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Disclaimer

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 purpose of the Georgia Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is to provide for a continuous and systematic procedure that identifies and reviews specific traffic safety issues around the state to identify locations with potential for improvement. The ultimate goal of the HSIP process is to reduce the number of crashes, injuries and fatalities by eliminating certain predominant types of crashes through the implementation of engineering solutions. Each year, the Department sets aside safety funding to implement safety projects. The Highway Safety Improvement Program allocated approximately $69,304,810 in highway safety funds during Fiscal Year 2013. This past year represented the seventh consecutive year of lower fatalities after reaching a 32-year high in 2005. Georgia’s total number of fatalities decreased approximately 3.0% from the previous year. Despite no discernible change in statewide travel, Georgia’s statewide fatality rate also decreased. These trends are closely monitored by all highway safety professionals in Georgia and remain the focus of the state’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).

The Governor’s Office of Highway Safety (GOHS) develops and supports the SHSP. The plan has specific Emphasis Area Task Teams that are organized to develop specific emphasis area countermeasures. Countermeasures are represented in proposed safety projects. Combining existing highway safety plans represented in HSIP and professional efforts of the task team members has successfully leveraged many existing resources to address the safety emphasis target areas. The multi-disciplinary safety teams have succeeded in engaging the four safety E’s into their efforts to identify safety projects.

Projects that comprise the HSIP are usually moderately-sized projects that include intersection improvements, signal upgrades (LEDs), ramp improvements, corridor improvements, turn lanes, signage, corridor improvements and traffic engineering studies. All public roads are included in one or more the various emphasis areas of the program. Safety projects may be nominated or identified from a large number of sources. One of the most common methods is by an analysis of vehicle crash locations and types.

Locations reported by citizens, elected officials, local governments, city and county engineers, emergency agencies and metropolitan planning organizations are all accepted for analysis. A project may qualify as a safety project because of a positive impact on an existing safety problem, because of evidence that it will prevent a hazardous condition, or because, it falls into one of several pre-approved categories of improvements that are known to provide safety benefits. Examples of this last category include guardrail, traffic signals, railroad crossing
warning devices, and most intersection improvements. Public pedestrian and bicycle facilities and traffic calming projects may also be eligible for hazard elimination projects. Once a project has been identified, a benefit/cost analysis is performed.

The Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) and local governments are encouraged to develop high crash lists for local roads that can be used to identify hazard elimination projects. City and county engineers and local public agencies are encouraged annually to examine local road systems and recommend safety projects. These projects will be submitted to the District Traffic Engineer for approval and recommendation for project concept and project programming in the Office of Traffic Operations in exactly the same manner as projects on the State Routes.

As Georgia highway fatalities continue to decline, the nation’s highway fatalities increased five percent in 2012 to approximately 36,200. The aggressive safety emphasis by Georgia DOT, the Department of Public Safety and the Governor’s Office of Highway Safety continue to keep the state’s numbers trending downward. Every Georgia DOT project is designed and constructed to meet or exceed federal safety guidelines. GDOT continues to look for still more ways to improve safety. The Office of Traffic Operations is refining and utilizing our crash data and road safety audits to improve safety and reduce fatalities, injuries and crashes. We are building roundabout intersections, increasing the use of cable barrier on interstate highways and freeways, raising center concrete median barriers, installing rumble strips, installing more retro-reflective signage, applying pavement markings, coordinating traffic signal timing, installing pedestrian accommodations to make our roads safer.
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.

The state is continuing the high risk rural roads program as part of the HSIP. The Department employs consultants to coordinate with the Department's District Traffic Operations and local government to identify a group of roads that are not part of the state highway system and have safety deficiencies. Once the roads are selected, the list is prioritized and selected by a review team. The cost of the planned safety improvements are taken into consideration as well as the effectiveness of each countermeasure. The Department dedicates $1 million annually for each of the state’s seven construction districts. This money is solely
used to fund our off-system safety program. The work normally consist of installing retro-reflective signage, applying pavement markings, installing rumble strips or guardrail.

