

STATE	Q1 - Are you adoptig the 2009 MUTCD and recent amendment as-is?	Q2 - Are you adopting the 2009 MUTCD with a supplement to modify 1A.09 and 1A.13:	Q3 - To what extent does your supplement change these sections?	Q4- What other options have you taken or will take that are acceptable to your Division?
AL	We have not adopted yet. Depends on FHWA's actions. We are more comfortable with the new proposed language but not satisfied.	We are preparing to adopt the 2009 with a short supplement. The supplement will be the language provided in the 2003 MUTCD, Section 1A.09 and portions of 1A.13, unless FHWA adopts these changes.		We anticipate Division acceptance of our supplement based on other states' approval. We are prepared to either adopt with our supplement or to adopt with FHWA's changes.
AK	No	We are modifying both.	1A.09: return to restore language from 2003 MUTCD; - 1A.09 first Guidance Paragrach; 1A.13; - eliminate final sentence of Item A ("definition" of Standard) in paragraph 01.	There are quite a number. However, not all are significant changes, nor do they weaken standard language. You can download our previous supplement at this link (http://www.dot.state.ak.us/stwddes/dcstraffic/atmintr01.shtml) to get a feeling for the sort of changes we're making.
AZ	No	Arizona is in the process of developing & approving a state-specific MUTCD supplement. In September we submitted our draft Supplement which is under review by our FHWA Division Office and county/local/municipal traffic engineers. We anticipate finalization & approval of the Supplement prior to the January 2012 deadline.	The scope of the Arizona Supplement is to revise MUTCD definitions that conflict with state statute (intersection, highway, etc.), to incorporate traffic control mandated by state statute (school crossings, photo enforcement, etc.) and to make minor modifications to Guidance, Support, and Option based on state practice. In Sections 1A.09 and 1A.13, ADOT proposes to revert to the 2003 & earlier definitions and applications of Standard and Guidance.	
AR	Arkansas also has an automatic MUTCD adoption procedure. Our Vehicle & Traffic Law references the "current MUTCD" within several statutes. As soon as the newest edition of the MUTCD is adopted through the Federal register, it automatically becomes law here. As such, Arkansas officially adopted the 2009 MUTCD on January 15, 2010.	We do not have a state supplement.		
CA	No, we haven't adopted National MUTCD 2009 yet but plan to do it between January 2 through 15, 2012. No, we do not plan to adopt this recent amendment as-is.	Yes	California MUTCD will modify Section 1A.13 by deleting the statement "Standard statements shall not be modified or compromised based on engineering judgment or engineering study." No modification will be made to Section 1A.09.	We are looking into adding the proposed Section 1A.09 text and in addition adding the text to recommend documentation when deviating from a Standard at a particular location. We have written to FHWA to request the proposed change be made an official change on or before January 15, 2012 so that it can be incorporated into the soon to be released California MUTCD 2012.

STATE	Q1 - Are you adoptig the 2009 MUTCD and recent amendment as-is?	Q2 - Are you adopting the 2009 MUTCD with a supplement to modify 1A.09 and 1A.13:	Q3 - To what extent does your supplement change these sections?	Q4- What other options have you taken or will take that are acceptable to your Division?
CO	No	Yes, adoption should occur Dec 15 with our Transportation Commission.	Colorado is adopting the MUTCD with a supplement that modifies 1A.09 and 1A.13 of the 2009 version. 1A.09 is modified by adding back in the 2003 langauge "... should not be considered a substitute for engineering judgment" and "engineering judgment should be exercised ..." 1A.13 is modified by deleting the statement "Standard statements shall not be modified ...". These changes have been approved by our FHWA Division upon consultation with FHWA HQ.	
DE	We adopt our own MUTCD, which the feds then bless as being in substantial conformance with the federal manual. After 1.5 years of hard work and a fair amount of consultant help, we adopted our new MUTCD in July 2011. It is available at: http://www.deldot.gov/information/pubs_forms/manuals/de_mutcd/index.shtml .	Per the federal interpretation letter, we reverted to the 2003 MUTCD definition of shall and engineering judgment.	We are generally supportive of FHWA's proposed modifications to Sections 1A.09 and 1A.13. We still have serious concerns about substantial conformance, compliance dates, when upgrades are required (systematic upgrading), which we will continue to press FHWA on.	
FL	Florida is on schedule to adopt the 2009 MUTCD as-is on Jan 15, 2012. We are hoping that FHWA will revise the proposed amendment on engineering judgment in sections 1A.09 and 1A.13 before Jan 15, 2012, if not we think we will be ok with the FHWA issued Interpretation Letter on this issue.	Florida does not have a Supplemental MUTCD, and historically has not done any adoption with any exceptions or additions.		
HI	Yes, we will adopt upon completion of the rule making process currently in progress to revise the language on engineering judgement.			
ID	No	Yes. We substituted the 2003 language.	We essentially reverted back to the 2003 language.	Our division allowed a straight substitution of the language.
IL	No	Illinois adopted the 2009 MUTCD in March of this year as modified by a state supplement.	The supplement revised the definition of "Standard" as shown below to be closer to the 2003 definition as allowed by the FHWA Official Interpretation in Oct. 2010.	The supplement was approved as being in substantial conformance with the MUTCD.

