

# **Minimum Traffic Sign Retroreflectivity Levels Results of 2010/2011 Follow up Survey of Washington Cities and Counties**

**Conducted by Washington State Department of Transportation  
Highways and Local Programs Divisions**

**January 2011**

## **Background information:**

In spring 2008 and winter 2009 cities and counties were invited to answer a survey. The goal was to help Washington's cities and counties make sense of a change to the 2003 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). This change, found in 2003 MUTCD Revision 2, set minimum levels for sign retroreflectivity. It requires public agencies to maintain their signs to at least minimum levels. And it set three phase-in compliance dates for agencies to do so.

Survey questions ranged from "Has your agency estimated the cost for meeting compliance requirements? What are the costs?" to "What funding sources will your agency pursue to meet the new requirements?" From these two surveys, we heard from 7 cities, 10 counties and one public works consultant. At the time, some agencies were not yet sure how they would proceed.

The goal of this follow up survey is to glance at how agencies are now meeting or planning to meet the minimum retroreflectivity levels. We heard from 59 cities and 12 counties.

## **Target Compliance Dates:**

- January 22, 2012 to implement and then continue to use an assessment or management method that is designed to maintain traffic sign retroreflectivity at or above the minimum levels shown in Table 2A-3 of the 2003 MUTCD Revision 2.
- January 22, 2015 to replace any regulatory, warning, or ground-mounted guide (except street name) signs that do not meet the minimum retroreflectivity levels.
- January 22, 2018 to replace any street name signs and overhead guide signs that do not meet the minimum levels.

## **Note:**

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) came out with the 2009 MUTCD on December 16, 2009. Washington State has not yet adopted it but plans to in spring 2011. A committee composed of local agencies and Washington State Department of Transportation is revising Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 468-95. Then a public process will follow to adopt the new manual.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published a Federal Register November 30, 2010 that requested comments from local and state agencies. FHWA invited local and state agencies who may

have concerns over their ability to meet one or more of seven of the 58 target compliance dates listed in the 2009 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) to comment. They accepted comments on all three of the target compliance dates for traffic sign retroreflectivity. Comments were due to FHWA by January 14, 2011 and FHWA is currently reviewing those comments.

**Agencies who responded to the 2010/2011 survey:**

Total Agencies: 71

**Cities: 59**

**Counties: 12**

Aberdeen	Spokane	Anonymous City N	Chelan
Battle Ground	Sumas	Anonymous City O	Clallam
Bremerton	Sumner	Anonymous City P	Douglas
Clarkston	Tekoa	Anonymous City Q	Grant
Cosmopolis	Tieton	Anonymous City R	Grays Harbor
Deer Park	Tumwater	Anonymous City S	King
Enumclaw	Waitsburg	Anonymous City T	Pierce
Federal Way	Walla Walla	Anonymous City U	Skagit
George	Wenatchee	Anonymous City V	Spokane
Goldendale	Woodland	Anonymous City W	Thurston
Harrah	Yakima		Walla Walla
Kalama	Anonymous City A		Anonymous County A
Kennewick	Anonymous City B		
Kent	Anonymous City C		
Lynnwood	Anonymous City D		
Marysville	Anonymous City E		
Mountlake Terrace	Anonymous City F		
Nespelem	Anonymous City G		
Oakville	Anonymous City H		
Prosser	Anonymous City I		
Raymond	Anonymous City J		
Richland	Anonymous City K		
Sedro-Woolley	Anonymous City L		
Selah	Anonymous City M		
Snoqualmie			

**3) Did your agency respond to the spring 2008 or winter 2009/2010 survey?**

Yes: 8 agencies

- **5 Cities:** Federal Way, Kennewick, Richland, Snoqualmie and Anonymous City A.

- **3 Counties:** Grays-Harbor County, King County and Spokane County.

No: 19 agencies

- **18 Cities:** Bremerton, Clarkston, Deer Park, Enumclaw, Mountlake Terrace, Oakville, Raymond, Sedro-Woolley, Tekoa, Walla Walla, Wenatchee, Woodland, Anonymous Cities D, F, I, P, Q and U.
- **1 County:** Clallam County.

Don't Know: 44 agencies

- **36 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Cosmopolis, George, Goldendale, Harrah, Kalama, Kent, Lynnwood, Marysville, Nespalem, Prosser, Selah, Spokane, Sumas, Sumner, Tieton, Tumwater, Waitsburg, Yakima, Anonymous Cities B, C, E, G, H, J, K, L, M, N, O, R, S, T, V and W.
- **8 Counties:** Chelan County, Douglas County, Grant County, Pierce County, Skagit County, Thurston County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

**4) Is your agency aware of the compliance dates for sign retroreflectivity?**

Yes: 62 agencies

- **50 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Bremerton, Cosmopolis, Deer Park, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Goldendale, Harrah, Kennewick, Kent, Lynnwood, Marysville, Mountlake Terrace, Oakville, Prosser, Raymond, Richland, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Sumas, Sumner, Tieton, Tumwater, Walla Walla, Wenatchee, Woodland, Yakima, Anonymous Cities A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J, K, M, N, O, P, Q, R, T, U, V and W.
- **12 Counties:** Chelan County, Clallam County, Douglas County, Grant County, Grays-Harbor County, King County, Pierce County, Skagit County, Spokane County, Thurston County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

No: 9 Agencies

- **9 Cities:** Clarkston, George, Kalama, Nespalem, Tekoa, Waitsburg, Anonymous Cities I, L and S.

**5) Will your agency be able to meet the deadline for having an assessment or management method in place? (January 22, 2012)**

Yes: 51 agencies

- **40 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Bremerton, Deer Park, Enumclaw, Federal Way, George, Harrah, Kennewick, Kent, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Nespalem, Oakville, Raymond, Richland, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Sumas, Sumner, Tieton, Tumwater, Waitsburg, Walla Walla, Wenatchee, Yakima, Anonymous Cities A, B, C, D, G, J, N, P, Q, R, S, T, V and W.
- **11 Counties:** Chelan County, Clallam County, Douglas County, Grant County, King County, Pierce County, Skagit County, Spokane County, Thurston County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

No: 18 agencies

- **18 Cities:** Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Goldendale, Kalama, Prosser, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Tekoa, Woodland, Anonymous Cities E, F, H, I, K, L, M, O and U.