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

- [x] Design
- [x] Planning
- [x] Maintenance
- [x] Operations
- [x] Governors Highway Safety Office
- [ ] Other:

**Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.**

Georgia’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) involves a variety of internal and external partners at the federal, state and local levels as well as the private sector. The SHSP was in place during FY 2013 with Task Teams developing plans for the various Emphasis Areas. The task teams are comprised of a combination of engineering, emergency management, enforcement and education professionals who come from community organizations, private businesses, schools, and public institutions. The teams work together to establish measureable goal(s) that are designed to improve one or more of the established emphasis areas. Throughout the year, the teams track their progress against their goal(s). The teams report their progress to the participating groups and to the Governor’s Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). Also, the (GOHS) hold quarterly Safety Program Leadership Meetings for the Executive Board and task team leaders. GDOT’s Safety Action Plan is executed to implement engineering solutions to highway safety problems. GDOT’s Safety Action Plan is a key component of its HSIP and both are aligned with the goals of the state’s SHSP and a number of its Emphasis Areas.

Georgia’s SHSP Key Emphasis Areas are as follows:

+ Occupant Protection - Seatbelts and Air Bags
+ Serious Crash Type - Intersections, Keeping Vehicles on the Road – lane departure, Head-on and Cross Median Crashes, Minimizing Consequences of Leaving Road, Work Zones
+ Aggressive Driving/Super Speeder
+ Impaired Driver
+ Age related issues - Graduated Driver's Licensing, Younger Adult Drivers, Older Drivers
+ Non-motorized User - Pedestrians, Bicyclists
+ Vehicle Type - Heavy Trucks, Motorcycles
+ Trauma System/Increasing EMS Capabilities
+ Traffic/Crash Records and Data Analysis
+ Traffic Incident Management Enhancement (TIME)
+ Traffic/Crash Records and Data Analysis
+ Traffic Incident Management Enhancement (TIME)

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

☒ Metropolitan Planning Organizations
☒ Governors Highway Safety Office
☒ Local Government Association
☒ Other: Other-Public Safety & Local Law Enforcement

Identify any program administration practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.
Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee

Other:

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

**Program Methodology**

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

- [x] Median Barrier
- [x] Intersection
- [x] Safe Corridor
- [x] Horizontal Curve
- [x] Bicycle Safety
- [x] Rural State Highways
- [ ] Skid Hazard
- [x] Crash Data
- [x] Red Light Running Prevention
- [x] Roadway Departure
- [x] Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- [x] Sign Replacement And Improvement
- [x] Local Safety
- [x] Pedestrian Safety
- [x] Right Angle Crash
- [ ] Left Turn Crash
- [ ] Shoulder Improvement
- [ ] Segments
- [ ] Other:

Program: Median Barrier

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012
### What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Crashes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Exposure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Roadway</strong></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</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

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

Program: Intersection

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012
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

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
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Cost Effectiveness
☒ minimum severity index 1

Program:  Safe Corridor
Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?

**Crashes**

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

**Exposure**

- X Traffic
- □ Volume
- □ Population
- □ Lane miles
- □ Other

**Roadway**

- □ Median width
- X Horizontal curvature
- □ Functional classification
- □ Roadside features
- □ Other

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
- X Relative severity index
- X Crash rate
- X 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
- X Excess proportions of specific crash types
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
Program: Horizontal Curve

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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

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

Severity index 2
Program: Bicycle Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

Exposure
- Traffic
- Volume
- Population

Roadway
- Median width
- Horizontal curvature
- Functional classification
- Lane miles
- 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 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

☐ 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
Program: Rural State Highways

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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</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

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
2013 Georgia Highway Safety Improvement Program

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

Program: Crash Data

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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
Check the box for each crash measure:
- [x] Crash rate
- [ ] Critical rate
- [x] 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?
- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

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

If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program. These projects are generally more systemic in nature.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
- [x] 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
  - Incremental B/C
  - Ranking based on net benefit
  - Cost Effectiveness

---

Program: Red Light Running Prevention

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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
  - 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-identification of crashes that may be correctable by red-light cameras

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
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

Program: Roadway Departure

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

- **Exposure**
  - Traffic
  - Volume

- **Roadway**
  - Median width
  - Horizontal curvature
  - 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 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
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

Program: Low-Cost Spot Improvements

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?

**Crashes**
- [ ] 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?

- [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
- [x] 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
- [x] 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?

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

- [ ] Competitive application process
- [x] 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).