STATE	Q1 - Are you adoptig the 2009 MUTCD and recent amendment as-is?	Q2 - Are you adopting the 2009 MUTCD with a supplement to modify 1A.09 and 1A.13:	Q3 - To what extent does your supplement change these sections?	Q4- What other options have you taken or will take that are acceptable to your Division?
IN	Indiana is adopting our own version- it will be the 2011 Indiana MUTCD. Our FHWA division office has just concurred and we should have it officially adopted very soon.	We did include modifications to 1A.09 and 1A.13 in our version.	To 1A.09 we added 1) a guidance statement and 2) an option statement that respectively 1) recommends application of engineering judgment to decide appropriate use of traffic control devices and 2) allows for variation from standards where engineering study shows the standard is impractical or impossible to meet. To 1A.13 we added a statement to the definition of Standard to make it clear that the bold type used for figure and table titles do not necessarily signify a Standard.	
IA	Yes		Use the 2003 MUTCD language for 1A.09 and 1A.13	
KY	We have not adopted the 2009 MUTCD yet. Adoption in Kentucky requires modification to an existing Administrative Regulation which goes through a legislative process. We had delayed adoption of the 2009 MUTCD as long as possible because of our concern in the "shall" definition and elimination of other language regarding "engineering judgment". However, we were forced to initiate the Administrative Regulation modification process a month ago to have any chance of getting the 2009 MUTCD adopted by mid-January of next year.	We do not have a state supplement in Kentucky. Historically speaking, we have adopted the MUTCD in its entirety.	The way we elected to address the issue was to add language to the Administrative Regulation similar to language in the 2003 MUTCD. We added the phrase "this Manual should not be considered a substitution for engineering judgment". Our hope is that this version/language will only be in effect for a short time and that the FHWA will make the necessary modifications to the MUTCD. This was the only option we felt that we had considering the time constraints of adopting the 2009 MUTCD.	
ME	We hope that the '09 is adoptable by the January deadline. I believe the NPA was a start toward our agreeing to adoption.	No		None, but they know how dissatisfied we were (are) with the current version.
MA	No	We have not yet adopted the 2009 Manual and are currently finishing our state-specific Amendments to the 2009 MUTCD which is similar in nature to a State supplement, but instead documents how we amend the document based on our preferred standards.	We are proposing to add a modified definitions of Standard and Guidance from Sections 1A.09 and 1A.13 in order to provide us with the ability to use engineering judgment/study in a case where we can not meet the hard and fast definition of the standard. Our proposal is similar to what NYSDOT is using in regards that it is necessary to document the decision to deviate from the standard based on the engineering judgment/study applied.	We still have to gain final blessing of our FHWA Mass Division Office regarding substantial compliance.

STATE	Q1 - Are you adoptig the 2009 MUTCD and recent amendment as-is?	Q2 - Are you adopting the 2009 MUTCD with a supplement to modify 1A.09 and 1A.13:	Q3 - To what extent does your supplement change these sections?	Q4- What other options have you taken or will take that are acceptable to your Division?
MI	Michigan will have its own state manual based on the 2009 MUTCD. The differences are due to specific state law.	We are adopting the language used in the 2003 MUTCD for 1A.09 and 1A.13 which is permitted by FHWA for states which have their own manuals.	These sections will mirror the 2003 MUTCD.	The Michigan Division of FHWA is good to work with but ensures we will not modify any standards unless our state law conflicts.
MN	No	We plan to use the 2003 MUTCD language for 1A.09 and 1A.13 as allowed by FHWA per the Interpretation of October 1, 2010.	We plan to revert to the 2003 MUTCD language fully.	This is acceptable to our Division. However, we currently have outstanding issues with three 2009 Standard Statements. We have written FHWA asking for approval to change these standards and still be in substantial conformance. Our Division office agrees with our request. We are waiting for FHWA to respond. If they do not allow us to change these, we will have not determined our final course of action. Our three issues relate to the following: 1) horizontal alignment warning signs on freeway interchange ramps, 2) arrow size on overhead freeway sign panels, and 3) Specific Service sign panel configuration
MS	We adopted the 2009 MUTCD in March 2010 as is.	We do not have a supplement. We would like to see the MUTCD return the 2003 language for these sections. However, the proposed language in the NPA does make some progress.		We will continue to abide by the 2003 MUTCD until such changes are made.
NH	No	We have adopted the 2009 MUTCD with several exceptions.		
NJ	New Jersey has an automatic MUTCD adoption procedure. Our motor vehicle law references the "current MUTCD" within several statutes. As soon as the newest edition of the MUTCD is adopted through the Federal register, it automatically becomes law here.	We have no state supplement.		