**6) If the answer to number 5 is no, what would it take to make it possible for your agency to comply?**

- Funding and/or personnel. (Cosmopolis, Goldendale, Prosser, Tekoa, Spokane, Anonymous City E, F, H, I, K, L, M, O and U)
- Push out the compliance dates. (Goldendale, Snoqualmie and Anonymous City M)
- Modifications to our computerized database. (Spokane)
- Training. (Anonymous City I)
- More help. (Anonymous City L)
- Would prefer to answer as other than yes/no. The managing data base may (or may not) be complete and accurate by 2012. (Marysville)

**7) What sign assessment or management method, or combinations of methods, has your agency selected to meet the minimum retroreflectivity requirements?**

Visual nighttime inspection: 29 agencies

- **21 Cities:** Aberdeen, Enumclaw, Federal Way, George, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Prosser, Raymond, Selah, Snoqualmie, Sumas, Sumner, Tieton, Walla Walla, Yakima, Anonymous Cities A, D, G, H, K and T.
- **8 Counties:** Chelan County, Clallam County, Douglas County, Grays Harbor County, King County, Skagit County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

Control signs: 13 agencies

- **9 Cities:** Enumclaw, Federal Way, Harrah, Kennewick, Prosser, Richland, Spokane, Anonymous Cities E and J.
- **4 Counties:** Clallam County, Grays Harbor County, Pierce County and Anonymous County A.

Expected sign life: 19 agencies

- **14 Cities:** Kennewick, Kent, Lynnwood, Marysville, Mountlake Terrace, Prosser, Raymond, Selah, Snoqualmie, Sumas, Anonymous Cities F, G, J and R.
- **5 Counties:** Chelan County, Grant County, Spokane County, Thurston County and Walla Walla County.

Measured sign retroreflectivity: 10 agencies

- **7 Cities:** Battle Ground, Prosser, Spokane, Sumner, Anonymous Cities A, B and Q.
- **3 Counties:** Grant County, King County and Pierce County.

Blanket Replacement: 9 agencies

- **7 Cities:** Kent, Prosser, Selah, Snoqualmie, Tieton, Anonymous Cities R and V.
- **2 Counties:** Douglas County and Grant County.

Other methods: 2 agencies

- **1 City:** City of Lynnwood.
- **1 County:** Clallam County.

Combination of Methods: 14 agencies

- **11 Cities:** Aberdeen, Deer Park, George, Oakville, Raymond, Richland, Selah, Tumwater, Anonymous Cities E, N and W.
- **3 Counties:** Clallam County, Grant County and Grays Harbor County.

Don't know yet: 21 agencies

- **21 Cities:** Bremerton, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Goldendale, Kalama, Nespelam, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Tekoa, Waitsburg, Wenatchee, Woodland, Anonymous Cities I, L, M, O, P, S, T, U and W.

**8) If your answer to number 7 was "other methods" or "combination of methods", please describe these methods.**

- We would like to use a retro-reflectometer along with the night time inspections for comparisons and control data. (Aberdeen)
- Expected sign life and visual nighttime inspection. (Deer Park)
- Sign post replacement during sign work for maintenance, all non reflective signs are replaced. (Oakville)
- Inspection by Public Works personnel. (Raymond)
- Historically we did night time inspections but in 2011 we plan to purchase a retro-reflectometer. (Tumwater)
- We plan on using expected life, adjusted for actual performance of samples, field control signs. (Anonymous City E)
- When a sign is found to be of compromised quality, the sign will be replaced. Inspection methods include- daytime inspections while performing sign cleaning/straightening, night inspections during call-out activities and notification by inter-agency communication. (Clallam County)
- Measured retroreflectivity, expected sign life and blanket replacement. (Grant County)

**9) How many signs does your agency manage?**

- 0-200. (Cosmopolis, George, Harrah, Kalama, Raymond, Tieton and Anonymous City C)
- 200-500. (Clarkston, Deer Park, Oakville, Tekoa, Anonymous City R and W)
- 1,500-2,000. (Battle Ground, Enumclaw, Snoqualmie, Anonymous Cities A, D, O)
- 2,500-3,000. (Mountlake Terrace, Sumner, Anonymous City F and Walla Walla County)
- 4,000-5,000. (Tumwater, Walla Walla and Douglas County)
- 7,000-10,000. (Bremerton, Anonymous City B, Chelan County and Grant County)
- 10,000-12,000. (Federal Way, Kennewick, Marysville, Wenatchee and Grays Harbor County)

- 12,000-20,000. ( Kent, Clallam County, Skagit County, Thurston County and Anonymous County A)
- 20,000-30,000. (Yakima, Anonymous City E and Pierce County)
- 30,000-40,000. (King County and Spokane County)
- 83,563. (Spokane)
- Unknown: 20 agencies  
**20 Cities:** (Aberdeen, Goldendale, Lynnwood, Nespelem, Prosser, Richland, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Sumas, Waitsburg, Woodland, Anonymous Cities G, H, L, P, Q, S, Y, U and V)

**10) Will your agency be able to meet the two deadlines to replace signs that do not meet minimum retroreflectivity levels (January 22, 2015 and January 22, 2018)?**

Yes: 42 agencies

- **32 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Deer Park, Federal Way, George, Harrah, Kennewick, Kent, Lynnwood, Nespelem, Oakville, Raymond, Richland, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Sumas, Sumner, Tieton, Waitsburg, Walla Walla, Yakima, Anonymous Cities A, B, D, G, H, L, N, Q and V.
- **10 Counties:** Chelan County, Douglas County, Grant County, Grays Harbor County, King County, Pierce County, Skagit County, Thurston County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

No: 24 agencies

- **22 Cities:** Bremerton, Enumclaw, Goldendale, Kalama, Mountlake Terrace, Prosser, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Tekoa, Wenatchee, Woodland, Anonymous Cities C, I, J, K, M, O, P, R, S, U and W.
- **2 Counties:** Clallam County and Spokane County.

