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Protection of Data from Discovery & Admission into Evidence

23 U.S.C. 148(h)(4) states “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for any purpose relating to this section [HSIP], shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location identified or addressed in the reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or other data.”

23 U.S.C. 409 states “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential accident sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings, pursuant to sections 130, 144, and 148 of this title or for the purpose of developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented utilizing Federal-aid highway funds shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.”
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Executive Summary

The Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT) through the Bureau of Transportation Planning and Modal Programs, Office of Safety Operations (OSO) is responsible for the administration of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The HSIP projects are consistent with the updated Alabama Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) 2nd Edition. The goal of Alabama’s SHSP is the “Toward Zero Deaths” initiative. This initiative has a goal of reducing fatalities by 50% within a 20-year time period. The SHSP has five focus areas: Driver Behavior, Infrastructure Countermeasures, Legislative Initiatives, Traffic Safety Information Systems and Safety Stakeholders Community. Alabama’s HSIP projects have focused on the areas of Infrastructure Countermeasures (construction), Driver Behavior (safety outreach campaigns), and Traffic Safety Information Systems (crash analysis). The Infrastructure Countermeasures Component of SHSP is administered through the OSO while the Safety Outreach and Crash Analysis components of SHSP is the responsibility of the Safety Management Section (SMS) in Bureau of Transportation Planning and Modal Programs.

Infrastructure Countermeasure HSIP projects are developed through a safety and operational analysis using crash data statistics, crash patterns, and benefit-cost engineering analysis. The projects have been more systemic in recent years directed toward specific needs identified through analysis such as Shoulder Widening Program, Interstate Median Barrier, and Horizontal Curve Signing. OSO collaborates with University Research Centers to develop data and analysis tools such as Roadway Improvement Safety Evaluation (RISE) and ALSAFE. RISE is a dashboard based tool that will provide ALDOT Division personnel with a method for selection of safety projects that will be cost effective. This tool will integrate safety needs into on-going maintenance projects. ALSAFE is a statewide planning level safety software tool which will aid ALDOT and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs).

The University Transportation Center for Alabama (UTCA) has a project underway to develop Safety Performance Factors (SPF) for state routes segments and intersections. The SPF’s will be specific for Alabama by applying Highway Safety Manual (HSM). By using these tools, the project selection and evaluation process will be enhanced.

Safety Outreach initiatives through SMS are coordinated with the ALDOT’s Media and Community Relations Bureau. Safety Campaigns such as “Click or Ticket it” and “Work Zone Safety” are handled through this Bureau.
Local roads safety and enforcement programs are included in the HSIP. Local roads safety has been emphasized through the High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP). The HRRRP projects have focused on upgrading signing for county roads and providing guardrail and safety end treatments for existing bridges. Local agencies and law enforcement representations participate on HSIP program development committees such as Road Safety Assessments (RSA). Also, the HSIP and Safety Operations manual is currently being updated for use by local agencies and Division Personnel to aid in developing projects and applying for HSIP funds.

Crash data is maintained and accessed through the Critical Analysis Reporting Environment (CARE) maintained by the University Transportation Center for Alabama (UTCA). This data is critical in the development of HSIP.

Utilizing the output safety analysis projects and studies underway will improve the ability of the state and local agencies to analyze and prioritize safety needs and projects in a more efficient manner.
Introduction

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. As per 23 U.S.C. 148(h) and 23 CFR 924.15, States are required to report annually on the progress being made to advance HSIP implementation and evaluation efforts. The format of this report is consistent with the HSIP MAP-21 Reporting Guidance dated February 13, 2013 and consists of four sections: program structure, progress in implementing HSIP projects, progress in achieving safety performance targets, and assessment of the effectiveness of the improvements.

Program Structure

Program Administration

How are Highway Safety Improvement Program funds allocated in a State?

- Central
- District
- Other

Describe how local roads are addressed as part of Highway Safety Improvement Program.

Local Roads are address through HSIP by using crash analysis and safety and operations analysis. HSIP funds are available to local agencies for low cost safety improvements such as striping, markings, signage, traffic signal upgrades, etc. Project selections are based upon crash data analysis as well as benefit to cost analysis. As this process continues, there is more focus on the system wide or corridor approach rather than isolated or hotspot locations. ALDOT is currently developing a HSIP/Safety Operations Manual for project selection. This manual will provide aid for both local agencies and local ALDOT Division/District Personnel that focus on the
eligibility and funding requirements for HSIP projects. Training and workshops will provided for those responsible for HSIP Program implementation.

The HRRRP addressed local county roads safety needs. HRRRP funds have been used to upgrade traffic striping, signage, bridge end safety treatments, as well as other low cost safety improvements. The projects were selected through an application process with a committee composed of FHWA, ALDOT, and local government representatives.