STATE	Q1 - Are you adoptig the 2009 MUTCD and recent amendment as-is?	Q2 - Are you adopting the 2009 MUTCD with a supplement to modify 1A.09 and 1A.13:	Q3 - To what extent does your supplement change these sections?	Q4- What other options have you taken or will take that are acceptable to your Division?
NY	New York also has an automatic MUTCD adoption procedure. Our Vehicle & Traffic Law references the "current MUTCD" within several statutes. As soon as the newest edition of the MUTCD is adopted through the Federal register, it automatically becomes law here. As such, NY officially adopted the 2009 MUTCD on January 15, 2010.	We do have a state supplement which was revised during 2010 and adopted on March 16, 2011.	A minor modification was made to Section 1A.13: INSERT the following paragraph: Support: 01A Site-specific conditions may lead agencies to determine that it is impossible or impractical to comply with a Standard, and that they must deviate from the requirement of a particular Standard at that location, or others with the same condition. In such limited specific cases, the deviation is allowed, provided that the agency or official having jurisdiction fully documents the engineering reasons for the deviation.	
NC	North Carolina General Statutes adopt the latest version of the MUTCD. It also adopts the latest version of the North Carolina Supplement.	Yes	Our supplement revises the language to match the 2003 MUTCD.	With a few minor exceptions, our supplement add to the MUTCD and most of these additions are relatively minor. We have tried to reduce our supplement as much as we can. The major variations are Right Turn on Red Arrow (NC treats Right on Red Arrow the Same as Right on Red Ball) and restrictions on left turns on red. North Carolina Statutes are very specific on left turn restrictions; however, we do eventually expect the have the statutes revised for the right turn on red arrow to align with the MUTCD.
OR	No	We had originally scheduled the adoption of the 2009 MUTCD and our State Supplement for the August 2011 Oregon Transportation Commission meeting. However, we had to postpone over FHWA Oregon Division objections on several sections in our State Supplement.	We have adopted a State Supplement for Section 1A.13 that reverts back to language found in previous editions of the MUTCD.	Our FHWA Oregon Division office did not have any issues with our Section 1A.13 language.
TN	We are now in the process of adopting the MUTCD with the proposed new wording. We are waiting on the Final Rule to get the final wording.			

STATE	Q1 - Are you adoptig the 2009 MUTCD and recent amendment as-is?	Q2 - Are you adopting the 2009 MUTCD with a supplement to modify 1A.09 and 1A.13:	Q3 - To what extent does your supplement change these sections?	Q4- What other options have you taken or will take that are acceptable to your Division?
TX	No	<p>Yes. The Texas Transportation Commission adopted the 2011 Texas Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (TMUTCD) yesterday. The engineering judgement language was revised in our state manual.</p> <p>The 2011 TMUTCD will not be available on-line until December 7th when it</p>		
VA	Yes, the 2009 MUTCD will be formally adopted on Dec. 7th with a Virginia Supplement to the 2009 MUTCD.	Yes, FHWA Virginia Division approved the Virginia Supplement language June 2011 before the NPR.	The Supplement language in Virginia's Section 1A.13 is very close to the proposed rule change, as it mirrors much of the original definition of a Standard and deletes: "Standard Statements shall not be modified or compromised based only on engineering judgment".	The Virginia Supplement will govern where there is a conflict. Virginia's Supplement specifically requires engineering study so that documentation is on-file as to why deviation is needed. For more information see Pages 1-3 & 1-4 Section 1A.09 of the VA Supplement at: http://www.virginiadot.org/business/virginia_mutcd_supplement.asp .
WI	No	Wisconsin adopted the 2009 MUTCD with a supplement in May 2011.	The Wisconsin Supplement restores some of the 2003 MUTCD language regarding engineering judgment in Section 1A.09.	
WY	No not yet. We are working with the FHWA on the wording to adopt the manual with the 2003 definition of a shall statement. We have not yet agreed on the wording.	Yes	No options on the table to date. I feel the FHWA must give the manual back to AASHTO.	