serve in item B.2 of the fourth GUIDANCE statement to be consistent with changes in Section 2E.51 General Service Signs. (See also the discussion in Section 2E.51.)

131. In Section 2F.04 Number and Size of Logos and Signs, the FHWA changes the second STANDARD statement to require that a logo panel on signs for conventional roads and ramps not exceed 750 mm (30 in) in width instead of 600 mm (24 in) to be consistent with the proportions of panels for freeways and expressways. The FHWA received three comments from the NCUTCD, ATSSA and the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of this change, and adopts this change.

132. In Section 2F.08 Double-Exit Interchanges, the FHWA adds to the OPTION statement that at a double-exit interchange where there are four logo panels displayed for one of the exits and one or two panels to be displayed for the other exit, the logo panels may be arranged in three rows with two panels per row, to make the layout of the sign more logical. The FHWA received two comments from the NCUTCD and the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of this change, and one from the Minnesota DOT opposed to it. The opposing commenter suggested that the signing concept would confuse motorists. The FHWA believes that the commenter was confused as to what the sign would look like. Therefore the FHWA adds an illustration in Figure 2F-1 and believes that there should be no reason for drivers to be confused with this arrangement. The FHWA adopts the change.

133. In Chapter 2G TOURIST-ORIENTED DIRECTIONAL SIGNS, the FHWA changes "Typical" to "Examples of" in the titles of Figures 2G-1 and 2G-2 because the information shown is only an example of many acceptable arrangements of signs. The FHWA