Alabama is proactive in the development of safety tools such as RISE, usRAP and the use of the HSM that will assist in the analysis process of local roads. These projects and studies are being conducted by various universities and consultants. ALDOT is currently developing a Road Safety Assessments (RSAs) program. RSA is a formal safety performance examination of existing and proposed roadways by an independent and multi-disciplinary team. This program will be applicable to both state and local government projects.

SMS provides cities, counties and other municipalities with yearly crash data summaries, high crash information locations, individual crash reports, and other crash-related information as needed. This crash data provides information to help in identify immediate or potential safety needs. This data is also helpful in the selection process for safety program funding.

State and local agency personnel are presented opportunities to receive crash analysis training for the Critical Analysis Reporting Environment (CARE) program. This provides an analytical process to assess crash data for trends and use as needed. CARE training is held several times per year.

**Identify which internal partners are involved with Highway Safety Improvement Program planning.**

- Design
- Planning
- Maintenance
- Operations
- Governors Highway Safety Office
- Other: Other-ALDOT County Transportation
- Other: Other-ALDOT Computer Services
- Other: Other-ALDOT-Maintenance Bureau
**Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.**

OSO coordinates the HSIP program with internal bureaus and sections within the Department to the extent possible. HSIP projects are consistent with the SHSP.

A safety program was developed between the OSO and ALDOT's Maintenance Bureau to implement the statewide shoulder widening projects on resurfacing projects. The program addresses road departure crashes along rural state routes. The program works in conjunction with the state's resurfacing program and provides two (2') feet shoulders along routes with shoulder scoring, where feasible. HSIP funds are utilized to implement the improvements. The ALDOT Maintenance Bureau administers the program and assists OSO in the identification of state routes that are being widened and provides input for preparation of the HSIP Report.

ALDOT's Maintenance Bureau is tasked with a program to upgrade signage to meet the current MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices). OSO is collaborating by identifying high crash horizontal curve locations for enhanced signage upgrades. HSIP funding will be used to implement for this program.

Similar partnerships were developed between the ALDOT's County Transportation Bureau and SMS/OSO to implement the High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP). Since the beginning of the HRRRP, this partnership was essential in the development and implementation of the program. Areas of involvement range from the providing county engineers with crash data and analysis, to application development, review, and project selection. This "hands on" approach has been successful in addressing Alabama's local roads safety needs. SMS provides crash data for interdepartmental use, including Division Offices as well as, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Cities, and Counties and others as needed.

**Identify which external partners are involved with Highway Safety Improvement Program planning.**

- [x] Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- [ ] Governors Highway Safety Office
- [ ] Local Government Association
Other: Other-County and Local Govt
Other: Other-Ala Dept of Public Health
Other: Other-Ala Dept of Public Safety
Other: Other-Ala Dept of Education

Identify any program administration practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.

☐ Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee
☒ Other: Other-Implementing HSIP/Safety Operations Manual

Describe any other aspects of Highway Safety Improvement Program Administration on which you would like to elaborate.

The Office of Safety Operations’ vision is to develop and provide tools, processes, and guidance necessary to reduce the number and severity of crashes along the public road system of Alabama. OSO provides infrastructure road safety initiatives and strategies and provides rapid review, response, and resolution to roadway safety concerns.

OSO administers the HSIP program by developing innovative and progressive sub-programs consistent with the Alabama Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). The sub-programs are planned by fiscal year with available HSIP funding. OSO works closely with the FHWA Division Office Safety personnel to expedite funds in a timely manner.

By taking a pro-active approach in administration and planning for HSIP projects and with upper management support, OSO manages HSIP funds in a more progressive manner.
Program Methodology
Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

- ✔ Median Barrier
- ✔ Horizontal Curve
- ✔ Skid Hazard
- ✔ Roadway Departure
- ✔ Local Safety
- ✔ Left Turn Crash
- ✔ Other:

- ✔ Intersection
- ✔ Bicycle Safety
- ✔ Crash Data
- ✔ Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- ✔ Pedestrian Safety
- ✔ Shoulder Improvement
- ✔ Right Angle Crash
- ✔ Segments

Program: Median Barrier
Date of Program Methodology: 7/29/2003

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes
- ✔ All crashes
- ✔ Fatal crashes only
- ✔ Fatal and serious injury crashes only
- ✔ Other

Exposure
- ✔ Traffic
- ✔ Volume
- ✔ Population
- ✔ Lane miles
- ✔ Other

Roadway
- ✔ Median width
- ✔ Horizontal curvature
- ✔ Functional classification
- ✔ Roadside features
- ✔ Other-Use of HSM
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Relative severity index
- Crash rate
- Critical rate
- Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- Excess expected crash frequency using SPF
- Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- Probability of specific crash types
- Excess proportions of specific crash types
- Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

- Yes
- No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

- Competitive application process
- Selection committee
Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

- [ ] Relative Weight in Scoring
- [x] Rank of Priority Consideration

- [ ] Ranking based on B/C
  - [x] Available funding 50
- [ ] Incremental B/C
- [ ] Ranking based on net benefit
- [ ] Cost Effectiveness
- [x] Projects are ranked by priority 50

**Program:** Intersection

**Date of Program Methodology:** 1/2/2000

**What data types were used in the program methodology?**

- **Crashes**
  - [x] All crashes
  - [ ] Fatal crashes only
  - [x] Fatal and serious injury

- **Exposure**
  - [x] Traffic
  - [ ] Volume
  - [ ] Population

- **Roadway**
  - [ ] Median width
  - [ ] Horizontal curvature
  - [x] Functional classification
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Relative severity index
- Crash rate
- Critical rate
- Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- Excess expected crash frequency using SPF
- Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- Probability of specific crash types
- Excess proportions of specific crash types
- Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

- Yes
- No

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?

