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TOPIC: Section 2C.62 NEW Plaque (W16-15p)

AFFECTED PORTIONS OF MUTCD: Section 2C.62

BACKGROUND:
Section 1A.13 of the 2009 MUTCD revised the definition of a “Standard” by adding a sentence that stated “Standard statements shall not be modified or compromised based on engineering judgment or engineering study.”

Because of the strong opposition to this change in the definition, FHWA MUTCD Team Leader Hari Kalla and NCUTCD Chairperson Lee Billingsley, requested that each of the Technical Committees review all of the Standard statements in their sections to see if modifications are necessary in light of the revised definition.

DISCUSSION:
In its review of Section 2C, the Regulatory and Warning Sign Technical Committee (RWSTC) identified two Standard statements that may need modification. One of these
was paragraph 03 in Section 2C.62 which required that the NEW plaque be removed no later than six months after the regulation was put into effect.

There is no question that this plaque should generally be removed within six months of its placement. The question is whether this should be a requirement or a recommendation. Is engineering judgment ever needed to make this decision? One instance where engineering judgment might be necessary is near summer or winter resort areas when the regulation is put into place at the end of the season and the six months would be over before most of the out of town users have encountered the situation.

The RWSTC recognizes this sign will lose its system-wide effectiveness if it is routinely allowed to remain in place at specific locations for too long. But it is doubtful that the occasional misuse of this plaque will ever cause an accident at the location at which it is being used. That being the case, does the removal of the sign warrant it being a Standard? Is its misuse so egregious of an offense that agencies deserve to lose a lawsuit at a location when a random accident does occur. The RWSTC does not feel that this is the case and that the Standard should be changed to a Guidance statement

RECOMMENDATION: Amend Section 2C.62 to delete paragraph 03 and replace it with a Guidance statement.

Note: Proposed changes to the MUTCD are shown in underline red and removed text are shown in strikethrough red.

Changes following sponsor comments are shown in yellow highlight.

RECOMMENDED WORDING:

Section 2C.62 NEW Plaque (W16-15P)

Option:

01 A NEW (W16-15P) plaque (see Figure 2C-12) may be mounted above a regulatory sign when a new regulation takes effect in order to alert road users to the new traffic regulation. A NEW plaque may also be mounted above an advance warning sign (such as a Signal Ahead sign for a newly-installed traffic control signal) for a new traffic regulation.

Standard:

02 The NEW plaque shall not be used alone.

03 The NEW plaque shall be removed no later than 6 months after the regulation has been in effect.

Guidance

04 The NEW plaque should be removed no later than 6 months after the regulation has been in effect.

03 The NEW plaque should be removed no later than 6 months after it was installed.
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