

**CA MUTCD Part 3 Proposed Amendments from 2011 Draft Public Comments and
CTCDC Workshop Resolution**

#	CA MUTCD Section		CA MUTCD Page #	Public Comment	Commenter	CTCDC Workshop Resolution
1	Figure 3A-110 (CA)	Figure 3A-110 (CA)	671	In Figure 3A-110(CA) (page 684), for Detail 36A, change the label for the dashed white line from "See Detail 8 (Non-retroreflective Raised White Pavement Markers may also be used to simulate this line)" to "See Details 8,9 or 10" to match Caltrans Standard Plans Sheet A20C. For Detail 36B, delete the label "See Detail 8 (Non-retroreflective Raised White Pavement Markers may also be used to simulate this line)" as the lines are also (correctly) labeled "8 in White Line."	John Keber (Dist. 3)	Agree.
2	3B.03 Last Para.		678-679	There could be cases where multiple 8" lines and/or a hatched area should be placed between the LT lane and the adjacent thru lane.	Steve Pyburn (FHWA)	Agree. Text will be revised accordingly.
3	3B.04		679-680	Page 695, Paragraph 05: Change "Standard" to "Guidance." Reason for Recommendation: This would allow the use of solid single white line through curved sections of roadway where lane changes are discouraged. This should be combined with the Standard on Page 696, Paragraph 20.	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Agree, add reference to paragraph #5 for paragraph #20.
4	3B.04		681	In Section 3B.04 (page 697), the last paragraph (in blue) states that lane line patterns Detail 12 or 13 shall be used "except when used in snow areas, the raised pavement markers will be recessed." In District 3, Detail 11 (recessed thermoplastic on new construction projects) is used in the higher elevations of the Sierra because recessed pavement markers are not feasible due to severe weather , tire chains, etc. Change "in snow areas, the raised pavement markers will be recessed" to "in snow areas, the raised pavement markers , if used, shall be recessed ; otherwise, use Detail 8 or 11."	John Keber (Dist. 3)	Agree.
5	3B.16		690	There seems to be a discrepancy in Chapter 3. Section 3B.16 says in black as a standard that "if used, stop lines....", then later in the section in blue as a standard says "A limit line shall be placed in conjunction with STOP (R1-1) signs on paved approaches, except here.	Jim Brunner	Agree, paragraph #21 will be deleted. Section 3B.16, Paragraph #21 needs to be verified in accordance with CVC. Paragraphs #1 & #2 should suffice.
6	3B.16		690	At the bottom of page 705 the Standard states, "A limit line shall be placed in conjunction with STOP (R1-1) signs on paved approaches, except where marked crosswalk exists." In Santa Rosa and other local jurisdictions there are many intersections of two local streets or tee intersections. Often one of those streets will be stop controlled due to limited sight distance or to establish right of way. These streets generally have low volumes and serve only local vehicles. Engineering judgment has been used to not install the limit lines or crosswalks to save on initial installation and continuing maintenance costs. Although this is not a new addition to the CA MUTCD, it is an additional restriction that the Federal MUTCD does not require. It would be more appropriate if the standard was changed to guidance, to allow engineering judgment to dictate whether to install limit lines on all roads.	Robert M. Sprinkle (City Traffic Engineer, Santa Rosa)	Agree, paragraph #21 will be deleted. Section 3B.16, Paragraph #21 needs to be verified in accordance with CVC. Paragraphs #1 & #2 should suffice.
7	3B.16		689-690	Paragraph 01: Change to read "Stop lines, if used, shall be used to..." Reason for Recommendation: Clarifies that this is always what stop lines are for, when they are used. Paragraph 13 and 14: Remove "(stop)" references to be consistent with California law.	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Section 3B.16, Paragraphs #1, #13 & #14 comments: Agree, add reference to paragraph #5 for paragraph #20.
8	3B.16		689-690	In Section 3B.16 (pages 704-706), "Stop and Yield Lines," and/or Section 3B.18 (pages 706- 708), "Crosswalks Markings," guidance is needed for "international" crosswalks (i.e., longitudinal lines only) at controlled (whether by stop signs or traffic signals) intersections and whether a limit line is required in advance of the international crosswalk. In the "Crosswalks.docx" attachment, examples are shown of international crosswalks without a limit line and international crosswalks with a limit line . I recommend specifying that a limit line be required when an international crosswalk is used at a controlled intersection.	John Keber (Dist. 3)	Agree on the need for edits. Limit line is not required with the international crosswalk.