- Yes
How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☐ selection committee
☒ Other-Division selection of Candidates

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

☒ Ranking based on B/C 1
☒ Available funding 2
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Cost Effectiveness

Program: Horizontal Curve
Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗ All crashes</td>
<td>✗ Traffic</td>
<td>✗ Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>☐ Volume</td>
<td>☐ Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Fatal and serious injury crashes only</td>
<td>☐ Population</td>
<td>☑ Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>☐ Lane miles</td>
<td>☑ Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What project identification methodology was used for this program?**

- ✗ Crash frequency
- ☐ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- ☐ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- ☐ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- ☐ Relative severity index
- ☐ Crash rate
- ☐ Critical rate
- ☐ Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- ☐ Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
- ☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- ☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- ☐ Probability of specific crash types
- ☐ Excess proportions of specific crash types
- ☐ Other

**Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?**
Yes

[ ] No

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

[ ] Competitive application process

[ ] Selection committee

[ ] Other-Program is being developed

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

[ ] Relative Weight in Scoring

[ ] Rank of Priority Consideration

[ ] Ranking based on B/C

[ ] Available funding

[ ] Incremental B/C

[ ] Ranking based on net benefit

[ ] Cost Effectiveness

[ ] Methodology being developed 100
Program: Rural State Highways

Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All crashes</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal and serious injury</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crashes only</td>
<td>Lane miles</td>
<td>Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other-No of lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Relative severity index
- Crash rate
- Critical rate
- Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- Excess expected crash frequency using SPF
- Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- Probability of specific crash types
Excess proportions of specific crash types
☐ Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
☐ Yes
☒ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
☐ Competitive application process
☒ Selection committee
☐ Other

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

☒ Relative Weight in Scoring
☐ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☒ Available funding 50
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☒ Cost Effectiveness 50
Program: Skid Hazard

Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ All crashes</td>
<td>☑ Traffic</td>
<td>☑ Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>☐ Volume</td>
<td>☐ Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Fatal and serious injury</td>
<td>☐ Population</td>
<td>☐ Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crashes only</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>☑ Lane miles</td>
<td>☑ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

☑ Crash frequency

☐ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

☐ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐ Relative severity index

☐ Crash rate

☐ Critical rate

☐ Level of service of safety (LOSS)

☐ Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs

☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
Probability of specific crash types
Excess proportions of specific crash types
Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
Yes
No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
Competitive application process
selection committee
Other - Program is being developed

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

Relative Weight in Scoring
Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C
Available funding 50
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit
Cost Effectiveness 50
Program: Crash Data
Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/1996

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ All crashes</td>
<td>☑ Traffic</td>
<td>☐ Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>☑ Volume</td>
<td>☐ Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Fatal and serious injury crashes only</td>
<td>☐ Population</td>
<td>☐ Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>☘ Lane miles</td>
<td>☐ Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☘ Other</td>
<td>☘ Other</td>
<td>☘ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

☑ Crash frequency

☐ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

☐ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐ Relative severity index

☐ Crash rate

☐ Critical rate

☐ Level of service of safety (LOSS)

☐ Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs

☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

☑ Yes

☐ No

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?

☐ Yes

☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process

☐ selection committee

☑ Other-Use of the CARE system

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

☑ Relative Weight in Scoring

☐ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C

☐ Available funding
Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Cost Effectiveness

Data Available Statewide 100

Program: Roadway Departure

Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes

- All crashes
- Fatal crashes only
- Fatal and serious injury crashes only
- Other

Exposure

- Traffic
- Volume
- Population
- Lane miles
- Other

Roadway

- Median width
- Horizontal curvature
- Functional classification
- Roadside features
- Other-Existing Shoulder if applicable

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency

- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
Relative severity index
Crash rate
Critical rate
Level of service of safety (LOSS)
Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
Probability of specific crash types
Excess proportions of specific crash types
Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
Yes
No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
Competitive application process
selection committee
Other-In conjunction with Resurfacing Maintenance Program

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).
Relative Weight in Scoring
Rank of Priority Consideration
Program: Low-Cost Spot Improvements

Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/1993

What data types were used in the program methodology?

