

## Survey Results - Lane Designation & Terminology

|      | Respondent Agency/<br>Organization | Agree with CHP<br>Numbering<br>System | Disagree with CHP<br>Numbering<br>System | Comments   |
|------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| FHWA | ETO                                | X                                     |  | <p>Likes using left shoulder and right shoulder, then the numbering system left to right for responders.</p> <p>Use NIMS guidance of plain language for anything else such as HOT, HOV, contraflow, accerlation, verge, exclusive left and right lanes, etc.</p>   |
|      | Resource Center                    | X                                     |  | <p>This is an area I am glad to see someone taking the initiative and trying to develop standard nomenclature for numbering lanes. The proposed method seems as logical as any – numbering the lanes is a must on most urban freeways and left to right is probably the most common.</p>   |
|      | Office of Operations               |                                       |  | <p>The left and right designations are sometimes also referred to in the profession as "inside" and "outside", respectively so you might want to note these as an "aka" for whichever terminology is adopted.</p> <p>Unsure if this is an MUTCD issue since you could not effectively use any terms other than left, right, and center on signing for the road user. When several lanes on the left are closed, the sign legend "2 LEFT LANES CLOSED AHEAD" is used rather than left and left-center, for example.</p> <p>At this point I don't see this as an MUTCD issue but I would encourage the NTIMC to continue their work on this.</p> |

|        |                               |   |  |   |
|--------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Police | Florida Highway Patrol        |   |  | <p>We went through a similar discussion in Florida about a year or two ago. The FDOT was floating the idea of lane numbering similar to that described in your email, since this is also the way that lanes are identified in the Sunguide Software used in our TMCs. Operationally, and practically, the responder community felt that common terminology like that you also included (inside shoulder, inside, left, etc.) was more expedient and easily understandable by everyone involved. Now the 5+ lane scenario does complicate things, as you point out. Interestingly, the example photograph that you used includes a buffer separated HOV lane, yet it was not included in the numbering. How would we count lanes in those scenarios, undoubtedly common in the 5+ lane world. Would we use common terminology for shoulders and numbers for lanes?</p> <p>Additionally, a numbering standard may work well in freeway applications, but not be as easily applied on arterials with multiple turn lane configurations or the use of something like a TWLT. It may get as complicated as “plain language” terminology.</p> <p>I think that the biggest obstacle to introducing a numbering system for lanes becomes one of training and orientation. Getting the word out and changing a culture can take many years. With all of that said, I think that moving toward a common terminology has many benefits and is worth considering further, whether it be "plain language", numeric, or some combination.</p> |
|        | Kansas City Police Department | X |  | Agrees and would like to see language included in MUTCD.  |

|              |  |   |  |  |
|--------------|--|---|--|--|
| Fire         | Independence Fire Department   | X |  | Makes sense to me, and it keeps it simple. This would be easy to implement as a standard, and I would go as far as suggesting letting the publishers of EMS textbooks know once this is decided to include in sections of the text regarding response to our roadways and traffic management.  |
|              | Bloom TWP Fire Department  | X |  | I'm in favor of the proposed lane numbering system.  |
|              | City of Romulus  | X |  | Agree with format. Seems simple and straightforward.   |
| Other Groups | Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals (ATSIP) |   |  | If your question is to define what a lane is, I would use the Model Minimum Uniformed Crash Criteria (MMUCC) <a href="http://www.mmucc.us">http://www.mmucc.us</a> definition. A few year back the Federal Government tied Highway dollars to the use of MMUCC, due to this fact most states use this criteria for all highway definitions. Another good resource is the ANSI D 16.1 manual, <a href="http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/ANSID16.PDF">http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/ANSID16.PDF</a> . This manual is also a standard when States develop their highway definitions. You asked if there were any pitfall you may encounter with your development. I would use the two manuals I have listed above to avoid any pitfalls. They are a standard most States have adopted and it will help to make a national standard more viable. I hope this helps and if you need further let me know. |
|              | NCUTCD   |   |  | NCUTCD TTC Committee is interested in receiving a recommendation that has been vetted by the NTIMC for consideration as language for MUTCD Chapter 6-1.  |