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

- [x] Ranking based on B/C 1
- [ ] Available funding
- [ ] Incremental B/C
- [ ] Ranking based on net benefit
- [ ] Cost Effectiveness

Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?
### 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
- [x] 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
- [x] Excess proportions of specific crash types
- [ ] Other

### Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
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-Off system route can receive marking upgrades from the off system safety program application

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

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Cost Effectiveness
Program: Local Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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 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

☐ 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
Program: Pedestrian Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crashes only</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 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

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
Program: Right Angle Crash

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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 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

- 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
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit
Cost Effectiveness

Program: Left Turn Crash
Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2012

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
- 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
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

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

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

30

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
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.

☐ Highway Safety Manual
☑ Road Safety audits
☐ Systemic Approach
☐ Other:

Describe any other aspects of the Highway Safety Improvement Program methodology on which you would like to elaborate.
### Progress in Implementing Projects

**Funds Programmed**

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

- Calendar Year
- State Fiscal Year (Checked)
- 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>67633059.13</td>
<td>69304810.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>3609665</td>
<td>3849665</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
$7,000,000.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
$7,000,000.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$5,221,900.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$5,221,900.00

How much funding was transferred into the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period?
$0.00

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

$0.00

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

N/A

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

N/A
### 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>Funding Category</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>AA DT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0007190 Chatham SR 204 FM CR 803/FORT ARGYLE ROAD TO CR 770/OLD RIVER ROAD</td>
<td>Alignment Horizontal curve realignment</td>
<td>1 Miles</td>
<td>216023 1</td>
<td>216023 1</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Minimizing the consequences of leaving the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008618 Bulloch SR 67 BYPASS @ CR 142/PULASKI ROAD</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>993 0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000408 Spalding SR 16 @ CR</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes -</td>
<td>1 Numb</td>
<td>155151</td>
<td>155151</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Rural Minor</td>
<td>727 55</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>Improving the</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</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>35/VAUGHN RD &amp; CR 507/ROVER RD - TURN LANES</td>
<td>miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0004166 Fulton SR 3/NORTHSIDE DRIVE @ CS 53/COLLIER RD</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>193048 11</td>
<td>193048 11</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>136 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012692 Fulton CS 138/SPALDING DR @ 1 LOC - OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>84940</td>
<td>84940</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>466 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008380 ALL SR 23 @ 7 LOCS; SR 27 @</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>817299</td>
<td>817299</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Improvement Details</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Safety Agency</td>
<td>Notes</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 LOCS &amp; SR 30 @ 27 LOCS IN DIST 5</td>
<td>signing - add basic advance warning</td>
<td>ers n 148</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>County Agency</td>
<td>SAFETY AWARENESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010517 Bibb OFF SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 12 CR LOC IN BIBB COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection signing - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>12 Numb ers</td>
<td>HSIP (Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>County Highwa y Agency</td>
<td>IMPROVING THE DESIGN AND OPERATI ON OF HIGHWAY INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012749 Fulton/DeKalb SPALDING DRIVE @ 4 LOCS - OFF SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection signing - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>4 Numb ers</td>
<td>HSIP (Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>County Highwa y Agency</td>
<td>IMPROVING THE DESIGN AND OPERATI ON OF HIGHWAY INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532780- Chatham SR 204/ABERCORN ST @ LARGO DRIVE IN SAVANNAH</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection signing - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>1 Numb ers</td>
<td>HSIP (Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>State Highwa y Agency</td>
<td>IMPROVING THE DESIGN AND OPERATI ON OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Intersection Traffic Control</th>
<th>Project Numbers</th>
<th>HSIP Section</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0008253 Walker SR 1/US 27 @ CR 586/KAY CONLEY ROAD | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 1 Numbers | 639436 | 639436 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 144 90 | 45 State Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of highway intersections | Intersecti
| 0000409 Spalding SR 16 @ CR 496/688/OLD 85 CONNECTOR/HOLLONVILLE RD - ROUNDABOUT | Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout | 1 Numbers | 750000 | 750000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 659 0 | 55 State Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of highway intersections | Intersecti
| 0004732 Columbia SR 47 @ SR 223 - ROUNDABOUT | Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout | 1 Numbers | 193123 9 | 193123 9 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 585 0 | 55 State Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of | Intersecti
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Numbers 1</th>
<th>Numbers 2</th>
<th>Agency Section</th>
<th>Agency Type</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Intersections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0006864 Fulton SR 154 @ CR 1376/CEedar GROVE ROAD &amp; CR 1374/RIDGE ROAD-ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>160000</td>
<td>160000</td>
<td>BSIP Section 148</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007311 Fulton CR 3266/BELL ROAD @ CR 72/BOLES ROAD-ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>BSIP Section 148</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007644 Bibb SR 74/THOMASTON ROAD @ CR 61/LAMAR ROAD - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>233291 4</td>
<td>233291 4</td>
<td>BSIP Section 148</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 0008534 Peach SR 247 CONN @ CR 189/JOHN E SULLIVAN ROAD/WALKER ROAD - ROUNDABOUT |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout | 1 Numbers | 185403 6 | 185403 6 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 969 0 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of highway intersections |

