

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.



National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

12615 West Keystone Drive * Sun City West, AZ, 85375
Telephone (623)680-9592 * e-mail: ncutcd@aol.com

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Item No.: 15B-RW-02

NCUTCD Proposal for Changes to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE: Regulatory & Warning Signs
ITEM NUMBER: 15B-RW-02
TOPIC: Selecting Type of Traffic Control for Unsignalized Intersections
ORIGIN OF REQUEST: RW Task Force: Tom Heydel (chair), Bob Seyfried, Robert Weber,
Jim Pline, Fred Ranck, Lee Roadifer, Paul Carlson
Results from NCHRP Web-Only Document 213, Potential MUTCD
Criteria for Selecting the Type of Control at Unsignalized
Intersections

**AFFECTED SECTIONS
OF MUTCD:** Sections 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07, 2B.09

DEVELOPMENT HISTORY:

- 8
9
10
11
12
13
- Approved by Technical Committee: 06/17/2015
 - Approved by RWSTC Technical committee following sponsor comments: 01/06/2016
 - Approved by NCUTCD Council: 01/08/2016

14
15
16
17
18
19

This is a proposal for recommended changes to the MUTCD that has been approved by the NCUTCD Council. This proposal does not represent a revision of the MUTCD and does not constitute official MUTCD standards, guidance, or options. It will be submitted to FHWA for consideration for inclusion in a future MUTCD revision. The MUTCD can be revised only through the federal rulemaking process.

SUMMARY:

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

The MUTCD related to selection of traffic control in Part 2B has seen some but not significant changes since 1971. The volume and crash numbers contained within Section 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09 have not been evaluated based on research since that time. Research was needed to look at the warrants (criteria) for determining whether an intersection should have no control, yield control or stop control. Signal control warrants are already provided for in Part 4. Accordingly, an NCHRP research project was awarded. This research project results was used to develop this language. Research: NCHRP Project 03-109, Criteria for selecting type of control for unsignalized intersections

DISCUSSION

30
31
32
33

Updating or developing new warrants (criteria) is the focus of the NCHRP 03-109 report. The report has been finalized and is dated March 2015. Prior to this there was much discussion regarding whether or not to go directly to Council under the exception in June or go out to

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended Change to the MUTCD was rescinded by the NCUTCD Council on January 12, 2024.

s. RWSTC voted to go to sponsors in the fall 2014 to then take action at the January 2015 meeting in Arlington, Virginia. The following is the recommended language as presented by the sponsor and includes changes made as a result of sponsor comments in the fall of 2014 and as approved by RWSTC January 7, 2015. **Council tabled the proposal on January 9, 2015.**

38 This proposal makes significant changes to 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09. Therefore, rather
39 than showing changes with crossouts and new text to the impacted sections, it was decided to
40 show only the new text and existing retained 2009 MUTCD text in the proposal. We did this in
41 hopes that it would provide less confusion by starting with a clean slate for these 4 sections of
42 the existing MUTCD given the almost complete rewrite.

43
44 **At the end of the proposal, we have included the present language from sections 2B.04,
45 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09 to show what portions we retained and what is not retained by ~~red
46 strikethrough.~~**

47
48 **RECOMMENDED MUTCD CHANGES**

49
50 The following present the proposed changes to the current MUTCD within the context of the
51 current MUTCD language. Proposed additions to the MUTCD are shown in blue underline and
52 proposed deletions from the MUTCD are shown in ~~red strikethrough~~. Changes previously
53 approved by NCUTCD Council (but not yet adopted by FHWA) are shown in green double
54 underline for additions and ~~green double strikethrough~~ for deletions. In some cases, background
55 comments may be provided with the MUTCD text. These comments are indicated by
56 [highlighted light blue in brackets].

