

Attachment No.7

RW SIGNS NO. 6



**National Committee on  
Uniform Traffic Control Devices**

17200 West Bell Road No.1135 \* Surprise, Ariz. 85374  
Telephone (623) 214-2403 \* e-mail: ncutcd@aol.com

Agenda item III.6, Jan 2013

**National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices  
RWSTC RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWING SPONSOR COMMENTS**

**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE: NCUTCD Regulatory & Warning Signs Technical Committee**

**DATE OF ACTION (Task force): June 8, 2012, revised 12-21-12 following sponsor comments**

**TASK FORCE: School Issues Task Force: Mark Bott (chair), Ron Lipps, Greg Bothwell, Gerry Wilhelm, Dan Magri, Michael Moule, David Woosley, Tom Heydel**

**RWSTC APPROVAL DATE: 1-9-13**

**TRANSMITTAL TO SPONSORS DATE: Fall 2012**

**RWSTC APPROVAL DATE FOLLOWING SPONSOR COMMENTS: 1-10-13**

**COUNCIL APPROVAL DATE: 1-11-13**

**TOPIC: New Standard statement prohibiting use of the School Crossing assembly on an approach controlled by a YIELD sign**

**AFFECTED PORTIONS OF MUTCD: Section 7B.12, ¶03, School Crossing**

**DISCUSSION/QUESTION:**

Recent prior versions of the MUTCD (Section 7B.09) and the 2008 NPA (Section 7B.11) provided that the School Crossing assembly “shall not be installed on approaches controlled by a STOP sign.” They did not, however, prohibit the assembly’s use on approaches controlled by YIELD signs. That changed with the 2009 MUTCD. It prohibits using the assembly on approaches controlled by YIELD signs as well as those controlled by STOP signs. Paragraph 03 of Section 7B.12 School Crossing Assembly reads:

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

44 FHWA’s stated rationale for this sudden revision to the Standard is based on comments from a  
45 single local jurisdiction and FHWA’s belief that the previous language conflicted with Section  
46 2B.04. That rationale was included in the December 16, 2009 Federal Register, which published  
47 the Final Rule adopting the 2009 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). No  
48 research related to this issue was cited. The Federal register reads:  
49

50 527.

51 A local DOT recommended that the School Crossing assembly be prohibited on approaches  
52 controlled by a YIELD sign in addition to those controlled by a STOP sign. The FHWA  
53 agrees that this is necessary to provide consistency with the final rule for STOP and YIELD  
54 sign applications in Section 2B.04 Right-of-Way at Intersections. Accordingly, the FHWA  
55 adopts in this final rule a modified paragraph 03 to prohibit the School Crossing assembly on  
56 approaches controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign.

57 Neither the National Committee (NC) nor the public had an opportunity to review or comment  
58 on this change to the Standard.  
59

60 The conflict between the original provision of Section 7B.12 03 and Section 2B.04 that FHWA  
61 cites is unclear. Section 2B.04 addresses the assignment of the right-of-way at an intersection.  
62 Paragraph 03 of Section 7B.12 addresses how the location of a crossing can be conveyed to road  
63 users. No conflict is apparent.  
64

65 There is no prohibition on the use of the Pedestrian (Crossing) (W11-2) sign with a diagonal  
66 downward pointing arrow plaque at crossings other than School Crossings (See Section 2C.50  
67 04.  
68

69 Assuming that the School Crossing assembly provides beneficial guidance to road users on  
70 approaches where vehicles are not required to stop, prohibiting their use where YIELD signs are  
71 placed could have a negative effect on the safety of school children.  
72

73 The extent to which the new Standard will require removal of School Crossing assemblies  
74 currently in place on YIELD controlled approaches also is unclear. If they can remain until the  
75 end of their useful lives, there should be no added signing burden. If FHWA mandates their  
76 removal sooner, states and local jurisdictions will face additional costs.  
77

78 In the apparent absence of any research and the rationale given by FHWA for the change to the  
79 Standard, the change is not justified and could adversely affect the safety of school children. In  
80 response, the RWSTC approved deleting the YIELD sign from the standard on June 22, 2011. In  
81 the fall 2011, the recommendation of deleting the YIELD sign from the standard was sent to  
82 sponsors for comments. Below is a summary of the comments.  
83

84 IBTTA, 2 of 37 AASHTO member states, 1 of 6 ASCE responders, and 4 of 17 ITE responders  
85 indicated that they do not concur with the proposal. In addition, 1 ITE responder concurred in  
86 part and 1 AASHTO state and 1 of 6 LAB responders concurred, but offered comment. The  
87 remaining responses supported the proposal.  
88

