

APPROVED IN NCUTCD GENERAL SESSION ON JANUARY 20, 2006

**National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

Approved by NCUTCD Council January 20, 2006

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE : **Regulatory/Warning Sign TC**

DATE OF ACTION: 1-18-2006

REQUEST NUMBER

TOPIC: **Overhead Sign Lighting in Section 2A.08 Retroreflectivity and Illumination**

ORIGIN OF REQUEST: **Wisconsin DOT**

DISCUSSION:

Section 2A.08 of the 2003 MUTCD provides guidance that all overhead sign installations should be illuminated unless an engineering study shows that retroreflection will perform effectively without illumination.

Problem statement:

This language says that written documentation is needed (engineering study) if the practioner decides that illumination is not warranted. Overhead sign installations such as street name signs, lane use signs (R3-8 series) and other smaller sign installations generally would not warrant overhead lighting and may very well be impractical for structural reasons. Many overhead sign installations on conventional highways are on monotube structures, not adequate to support overhead lighting.

Freeway and Expressway

Freeway and Expressway overhead structures should have illumination unless an engineering study determines otherwise. This is consistent with the 2A.08 language in the manual.

Conventional Highways and Special Purpose roads

Overhead structures on these type of facilities generally would not have illuminated signs unless an engineering study or judgment saw a need to provide additional illumination for older drivers. While there is recognition that illumination of signs provides for increase

readability and conspicuity; the practical nature of conventional highway structures may preclude it.

Proposal

Change the language to read the same as it is now for expressways and freeways but soften the language for conventional highways and special purpose roadways to read “engineering judgment” rather than “engineering study”.

Note: January 6, 2005 Approved by Regulatory and Warning Sign Technical Committee for Transmittal to Sponsors for comments

RECOMMENDED WORDING:

It is recommended that **Section 2A.08 Retroreflectivity and Illumination** be revised as follows

Guidance:

~~All overhead sign installations should be illuminated unless an engineering study shows that retroreflection will perform effectively without illumination.~~

All overhead sign installations on freeways and expressways should be illuminated unless an engineering study indicates that retroreflection will perform effectively without illumination.

All overhead sign installations on conventional roads or special purpose roads should be illuminated unless engineering judgment indicates that retroreflection will perform effectively without illumination.

Option:

Sign elements may be illuminated by the means shown in Table 2A-1.

VOTE: For = Majority
Opposed = Roger Wentz
Abstentions = None