57
58 **Note: Existing MUTCD text is shown in black text. 2009 MUTCD deleted text is not shown
59 for sections 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09 within the new clean sections (2B.X1 to 2B.X14)
60 proposal but rather for clarity is shown at the end of the proposal. We are deleting these
61 sections and replacing them with the following:**

62
63 **PART 2. SIGNS**

64
65 **CHAPTER 2B. REGULATORY SIGNS, BARRICADES, AND GATES**

66
67 **The section numbers shown are for the structure of the 2009 Chapter 2B. If FHWA splits
68 the current regulatory sign chapter into multiple chapters, this proposal would be a stand-
69 alone chapter.**

70
71 **NOTE: Sections 2B.05 (STOP sign and ALL WAY plaque) and 2B.08 (YIELD sign) and
72 2B.10 (STOP sign and YIELD sign placement) in the existing 2009 manual do not change.
73 They would be inserted either before, after or somewhere between these proposed sections
74 as deemed appropriate by FHWA.**

75
76
77 **Sections 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09 are deleted and replaced with the following:**

78
79 **Section 2B.04 General Considerations at Intersections**

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**

This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

80 Support:
81 Signalized intersections represent the most common forms of intersection right-of-way
82 Selection of unsignalized control might be affected by specific requirements of state law
83 ordinances.

84 02 Roundabouts, traffic circles and other circular intersections are types of intersections and
85 are not traffic control devices. The YIELD sign at the roundabout is the traffic control device.
86 The decision to convert an intersection from a traditional intersection to a roundabout is an
87 engineering design, traffic operations, and/or safety decision and not a traffic control device
88 decision. As such, criteria for conversion from a traditional intersection to a roundabout are not
89 included in the MUTCD.

90 Guidance:

91 03 The type of traffic control used at an unsignalized intersection should be the least restrictive
92 that provides appropriate levels of safety and efficiency.

93 Support:

94 04 Some types of right-of-way control that can exist at an unsignalized intersection are listed
95 below in order from the least restrictive to the most restrictive.

96 A. No intersection control: There are no right-of-way traffic control devices on any of the
97 approaches to the intersection. (See Section 2B.04c for guidance).

98 B. Yield control: YIELD signs are placed on all approaches (for a roundabout), on
99 opposing approaches for a 4-leg intersection, on a single approach for a 3-leg
100 intersection, or in the median of a divided highway. The YIELD signs are placed on the
101 minor road. (See Section 2B.04d for guidance)

102 C. Minor road stop control: STOP signs are typically placed on opposing approaches (for a
103 4-leg intersection) or on a single approach (for a 3-leg intersection). The STOP signs
104 are normally placed on the minor road. (See Section 2B.04a for guidance on selecting
105 the minor road.)

106 D. All-way stop control: STOP signs are placed on all approaches to the intersection. (See
107 Section 2B.04f for guidance).

108 Guidance:

109 05 When selecting a form of unsignalized intersection control, the following factors should be
110 considered:

111 A. Vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic volumes on all approaches. [From 2009
112 MUTCD Section 2B.04 Paragraph 02] Where the term units/day or units/hour is
113 indicated, it should be the total of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian volumes

114 B. Driver yielding behavior with regard to all modes of conflicting traffic including
115 bicyclists and pedestrians.

116 C. Number and angle of approaches.

117 D. Approach speeds.

118 E. Sight distance available on each approach.

119 F. Reported crash experience. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04 Paragraph 02]

120 G. The presence of a grade crossing near the intersection for queue back up from the
121 grade crossing.

122 06 Yield or Stop signs should not be used for speed control. [From 2009 MUTCD Section
123 2B.04 Paragraph 05]

124 **Standard:**

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

Because the potential for conflicting commands could create driver confusion, Yield or Stop signs shall not be used in conjunction with any traffic control signal operation, except in the following cases:

If the signal indication for an approach is a flashing red at all times;

- B. If a minor street or driveway is located within or adjacent to the area controlled by the traffic control signal, but does not require separate traffic signal control because an **extremely** low potential for conflict exists; or
- C. If a channelized turn lane is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island and the channelized turn lane is not controlled by a traffic control signal. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 10]

08 Except as provided in Section 2B.04d, Stop signs and Yield signs shall not be installed on different approaches to the same unsignalized intersection if those approaches conflict with or oppose each other. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 11]

09 Portable or part-time Stop or Yield signs shall not be used except for emergency and temporary traffic control zone purposes. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 12]

10 A portable or part-time (folding) Stop sign that is manually placed into view and manually removed from view shall not be used during a power outage to control a signalized approach unless the maintaining agency establishes that the signal indication that will first be displayed to that approach upon restoration of power is a flashing red signal indication and that the portable Stop sign will be manually removed from view prior to stop-and-go operation of the traffic control signal. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 13]

Option:

11 A portable or part-time (folding) Stop sign that is electrically or mechanically operated such that it only displays the Stop message during a power outage and ceases to display the Stop message upon restoration of power may be used during a power outage to control a signalized approach. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 14]

Section 2B.04a Determining the Minor Road for Unsignalized Intersections

Guidance:

01 The selection of the minor road to be controlled by Yield or Stop signs should be based on one or more of the following criteria:

- A. A roadway intersecting a designated through or numbered highway.
- B. A roadway with the lower functional classification.
- C. A roadway with the lower traffic volume.
- D. A roadway with the lower speed limit.
- E. A roadway that intersects with a roadway that has a higher priority for one or more modes of travel.