**11) What percent of existing signs within your jurisdiction will need to be replaced to meet the minimum retroreflectivity requirements by MUTCD's phase-in compliance dates? Please also add any comments you may have.**

- Minimal. (Anonymous City A)
- 0%-5%. (Raymond, Richland, Anonymous Cities D, Q, Grays Harbor and Anonymous County A)
- 5%-10%. (Tieton, Yakima and Douglas County)
- 10-15%. We have had a pretty good program and have used the best materials for many years. (Kennewick)
- 15%-25%. (George, Oakville, Sumner and Anonymous City J)
- We identified about 25% of our total sign inventory, all street name signs that did not meet the requirements. We have replaced about half of these to date. (Pierce County)
- 25% Regulatory, 80% Warning and 0 Street Identification due to blanket replacement from 2005 – 2008. (Anonymous City N)
- 25%-30%. (Walla Walla and Anonymous City F)
- 30% yellow/black- 40% orange/black 15% red/white 80% green/white.

- (Clallam County)
- Less than 35%. (Grant County)
- 40%. (Anonymous Cities B and W)
- 50%. (Anonymous City K, Chelan County and Thurston County)
  
- More than 50%. But this will be an expense that will put a strain on our budget. (Anonymous City C)
- 60%. (Deer Park)
- 70%. (Clarkston, Snoqualmie and Spokane)
- 75%. (Bremerton, Mountlake Terrace and Anonymous City U)
  
- 80%-90%. (Cosmopolis, Prosser and Anonymous City P)
- 95%-100%. (Waitsburg and Anonymous City R)
- All. (Anonymous City O)
- Unknown at this time. (Aberdeen, Enumclaw, Goldendale, Kalama, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Spokane, Sumas, Tekoa, Tumwater, Wenatchee, Woodland, Anonymous Cities E, H, I and L)
- With cities struggling to meet budgets especially in this area, sign upgrades are going to be difficult. (Anonymous City S)
  
- We are in the process of inspecting our sign inventory to determine the percentage. (Kent)
- Not sure: We have actively replaced signs that are visually out of compliance for the past few years. (Lynnwood)
- Wish you had a 'questionable' option. We are committed to meet the deadlines, but realistically both staffing and budget could be too tight to assure compliance. Budgets revenues are still down. The city had some layoffs, but not in signing. General funds and staff are limited. (Marysville)
- We should have all new signs installed by compliance dates. (Anonymous City V)
- They all meet retroreflectivity requirements now. (Harrah and Skagit County)

**12) Has your agency estimated the cost for meeting the compliance requirements that are above and beyond your original/planned sign maintenance activities?**

Yes: 11 Agencies

- **7 Cities:** Kent, Mountlake Terrace, Oakville, Walla Walla, Anonymous Cities B, E and J.
- **4 Counties:** Clallam County, Grant County, Pierce County and Thurston County.

No: 54 Agencies

- **46 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Bremerton, Cosmopolis, Deer Park, Enumclaw, Federal Way, George, Goldendale, Harrah, Kalama, Nespalem, Prosser, Raymond, Richland, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Sumas, Sumner, Tieton, Tumwater, Waitsburg, Wenatchee, Woodland, Yakima, Anonymous Cities A, C, D, F, G, H, I, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and W.
- **8 Counties:** Clallam County, Douglas County, Grays Harbor County, King County, Skagit County, Spokane County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

We don't know yet: 5 Agencies

- **5 Cities:** Clarkston, Lynnwood, Marysville, Tekoa and Anonymous City K.

**13) What are these costs and what are they based on?**

On time capital cost: 8 agencies

- \$7,020. (Cosmopolis)
- \$12,000. (Clarkston)
- \$30,000. (Anonymous City B)
- \$35,000. Based on 1,300 signs. (Enumclaw)
- \$50,000. (Anonymous City J)
  
- \$180,000. (Prosser)
- \$200,000. Based on replacing 50% of our signs @ \$50 each. (Chelan County)
- \$700,000. 8000 signs x \$85/replacement - this is probably a low end cost but is based upon our average cost per unit in inventory. (Thurston County)

Annual cost: 14 agencies

- \$350. (Oakville)
- \$2,000. Initial annual expenditure. (Anonymous City R)
- \$2,500. (Walla Walla)
- \$3,000. (Clarkston)
- \$6,500. (Douglas County)
  
- \$15,000. Assessment of labor. (Enumclaw)
- \$17,000. (Anonymous City J)
- \$30,000. (Mountlake Terrace)
- \$50,000. Labor and materials. (Chelan County)
- \$60,000. (Prosser)
  
- \$100,000. 1200 signs x \$85/replacement - this is probably a low end cost but is based upon our average cost per unit in inventory. (Thurston County)
- \$200,000. (Kent)
- \$300,000. Meeting requirements by 2018. (Anonymous City E)
- 15-20%. Higher sheeting cost. (Grant County)

Other costs: Agencies: 3 agencies

- Increased amounts of funding as deadlines approach. (Anonymous City R)
- \$80,000. Asset Management System. (Thurston County)
- \$150,000. Replacement of sign posts etc. (Enumclaw)

Unknown at this time: 4 agencies

- (Marysville, Anonymous Cities A, U and V)

**14) When did or when does your agency intend to begin making necessary changes to meet retroreflectivity requirements?**

- Finished. (Raymond)
- We currently have a program in place. (Bremerton, Federal Way, Kennewick, Kent, Marysville, Yakima, Anonymous Cities E, G, J, V and Skagit County)
- We are currently and have been in an active program to replace non-reflective signs with High Intensity Prismatic signs. (Chelan County)
- We are already buying the better reflective signs when we install new ones. (Sumas, Snoqualmie, Sedro-Woolley, Tieton, Anonymous Cities R and W)
- We continue to replace signs as needed and will increase the replacement the next two years as long as we have the personnel and funding to accelerate the process. (Aberdeen)
  
- Replacement as needed. (Anonymous City I)
- Already in our building code by reference. (Anonymous City P)
- We started checking night time reflectivity annually 10 years ago. (Anonymous City D and Walla Walla County)
- 2002. 1) We adopted higher sheeting requirements for warning signs 2) 2006 we adopted higher sheeting requirements for regulatory signs 3) 2011 We will adopt new sheeting requirements and design for street signs 4) 2007, 2010 - used grants to upgrade many warning and regulatory signs to improve reflectivity. (Thurston County)
- We started using higher grade sheeting in 2003 on regulatory signs and have increased that to all signs in 2007. (Anonymous City F)
  
