

#	CA MUTCD 2026 Part 5 Public Comment Submitted	SME WG Review - Discussions & Recommendation	CA MUTCD Part/Topic Owner and/or SME WG Lead Comments & Response	Resolution of Public Comment (CTDC Agenda Item Proposal)
1	<p>I am reaching out on behalf of May Mobility to express steadfast support of the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) effort to update the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Specifically, we are pleased to see a new dedicated section focused on autonomous vehicles. May Mobility's autonomous vehicles have been operated in multiple communities across the US and globally, including in California. One of the essential functions for autonomous driving in urban environments is the traffic light detection and classification. May Mobility's On-Vehicle Traffic Light Detection and Classification System (OVTL) is a data driven multi-sensor system that utilizes AI technology to aid the decision making for vehicles around intersections. As traffic control devices, travel corridors, vehicles, and other infrastructure become more and more connected and complex, we need to ensure we are accounting for the interconnectivity of all of these emerging mobility technologies. California and the CA DMV have remained at the cutting edge of mobility technologies and we appreciate the DMV adopting policies and practices that give consideration to both the human driver and driving automation system technology needs.</p> <p>May Mobility believes that innovation can help solve many of our nation's transportation challenges, but that technology should always serve as a means rather than an end. When leveraged and deployed in response to a specific need or with integration in mind, AVs can bring immense value to all types of communities. We are pleased to see California DMV's leadership in committing to mobility innovation and to the many possibilities that AVS technology might bring to communities.</p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> There was no specific comment that was directly related to the actual CA MUTCD 2026 Part 5 posted files or any text, figure or table contents.</p> <p><b>Comments acknowledged, no action needed.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> Stan Slavin, CA MUTCD Part 5 Owner - Agreed with SME WG review and discussion.</p> <p><b>No action needed.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> <b>No action needed.</b></p>
2	<p>Section 5B.02/Paragraph 02. Item F of the Guidance statement should reference Caltrans Standard Plan Detail A20E for contrast markings to create greater contrast.</p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> Agree with comment intent, to provide additional reference (CT Standard Plan A20E "Traffic Lines Typical Details for Contrast Striping") related to Item "F" topic on contrast markings.</p> <p>Since Item "F" in Section 5B.02 does not include a reference to Part 3 section, to be consistent with other items, it was agreed that text reference be added at the end of item "F" as "(see Section 3A.03)". This will result in providing more information on the topic of contrast markings.</p> <p>SME WG members agreed to suggest adding a reference to CT Standard Plan A20E in Section 3A.03 in Part 3, as it would be more appropriate to add it there, as it is the primary section for contrast markings topic in MUTCD. It will also avoids multiple and duplicative references in the manual. This request is similar to the current reference added in CA MUTCD 2014R8 Section 3B.11 paragraph #15 text, referencing Caltrans Standard Plan A20D.</p> <p><b>Action: Add text reference at the end of item "F" in Section 5B.02 as "(see Section 3A.03)".</b></p> <p><b>This request to be forwarded to SME WG for Part 3, for review and acceptance, as deemed appropriate.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> Stan Slavin, CA MUTCD Part 5 Owner - Agreed with SME WG review and recommendations.</p> <p><b>Action: Add text reference at the end of item "F" in Section 5B.02 as "(see Section 3A.03)".</b></p> <p><b>Forward request to SME WG for Part 3 for their review and acceptance, as deemed appropriate, suggesting adding of reference to CT Standard Plan A20E in Section 3A.03 of Part 3. It would be similar to the current reference to Caltrans Standard Plan A20D added in CA MUTCD 2014R8 Section 3B.11 paragraph #15.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> <b>Action: Add text reference at the end of item "F" in Section 5B.02 as "(see Section 3A.03)".</b></p>