02 When two roadways that have relatively equal volumes, speeds, and/or other characteristics intersect, the following factors should be considered in selecting the minor road for installation of YIELD or STOP signs:

(above is similar to 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04, paragraph 09)

- A. Controlling the direction that conflicts the most with established pedestrian crossing activity or school walking routes;
- B. Controlling the direction that has obscured vision, dips, or bumps that already require drivers to use lower operating speeds; and

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**

This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

Controlling the direction that has the best sight distance from a controlled position to observe conflicting traffic.

2B.04b Alternatives to Changing Intersection Right-of-Way Control

175 Guidance:

176 01 Before converting to a more restrictive form of right-of-way control at an unsignalized
177 intersection, consideration should be given to alternative treatments that address safety,
178 operational, or other concerns.

179 Option:

180 02 Alternatives that may be considered include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 181 A. Where Yield or Stop controlled, installing YIELD AHEAD or STOP AHEAD signs on
182 the appropriate approaches to the intersection;
- 183 B. Removing parking on one or more approaches;
- 184 C. Improving intersection sight distance;
- 185 D. Installing warning signs along the major street to warn road users approaching the
186 intersection;
- 187 E. Relocating the stop line(s) and/or yield line to improve the sight distance at the
188 intersection;
- 189 F. Installing transverse rumble strips or other traffic calming measures designed to reduce
190 speeds on the approaches;
- 191 G. Installing a red flashing beacon at the intersection to supplement Stop control;
- 192 H. Installing yellow flashing beacons on warning signs in advance of a STOP or YIELD
193 sign controlled intersection on major- and/or minor-street approaches;
- 194 I. Adding one or more lanes on a minor-street approach to reduce the number of vehicles
195 per lane on the approach;
- 196 J. Revising intersection geometrics by adding pedestrian refuge islands and or curb
197 extensions at the intersection to channelize vehicular movements and reduce the time
198 required for a vehicle to complete a movement;
- 199 K. Revising the geometrics at the intersection to add pedestrian median refuge islands
200 and/or curb extensions;
- 201 L. Installing roadway lighting if a disproportionate number of crashes occur at night;
- 202 M. Restricting one or more turning movements, perhaps on a time-of-day basis, if alternate
203 routes are available;
- 204 N. Installing a pedestrian hybrid beacon (see Chapter 4F), Rectangular Rapid Flash
205 Beacons (Interim approval 1A.11) or In-Roadway Warning Lights (see Chapter 4N) if
206 pedestrian safety is the major concern;
- 207 O. Converting to a roundabout; and
- 208 P. Employing other proven alternatives, depending on conditions at the intersection.

209 **NOTE: Items D-P noted above were taken from Part 4B.04**

210

Section 2B.04c No Intersection Control

212 Guidance:

213 01 The decision to use no intersection control should be based on engineering judgment.

214 Option:

215 02 The following factors may be considered:

- 216 A. Intersection sight distance is adequate on all approaches.

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**

This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

All approaches to the intersection are a single lane approaches and there are no separate turn lanes.

The combined vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian volume (existing or projected) entering the intersection from all approaches averages less than 1,000 units per day or 80 units in the peak hour.

D. None of the approaches to the intersection are for a through highway.

E. The angle of intersection is between 90 and 75 degrees.

F. The functional classification of the intersecting streets is either the intersection of two local streets or the intersection of a local street with a collector street.