- 2005. (Clarkston and Douglas County)
- During the last 5 years the program has been in effect. Not because of regulation but because it's the safe thing to do. (Oakville)
- 2007. (Mountlake Terrace and Anonymous City B)
- All new signs purchased and installed as of 2008 meet minimum requirements. We have not started comprehensive replacement. (Spokane County)
- 2008. (Spokane, Sumner, Grant County and Pierce County)
- Started in 2008/2009 by replacing STOP signs throughout the city with new signs meeting standards. Also signage projects coupled with street projects have met standards. (Deer Park)
  
- 2009. (Prosser and Tumwater)
- Mid- 2010. We invested in up-to-date sign shop inc. computer, plotter, press roller, streamlined shop inventory etc. (Clallam County)
- We replaced some signs in 2010 nothing is in the budget for 2011. (Anonymous City S)
- 2010. (Richland and Walla Walla)
- The new program, meeting the sign retroreflectivity requirements will commence this next fall/winter. (Grays Harbor County)
- 2011. (Wenatchee, Anonymous Cities A and C)
- 2012-2015. (Cosmopolis)

- 2013. ( Battle Ground)
- 2014. (Waitsburg)
- When it becomes mandated by state law for local agencies. (Enumclaw)
- Following our assessment. (Anonymous City U)
- Slowly. (Anonymous City O)
- We are monitoring the Federal Compliance dates to see if they will change. (King County)
- We don't know. (Kalama, Selah and Tekoa)

**15) What steps has your agency accomplished so that signs meet minimum retroreflectivity requirements by MUTCD's phase in compliance dates? Feel free to discuss training, building a sign management or assessment program, changing out a certain percentage of signs, etc.**

Training

- Staff has attended Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) training. A Geographic Information System (GIS) database has been produced and maintained which included a Global Positioning System (GPS) of recently acquired Urban Growth Area (UGA). Staff person was added, but the addition was delayed a year by the economy, which may have us behind that time frame in meeting compliance. We are about to take possession of a new dedicated sign service vehicle. (Marysville)
- We have attended training with the International Municipal Signal Association (IMSA), Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Washington State University (WSU), decided on a night time visual assessment program and made changing out regulatory signs a priority. (Anonymous City D)
- We are in the process of creating a tiered training program for employees that may work w/signage. This includes for now, 1 highly trained (IMSA, WSDOT, Traffic Solutions, FHWA programs) 1 intermediate and 8-10 alternate base trained (in house). We are investigating methods of updating our in-place inventory system in order to track age, orientation and exposure of signs. We are phasing out our existing in shop inventory of Engineering Grade signage in order to ultimately be all High Intensity Prismatic. (Clallam County)
- In 2009 we participated in American Public Works Association (APWA) web training and began to collect asset information such as sign location and condition. In 2010 we continued to collect asset information and in 2011 we hope to be done collecting asset info and start measuring sign retroreflectivity. (Tumwater)
- Training, all replacement signs meet new standards, certain types of whole sale change outs, purchased a retroreflectometer, managing dates of in-service versus manufacturers expected life. (Grant County)
- We have trained staff and are inspecting our inventory. (King County)

Developed a sign inventory

- We have developed a sign inventory data base. (Sumner)
- We have put together an inventory system and have done nighttime inspections. (Anonymous City G)
- Initial Inventory done - no assessment efforts yet. (Enumclaw)

- We did a full sign inventory in 2009 and noted what type of sheeting each sign had; we then noted all of the type one engineer grade signs and prioritized their replacement. We will then move to the regulatory signs that are type 1. (Anonymous City N)
- Updating our current inventory, training personnel on our sign management and replacement process. (Kent)
- Sign inventory, annual nighttime reflectivity tests, replace knocked down signs and signs not meeting reflectivity with high intensity prismatic sign faces as needed. (Anonymous City B)
- All signs are tracked using a central GPS inventory database. Records are available for each sign back to 2002. Traffic division personnel have been asked to report within the first quarter of 2010. (Lynnwood)
- Recognize the need for an upgraded sign database. (Wenatchee)
- We have begun confirming that our sign inventory list is accurate. Shortly we hope to purchase the device that measures the retroreflectivity level so that we can begin identifying which signs will need to be replaced. All engineering standards have been changed to include the most recent edition of the MUTCD. (Battle Ground)
- We are in the process of building our sign management and then plan to get our set of control signs in place. Our inventory software will allow us to search installation dates on signs, giving us an idea of which to check first for compliance. (Kennewick)

#### Assessment or management program

- We have used our retroreflectivity program as a base/foundation for an asset management program. We have been able to get much more life from some of our signs because they meet the requirements. The money that we are saving by not replacing signs that we would have normally replaced is being used to fund the street sign replacement program. We have replaced over 3,000 of the 6,000 identified street name signs. We should have this change out completed by 2014. (Pierce County)
- See answer to 14. 2) 2010 - we selected a new asset management system for signs and other public works assets. 3) 2009/2010 scheduled webinars for staff; discussed in staff meetings. 4) Replace about 1200 signs a year. (Thurston County)
- We will complete a survey in 2010 and incorporate in our sign management program. (Sedro-Woolley)
- Building a sign management and assessment program. (Anonymous City A)
- Setting up replacement management and inventory program. (Anonymous City R)
- We have had a management method in place for a number of years. We are continuing to improve it. The hard part is coming up with enough staff and money in this economy. (Anonymous City J)

#### Visual inspection

- We do night inspections as well as changing out as many as we can with dollars in budget. As well as making our own signs. (Douglas County)
- Visual inspection by Public Works personnel. (Raymond)
- We now do night time inspections, use a maintenance log and will pursue an assessment program this coming year. (Aberdeen)

## Sign replacement

- Changing out old signs. (Clarkston)
- Changing out signs, by group and by age. (Spokane)
- Our plan is to change signs out per year based on our annual cost. (Anonymous City V)
- Changing out signs as needed and extra signs as funds allowed. (Tieton)
- Change out signs when needed. We have paper documentation and use Mobility through the County Road Administration Board (CRAB). (Walla Walla County)
- Continuing with existing sign replacement. (Deer Park and Federal Way)
- We have been upgrading signs to meet the new requirements since they were published. We have been doing some neighborhood wide replacements in conjunction with an anti-vandalism campaign. We also have been doing periodic night time inspections to find signs that have lost reflectivity. (Yakima)
  