#	CA MUTCD Section		CA MUTCD Page #	Public Comment	Commenter	CTCDC Workshop Resolution
9	3B.20		695	Paragraph 02: Add TRAIL XING to the list of markings. Reason for Recommendation: This verbiage will be more easily understood for trail crossings than the currently shown <Bike Symbol> XING, which fails to denote pedestrians could be crossing and conflicts with the TRAIL XING plaque and <Bike Symbol>/<Ped Symbol> sign that would be used adjacent to the markings.	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Agree, add option of TRAIL XING.
10	3B.21		699	The meaning of "equation" is not clear in this context.	Steve Pyburn (FHWA)	Agree. Add brief text explaining the "equation".
11	3B.23		701	The purpose of deleting paragraphs is not clear. The section referenced in support do not address pavement markings for raised median. Retain as guidance.	Steve Pyburn (FHWA)	Agree. Paragraphs #08 & #09 will be "undeleted". These paragraphs recommendations are current practice.
12		Figure 3B-7 and Figure 3B-7 (CA)	711-712	Make dimension between 2-way left turn arrows consistent with the dimension shown in Figure 3B-7 (CA). Reason for Recommendation: One shows "8 – 16 ft" while the other shows "The distance between Two-Way Arrows is generally equal to the arrow size."	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Agree, but rather than editing National MUTCD Fig. 3B-7, it will be deleted. In addition, Fig. 3B-7(CA) pavement arrows needs to be revised as they are high speed arrows.
13		Figure 3B-16 (CA)	739-740	Clarify whether 12 ft. dimension is from centerline or from where. In addition, if the roadway is narrower (or wider), are less (more) triangles allowed? If so, show examples.	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Fig. 3B-16(CA) less or more triangles: Delete Fig. 3B-16(CA) and revert back to National Fig. 3B-16 which allows more flexibility with the size and spacing of triangles. The 12-foot dimension is the lane line markings, centerline marking or edge line markings, as applicable.
14		Figure 3B-19	742	Add ladder-style crosswalk striping on left leg of Figure. Reason for Recommendation: This striping is common and would serve as a good example in the Figure.	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Agree, figure needs to be revised for the ladder issue per ADA.
15		Figure 3B-19	742	This figure should include the "Triple-Four" crosswalk marking as used by the City of Sacramento. This and the other recommendations of the Caltrans Crosswalk Committee that involve traffic control devices should be included in the California MUTCD.	Richard Haggstrom SHSP CA8 Committee	Agree.
16		Figure 3B-19	742	We should add the "triple four" crosswalk marking on Figure 3B-19.	Roberta McLaughlin	Agree.
17		Figure 3B-19	742	This figure should include the "Triple-Four" crosswalk marking as used by the City of Sacramento. This and the other recommendations of the Caltrans Crosswalk Committee that involve traffic control devices should be included in the California MUTCD.	The SHSP CA 8 Committee	Agree.
18		Figure 3B-21 (CA)	747	Add 4 ft dimension on bottom detail, between the 20 ft dimensions. Reason for Recommendation: Clarifies spacing between marked parking spaces.	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Fig. 3B-21(CA) comment: Agree, figure needs to be revised and looked into in more detail. Compare Fed. fig. & CA Fig., text needs to match the Fig.

#	CA MUTCD Section		CA MUTCD Page #	Public Comment	Commenter	CTCDC Workshop Resolution
19		Figure 3B-23 (CA)	749	Add TRAIL into examples. Reason for Recommendation: See comment above regarding Trail Xing.	Laura R. Wells (DDT City of San Jose)	Fig. 3B-23(CA) comment: Agree, add option of TRAIL XING.
20	3F.04	Figure 3F-1	806	In Section 3F.04 (page 824), Guidance "a" in the added blue text identifies delineators to be placed "on the outsides of highway curves," which has been the practice in California for many years. Figure 3F-1 (page 827), shows delineators on the inside of a curve, which conflicts with this written policy, and delineators in both directions on the outside of the curve, which presents confusion for designers who are not familiar with Caltrans delineator types (such as Type E, with retroreflective sheeting on both the front and back sides). Either edit/cross out the non-applicable information in Figure 3F-1 or replace this figure with Figure 6-47 that was used in the Traffic Manual prior to adoption of the MUTCD, so that the written policy and the figure showing examples will be complementary instead of conflicting.	John Keber (Dist. 3)	Agree, this issue needs to be reconciled.
21	3H.01	3H.01	815	The figure specifies only one height, 36". This statement implies other heights on non-state highways are acceptable.	Steve Pyburn (FHWA)	Agree. Text will be revised accordingly.
22	3H.01		815	Not a public comment but came up in workshop discussion. Need to add reference to Figure 6F-102(CA).		