#	CA MUTCD 2026 Part 5 Public Comment Submitted	SME WG Review - Discussions & Recommendation	CA MUTCD Part/Topic Owner and/or SME WG Lead Comments & Response	Resolution of Public Comment (CTCDC Agenda Item Proposal)
3	<p>Section 5B.06, p.4: There is currently a Support statement that vertical separation of bicycle facilities "can facilitate detection by driving automation system sensors." This suggests that bicycle facilities without vertical separation are at risk of intrusion by vehicles with driving automation systems. Therefore, vertical separation should be recommended as Guidance for all bicycle facilities in order to ensure safety for bicyclists in the context of increasing vehicle automation.</p>	<p><b>10/2/2024:</b> <b>Majority of the Working Group agreed to keep this as a support statement. While the vertical separation is a design feature and not a traffic control device, vertical separators (or channelizers) are traffic control devices. There is no definitive research or facts presented by the AV industry indicating that AV's need vertical separation features in order to maintain separation from bike lanes. While these features can facilitate detection of bike lanes, they should be installed consistent with the support statements provided in Section 9E.07.</b></p> <p><b>9/18/24:</b> Do not disagree in principle with the comment. Disagree with the specifics of this comment that relate to making the use of vertical separation a Guidance or recommended practice for all bicycle facilities and incorporating it in CA MUTCD. Reason for disagreeing is that the "vertical separation" element, in itself, is not a traffic control device, rather it is a design feature that involves design engineering decisions. There was some discussion to agree with the comment, to have CA MUTCD take a leadership role in promoting bicyclist safety, which could potentially lead to its incorporation into other planning and design publications. FHWA CA Division recommended no change in response to this comment, and if agreeing with comment, to only include new text as "Support", not Option, Standard or Guidance. It was agreed that it would not be appropriate for CA MUTCD to be taking a lead role on non-traffic control device topics. CA MUTCD authority, per CVC 21400, is limited to only traffic control devices. Agreeing with this recommendation to include the use of vertical separation as a Guidance or recommended practice for all bicycle facilities in CA MUTCD will not be supported by CVC 21400.</p> <p><b>No action needed.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> Stan Slavin, CA MUTCD Part 5 Owner - Agreed with SME WG review and recommendations.</p> <p><b>No action needed.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> <b>No action needed.</b></p>
4	<p>Section 5B.06 Page Number: 4 Comment: If A and B of the guidance can help driving automation systems detect people on bikes through the simple application of a sign or plaque, then I see no need for "should consider" language. This needs to be "shall" to protect people on bikes.</p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> Disagree with comment. Automated Vehicles and driving automation system sensors and related topics are new, it may potentially be too early to draw conclusions on their functionality and operation, especially in detecting people on bikes. This Part 5 and Automated vehicles topic itself is new to the MUTCD with all new content. Changing this Guidance to Standard will remove the flexibility allowed in the current NMUTCD resulting in the use of these signs and plaques as the default practice. In general, the Standard statements in the MUTCD are based on laws, regulations or proven safety best practices.</p> <p>Another reason for disagreeing with this comment is that the primary topics for W9-5, W9-5a, R3-17 signs and R3-9dP plaque belong in Part 2 &amp; Part 9 (Sections 2B.321, 2B.33, 9B.04 and 9C.07) and these policies are under text heading of "Option". In Part 5 they are being "recommended" under text heading "Guidance", which exceeds the minimum "optional" policies in Part 2 &amp; 9. Further, Section 9C.07 in Paragraph #04 recommends "...to avoid excessive use of signs, the Bicycle Lane Ends warning sign should not be used where a bicycle lane is dropped on the approach to an intersection and resumes immediately after the intersection..."</p> <p><b>No action needed in Part 5.</b></p> <p><b>This request to be forwarded to SME WGs for Parts 2 and 9, for review and acceptance, as deemed appropriate.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> Stan Slavin, CA MUTCD Part 5 Owner - Agreed with SME WG review and recommendations.</p> <p><b>No action needed in Part 5.</b></p> <p><b>Forward request to SME WGs for Part 2 and 9 for their review and acceptance, as deemed appropriate.</b></p>	<p><b>9/18/24:</b> <b>No action needed in Part 5.</b></p>