- Replaced stop, yield, and school signs. Building sign inventory for other sign types. Budgeted for initial replacements. (Anonymous City E)
- Changing out a certain percentage of signs. (Anonymous City W)
- By changing out 15% per year. (Walla Walla)
- About 25% of our street name signs meet the retroreflectivity requirement. All new signs installed since 2007 meet the new requirements. (Mountlake Terrace)
- Our agency has changed out over 97% of engineer gauge sheeting and have been using DG3 3M reflective sheeting and EC vinyl for about 15 years. (Richland)

## Other

- Started with stop signs. (Anonymous City O)
- We began only purchasing High Intensity sheeting on all regulatory signs back in 2003 and all warning signs in 2007. (Anonymous City F)
- An account of all signs managed, and all signs needing replaced. And we have begun using the sign retroreflectivity toolkit. (Anonymous City C)
- We have discussed the need to replace signs however because of staffing needs, not much has been accomplished. (Anonymous City S)
- Require that all new signs be Diamond Grade sheeting. (Snoqualmie)
- All signs that we are and have been replacing for the last three years meet or exceed minimum requirements. (Chelan County)
- All new and replacement signs are in compliance. (Bremerton)
- No steps necessary, our program is already in place. (Skagit County)
- None. (Goldendale, Selah, Tekoa, Waitsburg, Woodland and Anonymous City U)

**16) This question is for agencies that have started changing out signs to ones that meet the minimum retroreflectivity requirements. What percent of signs that need to be replaced have been replaced so far?**

- 1%. (Anonymous City O)
- 5%. (Sumner and Anonymous Cities G and W)
- 10%. (Bremerton, Cosmopolis, Federal Way, Snoqualmie and Anonymous Cities J, N)

- 15%. (Walla Walla, Anonymous City E and Clallam County)
- 18%. (Mountlake Terrace)
- 20%. (Yakima)
- 25%. (Raymond)
- 30%. (Clarkston and Anonymous City V)
- 40%. (Deer Park)
- 50%. (Enumclaw, Grant County and Pierce County)
- 60%. (Anonymous City B)
- 70%. (Anonymous City F)
- 80%. (Oakville and Douglas County)
- 85%. (Tieton)
- 90%. (Anonymous City D)
- 97%. (Richland)
- 100%. (Harrah and Anonymous County A)
- Unknown at this time. (Aberdeen, Goldendale, Kennewick, Lynnwood, Sedro-Woolley, Spokane, Wenatchee, Anonymous City A and Walla Walla County)

**17) What does your agency still need to accomplish to meet the minimum retroreflectivity requirements by MUTCD's phase-in compliance dates? Select all answers that apply.**

Build a sign management or assessment program: 36 Agencies

- **33 Cities:** Aberdeen, Bremerton, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Enumclaw, George, Kalama, Kennewick, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Nespalem, Prosser, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Sumas, Tieton, Tumwater, Wenatchee, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, C, E, H, I, K, L, M, P, S, U and W.
- **3 Counties:** Clallam County, Grays Harbor County and Spokane County.

Establish a sign inventory: 33 Agencies

- **32 Cities:** Aberdeen, Bremerton, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, George, Kalama, Kennewick, Mountlake Terrace, Nespalem, Prosser, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Sumas, Tekoa, Tieton, Tumwater, Wenatchee, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, D, E, H, I, J, K, L, M, O, P, R, S and V.
- **1 County:** Spokane County.

Sign inspection: 38 Agencies

- **35 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Bremerton, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Enumclaw, Goldendale, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Nespalem, Prosser, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Spokane, Sumas, Sumner, Tekoa, Tumwater, Waitsburg, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, D, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, N, P, R, S, U and W.
- **3 Counties:** Clallam County, Grays Harbor County and King County.

Purchase inspection equipment: 18 Agencies

- **17 Cities:** Battle Ground, Bremerton, Clarkston, Enumclaw, Kalama, Sumner, Tumwater, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, H, I, K, N, P, R, S and W.
- **1 County:** Walla Walla County.

Purchase sign management software: 20 Agencies

- **19 Cities:** Aberdeen, Cosmopolis, Enumclaw, Goldendale, Kalama, Kent, Prosser, Richland, Sedro-Woolley, Snoqualmie, Woodland, Yakima, Anonymous Cities C, D, H, I, K, L and W.
- **1 County:** Thurston County.

Training: 34 Agencies

- **29 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Bremerton, Clarkston, Enumclaw, George, Kalama, Kent, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Prosser, Sedro Woolley, Selah, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Sumas, Tieton, Tumwater, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, C, G, H, I, K, M, S, U and W.
- **5 Counties:** Clallam County, Grays Harbor County, King County, Spokane County and Thurston County.

Hire one or more staff members: 13 Agencies

- **13 Cities:** Aberdeen, Bremerton, Enumclaw, Mountlake Terrace, Spokane, Woodland, Yakima, Anonymous Cities E, F, J, K, L and S.

Ask another local agency for assistance: 8 Agencies

- **8 Cities:** Aberdeen, Bremerton, Kalama, Selah, Woodland, Anonymous Cities H, L and S.

Ask Washington State Department of Transportation for assistance: 16 Agencies

- **14 Cities:** Aberdeen, Bremerton, Enumclaw, Kalama, Kennewick, Kent, Snoqualmie, Tekoa, Woodland, Anonymous Cities H, L, M, R and S.
- **2 Counties:** Clallam County and Grays Harbor County.

Ask Federal Highway Administration for assistance: 11 Agencies

- **10 Cities:** Aberdeen, Bremerton, Kalama, Kent, Snoqualmie, Woodland, Anonymous Cities H, L, R and S.
- **1 County:** Clallam County.

Funding: 44 Agencies

- **38 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Bremerton, Cosmopolis, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Kalama, Kennewick, Lynnwood, Marysville, Mountlake Terrace, Prosser, Selah, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Sumas, Sumner, Tekoa, Waitsburg, Walla Walla, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, C, E, F, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, R, S, U and W.
- **6 Counties:** Chelan County, Clallam County, Douglas County, King County, Spokane County and Thurston County.

Still need to learn more about the requirements: 13 Agencies

- **13 Cities:** Clarkston, Goldendale, Kalama, Nespalem, Selah, Snoqualmie, Sumas, Tekoa, Waitsburg, Anonymous Cities A, C, I and S.

We don't know yet: 5 Agencies

- **4 Cities:** Goldendale, Selah, Tekoa and Anonymous City S.
- **1 County:** Grant County.

