

incidents therefore, this statement remains a GUIDANCE in this final rule.

225. In Section 6C.07 Termination Area, the FHWA clarifies the STANDARD statement to indicate that temporary traffic control devices other than END ROAD WORK signs can be used to signify the end of a termination area. The FHWA received one comment from the City of Tucson, Arizona, in support of this change, and one comment from a private citizen opposed to it. The opposing commenter suggested that the STANDARD statement be deleted or changed to an OPTION because the many work zones have no deviation from the normal path. The FHWA disagrees with changing the STANDARD statement because it is clear that if road users have not been diverted from their normal path, then a termination area would not be needed, and this section would not apply. The FHWA adopts the change as proposed in the NPA.

To provide flexibility to jurisdictions, the FHWA adds to the OPTION statement that a longitudinal buffer space may be used between the work space and the beginning of the downstream taper. The FHWA received one comment from the NCUTCD opposed to this change, stating that the paragraph should be deleted because the area between the work space and the beginning of the downstream taper is not a buffer space. The FHWA disagrees because such a buffer space could be used in a variety of locations, such as for a center lane closure on a multi-lane undivided highway or on a two-lane, one-way operation. The FHWA adopts this change as proposed in the NPA.

The FHWA also received two comments from the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, and a private citizen suggesting that an additional paragraph be added to the OPTION stating that the use of END ROAD WORK signs is optional for most daytime maintenance and utility operations. The FHWA disagrees that this sentence is needed because there are several terms within the section to indicate that use of an END ROAD WORK sign is not mandated for termination areas.

226. In Section 6C.08 Tapers, the FHWA revises the first GUIDANCE statement to indicate that the appropriate taper length should be determined using the criteria in Tables 6C-3 and 6C-4 to address a comment from a private citizen stating that the word "minimum" does not accurately describe the taper lengths in the table. The FHWA agrees that the change is needed to correct the error, and revises the GUIDANCE statement in this final rule. The same commenter suggested

that the FHWA also revise the second paragraph of the GUIDANCE statement, to remove the word "maximum" when referring to the distances between devices in a taper. The FHWA disagrees because it would not be acceptable to have longer spacing unless there is a good engineering reason to do so. The FHWA also inserts a new table numbered and titled, "Table 6C-4 Formulas for Determining Taper Lengths" immediately following Table 6C-3. This table contains the formulas that were included as notes to Table 6C-3 in the NPA, except that they are included in a tabular format for clarity. This table is also identical to Table 6H-4.

In the fifth GUIDANCE statement, the FHWA deletes the word "minimum" from the description of the length of a downstream taper in this final rule. The FHWA received two comments from the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, and a private citizen suggesting the word "minimum" be replaced with the word "maximum," however the FHWA disagrees. Criteria for downstream tapers, as shown in Table 6C-3 indicate a set distance, not a minimum or maximum length.

The FHWA received three comments from the Ohio DOT, the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, and a private citizen suggesting changes to the shifting and downstream taper entries in Table 6C-3. Because there were no changes proposed to this table (other than the table number), these comments are outside the scope of the NPA. Such changes would need to be proposed in a future rulemaking.

The FHWA revises Figure 6C-3 Example of a One-Lane, Two-Way Traffic Taper to illustrate a downstream longitudinal buffer space (between the work space and traffic from the open-lane approach); a downstream taper, noted "100 ft MAXIMUM;" shifts the flagger and warning sign symbols on the open-lane approach accordingly so that the flagger is stationed well beyond the last cone in the downstream taper; and on both approaches, shift the END ROAD WORK symbols so that they are opposite the last warning signs.

227. In Section 6C.10 One-Lane, Two-Way Traffic Control, the FHWA received two comments from the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, and a private citizen suggesting that an OPTION be added after the STANDARD statement to indicate that where traffic speeds and volumes are low, and where the work area is short and sight distance is good, vehicular traffic may be self-regulating. The FHWA disagrees with adding this language at this time because similar text is already included in the

SUPPORT statement. Changing that SUPPORT to an OPTION may be considered in a future rulemaking.

The FHWA received two comments from the same commenters suggesting that the last paragraph of the GUIDANCE be revised to delete pilot cars as one of the means for controlling opposing traffic flows on a one-lane roadway where affected traffic is not visible from one end to the other because a pilot car alone cannot coordinate traffic movements at both ends of the operation. The FHWA agrees with the commenter and, rather than deleting the option to use a pilot car, the FHWA clarifies that a pilot car uses a flagger as defined in Section 6F.54 PILOT CAR FOLLOW ME Sign (G20-4).

228. In Section 6D.01 Pedestrian Considerations, the FHWA proposed adding a new GUIDANCE statement at the beginning of the section to indicate that pedestrians of all ages and abilities should be provided a detectable and usable travel path. The FHWA received one comment from the NCUTCD opposed to the new GUIDANCE, suggesting that the text be reworded and classified as a SUPPORT statement. The FHWA disagrees and adds the introductory STANDARD statement at the beginning of this section to emphasize accessibility provisions, as discussed above at the start of the Part 6 discussion.

In the NPA, the FHWA proposed modifying the second SUPPORT statement to include information on other publications that can provide useful data for assisting the planning for, and the design of, pedestrian facilities. The FHWA received one comment from the NCUTCD opposing this language and suggesting that a new Section 6D.02 Accessibility Considerations be added. The FHWA also received three comments from commenters representing the visually disabled community suggesting additional wording to clarify that speech messages provided by an audible information device are more helpful to pedestrians with disabilities than Braille and raised character signs. The FHWA agrees with the commenters and withdraws the proposed language. In this final rule, the FHWA adds Section 6D.02 Accessibility Considerations and revises Section 6D.01 by adding two paragraphs to the SUPPORT with more detailed information describing how to provide information to pedestrians with visual disabilities via audible messages, and adds a GUIDANCE statement recommending locator tones be used with pushbuttons, to be consistent with Part 4 of the MUTCD.