Section 2B.04d Yield Control

Guidance:

01 At intersections where a full stop is not necessary at all times, consideration should first be given to using less restrictive measures such as Yield signs. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.06, Paragraph 01]

02 Yield control should be considered when engineering judgment indicates that all of the following conditions apply:

A. Intersection sight distance is adequate on the approaches to be controlled by YIELD signs.

B. Each approach to be controlled is a single lane.

C. One of the following crash-related criteria applies:

a. For changing from no intersection control to yield control, there have been two or more reported crashes in a 12 month period that are susceptible to correction by installation of a YIELD sign.

b. For changing from minor road stop control to yield control, there have been two or fewer reported crashes in a 12 month period.

D. Entering intersection volume of less than 1800 units per day or 140 units in the peak hour.

E. The angle of intersection is between 90 and 75 degrees.

F. The functional classification of the intersecting streets is either the intersection of two local streets or the intersection of a local street with a collector street.

Option:

03 Yield control may be established at an intersection when any of the following conditions apply:

A. At the second crossroad of a divided highway, where the median width at the intersection is 30 feet or greater. (see Figure 2B-15) In this case, a YIELD sign may be installed at the entrance to the second roadway. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 1, item B]

B. For a channelized turn lane that is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island, even if the adjacent lanes at the intersection are controlled by a highway traffic control signal or by a STOP sign. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 1, item C]

C. At an intersection where a special problem exists and where engineering judgment indicates the problem to be susceptible to correction by the use of the YIELD sign. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 1, item D]

D. Facing the entering and exiting roadway for a merge-type movement if engineering judgment indicates that control is needed because acceleration or deceleration geometry

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**

This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

and/or sight distance is not adequate for merging traffic operation. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 01, item E]

On an approach to an intersection where the only permissible movement is a right turn movement with an intersection geometry similar to a channelized right turn lane or an approach to a roundabout.

Guidance:

04 The Yield signs should be installed on opposing minor- road approaches (for a 4-leg intersection) or on the minor-road approach for a 3-leg intersection. (See Section 2B-X3) for information to identify the minor road. When two intersecting roadways have relatively equal volumes, speeds and other characteristics, yield control should be established on the approach that conflicts most with established pedestrian crossing activity or school walking routes or bicycle crossing activity

Standard:

05 A Yield sign shall be used to assign right-of-way at the entrance to a roundabout. Yield signs at roundabouts shall be used to control the approach roadways and shall not be used to control the circulatory roadway. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 02]

~~06—Other than for all of the approaches to a roundabout,~~ **Yield signs shall not be placed on all of the approaches to an intersection, except at roundabouts. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.09, Paragraph 03]**

Section 2B.04e Minor Road Stop Control

Guidance:

01 Stop control on the minor road approach or approaches to an intersection should be considered when engineering judgment indicates that one or more of the following conditions exist:

- A. A restricted view exists that requires road users to stop in order to adequately observe conflicting traffic on the through street or highway. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.06 Paragraph 2B]
- B. Crash records indicate:
 - 1. For a four-leg intersection, there are three or more reported crashes in a 12-month period or six or more reported crashes in a 36-month period, were of a type susceptible to correction by installation of minor- road stop control.
 - 2. For a three-leg intersection, there are three or more reported crashes in a 12-month period or five or more reported crashes in a 36-month period, were of a type susceptible to correction by installation of minor- road stop control.
- C. The intersection is of a lower functional classification road with a higher functional classification road. [similar thought as in 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.04 Paragraph 03.A]
- D. Conditions that previously supported installation of an all-way stop control under all-way stop control criteria no longer exist.

Section 2B.04f All-Way Stop Control

Guidance:

01 The decision to ~~install~~ establish all-way stop control at an unsignalized intersection should be based on an engineering study. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 Paragraph 03] All-Way stop control should

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended Change to the MUTCD was rescinded by the NCUTCD Council on January 12, 2024.

The evaluation of the need for all-way stop control should include an analysis of factors to the existing operation and crash experience at the study intersection and the potential to improve these conditions and the applicable factors contained in the following all-way stop criteria:

- 312 A. All-Way Stop Control Criteria A: Crash Experience (Section 2B.04g)
- 313 B. All-Way Stop Control Criteria B: Sight Distance (Section 2B.04h)
- 314 C. All-Way Stop Control Criteria C: Transition to Signal Control or YIELD control at
- 315 Roundabout (Section 2B.04i)
- 316 D. All-Way Stop Control Criteria D: 8-Hour Volume (Vehicle, Pedestrians, Bicycles)
- 317 (Section 2B.04j).
- 318 E. All-Way Stop Control Criteria E: Other Factors (Section 2B.04k)

Standard:
03 The satisfaction of one or more all-way stop control criteria shall not in itself require the installation of all-way stop control.