Nothing. We're Ready: 8 Agencies

- **5 Cities:** Deer Park, Oakville, Raymond, Anonymous Cities B and Q.
- **3 Counties:** Pierce County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

Other: 2 Agencies

- **1 City:** Marysville.
- **1 County:** Clallam County

**18) Did your agency attend the 5-hour Traffic Sign Retroreflectivity Measurement and Management class in November 2010? The class was sponsored by WSDOT Highways and Local Programs and the Federal Highway Administration.**

Yes: 23 Agencies

- **16 Cities:** Aberdeen, Enumclaw, Kennewick, Kent, Marysville, Richland, Spokane, Wenatchee, Yakima, Anonymous Cities A, D, E, J, N, P and V.
- **7 Counties:** Chelan County, Douglas County, Grays Harbor County, King County, Pierce County, Thurston County and Anonymous County A.

No: 44 Agencies

- **40 Cities:** Bremerton, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Deer Park, Federal Way, George, Goldendale, Harrah, Kalama, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Nespalem, Oakville, Prosser, Raymond, Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Snoqualmie, Sumas, Sumner, Tekoa, Tieton, Tumwater, Waitsburg, Walla Walla, Woodland, Anonymous Cities B, C, F, G, H, I, M, O, Q, R, S, T, U and W.
- **4 Counties:** Clallam County, Grant County, Skagit County and Walla Walla County.

We don't know: 4 Agencies

- **3 Cities:** Battle Ground, Anonymous Cities K and L.
- **1 County:** Spokane County.

**19) If your agency did not attend the class noted in question 18, would your agency be interested in attending our next class?**

Yes: 44 Agencies

- **36 Cities:** Battle Ground, Bremerton, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Deer Park, George, Goldendale, Kalama, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Nespalem, Prosser,

Sedro-Woolley, Selah, Snoqualmie, Sumas, Sumner, Tekoa, Tieton, Tumwater, Waitsburg, Walla Walla, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, B, C, G, H, I, K, O, P, S, T, U and W.

- **8 Counties:** Clallam County, Douglas County, Grant County, King County, Skagit County, Spokane County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

No: 4 Agencies

- **4 Cities:** Federal Way, Oakville, Raymond and Anonymous City Q.

We don't know: 5 Agencies

- **5 Cities:** Harrah, Anonymous Cities F, L, M and R.

**20) If your agency's staff needed training or your agency has identified that staff needs training, where did you/do you plan to get this training?**

- Webinars, local training through WSDOT, WCIA, Association of Washington Cities (AWC), etc. (Anonymous City B)
- On the internet. (Anonymous Cities G and R)
- Peers; FHWA; WSDOT. (Aberdeen, Snoqualmie, Spokane, Tieton, Walla Walla, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, E, Grant County, King County and Spokane County)
- IMSA, LTAP, Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) and APWA .(Tumwater, Wenatchee and Yakima)
- Yes. But we have not found much in the way of training in regards to signing and reflectivity. Note: Our operations/maintenance staffs are trained/certified from ISMA for signs/markings but generally we believe a more robust statewide effort is needed for traffic operations/maintenance staff and their supporting engineer's/technicians. If this is so important, why are there not more regular training opportunities in Washington? (Thurston County)
- We went to the LTAP training in Spokane Wash. Nov 16 2010. (Clallam County, Douglas County and King County)
- MUTCD. (Clarkston and Anonymous City O)
- We attended an Urban Traffic Engineers Council (UTEC) meeting not long ago featuring a speaker who outlined and explained the topic in summary detail. More training from WSDOT Highways and Local Programs (H&LP) will be helpful. (Lynnwood)
- Pierce County has an excellent system and is always willing to help our agency. (Anonymous City N)
- More training would be sought and needed. (Deer Park)
- Always could use training. (Walla Walla County)
- We're hoping a class will be held nearby. We were not aware of the new mandates. (Tekoa)
- At this time those needing training have been trained but we would look at any additional training as provided and needed, especially if it's a new class. (Kennewick)

- This may be in-house training to use existing software. (Aberdeen, Mountlake Terrace and Grays Harbor County)
- Not sure. (Battle Ground, Bremerton, Kalama, Anonymous Cities F, I and S)

**21) What funding sources does your agency use or what sources will your agency pursue to meet the new requirements? Select all answers that apply.**

No new funding sources: 20 Agencies

- **17 Cities:** Bremerton, Enumclaw, George, Kalama, Kent, Maysville, Prosser, Richland, Snoqualmie, Sumner, Tieton, Walla Walla, Anonymous Cities D, E, I, V and W.
- **3 Counties:** Clallam County, Pierce County and Thurston County.

County road funds or street use funds: 29 Agencies

- **18 Cities:** Deer Park, Harrah, Mountlake Terrace, Oakville, Sedro-Woolley, Spokane, Sumas, Tekoa, Waitsburg, Woodland, Anonymous Cities B, E, G, H, I, L, P and R.
- **11 Counties:** Chelan County, Clallam County, Douglas County, Grant County, Grays Harbor County, King County, Skagit County, Spokane County, Thurston County, Walla Walla County and Anonymous County A.

Local improvement district: No Agencies

Issue bonds: 1 Agency

- **1 City:** Yakima.

Special appropriations from council: 8 Agencies

- **8 Cities:** Cosmopolis, Deer Park, Kennewick, Kent, Mountlake Terrace, Yakima and Anonymous Cities H and R.

Grants: 17 Agencies

- **11 Cities:** Kennewick, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Snoqualmie, Waitsburg, Woodland, Yakima, Anonymous Cities E, H, R and W.
- **6 Counties:** Chelan County, Clallam County, Grant County, Spokane County, Thurston County and Anonymous County A.

This has not yet been determined: 26 Agencies

- **25 Cities:** Aberdeen, Battle Ground, Bremerton, Clarkston, Cosmopolis, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Lynnwood, Nespalem, Selah, Tumwater, Wenatchee, Woodland, Anonymous Cities A, C, E, J, K, M, N, O, R, S, T and U.
- **1 County:** Clallam County.

Other: 5 Agencies

- **3 Cities.** Raymond, Snoqualmie and Anonymous City Q.
- **2 Counties.** Douglas County and King County.