|                         |                    |   |   |  |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| Transportation Agencies | Michigan DOT       |   | X | This is an interesting suggestion. I like the concept, but I'm not sure I agree with the specific proposal. Whenever I refer to lanes on a multilane highway, the first lane is the far right lane, the 2nd lane is the middle, and the 3rd is the next or left lane, etc. Essentially the thinking here is opposite of what California is proposing.  |
|                         | City of Long Beach | X |   | <p>Agreed in concept to the lane number system ..... this nomenclature is in standard use in California.</p> <p>As for the Katty Freeway @ Beltway 8 picture the lane designation/numbering would be something like the following:<br/> HOV Left Shoulder, HOV Lane #1, HOV Lane #2, HOV Right Shoulder, Mainline Left Shoulder, Mainline Lane #1, Mainline Lane #2, Mainline Lane #3, Mainline Lane #4, Mainline Lane #5, Mainline Right Shoulder, Auxiliary Left Shoulder, Auxiliary Lane #1, Auxiliary Lane #2, Auxiliary Right Shoulder</p> <p>Of course shoulders or lanes not in existence would be dropped. Essentially there are three "roadways" types possible in each direction ..... HOV, Mainline, &amp; Auxiliary. I think in Houston they use reversible HOV lanes ..... but the concept is the same ..... the HOV facility would be considered a separate facility or roadway for naming purposes.</p> |

|               |      |  |  |
|---------------|------|--|--|
| Private Firms | SAIC |  | <p>I submit the following for the consideration of the Committee as support and as background for the committee.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is it possible that the provided example of the CHP using “Lane Numbering” is for both response clarification and crash reporting?</li> <li>2. Does the CHP number the lanes from left to right on their standard crash reports diagram?</li> <li>3. The question of which came first is probably impossible to answer since it was established a long time ago.</li> <li>4. Other Police agencies do not number the lanes as such (In MA we went from right to left, but in MA we never had more than 4 lanes to deal with. 3 and 2 lanes are most common).</li> <li>5. I have reached out to the Governors Highway Safety Association and a member of the Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals (ATSIP) as they are two organizations that are used by the DOT to establish data elements in the MMUCC.</li> <li>6. I also include the plain language mandate by NIMS so that we can reconcile our final decision against this document.</li> </ol> <p>When we ask other responders to accept terminology for a crash scene we need to understand why they do what they do. That is pretty much the basis of TIM. I suggest that the MUTCD would not be the prevailing document for respect the wishes of those that have developed the MMUCC.</p> |
|---------------|------|--|--|

|               |                           |   |  |   |
|---------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| Private Firms | Delcan                    | X |  | <p>Generally the locals understand and don't have a problem knowing which side or direction something is on. The confusion often comes from going through different communications centers. There are a number of terms used so a common set would be good in the long run.</p> <p>Shoulders can be referred to as:<br/>berms, emergency lanes, breakdown lanes</p> <p>Lanes can be referred to as:<br/>inside lanes, outside lanes, middle lanes, median lanes, collector distributor lanes, slow lanes, fast lanes, left lanes, right lanes, bus lanes, transit lanes, HOV lanes, climbing lanes</p> <p>Lanes are mostly counted from left to right, but in some places they are counted from right to left</p> |
|               | Telvent<br>Farradyne Inc. |   |  | <p>Agrees with comments from Delcan.</p> <p>Additional lane terms:<br/>shoulder, HOT lanes, truck-only lanes, toll lanes, passing lanes, contraflow lanes (this really causes a dilemma), right and left turn (both optional and exclusive) lanes, verge (where the shoulder or turf where a shoulder would normally be), clear zone, divided medians, undivided medians</p>  |

|               |                        |   |  |   |
|---------------|------------------------|---|--|---|
| Private Firms | Pat Noyes & Associates | X |  | <p>I concur with one of the earlier comments about "plain English;" however, it is difficult to use terms like left, middle, and right on a facility with more than three lanes. I think the easiest option is the one you are suggesting, starting the numbering from the left and moving out. After that, I think plain English works: inside shoulder, outside shoulder, on-ramp, off-ramp. The most common, simplest terms should be used for specialty lanes like HOV and reversible. That may be where the challenge is but I believe it will be localized and may not need to be addressed on such a standardized basis.</p> |
|               | Gannett Fleming        |   |  | <p>In Pennsylvania:</p> <p>PennDOT does not have a standard.</p> <p>PA Turnpike starts with a 1 at the left and works left to right. Ramps are given letters.</p> <p>Pennsylvania State Police use left, center, or right</p> <p>There is no standard among the fire services.</p>  |