

CENTER signs. The FHWA removes all size notations from the signs in this figure, and lists the sign sizes under the "Conventional Roads" column in the new table in this chapter. The FHWA received two comments from Caltrans and the Arizona DOT questioning why the EM-1 sign in the illustration includes the word "HURRICANE." Because this is probably the most common type of evacuation route that is currently signed in the U.S., the FHWA uses the hurricane sign in the figure as an example. To address these comments in this final rule, the FHWA adds an asterisk to the EM-1 sign and a note stating that HURRICANE is an example of one type of evacuation route, and that the legend for other types may also be used, or this line of text may be omitted.

139. In Section 2I.08 Emergency Aid Center Signs (EM-6 Series), the FHWA adds to the STANDARD statement that the EM-6 series signs shall be a horizontal rectangle and that the identifying word and the word "CENTER", the directional arrow, and the border shall be black on a white background. Although this text was not included in the NPA, the FHWA adopts this change in this final rule to clarify the colors of these signs, consistent with longstanding requirements of the Standard Highway Signs book for the design of these signs. This does not impose any new requirements.

Discussion of Adopted Amendments to Part 3—Markings

140. In Section 3A.01 Functions and Limitations, based on a comment from the NCUTCD, the FHWA adds a list describing the hierarchy system for longitudinal lines in order to clarify the intended functions of various types of longitudinal lines, similar to text that was in Section 3A.06 of the 2000 MUTCD. This text is most appropriately located in Section 3A.01.

141. In Section 3A.03 Materials, the FHWA received one comment from the Motorcycle Safety Foundation requesting that motorcycles be considered when selecting pavement marking materials, especially longitudinal markings, because traction is important to motorcyclists. Because the FHWA did not propose changes to this section in the NPA, and a change to add "motorcycles" could have a significant impact on agencies, the FHWA declines incorporating any changes at this time. This goes beyond the scope of this rulemaking and would need to be addressed in a future rulemaking.

142. In Section 3A.04 Colors, the FHWA revises the STANDARD statement to clarify the use of black

markings. Black markings can be used in conjunction with any other color marking to add contrast to it. The FHWA removes the existing reference to object markers because it is not an appropriate reference. The FHWA received one comment from the City of Tucson, Arizona, supporting these changes to this section. A traffic control device manufacturer suggested adding a paragraph to denote that channelizing devices such as tubular markers and longitudinal channelizers are often used to reinforce white channelizing lines. The FHWA declines incorporating this comment because this topic is adequately covered in Section 3F.02 Channelizing Devices.

Additionally, the FHWA removes the section titled, "Section 3A.05 Colors of Pavement Markings" (as it appeared in the NPA) and moves this information to Section 3A.04. The FHWA rennumbers the remaining sections accordingly.

In response to comments from the NCUTCD and the Wisconsin DOT, the FHWA removes the reference to white and yellow raised pavement markers, because raised pavement markers are distinguished from others by their physical characteristics, rather than color. Raised pavement markers are described in detail in Section 3B.11 Raised Pavement Markers.

The Ohio DOT and a traffic engineering consultant suggested adding text in this section to acknowledge that blue raised pavement markers may be used as fire hydrant locators. The FHWA agrees with this addition in conjunction with the addition of blue raised pavement markers to Section 3B.11, and adds a sentence to the STANDARD statement in Section 3A.04.

143. In Section 3A.05 Widths and Patterns of Longitudinal Pavement Markings (referred to as Section 3A.06 in the NPA), the FHWA received two comments from the NCUTCD and the Ohio DOT opposed to proposed changes to the STANDARD statement to remove the descriptions of the functions of longitudinal pavement markings. The FHWA agrees with these comments and moves these items to Section 3A.01 Functions and Limitations.

Additionally, the FHWA moves the last item of the STANDARD, pertaining to lengths of broken and dotted lines, to Section 3B.11 Raised Pavement Markers and revises it to clarify that it pertains to the spacing of raised pavement markers.

The FHWA deleted "on rural highways" from the GUIDANCE statement to clarify that this guidance refers to all roadway types, not just rural highways. A private citizen expressed concern that this revision would imply

that the pavement marking section would be applicable to toll facilities as well. Due to the unique nature of toll plazas, the citizen suggested that uniformity of toll plaza marking be addressed before including toll facilities under the blanket of "all roadway types." While the FHWA realizes that toll plaza applications are not specifically discussed in the MUTCD, the FHWA plans to study toll plaza applications and defers that discussion to a future rulemaking. The FHWA adopts the revision, as proposed in the NPA.

The FHWA received one comment from the Washington DOT supporting the FHWA's proposal to revise the OPTION statement to differentiate between the dimensions for dotted lines used for line extensions and lane drop/add markings and the proposed revisions to the dimensions for the line segments and gaps to be consistent with other sections in Part 3. The Wisconsin DOT opposed this revision, stating that they are using a higher gap ratio. The Ohio DOT felt that this should be a GUIDANCE statement. Because changing this to a GUIDANCE may have cost impacts to agencies, the FHWA adopts the language as proposed in the NPA as an OPTION, but the FHWA may consider changing it to a GUIDANCE in a future rulemaking.

144. In Section 3B.01 Yellow Centerline Pavement Markings and Warrants, the FHWA changes the title "Yellow Centerline and Left Edge Line Pavement Markings and Warrants" to "Yellow Centerline Pavement Markings and Warrants." The FHWA also moves the fourth STANDARD statement of Section 3B.01 to Section 3B.06 Edge Line Pavement Markings because edge lines are appropriately covered in Section 3B.06. The FHWA received one comment from the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of these changes, and the FHWA adopts these changes.

A traffic engineering consultant suggested that the term "traffic lane" be clarified to specify whether parking lanes and bicycle lanes were included. The FHWA agrees with this suggestion, and replaces the phrase "traffic lane" with "lanes for moving motor vehicle traffic" where appropriate in this section. The FHWA received a comment from a private citizen in Newton, Massachusetts stating that it is common practice in the northeast to paint a single yellow centerline stripe on narrow or low-volumes streets. The commenter suggests additional language explaining the use of single yellow centerlines be added to this section to account for the proposed changes to remove the descriptions of longitudinal