89 The frequently cited reasons for non-concurrence was that the School Crossing assembly  
90 detracted from the conspicuity of the YIELD sign, that the control provided by the YIELD sign  
91 was a more prominent control that should not be diminished by the lesser control provided by the  
92 assembly, or that the appropriate location for the assembly is the same as that for the YIELD sign  
93 and both could not coexist. The California prohibition/practice of prohibiting the assembly on  
94 approaches controlled by STOP or YIELD signs or traffic signals was cited as a reason for  
95 opposing the proposal. In spite of the lack of research to support the addition of the prohibition  
96 against using the School Crossing assembly on approaches controlled by YIELD signs in the  
97 2009 MUTCD, some responders cited a lack of research supporting its elimination as a reason  
98 for opposing the proposal.  
99

100 In addressing the inconsistency between the prohibition of the School Crossing assembly in  
101 7B.12 and the lack of a similar provision for the Pedestrian Crossing sign in 2C.50, some of the  
102 respondents suggested adding a prohibition against using the Pedestrian Crossing sign on YIELD  
103 controlled approaches to 2C.50. Some suggested adding a prohibition against using the School  
104 Crossing assembly and/or the Pedestrian Crossing sign on approaches controlled by traffic  
105 signals. Finally, there were suggestions that these standard provisions or at least the YIELD sign  
106 provision be revised to be guidance.  
107

108 All of the sponsor comments and suggestions were considered by the School Issues Task Force  
109 as were the previous unanimous RWSTC favorable vote on the proposal and the 63 sponsor  
110 ballots in concurrence with the proposal. On January 18, 2012 the task force recommended that  
111 the RW No 3 proposal remain unchanged.  
112

113 The approved RWSTC language of deleting the YIELD sign from the standard was disapproved  
114 by the council on January 19, 2012. The reasons for council disapproval: no consensus on the  
115 issue of signalized intersections and STOP control locations and roundabout control. The vote  
116 was:  
117

118 **COUNCIL VOTE:**

119 **For: 14**

120 **Opposed: 19**

121 **Abstentions: 2**  
122

123 The addition of traffic signals to the standard was not sent to the sponsors in the fall 2011 for  
124 comments although two sponsors did recommend adding traffic signals in their responses. The  
125 task force still contends that at a STOP sign, the driver is always required to STOP, giving the  
126 driver an excellent opportunity to observe pedestrians, including school children. On an  
127 approach controlled by a YIELD sign, many drivers concentrate on potential conflicts with  
128 approaching vehicles, but, unless they stop for the vehicle traffic, they fail to respond to  
129 pedestrians. Granted they are required to yield to or stop for to pedestrians under various  
130 circumstances, but many drivers fail to notice or ignore pedestrians at YIELD controls,  
131 especially in right turn bypass lanes. At a traffic control signal, the driver is only required to stop  
132 if there is a red indication or, in some states, a yellow indication. The driver can proceed if there  
133 is a green indication.  
134

135 To address the council concerns and give the practitioner the opportunity to use the School  
136 Assembly on approaches controlled by YIELD signs the task force recommended changing the  
137 restriction from a standard to guidance. The practitioner could use the School Crossing assembly  
138 on approaches controlled by YIELD signs through an engineering study or engineering  
139 judgment. For approaches to a roundabout or a signalized intersection with a right turn lane  
140 controlled by YIELD signs an Option statement is recommended allowing a School Crossing  
141 assembly to be used. The recommendation received unanimous support on 6-20-12 from the  
142 RWSTC to send out to sponsors for comments.

143 In the fall 2012, the recommendation was sent to sponsors for comments. Thirteen comments  
144 were received for concurrence in part or do not concur. Six of these were consistent with the  
145 comments received by sponsors in 2011.

146  
147 The frequently cited reasons for non-concurrence was that the School Crossing assembly  
148 detracted from the conspicuity of the YIELD sign, that the control provided by the YIELD sign  
149 was a more prominent control that should not be diminished by the lesser control provided by the  
150 assembly, or that the appropriate location for the assembly is the same as that for the YIELD sign  
151 and both could not coexist. Therefore, the School Crossing assembly shall not be permitted at  
152 approached controlled by a YIELD sign. Three additional comments concentrated on permitting  
153 the School Crossing assembly at intersections regardless the traffic control. All of these  
154 comments mirror the discussion at the Council's discussion on January 12, 2012 when the  
155 recommendation was to delete the YIELD sign from the standard. Two additional comments  
156 with concur in part were editorial.

157  
158 All of the sponsor comments and suggestions were considered by the School Issues Task Force  
159 as were the previous two unanimous RWSTC favorable votes on the proposal and the 65 sponsor  
160 ballots in concurrence with the proposal. On December 21, 2012 the task force recommends that  
161 the RW No 6 proposal remain unchanged except for an editorial revision to the Option of the use  
162 of the School Crossing assembly at a channelized right turn lane controlled by YIELD signs.

