Disclaimer: This document shows only the changes in the 2009 MUTCD, Revision 1,2, and 3, made for the 11th Edition of the MUTCD; it not an official representation of the 11th Edition and may contain unintended errors or omissions. It was prepared to assist practitioners with identifying text changes only. Figures and tables are not included. This document does not explicitly identify where text was moved or reorganization for the 11th edition, such text will resemble other deletions and additions. The official version of the MUTCD is located on the FHWA MUTCD website (https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/index.htm).

Description: This document shows the changes from 2009 MUTCD text, including Revision 1, 2, and 3, made for the 11th Edition of the MUTCD. Some parts of 11th Edition include reorganization of 2009 MUTCD material. Users of this document should refer to the Federal Register and the supplemental table of changes posted in the Federal Register docket for the MUTCD 11th Edition Final Rule to obtain information on reorganized and relocated text from the 2009 MUTCD for the 11th Edition, as well as other changes.

The Final Rule for the MUTCD 11th Edition provides general information about significant change to the MUTCD. A supplementary table of changes is included in the Final Rule docket to provide information on changes not explicitly detailed in the Final Rule by means of a comparison between the Federal Register description of changes listed in the Notice of Proposed Amendments (NPA) for the 11th Edition issued on December 14, 2020, and the disposition of comments received in response to that Notice. Practitioners will find the supplemental table of changes helpful in determining how proposed text in the NPA was either incorporated or changed to establish the MUTCD 11th Edition.

In this comparison document, new text or newly relocated text for the 11th Edition is shown in <u>blue underline</u> and 2009 MUTCD text that has been removed or moved to another Section of the MUTCD is shown in <u>red strikethrough</u>.

Additionally, Part 5 is omitted from this comparison document as this Part is completely new material in the 11th Edition. Relevant provisions from the previous version of Part 5, Low Volume Roads, have been moved to other Parts of the 11th Edition and shown in blue underline, as appropriate, or removed completely as appropriate. See supplemental tables of changes for more information on text changes.

Finally, this document is only provided by FHWA to help practitioners quickly identify changes incorporated into the 11th Edition of the MUTCD. Though every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of this document, there may be unintentional differences between the text shown in this document and the text of the official version of the 11th Edition MUTCD. The official version is located at: https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/.

1 CHAPTER 7A. GENERAL

Section 7A.0401 Secope Introduction

Standard Support:

Part 7 sets forth basic principles and prescribes standards that shall be followed in the for the design, application, installation, and maintenance of all traffic control devices (including signs, signals, and markings) and other controls (including adult crossing guards) required for the special pedestrian conditions in school areas.

Support:

 Sections 1A.01 and 1A.08 contain information regarding unauthorized devices and messages. Sections 1A.02 and 1A.07 contain information regarding the application of standards. Section 1A.05 contains information regarding the maintenance of traffic control devices. Section 1A.08 contains information regarding placement authority for traffic control devices. Section 1A.09 contains information regarding engineering studies and the assistance that is available to jurisdictions that do not have engineers on their staffs who are trained and/or experienced in traffic control devices.

Provisions contained in Chapter 2A and Section 2B.06 are applicable in school areas.

Part 3 contains provisions regarding pavement markings that are applicable in school areas.

Part 4 contains provisions regarding highway traffic signals that are applicable in school areas. The School Crossing signal warrant is described in Section 4C.06.

Section 7A.01 Need for Standards

Section 7A.02 School Route Planss and Established School Crossings

21 Guidance:

A school route plan for each school serving elementary to high school students should be prepared in order to develop uniformity in the use of school area traffic controls and to serve as the basis for a school traffic control plan for each school.

The school route plan, developed in a systematic manner by the school, law enforcement, and traffic officials responsible for school pedestrian safety, should consist of a map (see Figure 7A-1) showing streets, the school, existing traffic controls, established school walk routes, and established school crossings.

<u>Bicycle use as a mode of transportation, as applicable, should also be considered if students biking to and from school are not allowed to use the sidewalks along the pedestrian route.</u>

The type(s) of school area traffic control devices used, either warning or regulatory, should be related to the volume and speed of vehicular traffic, street width, and the number and age of the students using the crossing.

School area traffic control devices should be included in a school traffic control plan.

Support:

To establish a safer route to and from school for schoolchildren, the application of planning criterion for school walk routes might make it necessary for children to walk an indirect route to an established school crossing located where there is existing traffic control and to avoid the use of a direct crossing where there is no existing traffic control.

The frequency of gaps in the traffic stream that are sufficient for student crossing is different at each crossing location. When the delay between the occurrences of adequate gaps becomes excessive, students might become impatient and endanger themselves by attempting to cross the street during an inadequate gap. In these instances, the creation of sufficient gaps needs to be considered to accommodate the crossing demand.

45 Guidance:

MUTCD 2009 EDITION* – MARK-UP SHOWING CHANGES ADOPTED IN 11TH EDITION

1	School walk routes should be planned to take advantage of existing traffic controls.
2	The following factors should be considered when determining the feasibility of requiring children to walk a longer distance to a crossing with existing traffic control:
4 5	A. The availability of adequate sidewalks or other pedestrian walkways to and from the location with existing control,
6	B. The number of students using the crossing,
7	C. The age levels of the students using the crossing, and
8	D. The total extra walking distance.
9	Support:
10	A School Crossing signal warrant is provided in Section 4C.06.
11	Section 7A.03 School Crossing Control Criteria
12	Support:
13	The frequency of gaps in the traffic stream that are sufficient for student crossing is different at each
14	crossing location. When the delay between the occurrences of adequate gaps becomes excessive, student
15	might become impatient and endanger themselves by attempting to cross the street during an inadequate
16	gap. In these instances, the creation of sufficient gaps needs to be considered to accommodate the
17	crossing demand.
18	A recommended method for determining the frequency and adequacy of gaps in the traffic stream is
19	given in the "Traffic Control Devices Handbook" (see Section 1A.11).
20	Section 7A.04 Scope

21