

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Individual Response Form

Sponsoring Organization: ITE

Name of person responding (Print): *Monica M. Suter*

Agency or Company: *City of Santa Ana*

City/State: *Santa Ana, CA*

Date Completed: *December 19, 2011*

Indicate whether you fully concur, concur in part, or do not concur with the technical committee recommendation by checking the appropriate box next to the recommendation.

If you concur in part or do not concur, indicate the reasons on the attached form. **Copy the form and use a separate form for each comment.** Make sure you indicate the recommendation number on each response form.

Send all forms back to Sponsoring Organization

Recommendation Number	Concur	Concur in Part	Do Not Concur
RW Signs No.1	X		
RW Signs No.2	X		
RW Signs No.3			X
RW Signs No.4	X		
RW Signs No.5	X		
RW Signs No.6	X		
RW Signs No.7		X	
RW Signs No.8	X		
RW Signs No.9	X		
RW Signs No.10	X		
Markings No.1	X		
Markings No.2	X		
Signals No.1	X		
Signals No.2		X	

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Individual Response Form

Copy this form and use separate form for each Recommendation Number.

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence

Sponsoring Organization: **ITE**

Name of Responder: *Monica M. Suter*

Recommendation Number: *Signals No. 2*

Reasons for X Partial or ___ Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):

Although I am a member of the 4D Task Force, in re-reading the existing 2009 version & Figure 4D-20 compared to this proposed version, the new version does not read easily and is more complicated than seems necessary. Additionally, the existing version is also a bit confusing to read and understand. Further, why do we need to disallow the option to use circular green and yellow indications for T-stem intersections for the various cases proposed?

In discussing this proposed section revision with a signal operations team member at the City of Santa Ana, he did not agree with Section C that prohibits the use of circular indications. (I concur.) Further, his input questioned if the new section or even the existing 4D.25 is needed in the MUTCD. Instead, the use of green and yellow arrows, etc. could be options determined by the traffic engineer based upon the prevailing conditions.

Key Question: Is there a particularly high collision rate/pattern that has found nationally at these types of locations which would imply that a change needs to be mandated?

- If so, let's add a support/option statement to the existing 4D-25 that says something like...

Support or Option: For locations where there is a concern or collision pattern history indicating a propensity of vehicles coming into conflict with opposing traffic, additional signage (see applicable Part 2 Sections) may be considered. Additionally, the use of flashing yellow arrows options and solid green and yellow arrow displays may help to clarify that through movements are not allowed.

The speed criterion listed does not appear to be based on research. Vehicle approach speeds from the stem of the T intersection may be a factor resulting in a collision pattern for some locations that would suggest that options to the circular green, yellow red indication displays may be more appropriate. However, approach speeds may not necessarily justify any reason to mandate a particular signal display—and may be arbitrary. A collision pattern would be the most accurate indicator that another display may be more appropriate or enhanced signage.

Additionally, by disallowing the circular green and yellow indications, for jurisdictions that do not prefer to use the flashing yellow arrows, traffic signal operations may be adversely impacted with regard to efficiency since this would mean that the pedestrians would have to be served in a separate phase than the green arrow. In urban areas, this could adversely impact the capacity/throughput of an intersection such that if there is not a known collision pattern justifying the need for limiting the use of the circular green and yellow indications, then why are we mandating this?

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Individual Response Form

Copy this form and use separate form for each Recommendation Number.

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence

Sponsoring Organization: **ITE**

Name of Responder: *Monica M. Suter*

Recommendation Number: *RW No. 3*

Reasons for Partial or X Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):

The reason for a strong non-concurrence on the proposed deletion the MUTCD's 2009 wording shown in the changes noted below is safety.

- **The School Crossing assembly shall not be installed on an approaches controlled by a STOP ~~or YIELD~~ sign.**

The most important message to convey at a yield-controlled crossing is to YIELD to anyone in the crossing. It is critical to not lose this simple meaning conveyed by the YIELD regulatory sign message as a stand-alone message without any other sign.

A very good point is made that this same restriction is not currently imposed on pedestrian crossing assemblies and this is an inconsistency. Thus, the pedestrian crossing signs with the diagonal arrows should also be prohibited at stop/yield and traffic signals. Further, agencies should be allowed the continued use of these signs until the end of their useful life given the fiscal realities of this change on some jurisdictions.

In California, we have traditionally been required not to clutter ANY Stop, Yield, or Traffic Signal locations with school or pedestrian crossing warning signs. In general, it is unwise to mix regulatory and warning signs at the same location as a key tenant of the MUTCD and good traffic engineering practice. I recall one of my mentors emphasizing that if we can't obtain compliance with stop/yield signs or at a traffic signal, then what do we expect to achieve with additional warning signs that will only further diminish the most critical message to STOP or YIELD?

As a workaround, the school or pedestrian crossing ahead sign assemblies could be provided as an option at some reasonable distance prior to the stop/yield signs & traffic signals, to emphasize that school children are in the area.

However, if there is low compliance with an existing stop/yield sign or a traffic signal, a stop ahead/yield ahead or signal ahead sign along with the enhancement of existing visibility of sign/traffic control, and/or other measures are probably more appropriate.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Individual Response Form

Copy this form and use separate form for each Recommendation Number.

Reasons for Partial or Non-Concurrence

Sponsoring Organization: **ITE**

Name of Responder: *Monica M. Suter*

Recommendation Number: *RW No. 7*

Reasons for **X** Partial or ___ Non-Concurrence (attach sheet if necessary):

From an editorial perspective, the change is appropriate because a guidance statement should not be contained within a “shall” paragraph.

Further, for many signs a “should” is probably a better choice than “shall” requirement. However, for both the static and variable speed limit signs where tickets can be issued, stricter application of standards may be more appropriate.

The concern is if static or variable speed limit signs are not posted after major intersections, it would be inappropriate to then issue tickets to unsuspecting motorists who may legitimately be unaware of the speed limit in the segment that the driver just entered from a major street. This would then allow a trap type of situation where unsuspecting, otherwise law-abiding citizens, could be given tickets—and revenue could be generated at the expense of these reasonable and safe drivers. In times of scarce budgets, it is important to be mindful of how our guidelines or a lack of standards can contribute to this type of situation and our professional obligation to help reduce the chance of this. Thus, standards/guidelines need to be stronger where we know there can or has been misuse of important traffic control devices.

Thus, I would recommend that instead, this guidance statement be changed to a standard statement and retained in the existing paragraph.