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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:
In July 2017, the National Transportation Safety Board issued a report on Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles (https://www.ntsb.gov/safety/safety-studies/Documents/SS1701.pdf). In this report, the NTSB made several recommendations. Two of the recommendations were directed to FHWA and involved the MUTCD (Page 57):

- (H-17-27) Revise Section 2B.13 of the MUTCD so that:
  - The factors currently listed as optional for all engineering studies are required,
  - Require that an expert system such as USLIMITS2 be used as a validation tool, and
• Remove the guidance that speed limits in speed zones be within 5 mph of the 85th percentile speed.

• (H-17-28) Revise Section 2B.13 of the MUTCD to (at a minimum) incorporate the Safe System approach for urban roads to strengthen protection for vulnerable road users.

In January of 2018 RWSTC established a Task Force to address these recommendations. The Task Force initiated a survey in the spring of 2018 to better understand how speed limits are set. Significant interest exists in the setting of posted speed limits from many sources within the NCUTCD sponsoring organizations and outside. The survey reached many of these groups (sent to NCUTCD, ITE, AASHTO/CTE, APWA, ASCE, NACTO, APBP and TRB). The survey was completed by 740 participants (see attached summaries and highlights below). Concurrently, Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) is completing the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) project 17-76 (Guidance for the Setting of Speed Limits) which is scheduled to be complete Fall 2019. The Task Force survey data were provided to the TTI team to assist with the investigation. AAA is conducting a similar survey of speed limits and the results of the draft Task Force survey results were shared with them this summer. The Task Force met several times and discussed the findings on June 14th in the context of the need for MUTCD changes. From this discussion two changes were forwarded to RWSTC for consideration (adding bicycle to the factors listed in paragraph 16 and changing from may to should for the factors to be considered in paragraph 16).

At the June 21, 2018 RWSTC meeting, discussions focused on the role of the MUTCD in setting traffic control device criteria as compared to establishing practice(s) for the setting of speed limits (and to what extent). Key comments made included:

1. many states/local agencies have their own laws/criteria for setting of speed limits (many are very detailed),
2. professionals who actually perform the studies rarely use only the 85th percentile speed (i.e. they use several other factors),
3. practitioners consider pace as an important factor when considering speed data (particularly increasing the percentage of vehicles within the 10-mpg pace),
4. an expansion of statutory requirements for speed limits could be considered (beyond single or a few speed categories) from which fewer engineering studies would be needed to establish reasonable speed limits, and
5. the use of 85th percentile for rural roads or interstate/freeways is different than urban streets (on urban streets, 85th percentile plays a less significant role). It is clear from the survey that analysts that establish speed zones utilize many factors beyond 85th percentile in their studies, including the context, i.e. where the street is and what function it serves.

Two votes were taken within RWSTC. The first asked if the MUTCD should address (a) both the criteria of speed limits signs as traffic control devices (e.g. color, size, retroreflectivity, etc…) and the factors for setting of speed limits or, (b) just the criteria for the traffic control device. The first vote was a choice between the options. Twelve voted for traffic control device only and 8 voted for traffic control device and factors for setting speed limits. A second vote was taken on a draft proposal prepared by the Task Force (which changed the factors in paragraph 16 of section
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2B.13 to should and added reference to bicyclists). It was rejected 8-11, noting a concern about
the need for research (NCHRP 17-76) which is underway.

Because of the split votes, it was decided to ask Council on June 22 to provide direction to the
Task Force about the two options (a. and b. from above). About 10 comments were received. The
general direction was that the MUTCD should reference the broad factors regarding setting of
speed limits and leave the definition and procedures to guidelines and/or states to set more
detailed criteria.

With that direction, the Task Force has prepared the following proposal which:

- Changes the MUTCD to reinforce the stated understanding that other factors have a role
  in setting speed limits (in addition to 85th percentile).
- Refines the factors in Paragraph 16 and moves this paragraph up along with the three
  other paragraphs that speak to setting of speed limits (#10 (unchanged), #12 and #13
  (unchanged)) to follow paragraph 1 which is the standard that speaks to setting of speed
  limits in response to NTSB.
- Retains reference to 85th percentile as a factor that should be considered, particularly for
  freeways, expressways and rural areas (modified paragraph 12 in response to NTSB).
- Leaves reference to setting of speed zones in broad terms allowing states/locals to
  establish detailed criteria based upon national guidance or based upon research, outside
  the MUTCD (this is our response to NTSB to include USLIMITS2 and Safe Systems).
- Anticipates the development of a national speed management guide (in development
  through NCHRP 17-76) for states and local agencies to use uniformly in establishing
  process of setting speed zones.
- Recommend that statutory speeds in states/local agencies follow speed management
  guidance being developed in NCHRP 17-76, but not address such in the MUTCD.

