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Anticipated MUTCD Changes
Interim Approval: Green Bike Lanes

- FHWA provided interim approval in April 2011
- Cities in TX can ask for blanket approval (through TxDOT) – see Section 1A.10 of 2011 TMUTCD
- Interim approval requirements provided at http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/res-interim_approvals.htm
- Anticipated to be an optional traffic control device in the next MUTCD
Red Colored Pavements

• For public transit systems
• Several experimentations underway (NYC, Chicago, San Francisco)
• Anticipated to be an optional traffic control device in the next MUTCD
Minimum Pavement Marking Retroreflectivity

• The 2011 TMUTCD has a placeholder section for a future rulemaking on this topic (Section 3A.03)

• Proposed Standard (approved by NCUTCD in June 2010):
  “Compliance shall be achieved by having a method in place and using the method to maintain the recommended minimum levels established in Table 3A-1. Provided that a method is being used, an agency or official having jurisdiction shall be in compliance even if there are occurrences when pavement markings do not meet the minimum retroreflectivity levels at a particular location or at a particular point in time.”
## Minimum Pavement Marking Retroreflectivity

### Table 3A-1 Minimum Maintained Retroreflectivity Levels for Longitudinal Pavement Markings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted Speed (mph)</th>
<th>≤ 30</th>
<th>35 – 50</th>
<th>≥ 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-lane roads with centerline markings only</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other roads</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Measured at standard 30-m geometry in units of mcd/m²/lux for clean and dry pavement markings.
2. Exceptions:
   A. When RRPMs supplement or substitute for a longitudinal line (see Section 3B.13 and 3B.14), minimum pavement marking retroreflectivity levels are not applicable as long as 2 RRPMs are maintained so that at least 3 are visible from any position along a line during nighttime conditions.
   B. When continuous roadway lighting assures that the markings are visible, minimum pavement marking retroreflectivity levels are not applicable.
   C. When delineators are placed along the roadway according to Section 3F.04, minimum pavement marking retroreflectivity levels are not applicable.

Table approved by NCUTCD in June 2010
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High-Visibility Crosswalks

• The current Standard:
  “When crosswalk lines are used, they shall consist of solid white lines that mark the crosswalk. They shall not be less than 6 inches or greater than 24 inches in width.”

• Proposed new classification of basic (two transverse lines) and high-visibility crosswalks

• Recommended to use high-visibility crosswalks for uncontrolled intersections

From 2011 TMUTCD
High-Visibility Crosswalks

• The current Standard:
  “When crosswalk lines are used, they shall consist of solid white lines that mark the crosswalk. They shall not be less than 6 inches or greater than 24 inches in width.”

• Proposed new classification of basic (two transverse lines) and high-visibility crosswalks

• Recommended to use high-visibility crosswalks for uncontrolled intersections

Exhibit approved by NCUTCD in June 2011
Aesthetic Treatments in Crosswalks

- Proposed Standard (approved by NCUTCD in June 2014):
  “Patterns that constitute a purely aesthetic treatment for the interior portion of a crosswalk shall be devoid of advertising and symbols and shall not implement elements of retroreflectorization. Aesthetic treatments for the interior portions of crosswalks shall not be of a surface that can confuse vision-impaired pedestrians who rely on tactile treatments or cues for navigation.”
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