163  
164

165 **RECOMMENDATION:**

166  
167 Revise the standard in Section 7B.12 (03) to allow the use of the School Crossing assembly on  
168 an approach to a roundabout or a signalized intersection with a channelized right turn lane  
169 controlled by YIELD signs as an Option. In addition, changing the restriction from a standard to  
170 guidance allows the practitioner to use the School Crossing assembly on approaches controlled  
171 by YIELD signs through an engineering study or engineering judgment.

172  
173 **Note: Proposed changes to the MUTCD are shown in underline red and removed text are**  
174 **shown in ~~strikethrough red~~.**

175  
176 **Recommended Wording:**

177  
178 **Section 7B.12 School Crossing Assembly**

179  
180 **Standard:**

181 01 If used, the School Crossing assembly (see Figure 7B-1) shall be installed at the school  
182 crossing (see Figures 7B-4 and 7B-5), or as close to it as possible, and shall consist of a School (S1-1)  
183 sign supplemented with a diagonal downward pointing arrow (W16-7P) plaque to show the location  
184 of the crossing.

186 02 The School Crossing assembly shall not be used at crossings other than those adjacent to  
187 schools and those on established school pedestrian routes.

189 03 The School Crossing assembly shall not be installed on an approaches controlled by a STOP  
190 ~~or YIELD~~ sign.

191  
192  
193 Guidance:

194 04 The School Crossing assembly should not be installed on an approach controlled by a YIELD  
195 sign

196  
197 Option:

198 05 The School Crossing assembly may be installed on an approach to a roundabout where the  
199 crosswalk is at least one car length in advance of the yield point at the entrance to the roundabout.

200  
201 06 At a signalized or Stop-controlled intersection the School Crossing assembly may be installed on  
202 an approach to a channelized right turn lane controlled by a YIELD sign.

203  
204 Option:

205 04 07 The In-Street Pedestrian Crossing (R1-6 or R1-6a) sign (see Section 2B.12 and Figure 7B-6) or  
206 the In-Street Schoolchildren Crossing (R1-6b or R1-6c) sign (see Figure 7B-6) may be used at  
207 unsignalized school crossings. If used at a school crossing, a 12 x 4-inch SCHOOL (S4-3P) plaque (see  
208 Figure 7B-6) may be mounted above the sign. The STATE LAW legend on the R1-6 series signs may be  
209 omitted.

210  
211 05 08 The Overhead Pedestrian Crossing (R1-9 or R1-9a) sign (see Section 2B.12 and Figure 2B-2)  
212 may be modified to replace the standard pedestrian symbol with the standard schoolchildren symbol and  
213 may be used at unsignalized school crossings. The STATE LAW legend on the R1-9 series signs may be  
214 omitted.

215  
216 06 09 A 12-inch reduced size in-street School (S1-1) sign (see Figure 7B-6) may be used at an  
217 unsignalized school crossing instead of the In-Street Pedestrian Crossing (R1-6 or R1-6a) or the In-Street  
218 Schoolchildren Crossing (R1-6b or R1-6c) sign. A 12 x 6-inch reduced size diagonal downward pointing  
219 arrow (W16-7P) plaque may be mounted below the reduced size in-street School (S1-1) sign.

220  
221 **Standard:**

222  
223 07 10 **If an In-Street Pedestrian Crossing sign, an In-Street Schoolchildren Crossing sign, or a**  
224 **reduced size in-street School (S1-1) sign is placed in the roadway, the sign support shall comply**  
225 **with the mounting height and special mounting support requirements for In-Street Pedestrian**  
226 **Crossing (R1-6 or R1-6a) signs (see Section 2B.12).**

227  
228 08 11 **The In-Street Pedestrian Crossing sign, the In-Street Schoolchildren Crossing sign, the**  
229 **Overhead Pedestrian Crossing sign, and the reduced size in-street School (S1-1) sign shall not be**  
230 **used at signalized locations.**

231

232 **RWSTC VOTE 6-20-12**

233 **For: Unanimous**

234 **Opposed:**

235 **Abstentions:**

236

237 **RWSTC Vote 1-9-13**

238 **For: 26**

239 **Opposed: 0**

240 **Abstentions: 1**

241

242 **COUNCIL VOTE: 1-11-13**

243 **For: 32**

244 **Opposed: 5**

245 **Abstentions: 1**

246

247 N:NCUTCD/JUNE 2012/ITEM IV.I Section 7B.12 school crossing assembly approved by RWSTC 6-  
248 10-12 READY FOR SPONSORS, REVISED FOLLOWING SPONSOR COMMENTS 12-9-12 ,  
249 approved by RWSTC 1-9-13, APPROVED BY COUNCIL 1-11-13

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293