These guiding principles outline the Task Force proposal for MUTCD changes which are
outlined below. It leaves the role of the MUTCD broad, as requested by the NCUTCD Council.
In responding to the NTSB proposal, changes have been made accordingly. The Task Force
anticipates more detailed guidance from impending national research and state/local procedures;
however, this should not affect the MUTCD. The MUTCD role is clarified and reorganized, but
not expanded.

The NTSB also referenced two processes that are more detailed: USLIMITS2 and Safe Systems.
Based upon the survey, discussion of the Task Force, technical committee and council it was
determined to not include a more detailed process in the MUTCD. The survey findings indicated
that about 84% of respondents had not utilized USLIMITS2. This raises a question as to why a
process that was established in 2006 has not garnered greater practical use. The Task Force
believes that this question must be answered before suggesting that they be included in the
MUTCD. USLIMITS2 and Safe Systems are both detailed procedures that may be better placed
in national guidelines rather than the MUTCD. The inclusion of USLIMITS2 or Safe Systems
would expand the role of the MUTCD and could conflict with future research and local/state
procedures; therefore, this NTSB proposal was not advanced.
SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS:

Background
- While consultants were the most represented group in the survey (~27%), state agency/DOT (~18%), smaller cities (~17%), county/regional agency (~16%) and larger cities (~9%) were also well represented.
- Survey respondents averaged 20 years of professional experience (nearly 15,000 collective years of experience).
- Participants had a wide range of experience with speed limit studies, somewhat equally spread over the five survey categories of 0, 1-5, 6-20, 21-50, 50+.
- Over 85% of the respondent have regularly (just less than 60%) or occasionally (about 25%) used the MUTCD.

Resources
- A majority of respondents depend upon the MUTCD or state/local guides/requirements in setting a speed zone.
- Few respondents have used USLIMITS2 (16%) – this reinforces an AASHTO/CTE August 2017 survey that indicated limited state use of USLIMITS2.

Criteria
- The top criteria that are always used in setting speed limits (over 50% responses) were:
  - For practitioners who had done >5 studies: speed of vehicles, statutory requirements, crash history, context (location), geometrics (curve), facility classification type.
  - For practitioners who had done 0 studies: context (location), context (land use), pedestrian activity, crash history.
- When asked what the five most important factors were the over 50% responses were:
  - For practitioners who had done >5 studies: speed of vehicles, crash history, context (location).
  - For practitioners who had done 0 studies: pedestrian activity, context (location), bicycle activity.
- When asked what the one or two most relied upon measures were the top responses were:
  - For practitioners who had done >5 studies: 85th percentile speed (88%), design speed (21%), pace speed (17%).
  - For practitioners who had done 0 studies: design speed (43%), 85th percentile speed (40%), average speed (20%).
- Related to setting speed limits and rounding the most frequent response was to round to the nearest 5 mph of the 85th percentile; but when given the option to choose how “would” they do it they offered nearly 350 comments.
- Table 1 below highlights the response to target/desired speed by facility type.

DISCUSSION:
There are 21 paragraphs in Section 2B.13. Five are standards, 4 are support, 5 are options and 7 are guidance. Based upon the findings of the Task Force so far, the key paragraphs in Section 2B.13 are paragraphs 12 (guidance) and 16 (option). All the other paragraphs focus on statutory...
speed limits, need for engineering study, requiring limits to be multiples of 5 mph, placement of
signs, use of warning signs with speed limit signs, where to conduct speed studies, special speed
limits, changeable message signs, and school zones.

The NTSB recommendations focus on the input provided related to the engineering studies. The
Task Force asked several questions of the RWSTC. The summary of the discussion is provided
below:

1. To what extent should the MUTCD define procedures/criteria for engineering studies?
   There was support on both sides of the question as to whether the MUTCD should be
   focused on traffic control device criteria or both TCD criteria and setting of speed limit
criteria. Discussion at Council provided the Task Force direction to keep the MUTCD
discussion about setting speed limits broad allowing states/locals to define the
procedures in more detail.

2. Given the implicit understanding of what 85th percentile means, is there a need to better
define the five items in paragraph 16 to be on a uniform level of understanding (e.g. what
defines crash experience comparable to our understanding of the 85th percentile)? Why
are bicyclists not noted in paragraph 16? Should any criteria be added to paragraph 16?
   Greater definition should be left to national research and state/local procedures.
   However, bicyclists should be listed in the factors of paragraph 16.