The following table from NCHRP Web-Only Document 213, “Potential MUTCD Criteria for Selecting the Type of Control at Unsignalized Intersections,” is shown for information only and is not part of the MUTCD proposal. It is shown to recap what is in the MUTCD proposed text.

Table 51. Recommended criteria for unsignalized intersection control.

Criteria	No Control	Yield Control	Minor-Road Stop	All-Way Stop
Number of Crashes susceptible to correction by intersection control	No crash criteria	Two or fewer reported crashes in a year ¹	4-leg: 3 or more within 12 months, 6 or more within 36 months ² 3-leg: 3 or more within 12 months, 5 or more within 36 months ²	4-leg: 5 or more within 12 months, 6 or more within 36 months ² 3-leg: 4 or more within 12 months, 5 or more within 36 months ²
Peak Hour Entering Volume	Maximum 80 units/hr ³	Maximum 140 units/hr ³	No volume criteria	No volume criteria
Entering Volume per day	Maximum 1000 units / day ⁴	Maximum 1800 units / day ⁵	No volume criteria	No volume criteria
8-hrs	No volume criteria	No volume criteria	No volume criteria	1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 units per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and 2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours; but 3. If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2. ⁶
Delay	No delay criteria	No delay criteria	No delay criteria	35 sec/veh ⁷
Other	Adequate sight	Adequate sight	Sight distance	Sight distance

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

2B.04j All-Way Stop Control Criteria D: 8 Hour Volume-(Vehicle, Pedestrians,

s)

all-way stop control may be established at an intersection where an engineering study

indicates:

- A. The volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 units per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and
- B. The volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours; but
- C. If the 85th percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values in Items A and B.

(Note: similar to 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 , Paragraph 04C)

Section 2B.04k All-Way Stop Control Criteria E: Other Factors

Option:

01 If no other criteria is met, an all-way stop control may be established at an intersection where an engineering study indicates that all-way stop control is needed due to other factors not addressed in the other all-way stop control criteria. These factors may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A. The need to control left-turn conflicts. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 Paragraph 05A]
- B. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar design and operating characteristics where all-way stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the intersection. [From 2009 MUTCD Section 2B.07 Paragraph 05D]
- C. Where pedestrian and/or bicycle crossings of the major street justify the installation of all-way stop control.

(similar to 2009 MUTCD section 2B.07 Paragraph 05B)

NOTE: Sections 2B.05 (STOP sign and ALL WAY plaque) and 2B.08 (YIELD sign) and 2B.10 (STOP sign and YIELD sign placement) in the existing 2009 manual do not change. They would be inserted either before, after or somewhere between these sections as deemed appropriate by FHWA.

~~**Section 2B.06 STOP Sign Applications**~~

This section is deleted

~~**Section 2B.07 Multi-Way Stop Applications**~~

This section is deleted

~~**Section 2B.09 YIELD Sign Applications**~~

This section is deleted

The following is present 2009 MUTCD language in the sections impacted, which are 2B.04, 2B.06, 2B.07 and 2B.09:

~~**Strikethrough-Red**~~ is MUTCD text being deleted.

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

404 The location or section of the 2009 MUTCD provided in square brackets [] shows where
405 being moved to.

406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449

2009 MUTCD:

Section 2B.04 Right-of-Way at Intersections

Support:

~~01—State or local laws written in accordance with the “Uniform Vehicle Code” (see Section 1A.11) establish the right-of-way rule at intersections having no regulatory traffic control signs such that the driver of a vehicle approaching an intersection must yield the right-of-way to any vehicle or pedestrian already in the intersection. When two vehicles approach an intersection from different streets or highways at approximately the same time, the right-of-way rule requires the driver of the vehicle on the left to yield the right-of-way to the vehicle on the right. The right-of-way can be modified at through streets or highways by placing YIELD (R1-2) signs (see Sections 2B.08 and 2B.09) or STOP (R1-1) signs (see Sections 2B.05 through 2B.07) on one or more approaches.~~

Guidance: (Moved to Section 2B.04)

~~02 Engineering judgment should be used to establish intersection control. The following factors should be considered:~~

