



***Traffic Control Devices Handbook***

© 2001 Institute of Transportation Engineers  
IR-112

Originally Posted: 04/06/04  
Updated: 01/10/05

- The following should be added to Table 1–4 (page 8), as the fourth item between “Convey a clear, simple meaning” and “Give adequate time for proper response:”

<b>Command respect from road users</b>	Design	Consistent with standards and approved requirements
	Placement	Installed at proper location
	Maintenance	Well maintained devices
	Uniformity	Consistent application for similar locations

- The correct text on pages 139 and 140 should read:  
*Initially it is necessary to determine whether enough sight distance exists so that motorists can adequately detect the presence of other vehicles in sufficient time to avoid a collision. If adequate sight distance does exist, then an intersection warning sign could be considered, but not required. If the approach traffic volumes are less than 100 AADT, then no intersection control is necessary since there is little possibility of two vehicles arriving at the intersection at the same time. As traffic volumes exceed 100 AADT and begin to approach 400 vehicles, then either a STOP or YIELD sign should be considered if there is not adequate intersection sight distance. Normally, the STOP or YIELD sign is installed for the vehicles approaching on the lower-volume roadway.*
- Page 161, the last sentence of the Uniform Vehicle Code quote should read:  
*“The right-of-way rule is modified at through highways and otherwise as stated in this chapter.” 8*  
  
*This means that at all residential intersections, the responsibility for collision avoidance is shared by all users.*
- Page 416, second paragraph, last sentence, the reference to the MUTCD should read “Chapter 4K.”



INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS  
PUBLICATIONS ERRATA

- Page 417, last paragraph, first column, should read  
“A study conducted in the state of Washington found that...

**NEW 01/10/05:**

- Page 110, the sentence after the equation in the second column should read  
Side friction factors (f) of 0.21, 0.18 and 0.15 are appropriate for ball-bank readings of 14 degrees, 12 degrees and 10 degrees, respectfully.
- Page 447, #9a, should read  
PELICANS, PUFFIN, or half
- Page 462, Replace PELICAN crossing section with the following:  
***PELICAN crossing***  
PELICAN (Pedestrian Light Control Activated) crossings were developed from the European pedestrian crossing technique at mid-block crosswalks. The technique incorporates a standard red-yellow-green signal that rests in green for vehicular traffic until a pedestrian wishes to cross. When a pedestrian wishes to cross, he or she activates a detector button and the signal then changes to yellow and then to red, and a WALK indication light is shown to the pedestrian. A pedestrian clearance interval is provided followed by a short flashing amber in the European version before the signal returns to steady green indication.  
  
***PUFFIN crossing***  
PUFFIN (Pedestrian User Friendly Intelligent) crossings are similar to the PELICAN crossing except they use detection to cancel pedestrian actuations when they are no longer required and overhead detection to extend the all-red time if pedestrians are in the crosswalk.
- Page 462, revise the section title ***Mini-PELICAN or half signal*** to read  
***Half signal***
- Page 462, the correct caption for Figure 13–1 is Pedestrian Signal.
- Page 463, the correct caption for Figure 13–2 is Half signal crossing.
- Pages 464–466 and 470, the use of TOCAN is incorrect. Please replace all occurrences with TOUCAN.
- Page 466, Section 13.4.9, delete the phrase “Mini PELICANS” in the fourth line.



INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS  
PUBLICATIONS ERRATA

- Page 467, the correct title for Table 13–4 is  
25-Year Collision History Summary for Half Signals (1974–1998)