3. What is the balance between “analysis of the current speed distribution of free-flowing
   vehicles (standard paragraph 1)” to other criteria (paragraph 12) as part of an engineering
   study? How would this affect paragraph 12?
   This should be left to guidelines, not in the MUTCD.

4. Is a specific reference to USLIMITS2 appropriate and is the current NCHRP research
   project (17-76) going to provide alternative guidance that should be considered?
   Given the survey finding that 84% of the respondents had not utilized USLIMITS2, the
   question as to “why” should be answered before change to the MUTCD is considered.
   Adding USLIMITS2 would substantially further the MUTCD role of defining the process
   or procedure of setting speed limits. This level of detail would be inconsistent with the
   MUTCD establishing broad criteria of setting speed limits and could impact state/local
   agencies who have detailed procedures.

5. Should the rounding approach to speed data be defined?
   This is a detail of setting a speed limit that would not be appropriate for the MUTCD.

6. What will enforcement and/or the judicial system accept if not the 85th percentile
   (paragraph 12)? Could speed limits for high crash corridors be set below the 85th
   percentile (note California recent approval) and is this a MUTCD role or a states/local
   role in defining the speed limit process?
   This should be left to guideline documents and national research rather than the
   MUTCD.

7. Given the commonality of responses to target speed for various facility types from the
   survey, should a reference be provided that would guide practitioners to further study
   when setting speeds above/below certain levels nationally (for example the 50%
   percentile response levels of the survey, Table 1)?
   This is a detail of setting speed limits and would be better in guidelines (or statutory
   change/requirements) rather than the MUTCD.
Table 1: Median Response to Target Speeds by Facility Type from June 2018 Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class/Type</th>
<th>Speed, mph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Freeway (rural)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Freeway (urban)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway (rural)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road (rural)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road (rural unpaved)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Arterial (5+ lanes)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Arterial (multi-lane)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Street</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Commercial District Street</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Street (used to leave a residential area)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Residential Street</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Zone Street</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. A criterion suggested for setting speed limits that is relatively new is “context – location”. Some may consider “road characteristics” or “environment” to be similar in concept (terms currently in the MUTCD). NCHRP Report 855 recommends an expanded functional classification system with five roadway types (freeways, principal arterial, minor arterial, collector, and local) and five context types (rural, rural town, suburban, urban, and urban core). These contexts “have been determined to not only represent unique land use environments, but also identify distinctions that require wholly different geometric design practices in terms of desired operating speeds, mobility/access demands and user groups”. Should the MUTCD recognize these different roadway type/context combinations especially if different speed limit setting practices are suggested for the different roadway type/context combinations? Table 1 shows the suggested target speeds from NCHRP Report 855.

Table 1. NCHRP Report 855 Suggested Target Speed for Context/Roadway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>Not addressed in 855 since “designs are based on federally developed standards with little flexibility”. Assumed to be High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested target speeds: Low (<30 mph), Med (30 to 45 mph), high (> 45 mph)

This is a detail of setting speed limits and would be better as a subject of guidelines (or statutory change/requirements) rather than the MUTCD.
The Task Force discussed these matters and found the following:

- Use of speed distribution in setting of speed zones is important and is one of the factors in setting speed zones.
- Re-enforce that the “other” factors than speed should be considered in setting speed zones (include in paragraph 16 and change to should (guidance) from may (option)).
- The inclusion of bicycle activity as a factor in paragraph 16 is important and should be included.
- Clarify “other factors” to include lane widths, medians, driveways, land use and past study data. Past studies provide valuable insights into understanding if or how speed distribution may have changed over time.
- To clarify the use of the 85th percentile speed (paragraph 12), limit the specificity of setting speed zones within 5 mph of the 85th percentile to use on freeways, expressways and rural highways.
- The industry uses and knowledge of USLIMITS2 is very limited. Before prescriptively requiring it as a methodology in MUTCD for setting speed zones (it was originally developed in 2006), more information is needed about why analysts do not use it currently. One request was to make the assessment more transparent to users (less of a black box). This level of detail is not likely appropriate for the MUTCD and rather should be part of national guidance document(s) for states/locals to utilize in establishing their policies.
- Setting of reasonable speed zones requires consideration of many factors that are not well defined in the MUTCD. These factors are best defined as part of national guidance/research documents and do not need to be defined in the MUTCD as they can involve state/local interpretation.
- The Task Force was not supportive of the elimination of studies in setting of non-statutory speed zones (that consider the appropriate factors) given the safety, enforcement and legal consequences.
- As the NCHRP 17-76 research progresses, consideration of target speeds (reflecting on survey findings in Table 1 and NCHRP 855 Table 2) should be considered further, but not part of MUTCD.