| 0009832 Morgan SR 24 Bypass at Bethany Bend Road - ROUNDABOUT |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout | 1 Numbers | 300000 | 300000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 717 0 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of highway intersections |

<p>| 0009880 Tattnall SR 23/US 25/US 301 @ SR 196-ROUNDABOUT |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout | 1 Numbers | 153000 | 153000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 617 0 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of highway intersections |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Traffic Control Type</th>
<th>Intersection Details</th>
<th>Number of Numbers</th>
<th>HSIP Section</th>
<th>Geometric Design</th>
<th>Traffic Control Design</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Improvement Details</th>
<th>Implementation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0009916 Richmond SR 88 @ CR 58/BATH EDIE ROAD - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011833 Fulton SR 154/CAMPBELLTON RD @ FAIRBURN RD &amp; BARGE RD-ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>28430</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012755 Fulton SR 279 FM FLAT SHOALS RD TO I-85/I-285 - ROAD SAFETY AUDIT-ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>035</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Control Type</td>
<td>Control Modification</td>
<td>Control Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Control Date</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>Design and Operation of Highways</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>Traffic Control</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>221875 Wilkinson SR 57 @ SR 18 - ROUNDBOUGHT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159805</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007362 Baldwin SR 22;SR 29;SR 49;SR 243;CS 546&amp;CS 578 @16 LOC IN BALDWIN CO -April 2013</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>286497</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>State/Local</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009729 Union OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 48 LOCS IN UNION COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - add stop line</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>350000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Improvement Description</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Origin Miles</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Destination Miles</td>
<td>Improvement Type</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>0010122 Irwin Off-System Safety Improvements @ 11 CR Locs In Irwin County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>11 Numbers</td>
<td>105071</td>
<td>105071</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010733 Thomas Off-System Safety Improvements @ 10 CR Locs In Thomas County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>28.2 Miles</td>
<td>97393</td>
<td>97393</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010734 GRADY Off System Safety Improvements On 11</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>44 Miles</td>
<td>127442</td>
<td>127442</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY ROADS</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</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>0010825 Baker OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 8 CR LOCS IN BAKER COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>8 Numbers</td>
<td>93436</td>
<td>93436</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010827 Seminole OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @10 CR LOC IN SEMINOLE COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>10 Numbers</td>
<td>104972</td>
<td>104972</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010847 FANNIN OFF SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT 14</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>14 Numbers</td>
<td>370681</td>
<td>370681</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFE TEA-LU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of</td>
<td>Intersecti on traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY/ROAD LOCATIONS</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Number of Locations</td>
<td>Number of Locations</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location Information</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>0010865 Glynn Off-System Safety Improvements @ 9 Locs in Glynn County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>9 Numbers</td>
<td>213000</td>
<td>213000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010876 Gordon Off-System Safety Improvements @ 25 Locs in Gordon County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>25 Numbers</td>
<td>93863</td>
<td>93863</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010922 Lee Off-System Safety Improvements @ 5 CR Locs in Lee County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>5 Numbers</td>
<td>40528</td>
<td>40528</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</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>0010923 FLOYD</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>HIGHWAY</td>
<td>11 Numb</td>
<td>428556</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>HRRRP</td>
<td>County Highwa</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010940 COLQUITT</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>HIGHWAY</td>
<td>13 Numb</td>
<td>120735</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>HRRRP</td>
<td>County Highwa</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010942 WILCOX</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>HIGHWAY</td>
<td>15 Numb</td>
<td>98717</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>HRRRP</td>
<td>County Highwa</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY ROAD LOCATIONS</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</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>0010945 Bulloch OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 7 LOCS IN BULLOCH COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72000</td>
<td>72000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010946 Cobb OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 5 LOCS IN COBB COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52292</td>
<td>52292</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010947 Crisp OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 7 CR LOCS IN CRISP COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>119592</td>
<td>119592</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Improvements Description</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>HSIP Code</td>