- **Crashes**
  - All crashes
  - Fatal crashes only
  - Fatal and serious injury crashes only
  - Other

- **Exposure**
  - Traffic
  - Volume
  - Population
  - Lane miles
  - Other

- **Roadway**
  - Median width
  - Horizontal curvature
  - Functional classification
  - Roadside features
  - Other

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
☐ Relative severity index
☐ Crash rate
☐ Critical rate
☐ Level of service of safety (LOSS)
☐ Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
☐ Probability of specific crash types
☐ Excess proportions of specific crash types
☐ Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
☐ Yes
☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
☐ Competitive application process
☐ selection committee
☐ Other

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).
Relative Weight in Scoring

Ranking based on B/C 50
Available funding 50
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit
Cost Effectiveness

Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement
Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All crashes</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal and serious injury crashes only</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Lane miles</td>
<td>Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What project identification methodology was used for this program?
Crash frequency
Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
Relative severity index
Crash rate
Critical rate
Level of service of safety (LOSS)
Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
Probability of specific crash types
Excess proportions of specific crash types
Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
Yes
No

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
Yes
No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
Competitive application process
selection committee
Other-HRRP
Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☒ Available funding 1
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☒ Cost Effectiveness 2

Program: Local Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

**Crashes**
- ☒ All crashes
- ☐ Fatal crashes only
- ☒ Fatal and serious injury crashes only
- ☐ Other

**Exposure**
- ☐ Traffic
- ☒ Volume
- ☐ Population

**Roadway**
- ☐ Median width
- ☐ Horizontal curvature
- ☒ Functional classification
- ☒ Roadside features
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Relative severity index
- Crash rate
- Critical rate
- Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
- Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- Probability of specific crash types
- Excess proportions of specific crash types
- Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

- Yes
- No

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?

- Yes
- No
How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☒ selection committee
☐ Other

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

☒ Relative Weight in Scoring
☐ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☒ Available funding 50
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☒ Cost Effectiveness 50

Program: Shoulder Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes Exposure Roadway
☒ All crashes ☒ Traffic ☐ Median width
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Relative severity index
- Crash rate
- Critical rate
- Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
- Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- Probability of specific crash types
- Excess proportions of specific crash types
- Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

- Yes
- No
How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☒ selection committee
☐ Other

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☐ Available funding 1
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☒ Cost Effectiveness 2

Program: Segments

Date of Program Methodology: 1/3/1993

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes Exposure Roadway
☒ All crashes ☒ Traffic ☒ Median width
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- [x] Crash frequency
- [ ] Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- [ ] Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- [ ] EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- [ ] Relative severity index
- [ ] Crash rate
- [ ] Critical rate
- [ ] Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- [ ] Excess expected crash frequency using SPF
- [ ] Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- [ ] Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- [ ] Probability of specific crash types
- [ ] Excess proportions of specific crash types
- [ ] Other

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?

☐ Yes
☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☒ selection committee
☒ Other-Division selection of Candidates

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4).

☒ Relative Weight in Scoring

☐ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☒ Available funding 50
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☒ Cost Effectiveness 50

What proportion of highway safety improvement program funds address systemic improvements?

85
Highway safety improvement program funds are used to address which of the following systemic improvements?

- Cable Median Barriers
- Rumble Strips
- Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation
- Pavement/Shoulder Widening
- Install/Improve Signing
- Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation
- Upgrade Guard Rails
- Clear Zone Improvements
- Safety Edge
- Install/Improve Lighting
- Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal
- Other Other-Horizontal Curve Signing and Marking Program

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- Engineering Study
- Road Safety Assessment
- Other:

Identify any program methodology practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.
Describe any other aspects of the Highway Safety Improvement Program methodology on which you would like to elaborate.

The Office of Safety Operations’ methodology for development of the HSIP Programs is directly related to the correlation with the goals and elements in the Alabama Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Program elements are focused toward reducing the number of fatalities and severe injuries in Alabama. A sample list of projects that are currently underway are as follows:

- 2' Shoulder Widening Program on the State Highway System
- Interstate Median Barrier Program
- Traffic Signal Inventory
- Speed Management Program Evaluation
- Roundabout Manual and Conceptual Design on Three State Routes Intersections
- Roadway Improvement Safety Evaluation (RISE) Program with site identification (pending)
- First Responders related to EMS
- Integrating Safety and Operations into ALDOT processes
- ALSAFE (Alabama Planning Level Safety Tool)
- usRAP (Road Assessment Program)
- Work Zone Mobility and Safety Assessment
- Wet-Weather Safety Analysis and Site Identification Methodology
- Horizontal Curve Resigning Program (with ALDOT Maintenance Bureau)
- Implementing Highway Safety Manual Procedures into overall program analysis
A table is attached detailing additional safety programs administered by ALDOT.

### Progress in Implementing Projects

**Funds Programmed**

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

- [ ] Calendar Year
- [ ] State Fiscal Year
- [ ] Federal Fiscal Year

Enter the programmed and obligated funding for each applicable funding category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Programmed*</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>12245316</td>
<td>23091700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1388102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR Special Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Grants - Section 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Grants (Section 406)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>50619167</td>
<td>116305902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>83 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
5 %

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
5 %

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
3 %

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
3 %

How much funding was transferred in to the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period?
0 %

How much funding was transferred out of the HSIP to other core program areas during the reporting period?