Following RSWTC comments changes were made to:

- Use the MUTCD definition for rural highways;
- Move functional class to the list of factors;
- Clarify when signals are spaces less than 1 mile, where to observe speeds;
- Clarify the use of the pace; and
- Move paragraph 14 below paragraph 15 and clarify its language.

RECOMMENDED MUTCD CHANGES

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

PART 1. GENERAL

CHAPTER 1A. GENERAL

Section 1A.13 Definitions of Headings, Words, and Phrases in this Manual
(Approved by Edit Committee 1-9-19).

132a. Pace – see Speed.

PART 2. SIGNS

CHAPTER 2B. REGULATORY SIGNS, BARRICADES, AND GATES

Section 2B.13 Speed Limit Sign (R2-1)

Standard:

Speed zones (other than statutory speed limits) shall only be established on the basis of an engineering study that has been performed in accordance with traffic engineering practices. The engineering study shall include an analysis of the current speed distribution of free-flowing vehicles.

Guidance:

Other factors that may be considered when establishing or reevaluating speed limits within speed zones are the following: [paragraph 01a and A-D moved from paragraph 16 and revised as indicated]

A. Speed distribution of free-flowing vehicles (such as current 85th percentile, the pace, and review of past speed studies)

B. Reported crash experience for at least a 12-month period relative to similar roadways.

C. Road characteristics (such as lane widths, curb/shoulder condition, grade, alignment, median type, and sight distance).

D. Road context (such as roadside development and environment including number of driveways and land use, functional classification, parking practices, presence of sidewalks/bicycle facilities).

E. Road Users (such as pedestrian activity, bicycle activity)

When a speed limit within a speed zone is posted on freeways, expressways, or rural highways, it should maximize the percentage of vehicles in the pace and should be within 5 mph of the 85th-percentile speed of free-flowing traffic vehicles. [paragraph 01b moved from paragraph 12 and revised as indicated]

States and local agencies should conduct engineering studies to reevaluate non-statutory speed limits on segments of their roadways that have undergone significant changes since the last review. (such as in the addition or elimination of parking or driveways, changes in the number of travel lanes, changes in the configuration of bicycle lanes, road geometrics, road context, traffic control signal coordination, or traffic volumes), [paragraph 01c moved from paragraph 10 and revised as indicated]
Speed studies for signalized intersection approaches should be taken outside the influence area of the traffic control signal, which is generally considered to be approximately 1/2 mile to avoid obtaining skewed results for the 85th-percentile speed. If the signal spacing is less than 1 mile, the speed study should be at approximately the middle of the segment. (paragraph 01d moved from paragraph 13 and revised as indicated)

**Standard:**

02 The Speed Limit (R2-1) sign (see Figure 2B-3) shall display the limit established by law, ordinance, regulation, or as adopted by the authorized agency based on the engineering study. The speed limits displayed shall be in multiples of 5 mph.

**Figure 2B-3 Speed Limit and Photo Enforcement Signs and Plaques**

03 Speed Limit (R2-1) signs, indicating speed limits for which posting is required by law, shall be located at the points of change from one speed limit to another.

04 At the downstream end of the section to which a speed limit applies, a Speed Limit sign showing the next speed limit shall be installed. Additional Speed Limit signs shall be installed beyond major intersections and at other locations where it is necessary to remind road users of the speed limit that is applicable.

**Support:**

04a The Traffic Control Devices Handbook contains suggested criteria on the spacing of speed limit signs. [approved by Council 1/20/2011, moved from the paragraph 07a position to this location]

**Guidance:**

04b Additional Speed Limit signs should be installed beyond major intersections and at other locations to remind road users of the speed limit that is applicable. [approved by Council 6/24/2011]

**Standard:**

05 Speed Limit signs indicating the statutory speed limits shall be installed at entrances to the State and, where appropriate, at jurisdictional boundaries in urban areas.

