Met or Made Significant Progress Determination Fact Sheet

Introduction

FHWA will assess State safety performance target achievement to determine whether States have met or made significant progress toward meeting their performance targets, per 23 U.S.C. 148(i). At least 4 out of the 5 safety performance targets must be either met or the actual outcome for the target is better than baseline performance to make significant progress.

While States have the option to establish any number of urbanized area targets and one non-urbanized area target, in addition to the required statewide targets, for any or all of the Safety Performance Measures, the urbanized and non-urbanized targets are not included in the determination of whether a State has met or made significant progress toward meeting its targets.

The Five Safety Performance Measures	
✓	Number of Fatalities
✓	Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT
✓	Number of Serious Injuries
✓	Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
✓	Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

Evaluating Whether a State Has Met or Made Significant Progress Toward Meeting its Targets

Meeting a Target:

If the actual outcome for a performance measure is less than the target, the target has been met.

Better than Baseline:

If a State has not met a target, FHWA will determine if the actual outcome for the target is better than the baseline performance for that target. The baseline performance is the 5-year rolling average for the target ending the year prior to the establishment of the State's target.

Data Sources for Determining Significant Progress

The table below indicates the data sources that are used to determine if a State has met or made significant progress toward meeting its targets.

Performance Target	Data Source(s) Used to Make Determination
Number of Fatalities	Final FARS (FARS Annual Report File (ARF) may be used if Final FARS is not available)
Rate of Fatalities	Final FARS (FARS ARF may be used if Final FARS is not available) and Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data
Number of Serious Injuries	State motor vehicle crash data base
Rate of Serious Injuries	State motor vehicle crash data base and HPMS data
Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	Final FARS (FARS ARF may be used if Final FARS is not available) and State motor vehicle crash data base

Example Significant Progress Determination for CY 2018 Targets

Performance Measure	5-year Rolling Averages			Target Achieved?	Better than Baseline?	Met or Made Significant Progress?
	TARGET (A) 2014 – 2018	ACTUAL (B) 2014 – 2018	BASELINE (C) 2012 – 2016			
Number of Fatalities	465.0	472.4	474.0	No	✓ **Yes**	**Yes** (4 out of 5 targets met or made significant progress)
Fatality Rate	0.980	0.990	0.988	No	No	
Number of Serious Injuries	2,560.0	2,578.4	2,703.2	No	✓ **Yes**	
Serious Injury Rate	4.126	4.214	4.288	No	✓ **Yes**	
Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	108.0	107.6	113.2	✓ **Yes**	N/A	

(A) *CY 2018* ***Targets*** *are established and reported in the August 31, 2017 HSIP Annual Report.*
(B) ***Actual performance*** *is the 5-year rolling average ending in the year for which the targets were established. In this case that is CY 2014-2018.*
(C) ***Baseline performance*** *is the 5-year rolling average that ends prior to the year in which the targets were established. In this case, that is CY 2012-2016, since the targets were established in 2017. Baseline performance is calculated in order to compare whether the actual outcome for CY 2014-2018 was better than the baseline performance (in this case CY 2012-2016), for the targets that were not met.*

Findings:

- The number of fatalities target **(465.0)** was not met, but the actual performance in 2014-2018 **(472.4)** was better than the 2012-2016 baseline **(474)**
- The fatality rate target **(0.980)** was not met. The actual performance **(0.99)** was worse than the baseline **(0.988)**
- The number of serious injuries target **(2,560.0)** was not met, but the actual performance **(2,578.4)** was better than the baseline **(2,703.2)**
- The rate of serious injuries target **(4.126)** was not met, but actual performance **(4.214)** was better than the baseline **(4.288)**
- The number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries target was met; therefore no other assessment is required.

Conclusion:

Since one target was met and three targets were better than the baseline, for this example, FHWA would determine that the State met or made significant progress toward meeting their 2018 targets.

What If a State Is Determined Not To Have Met Or Made Significant Progress Toward Meeting Its Targets?

If a State has not met or made significant progress toward meeting its targets, the State must comply with the provisions set forth in 23 USC 148(i) for the subsequent fiscal year. The State shall:

1) Use obligation authority equal to the HSIP apportionment for the year prior to the target year, only for HSIP projects.
2) Submit an HSIP Implementation Plan that describes actions the State will take to meet or make significant progress toward meeting its targets. The HSIP Implementation Plan should guide the State's project decisions so that the combined 148(i) provisions lead to the State meeting or making significant progress toward meeting its safety performance targets in subsequent years.

Note: In the example above, if the State had been determined to have not met or made significant progress toward meeting its CY 2018 targets, the State would have to use obligation authority equal to their FY 2017 HSIP apportionment only for HSIP projects in FY 2021 and submit an HSIP Implementation Plan for FY 2021.