10 %

Discuss impediments to obligating Highway Safety Improvement Program funds and plans to overcome this in the future.

None

Describe any other aspects of the general Highway Safety Improvement Program implementation progress on which you would like to elaborate.

None
### General Listing of Projects

List each highway safety improvement project obligated during the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Improvement Category</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>HSIP Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Fundraising Category</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownershp</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-68 FROM MP 47.2 TO 52.926, CHEROKEE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>306938</td>
<td>1805520</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-1(US 431) FROM MP 337.49 TO 341.19, MADISON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>4 Miles</td>
<td>421377</td>
<td>1493974</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>28202</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-1(US 72) FROM MP 86.042 TO 89.51, MADISON</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>103398</td>
<td>1723306</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>32573</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>SR, FROM MP</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>MILES</td>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULLMAN COUNTY</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3(US 31)</td>
<td>320.73 TO 325.43</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38464 8</td>
<td>356155 4</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. CLAIR COUNTY</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25(US-411)</td>
<td>174.33 TO 183.89</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59431 8</td>
<td>349599 1</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMESTONE COUNTY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2(US-72)</td>
<td>59.957 TO 72.234</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81364 4</td>
<td>753373 7</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67 FROM</td>
<td>35.57 TO 38.982</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30274 9</td>
<td>200495 9</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>5 Miles</td>
<td>10448</td>
<td>2616039</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>21348</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-5(US-11) FROM MP 124 TO 129.32, JEFFERSON COUNTY</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5 Miles</td>
<td>10448</td>
<td>2616039</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>21348</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-3(US-31) FROM MP 294.17 TO 298.79, JEFFERSON COUNTY</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5 Miles</td>
<td>27549</td>
<td>1836611</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>11230</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-18 FROM MP 52.49 TO 61.59 AND SR-69 FROM MP 188.348 TO 189.445, WALKER COUNTY</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>10 Miles</td>
<td>49048</td>
<td>23335643</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Multiple Classes</td>
<td>12458</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-75 FROM MP 1.93 TO</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>13344</td>
<td>190632</td>
<td>Other Federal</td>
<td>Urban Principal</td>
<td>30145</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Beginning Mile</td>
<td>Ending Mile</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-119</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.975</td>
<td>31.753</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Multiple Classes</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-39</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETE A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Minimizing the consequences of leaving the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-22</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95.972</td>
<td>104.05</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-14</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>208.147</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Federal</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alabama Highway Safety Improvement Program**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO 218.29, LEE COUNTY</td>
<td>or other</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-77 FROM MP 43.88 TO 51.523, CLAY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-183 FROM MP 0 TO 16.038, PERRY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-14 FROM MP 9.2 TO 19.261, PICKENS COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>FHWA Funds</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-171 FROM MP 13.6 TO 23.631, TUSCALOOSA COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95490</td>
<td>3535570</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-191 FROM MP 6 TO 14, CHILTON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>756754</td>
<td>3783768</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-6(US-82) FROM MP 98.874 TO 107.197, Chilton County</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>339579</td>
<td>2122367</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>2990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-69(US-82) AT CR-65(BEAR CREEK RD), TUSCALOOSA COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>607377</td>
<td>6073777</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>29750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds</td>
<td>Roadway Type</td>
<td>Cost Category</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-216 at CR-60(ROCKHOUSE RD/WOODLAND LAKE), TUSCALOOSA COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometrics - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>567745</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>735 0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-138 FROM MP 0 TO 0.724, MACON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>179134</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>559795</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94 FROM 0.50 TO 6, MONTGOMERY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>683150</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>2846458</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-8 FROM MP 87.876 TO 94.189, DALLAS COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>1294999</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>1294999</td>
<td>Multiple Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Total Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-8(US-80) FROM MP 95.06 TO 99.26, DALLAS COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>4 Miles</td>
<td>957950</td>
<td>3991457</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-14 FROM MP 108.171 TO 114.198, DALLAS COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>786475</td>
<td>2621584</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Multiple Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-6 (US-82) FROM MP 199.75 TO 205.90, BULLOCK COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>1020571</td>
<td>5669839</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-10 FROM MP 193.735 TO 201.421, BARBOUR COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8 Miles</td>
<td>708555</td>
<td>3080676</td>
<td>Other Federal -aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Federal Funds (i.e., STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Other Federal Funds (i.e., STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-192 FROM MP 1.966 TO 6.662, COFFEE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments, Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14013 5 233355 85</td>
<td>Other, Federal, Arterial - Other, 953 4 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-1(US 431) FROM MP 67 TO 72, BARBOUR COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments, Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80849 5 475585 1</td>
<td>Other, Federal, Arterial - Other, 214 73 65</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-134 FROM MP 62.125 TO 68.281, HENRY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments, Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61368 0 278945 3</td>
<td>Other, Federal, Collector, 207 0 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of rumble strips along existing paved shoulders</td>
<td>Roadway Rumble strips - edge or shoulder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30437 4 304374</td>
<td>HSIP, Multiple Classes, 0 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Roads in 7th Division</td>
<td>Shoulder Treatments</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>58900 3</td>
<td>226539 5</td>
<td>Other Federal-Aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-103 FROM MP 9.011 TO 15.293, GENEVA COUNTY</td>
<td>Widen Shoulder - Paved or Other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>58900 3</td>
<td>226539 5</td>