- ~~A. Vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic volumes on all approaches;~~
- ~~B. Number and angle of approaches;~~
- ~~C. Approach speeds;~~
- ~~D. Sight distance available on each approach; and~~
- ~~E. Reported crash experience. [Moved to Section 2B.04]~~

~~03—YIELD or STOP signs should be used at an intersection if one or more of the following conditions exist:~~

- ~~A. An intersection of a less important road with a main road where application of the normal right-of-way rule would not be expected to provide reasonable compliance with the law; [similar thought was included in 2B.04a)~~
- ~~B. A street entering a designated through highway or street; and/or (similar thought in 2B.04a)~~
- ~~C. An unsignalized intersection in a signalized area.~~

~~04 In addition, the use of YIELD or STOP signs should be considered at the intersection of two minor streets or local roads where the intersection has more than three approaches and where one or more of the following conditions exist:~~

- ~~A. The combined vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian volume entering the intersection from all approaches averages more than 2,000 units per day;~~
- ~~B. The ability to see conflicting traffic on an approach is not sufficient to allow a road user to stop or yield in compliance with the normal right-of-way rule if such stopping or yielding is necessary; and/or~~
- ~~C. Crash records indicate that five or more crashes that involve the failure to yield the right-of-way at the intersection under the normal right-of-way rule have been reported within a 3-year period, or that three or more such crashes have been reported within a 2-year period.~~

~~05 YIELD or STOP signs should not be used for speed control. (Moved to section 2B.04)~~

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

~~Section 2B.07 contains provisions regarding the application of multi-way STOP control at~~

~~07—Once the decision has been made to control an intersection, the decision regarding the appropriate roadway to control should be based on engineering judgment. In most cases, the roadway carrying the lowest volume of traffic should be controlled.~~

~~08—A YIELD or STOP sign should not be installed on the higher volume roadway unless justified by an engineering study.~~

Support:

09 The following are considerations that might influence the decision regarding the appropriate roadway upon which to install a YIELD or STOP sign where two roadways with relatively equal volumes and/or characteristics intersect:

- A. Controlling the direction that conflicts the most with established pedestrian crossing activity or school walking routes; (moved to section 2B.04a)
- B. Controlling the direction that has obscured vision, dips, or bumps that already require drivers to use lower operating speeds; and (moved to section 2B.04a)
- C. Controlling the direction that has the best sight distance from a controlled position to observe conflicting traffic. (moved to section 2B.04a)

Standard:

10 **Because the potential for conflicting commands could create driver confusion, YIELD or STOP signs shall not be used in conjunction with any traffic control signal operation, except in the following cases: (Moved to section 2B.04)**

- A. **If the signal indication for an approach is a flashing red at all times; (moved to section 2B.04)**
- B. **If a minor street or driveway is located within or adjacent to the area controlled by the traffic control signal, but does not require separate traffic signal control because an extremely low potential for conflict exists; or (moved to section 2B.04)**
- C. **If a channelized turn lane is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island and the channelized turn lane is not controlled by a traffic control signal. (moved to section 2B.04)**

11 **Except as provided in Section 2B.09, STOP signs and YIELD signs shall not be installed on different approaches to the same unsignalized intersection if those approaches conflict with or oppose each other. (moved to Section 2B.04)**

12 **Portable or part-time STOP or YIELD signs shall not be used except for emergency and temporary traffic control zone purposes. (moved to Section 2B.04)**

13 **A portable or part-time (folding) STOP sign that is manually placed into view and manually removed from view shall not be used during a power outage to control a signalized approach unless the maintaining agency establishes that the signal indication that will first be displayed to that approach upon restoration of power is a flashing red signal indication and that the portable STOP sign will be manually removed from view prior to stop-and-go operation of the traffic control signal. (Moved to Section 2B.04)**

Option:

14 A portable or part-time (folding) STOP sign that is electrically or mechanically operated such that it only displays the STOP message during a power outage and ceases to display the

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

message upon restoration of power may be used during a power outage to control a
shared approach. [moved to Section 2B.04]

~~Section 9B.03 contains provisions regarding the assignment of priority at a shared-use
path/roadway intersection.~~

~~**Section 2B.06 STOP Sign Applications**~~

~~Guidance:~~

~~01 At intersections where a full stop is not necessary at all times, consideration should first be
given to using less restrictive measures such as YIELD signs (moved to section 2B.04d)~~