**Support:**

06 In general, the maximum speed limits applicable to rural and urban roads are established:

A. Statutorily – a maximum speed limit applicable to a particular class of road, such as freeways or city streets, that is established by State law; or

B. As altered speed zones – based on engineering studies.

07 State statutory limits might restrict the maximum speed limit that can be established on a particular road, notwithstanding what an engineering study might indicate.
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The Traffic Control Devices Handbook contains suggested criteria on the spacing of speed limit signs. [approved by Council 1/20/2011, moved to paragraph 4a above]

Temporary Traffic Control Zone Speed signs are discussed in Part 6. The WORK ZONE (G20-5aP) plaque intended for installation above a Speed Limit sign is discussed in Section 6F.12. School Speed Limit signs are discussed in Section 7B.15 [moved from paragraph 15]

Option:

If a jurisdiction has a policy of installing Speed Limit signs in accordance with statutory requirements only on the streets that enter a city, neighborhood, or residential area to indicate the speed limit that is applicable to the entire city, neighborhood, or residential area unless otherwise posted, a CITYWIDE (R2-5aP), NEIGHBORHOOD (R2-5bP), or RESIDENTIAL (R2-5cP) plaque may be mounted above the Speed Limit sign and an UNLESS OTHERWISE POSTED (R2-5P) plaque may be mounted below the Speed Limit sign (see Figure 2B-3).

Guidance:

A Reduced Speed Limit Ahead (W3-5 or W3-5a) sign (see Section 2C.38) should be used to inform road users of a reduced speed zone where the speed limit is being reduced by more than 10 mph, or where engineering judgment indicates the need for advance notice to comply with the posted speed limit ahead.

States and local agencies should conduct engineering studies to reevaluate non-statutory speed limits on segments of their roadways that have undergone significant changes since the last review, such as the addition or elimination of parking or driveways, changes in the number of travel lanes, changes in the configuration of bicycle lanes, changes in traffic control signal coordination, or significant changes in traffic volumes. [moved to paragraph 01c]

No more than three speed limits should be displayed on any one Speed Limit sign or assembly.

When a speed limit within a speed zone is posted, it should be within 5 mph of the 85th-percentile speed of free-flowing traffic. [moved to paragraph 01b]

Speed studies for signalized intersection approaches should be taken outside the influence area of the traffic control signal, which is generally considered to be approximately 1/2 mile, to avoid obtaining skewed results for the 85th-percentile speed. [moved to paragraph 01d]

Support:

Advance warning signs and other traffic control devices to attract the motorist's attention to a signalized intersection are usually more effective than a reduced speed limit zone. [moved to paragraph 11a]

Guidance:

An advisory speed plaque (see Section 2C.08) mounted below a warning sign should be used to warn road users of an advisory speed for a roadway condition. A Speed Limit sign should not be used for this situation.

Advance traffic control warning signs (see Section 2C.36), advance intersection warning signs (see Section 2C.46), and/or other traffic control devices provide appropriate warning prior to attract the motorist's attention to a signalized intersection. are usually more effective than a reduced Speed limit sign zone should not be used for this purpose. [moved from paragraph 14 and revised as indicated]

Option:

Other factors that may be considered when establishing or reevaluating speed limits are the following:
A. Road characteristics, shoulder condition, grade, alignment, and sight distance;
B. The pace;
C. Roadside development and environment;
D. Parking practices and pedestrian activity; and
E. Reported crash experience for at least a 12-month period.

Two types of Speed Limit signs may be used: one to designate passenger car speeds, including any nighttime information or minimum speed limit that might apply; and the other to show any special speed limits for trucks and other vehicles.

A changeable message variable speed limit sign that changes the speed limit for traffic and ambient conditions may be installed provided that the appropriate speed limit is displayed at the proper times and locations in accordance with paragraphs 04 and 05. [approved by Council 1/19/2012 (1/28/2014)]

Standard:

The variable speed limit sign legend “SPEED LIMIT” shall be a black legend on a white retroreflective background.

Option:

The variable speed limit legend may be indicated by a display of white LEDs which are white on an opaque black background.

A changeable message The driver feedback sign (WX-XX) that displays to approaching drivers the speed at which they are traveling may be installed in conjunction with a Speed Limit sign to supplement the Speed Limit sign (See Section 2C.XX)

Guidance:

If a changeable message sign displaying approach speeds is installed, the legend YOUR SPEED XX MPH or such similar legend should be displayed. The color of the changeable message legend should be a yellow legend on a black background or the reverse of these colors. [approved by Council 1/28/2014]

Support:

Advisory Speed signs and plaques are discussed in Sections 2C.08 and 2C.14. Temporary Traffic Control Zone Speed signs are discussed in Part 6. The WORK ZONE (G2.5P) plaque intended for installation above a Speed Limit sign is discussed in Section 6F.12. School Speed Limit signs are discussed in Section 7B.15. [moved to paragraph 07a]