<td>Other Federal-Aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY IMPROVEMENT AT BRIDGE ENDS ON CR-66 OVER PATSALIGA RIVER, CRENshaw COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier End Treatments (Crash Cushions, Terminals)</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>35998</td>
<td>35998</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-15 FROM 105.628 TO 113.12, PIKE COUNTY</td>
<td>Widen Shoulder - Paved or Other</td>
<td>8 Miles</td>
<td>59810 6</td>
<td>299053 2</td>
<td>Other Federal-Aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-123 FROM MP 3.645 TO</td>
<td>Widen Shoulder - Paved</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>52910</td>
<td>195963</td>
<td>Other Federal</td>
<td>Rural Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Ending Station</td>
<td>Agency Fund(s)</td>
<td>Collector Agency</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-123 FROM MP 9.455 TO 12.854, HOUSTON COUNTY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.854</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-25 FROM MP 30.354 TO 37, MARENGO COUNTY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-103 FROM MP 15.293 TO 17.463, HOUSTON COUNTY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.463</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Contract No.</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Agency Staff ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-25 FROM MP 21.02 TO 30.354, MARENGO COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>9 Miles</td>
<td>493157</td>
<td>2465787</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-13(US-43) FROM MP 115.30 TO 118.16, MARENGO COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>143110</td>
<td>914625</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>3205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-7(US 11) FROM MP 0 TO 9, SUMTER COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>9 Miles</td>
<td>125561</td>
<td>2516226</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>3168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-42 (US-98) FROM MP 36.109 TO 36.776, BALDWIN COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>1 Miles</td>
<td>110393</td>
<td>110393</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>25500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>Cost Source</td>
<td>Cost Class</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Method of Keeping Vehicles in the Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-188 FROM MP 8.67 TO 19.687, MOBILE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>11 Miles</td>
<td>183667</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td>3066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-193 FROM MP 3.97 TO 17.803, MOBILE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>14 Miles</td>
<td>183667</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td>5868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Inventory and Safety Analysis--Pilot Project</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>155762</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Responder Solution Technique</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>147876</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Development (FIRST)</td>
<td>Development of Statewide Road Safety Assessment Guidance (RSA) Manual</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>265386</td>
<td>265386</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-9 (PLACING GUARDRAIL AND PAVEMENT MARKERS), ST. CLAIR COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - metal</td>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>45702</td>
<td>45702</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETE A-LU)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPGRADE SIGNS ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (WINSTON COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>24678</td>
<td>24678</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETE A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPGRADE SIGNS ON</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>14503</td>
<td>14503</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETE)</td>
<td>Rural Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number 26538 | 6 |
| Number 26538 | 6 |
| Number 14503 | 6 |
| Number 14503 | 6 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (LAWRENCE COUNTY)</th>
<th>(including post) - new or updated</th>
<th>ers</th>
<th>A-LU)</th>
<th>Road or Street</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>n and decision support systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNALS, STRIPING AND MARKINGS AT CAPSHAW ROAD, JONES RD, ZEHNER RD, QUINN RD, AND EASTER FERRY RD (LIMESTONE COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs and traffic control - other</td>
<td>1 Numb ers</td>
<td>36681</td>
<td>36681</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (MORGAN COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numb ers</td>
<td>41027</td>
<td>41027</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTRIPING</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15914</td>
<td>159148</td>
<td>HRRRP</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Decision Support Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND INSTALLING PAVEMENT MARKERS ON CR-29 FROM SR-22 TO CR-56 (COOSA COUNTY)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (CLEBURNE COUNTY)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29234</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>decision support systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (RANDOLPH COUNTY)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42070</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>decision support systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC STRIPING, MARKINGS, AND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95183</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>decision support systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Roadway signs and traffic control - other**
- **Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated**
- **Local Road or Street**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAVEMENT MARKERS ON CR-28(SANDFORT RD) FROM SR-169 TO PHENIX CITY LIMITS, RUSSELL COUNTY</td>
<td>Support systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (CHAMBERS COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>123 Numbers</td>
<td>34457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving information and decision support systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS(LEE COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>56 Numbers</td>
<td>140105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving information and decision support systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC STRIPING,</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement</td>
<td>2 Numbers</td>
<td>140105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKINGS, AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS ON CR-103/PINE GROVE RD FROM CR-24 TO SR-76 AND ON CR-26 FROM CR-511 TO 10TH STREET, TALLADEGA COUNTY</td>
<td>markings - remarking ers</td>
<td>A-LU)</td>
<td>Road or Street</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>n and decision support systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESURFACING, SIGNING, AND GUARDRAIL ON CR-63 FROM NORTH OF CR-861 TO BRIDGE AT UNNAMED TRIB. TO AT MULBERRY CREEK AND RESURFACING &amp; SIGNING</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 Miles</td>
<td>330516</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON CR-63 (DALLAS COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numb ers</td>
<td>52427</td>
<td>52427</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (AUTauga COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numb ers</td>
<td>26788</td>
<td>26788</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (BULLOCK COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numb ers</td>
<td>24173</td>
<td>24173</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (MACON COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>28636</td>
<td>28636</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (DALLAS COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>49056</td>
<td>49056</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (DALE COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>48056</td>
<td>48056</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMOVAL AND REALIGNMENT OF A</td>
<td>Alignment Alignment - other</td>
<td>1 Miles</td>
<td>79875</td>
<td>79875</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGMENT OF BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT ON CR-4 (GODA COUNTY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGN REPLACEMENT ON VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS (ESCAMBIA COUNTY)</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>12228</td>
<td>12228</td>
<td>HRRP (SHERA-LU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress in Achieving Safety Performance Targets

