On August 31, 2011, a Notice of Proposed Amendments was published in the Federal Register, proposing to revise Table I-2 in the Introduction of the 2009 MUTCD. This amendment would eliminate, extend, or otherwise revise most of the target compliance dates for upgrading existing traffic control devices in the field that do not meet the current MUTCD standards. Although compliance dates have been pushed back, efficient sign management can effectively allocate funding and in turn limit waste while increasing the overall goal of motorist safety. The ability for agencies to accurately forecast retroreflectivity deterioration will enable better management methods to meet the extended plan implementation deadline.

### Target Compliance Date

The proposed revision does not change the standards on maintaining minimum retroreflectivity levels (below), but it does eliminate the replacement dates for regulatory, warning, guide, and street name signs. The only remaining compliance date requires that agencies continue the implementation and use of assessment or management methods designed to maintain regulatory and warning sign retroreflectivity. The compliance date will be two years from the effective revision date of the 2009 MUTCD.

### Importance of Sign Management

In order to develop an adequate plan for effectively managing traffic signs, current issues relating to sign assets must be identified. Data collection efforts can provide necessary information for decision making. As actively managing a minimum retroreflectivity level for a large population of traffic signs is new in practice, data collection efforts should provide information to assess current compliance, as well as assist in future management. Data collection efforts are important as they provide needed information for any agency to determine specific situations affecting asset performance. Whether through sampling or full scale inventories, such efforts have proven extremely beneficial in the development of an efficient management strategy.

### Data Collection

The R² value for a linear regression between sign age and retroreflectivity was 0.26 which is less than ideal. This suggests that there are other factors that influence the deterioration rate of retroreflective sheeting. For this reason various attributes of each sign collected were recorded.

- Orientation
- Road Surface
- Mount Height
- Shoulder Surface
- Offset
- Location

In addition to forecasting deterioration it is important to remember that signs are exposed to damage that will greatly decrease the expected service life. This is especially prevalent on rural and canyon roads that experience a high rate of vandalism.