**22) Please explain and provide more detail for your answer to question 21 above.**

No new funding source

- The Street Fund is funded out of the General Fund so it has to compete with Public Safety, Parks and Administration for the limited dollars in that fund. Funding for this will take a few years by reallocating a percentage of signs each year until we are in compliance. (Snoqualmie)
- Budget funds. (Raymond)
- We have a sign replacement budget between three and four thousand dollars a year. (Clarkston)
- We will use our budget process to achieve the funding needed. If not approved as part of the budget, we'll have to get special appropriations from council. (Kent)
- We will have to meet compliance using our existing funding. This means that other areas of maintenance (pavement markings) will be neglected. (Spokane)
  
- Sign maintenance is funded by the general fund. There are no additional funds in the general fund for sign replacement. (Sumner)
- We used our existing signing fund over the last two years to update signs. (Tieton)
- We hope that our annual budget will be able to absorb the cost. (Tumwater)
- We added \$2,500.00 to our budget each year. (Walla Walla)
- We will be building funding in to future budgets. (Anonymous City A)
  
- Any funding will come out of current operating funds. (Anonymous City D)
- We are using our annual sign amount to purchase new signs. (Anonymous City V)
- We started this early enough to keep a certain amount of sign replacement in budget. (Douglas County)
- We have a sign budget and we will change out any sign that needs to be changed.
- We do not anticipate large impact to annual budget. (Grays Harbor County)
  
- We use our current budget allocation (which is not increasing). We also have and will continue to use state/federal grants to supplement county funds for sign upgrades. (Thurston County)
- Our road fund has been hit hard by these new requirements. 25% of one districts asphalt maintenance budget was redirected to the signage budget. (Clallam County)
- We have not asked for additional funding to comply with the new standards. (Pierce County)
- We will have to meet compliance using our existing funding. This means that other areas of maintenance (pavement markings) will be neglected. (Spokane)

County road funds or street use funds

- We use our local street funds to purchase replacement signs when needed. (Harrah, Selah, Tekoa and Anonymous City B)
- Funds received through tax authority to street fund and general fund appropriations from the City Council. (Deer Park)
- Our program is budgeted through the County Road Fund. (Skagit County)
- Street funds are for streets. (Oakville)

#### Local improvement district

- No Agencies

#### Special appropriations from council

- We will look to the city council to provide the funding level but will seek any grants that may be available. The city may put a street maintenance bond to vote that could include sign replacement. (Yakima)
- We will have to put a cost estimate together and seek additional funding from the city council in our next budget. If the economy picks up in the next couple of years, it would be cost effective to purchase some kind of reflectometer. (Anonymous City N)

#### Grants

- We will be looking into grant funding sources. (Aberdeen, Kennewick, Lynnwood and Clallam County)
- Some signs will be replaced as part of safety grants, if no other funding is available, we would need to determine how many signs can be replaced per year and not be a drain on the annual road/maintenance budget. (Spokane County)
- If grants are available, we will apply for them and hope for the best. The Legislature should treat this similar to the Storm Water funding program and provide financial support to the cities if they are going to make this a mandate. Street funding is at an all time low in order to support police and fire services. This makes it even harder for us. (Battle Ground)
- We cannot fully fund without grants. We are including projects in the Transportation Improvement Plan, but there is no guarantee that funds will not be re-appropriated. (Anonymous City E)
- We have a safety grant that addresses horizontal curve signing. All replacement signs will meet standards. Signing is a major function of our county road responsibilities so road funds are used. (Grant County)
- The city will appropriate funding during the annual budget cycle and will seek out grants if available. (Waitsburg)

#### This has not yet been determined

- We have not yet assessed the entire system and thus cannot estimate funding needs. (Wenatchee)

#### Other

- We will pursue all funding options as we become aware of them. Utilizing street use funds will reduce funds available for other street projects. Special appropriations from council are likely only for capital projects. (Mountlake Terrace)
- Sign maintenance is funded by the general fund. There are no additional funds in the general fund for sign replacement. (Sumner)
- We used our existing signing fund over the last two years to update signs. (Tieton)
- We hope that our annual budget will be able to absorb the cost. (Tumwater)
- We added \$2,500.00 to our budget each year. (Walla Walla)
- Will be building funding into future budgets. (Anonymous City A)

- Right now we have limited funding available for labor and materials for sign maintenance. (Anonymous City F)
- Funding for both inspection and maintenance is a big issue, as is the liability associated with these new standards. (King County)
- This will definitely cut into our budget at a time when funds are difficult to acquire. (Anonymous City G)
- We have been told that there may be some federal funds available, but it's very competitive and it's not likely we would receive any. (Anonymous City J)
- Our maintenance budget is already 15% funded with one-time funding, so increases are not likely. (Federal Way)
- Given the current state of the economy and the significant reduction in tax revenues, the City's priorities need to be established. Replacing signs isn't high on the list. (Anonymous City U)
- We are not even capable of providing minimum maintenance to our residential streets. Repair of bad streets should have safety priority for our minimal street dollars. (Kalama)
- There is no funding available. (Bremerton, Cosmopolis, Enumclaw, Goldendale, Marysville, Woodland and Anonymous City S )

**23) What comments or questions do you have?**

- Where do we acquire funding source information? (Aberdeen)
- Funding is our biggest issue. (Mountlake Terrace and Spokane)
- What aid funding is available from WSDOT and FHWA for the actual inspection and replacement? (King County)
- Will the Federal Government or State Government provide financial support to assist the cities in meeting this mandate? With the lack of street funding we are dealing with right now, our inability to properly fund our pavement maintenance program will be challenging enough. Taking the limited funds we have now away from our pavement program in order to replace what seems like perfectly good signs just to meet some reflectivity level is unfortunate to say the least. (Battle Ground)
- Everything is based on revenues, if the economy does not pick up, something will have to give. (Anonymous City N)
- There should be a population threshold before entities have to comply as it is harder to implement in a small city where funds are limited. (Waitsburg)
- In the current economic climate, with lay-offs, furloughs and budget cuts it is reasonable to expect that without "specific" signage funding these requirements may not be addressed in the manner intended by the FHWA. (Clallam County)
- This looks like an unfunded mandate. We agree that we need to have the safest streets that we can have however since there is no funding that comes with the new mandated codes it may not get put in the budget for quite some time. (Anonymous City S)
- With a reduced work force and limited funding it will be very difficult to meet all of these mandates. (Anonymous City F)