Overview of General Safety Trends
Present data showing the general highway safety trends in the state for the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures*</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>18755</td>
<td>21780</td>
<td>18222</td>
<td>14667</td>
<td>11459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance measure data is presented using a five-year rolling average.
Number of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

- 2008: 1115
- 2009: 1058
- 2010: 999
- 2011: 937
- 2012: 888

# Fatalities # Serious Injuries
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

Years

Fatality Rate (per HMVMT)  Serious Injuries Rate (per HMVMT)
To the maximum extent possible, present performance measure* data by functional classification and ownership.

### Year - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function Classification</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

- Major Highway
- Minor Highway
- Principal Arterial
- Minor Collector
- Local Road
- Principal Arterial (R)
- Major Collector (R)
- Principal Arterial (R)
- Minor Collector (R)
- Local Road (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways (R)
- Major Collector - Interstate (R)
- Principal Arterial - Interstate (R)
- Minor Collector - Interstate (R)
- Local Road - Interstate (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other (R)
- Minor Collector - Other (R)
- Local Road - Other (R)
- Principal Arterial (U)
- Minor Collector (U)
- Local Road (U)
- Principal Arterial - Other (U)
- Minor Collector - Other (U)
- Local Road - Other (U)
- Principal Arterial - Interstate (U)
- Minor Collector - Interstate (U)
- Local Road - Interstate (U)
- Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways (U)
- Minor Collector - Other Freeways and Expressways (U)
- Local Road - Other Freeways and Expressways (U)

Fatality Rate (per HVHIT)

-0.6 to 0.6
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification
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## Year - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>4763</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PARK, FOREST, OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PARK, FOREST OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATE AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE (OTHER THAN RAILROAD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAILROAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| OTHER PUBLIC
  INSTRUMENTALITY
  (E.G. AIRPORT,
  SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY) | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| INDIAN TRIBE NATION  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| OTHER                | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| OTHER                | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
Number of Fatalities by Roadway Ownership
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Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership
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Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

Alabama does not have the ability to extract roadway functional classification crash data at this time. Also, the Rate of Fatalities and Serious Injuries for roadway classification or roadway functional classification are not available.

**Application of Special Rules**

*Present the rate of traffic fatalities and serious injuries per capita for drivers and pedestrians over the age of 65.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older Driver Performance Measures</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance measure data is presented using a five-year rolling average.

The State of Alabama used the FARS data and Alabama’s Critical Analysis Reporting Environment (CARE). The FARS data for Alabama included Fatalities for Older Drivers and Pedestrians. From the CARE system, the total number of serious injury crashes was used. The two were added together then divided by the number of people in the State who are 65 years of age and older compared to the total State population to determine the rate.

The Special Rule does not apply to the State of Alabama at this time.
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

Does the older driver special rule apply to your state?

No
Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Improvements (Program Evaluation)

What indicators of success can you use to demonstrate effectiveness and success in the Highway Safety Improvement Program?

- [x] None
- [ ] Benefit/cost
- [ ] Policy change
- [ ] Other:
What significant programmatic changes have occurred since the last reporting period?

☐ Shift Focus to Fatalities and Serious Injuries

☐ Include Local Roads in Highway Safety Improvement Program

☐ Organizational Changes

☒ None

☐ Other:
Briefly describe significant program changes that have occurred since the last reporting period.

None
SHSP Emphasis Areas
For each SHSP emphasis area that relates to the HSIP, present trends in emphasis area performance measures.