~~02 The use of STOP signs on the minor street approaches should be considered if engineering
judgment indicates that a stop is always required because of one or more of the following
conditions:~~

~~A. The vehicular traffic volumes on the through street or highway exceed 6,000 vehicles
per day;~~

~~B. A restricted view exists that requires road users to stop in order to adequately
observe conflicting traffic on the through street or highway; and/or [moved to Section
2B.04e]~~

~~C. Crash records indicate that three or more crashes that are susceptible to correction by
the installation of a STOP sign have been reported within a 12-month period, or that
five or more such crashes have been reported within a 2-year period. Such crashes
include right-angle collisions involving road users on the minor street approach failing
to yield the right-of-way to traffic on the through street or highway.~~

~~Support:~~

~~03 The use of STOP signs at grade crossings is described in Sections 8B.04 and 8B.05.~~

~~**Section 2B.07 Multi-Way Stop Applications**~~

~~Support:~~

~~01 Multi-way stop control can be useful as a safety measure at intersections if certain traffic
conditions exist. Safety concerns associated with multi-way stops include pedestrians, bicyclists,
and all road users expecting other road users to stop. Multi-way stop control is used where the
volume of traffic on the intersecting roads is approximately equal~~

~~02 The restrictions on the use of STOP signs described in Section 2B.04 also apply to multi-way
stop applications.~~

~~Guidance:~~

~~03 The decision to install multi-way stop control should be based on an engineering study.
[Moved to Section 2B.04f]~~

~~04 The following criteria should be considered in the engineering study for a multi-way STOP
sign installation:~~

~~A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that
can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the
installation of the traffic control signal. (Moved to Section 2B.04i)~~

~~B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by
a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as
well as right-angle collisions.~~

~~C. Minimum volumes: (Moved to Section 2B.04j with some changes)~~

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**

540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585

This Recommended Change to the MUTCD was rescinded by the NCTCD Council on January 12, 2024.

1. *The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and*
2. *The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but*
3. *If the 85th -percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.*

~~D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.1, and C.2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C.3 is excluded from this condition.~~

Option:

05 Other criteria that may be considered in an engineering study include:

- A. The need to control left-turn conflicts; (Section 2B.04k)
- B. ~~The need to control vehicle/pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes;~~ (similar to section 2B.04k)
- C. Locations where a road user, after stopping, cannot see conflicting traffic and is not able to negotiate the intersection unless conflicting cross traffic is also required to stop; and (moved to section 2B.04h)
- D. An intersection of two residential neighborhood collector (through) streets of similar design and operating characteristics where multi-way stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the intersection. (Moved to Section 2B.04k)

~~Section 2B.09 YIELD Sign Applications~~

Option:

01 ~~YIELD signs may be installed:~~

- A. ~~On the approaches to a through street or highway where conditions are such that a full stop is not always required.~~
- B. At the second crossroad of a divided highway, where the median width at the intersection is 30 feet or greater. In this case, a STOP or YIELD sign may be installed at the entrance to the first roadway of a divided highway, and a YIELD sign may be installed at the entrance to the second roadway. (Moved to Section 2B.04d)
- C. For a channelized turn lane that is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an island, even if the adjacent lanes at the intersection are controlled by a highway traffic control signal or by a STOP sign. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]
- D. At an intersection where a special problem exists and where engineering judgment indicates the problem to be susceptible to correction by the use of the YIELD sign. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]
- E. Facing the entering roadway for a merge-type movement if engineering judgment indicates that control is needed because acceleration geometry and/or sight distance is not adequate for merging traffic operation. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]

Standard:

02 A YIELD (R1-2) sign shall be used to assign right-of-way at the entrance to a roundabout. YIELD signs at roundabouts shall be used to control the approach roadways and shall not be used to control the circulatory roadway. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]

**RESCINDED
JANUARY 2024**
This Recommended
Change to the MUTCD
was rescinded by the
NCUTCD Council on
January 12, 2024.

Other than for all of the approaches to a roundabout, YIELD signs shall not be placed
of the approaches to an intersection. [Moved to Section 2B.04d]
OF PROPOSAL

590 C:NCUTCD/January 2016/Heydel/15B-RW-02 unsignalized intersections approved by Council 1-8-16