- We feel the requirements should apply only to replacements over a larger period of time for compliance targets. Also, the Street Sign 6" letter requirement is completely unreasonable for low volume city local streets with 25 mph. (Enumclaw)
- The issue is the incremental cost difference with the increased sign sizes, and having to relocate them if there isn't enough room to keep them in the same location. (Federal Way)
- There's already a lot going on with replacing signs in Lynnwood that I'm not aware of; however, I am certain we do not yet have a plan for retroreflectivity compliance. (Lynnwood)
- Question 17 above, other. We probably need less than a full person and our GPS equipment has proved less than reliable contributing to data base upkeep and accuracy issues. (Marysville)
- Please set up a class and coordinate it with Local Programs. (Selah)
- It's our understanding that even if we have signs that do not meet the minimum retroreflectivity requirements, if we have a program in place to address the requirements than we are considered to be in compliance. (Tumwater)
- We think most agencies have already been performing night inspections including ours. Formalizing standards for retroreflectivity may increase an agencies risk for noncompliance. Many agencies may not currently have a comprehensive database of all their street signing and this needs to be in place prior to having the ability to comply with this standard. (Wenatchee)
- Most of our signs will be replaced ahead of the deadlines. We are more concerned with making sure we meet the deadline for regulatory and warning signs as there is a larger liability related to those installations. (Yakima)
- The compliance dates need to be pushed back. (Anonymous City J)
- Our agency is more worried about compliance dates for the elimination of street name signs with all caps. We, like many agencies, think that this unfunded mandate is useless and fruitless. (Anonymous City U)
- Now is not the time to force these requirements. (Anonymous City U)
- It seems that replacing all engineer grade signs is a waste, depending on the aspect of the sign some of our engineer grade signs are still reflective. (Chelan County)
- 1) The federal government should address the tort liability portion of this regulation. We have heard in webinars that they expect the court system to ensure compliance. It would seem to us that this is an inefficient/expensive way to ensure compliance.  
2) If sign maintenance/reflectivity is of such importance why are there not more regular training/certification programs in the state of Washington? We realize that ISMA provides training but we need something that occurs regularly, is designed for local officials in WA State, provides hands on training to staff and is provided annually to keep everyone up to date on regulations, technology, ideas, methods, etc. (Thurston County)
- What are the penalties for non-compliance? (Bremerton)
- Do we have to use a retroreflectivity device? (Clarkston)
- Help. (Kalama)
- Repeal this new law immediately. (Goldendale)

## 24) How would pushing out the compliance dates affect your answers to this survey?

- We are not looking to postpone the need to meet the requirements. But we realize that costs can be amortized over a greater time period if an extension is granted, which would be beneficial to general fund budgets. (Aberdeen)
- Unless we can put in place some sort of dedicated funding source to properly fund our street maintenance program, pushing out the compliance date will unlikely solve the problem. Someone needs to put in place a way to fund our streets. (Battle Ground)
- This would help us considerably. We simply do not have the funding necessary to complete this project. Several other cities are probably in the same situation. (Cosmopolis)
- It would be very helpful; another 5-10 years would help to cycle out the old signs. (Enumclaw)
- The longer the better. (Federal Way)
  
- It would really help us. (Kalama)
- We are striving to meet the dates as they are currently set, so pushing them out would probably not have much effect on us at this time. (Kennewick)
- I believe that Lynnwood would recognize that it would be good to adjust our existing sign replacement program regardless of having more time. (Lynnwood)
- It would increase the probability of on time compliance. (Marysville)
- We would have a higher percentage of signs in compliance based on more time to acquire funding. (Mountlake Terrace)
  
- If compliance could be staggered with stops signs first then other regulatory signs. (Selah)
- A longer period of time means that the cost could be spread out over a longer time. (Snoqualmie)
- Pushing it out would help out our funding issue. (Sumner)
- It would help us come up with funds and a plan for this mandate. (Tekoa)
- It would give us more time to phase in the replacements rather than changing them all out at once. (Waitsburg)
  
- It would only prolong the process. (Wenatchee)
- It would allow for legislative action to have the federal government pay for this mandate. (Woodland)
- It would help a great deal. (Anonymous City A)
- We might spend less each year and finish completion at a later date. (Anonymous City B)
- It would give us more time to adjust the budget so it may absorb the sign replacement. (Anonymous City C)
  
- It would give us time to get up to speed. We really were unaware of this, what appears to be another un-funded mandate. (Anonymous City I)
- We would have more time to research funding and maybe have more staff. (Anonymous City J)
- It may be necessary due to the economy. (Anonymous City N)

- It would certainly ease the burden. However providing funding for program, materials and manpower would be better. (Anonymous City S)
- If this is a federal requirement, how about the feds paying? If not, either cancel the requirement or put it out 3- 5 years to allow cities to recover financially for the current economic downturn. (Anonymous City U)
  
- It would make it a little easier for small counties like ours to absorb the cost of sign replacement. (Chelan County)
- We are sure that would help, unless due to budget cuts etc., we would be putting off the inevitable. (Clallam County)
- It would stretch out the cost of compliance over more periods making it less costly for individual years. (Grant County)
- It would allow more time for funding, inspection and ultimately delay lawsuits associated with reflectivity issues. (King County)
- It would spread budget impact over more years. (Spokane County)
  
- If the compliance dates where pushed out it would provide more certainty for compliance. Funding and staffing are a major impediment to meeting these requirements. Unless the federal government provides direct funding to meet these deadlines then they should be modified. If the deadline was extended our annual expenses would go down and thus compliance could become more manageable financially and with available staffing. (Thurston County)
- It would help especially those entities that need more time. (Walla Walla County)
- Not much. (Clarkston, Deer Park, Goldendale, Lynnwood, Oakville, Raymond, Richland, Tieton, Tumwater, Walla Walla, Wenatchee, Yakima and Anonymous City D, G. V and Douglas County, Grays Harbor County and Skagit County)

**Notes about this survey:**

- 1) Some editorial rephrasing was done to achieve a consistent format and to compile the results of all agencies.
- 2) If you have any questions, please contact Washington State Department of Transportation Highways and Local Programs Division, Traffic Services Branch at (360) 705-7385 or [carrutd@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:carrutd@wsdot.wa.gov).