### Year - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP-related SHSP Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instituting graduated licensing for younger drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining proficiency in older drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbing aggressive driving</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing impaired driving</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing seat belt use and improving airbag effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making walking and street crossing easier</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring safer bicycle travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving motorcycle safety and increasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing safety enhancements in vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing the consequences of leaving the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing head-on and across-median crashes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving information and decision support systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>888</td>
<td>11459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2008 to Year 2012

SHSP Emphasis Area
Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2008 to Year 2012

SHSP Emphasis Area
Groups of similar project types
Present the overall effectiveness of groups of similar types of projects.

**Year - 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP Sub-program Types</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of Fatalities</th>
<th>Number of Serious Injuries</th>
<th>Fatality Rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious Injury Rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>STATE ROUTES_ROR Crashes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Barrier</td>
<td>Interstate Median Crashes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type

- Air
- Angle
- Cross median
- Fixed object
- Sideswipe
- Head on
- Left turn
- Night-time
- Non-intersection
- Rear end
- Right-turn
- Run-off-road
- Speed-related
- Truck-related
- Vehicle/animal
- Vehicle/bicycle
- Wet road
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type

- Air
- Angle
- Cross median
- Fixed object
- Sideswipe
- Head on
- Left turn
- Night-time
- Non-intersection
- Rear end
- Right turn
- Run-off-road
- Speed-related
- Truck-related
- Vehicle/pedestrian
- Vehicle/animal
- Vehicle/bicycle
- Wet road

# of Serious Injuries
Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type

Rate of Serious Injury
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Systemic Treatments
Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

### Year - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic improvement</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement/Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>State Routes_ROR crashes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Median Barriers</td>
<td>Interstate Median Crashes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type

- Air
- Angle
- Cross median
- Fixed object
- Sideswipe
- Head-on
- Left turn
- Night-time
- Non-intersection
- Rear-end
- Right turn
- Run-off-road
- Speed-related
- Truck-related
- Vehicle/animal
- Vehicle/bicycle
- Vehicle/pedestrian
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type

- Air
- Angle
- Cross median
- Fixed object
- Sideswipe
- Head-on
- Left-turn
- Night-time
- Non-intersection
- Rear-end
- Right-turn
- Run-off-road
- Speed-related
- Truck-related
- Vehicle/animal
- Vehicle/bicycle
- Vehicle/wet road
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type
Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements
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Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

ALDOT has been integrating the Highway Safety Manual (HSM), GIS system and roadway inventory into the various safety program to improve safety data collection and analysis. There is also a study on "Integrating Safety and Operations into Planning, Design, Construction, and Post Construction Operations." This study includes research methodology and data collection, creates an environment for integrating Operations and Safety into Multimodal Planning efforts, reviews statewide, regional, corridor and sub-area opportunities, then concludes with a final workshop and study documentations.
Provide project evaluation data for completed projects (optional).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Improvement Category</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Bef-Fatal</th>
<th>Bef-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Bef-Other Injury</th>
<th>Bef-PDO</th>
<th>Bef-Total</th>
<th>Aft-Fatal</th>
<th>Aft-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Aft-Other Injury</th>
<th>Aft-PDO</th>
<th>Aft-Total</th>
<th>Evaluation Results (Benefit/Cost Ratio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Optional Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Files Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Structure: Program Methodology</td>
<td>Table of Brief Summary of Current programs_2013.docx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Glossary**

**5 year rolling average** means the average of five individual, consecutive annual points of data (e.g. annual fatality rate).

**Emphasis area** means a highway safety priority in a State’s SHSP, identified through a data-driven, collaborative process.

**Highway safety improvement project** means strategies, activities and projects on a public road that are consistent with a State strategic highway safety plan and corrects or improves a hazardous road location or feature or addresses a highway safety problem.

**HMVMT** means hundred million vehicle miles traveled.

**Non-infrastructure projects** are projects that do not result in construction. Examples of non-infrastructure projects include road safety audits, transportation safety planning activities, improvements in the collection and analysis of data, education and outreach, and enforcement activities.

**Older driver special rule** applies if traffic fatalities and serious injuries per capita for drivers and pedestrians over the age of 65 in a State increases during the most recent 2-year period for which data are available, as defined in the Older Driver and Pedestrian Special Rule Interim Guidance dated February 13, 2013.

**Performance measure** means indicators that enable decision-makers and other stakeholders to monitor changes in system condition and performance against established visions, goals, and objectives.

**Programmed funds** mean those funds that have been programmed in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to be expended on highway safety improvement projects.

**Roadway Functional Classification** means the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide.

**Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)** means a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary plan, based on safety data developed by a State Department of Transportation in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 148.

**Systemic safety improvement** means an improvement that is widely implemented based on high risk roadway features that are correlated with specific severe crash types.

**Transfer** means, in accordance with provisions of 23 U.S.C. 126, a State may transfer from an apportionment under section 104(b) not to exceed 50 percent of the amount apportioned for the fiscal year to any other apportionment of the State under that section.