<td>Project Numbers</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Improving the Design and Operation of Highways</td>
<td>Improving the Design and Operation of Highways</td>
<td>Intersecting Traffic Control</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>0011638 Dawson</td>
<td>Dawson County</td>
<td>Off-System Safety Improvements @ 47 Locs in Dawson County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>47 Numbers</td>
<td>350000</td>
<td>350000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011648 Turner</td>
<td>Turner County</td>
<td>Off-System Safety Improvements @ 9 Locs in Turner County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>9 Numbers</td>
<td>142487</td>
<td>142487</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011649 Dougherty</td>
<td>Dougherty County</td>
<td>Off-System Safety Improvements @ 7 CR Locs in Dougherty County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>7 Numbers</td>
<td>117857</td>
<td>117857</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>County/Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improvement Description</td>
<td>Traffic Intersection Improvement</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>0011653</td>
<td>Ware County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>8 Numbers</td>
<td>180000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011655</td>
<td>Hart County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>62 Numbers</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011701</td>
<td>Calhoun County</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>8 Numbers</td>
<td>124035</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2013 Georgia Highway Safety Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Intersection Traffic Control</th>
<th>Pavement Markings</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Varies</th>
<th>County Highway Agency</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0011735 Paulding OFF SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 45 LOCS IN PAULDING COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>45 Numbers</td>
<td>393943</td>
<td>393943</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011740 Early OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 14 CR LOCS IN EARLY COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>14 Numbers</td>
<td>162328</td>
<td>162328</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011751 WHEELER OFF SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS 6 COUNTY ROAD</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>6 Numbers</td>
<td>180000</td>
<td>180000</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LOCATIONS | Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified | 15 Numbers | 280000 | 280000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Varies | 0 | 0 | County Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of highway intersections | Intersecti
| 0011752 Camden OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 15 LOCS IN CAMDEN COUNTY | Highway intersections |
| | | | | | | | | | | on traffic control |
| 0011753 Mitchell OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 8 CR LOC IN MITCHELL COUNTY | Union | 8 Numbers | 140933 | 140933 | HSIP (Section 148) | Varies | 0 | 0 | County Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of highway intersections | Intersecti
| | | | | | | | | | | on traffic control |
| 0011754 Decatur OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 13 CR LOC IN DECATUR COUNTY | County | 13 Numbers | 152080 | 152080 | HSIP (Section 148) | Varies | 0 | 0 | County Highway Agency | Improving the design and operation of | Intersecti
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | on traffic control |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Intersection Traffic Control</th>
<th>Pavement Markings</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>County Highway Agency</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0011809 Atkinson</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>Off-System Safety Improvements @ 14 CR LOC IN ATKINSON COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>14 Numbers</td>
<td>145425</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011810 Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Off-System Safety Improvements @ 9 CR LOCs IN COFFEE COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>9 Numbers</td>
<td>134005</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011811 Tift</td>
<td>Tift</td>
<td>Off-System Safety Improvements @ 18 CR LOC IN TIFT COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>18 Numbers</td>
<td>124811</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>5 Numbers</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011812 Worth OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 5 CR LOC IN WORTH COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125419</td>
<td>125419</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011835 Franklin OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 23 CR LOC IN FRANKLIN CO</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011853 Quitman OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 7 CR</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80559</td>
<td>80559</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCS QUITMAN COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>11 Numbers</td>
<td>116753</td>
<td>116753</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012651 Ben Hill OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 11 CR LOC IN BEN HILL COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>5 Numbers</td>
<td>148103</td>
<td>148103</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012652 Randolph OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 5 CR LOC IN RANDOLPH COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>8 Numbers</td>
<td>166304</td>
<td>166304</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Problem Description</td>
<td>HSIP Numbers</td>
<td>Intersection Type</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0004527</td>
<td>Baldwin SR 29 BU/US 441 @ CR 466/SWINT &amp; CS 670/CARAKER/MILL EDGEVILLE</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>990185</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0004527</td>
<td>Baldwin SR 29 BU/US 441 @ CR 466/SWINT &amp; CS 670/CARAKER/MILL EDGEVILLE</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>990185</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010720</td>
<td>Columbia OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ SEV LOCS IN COLUMBIA COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>150 Miles</td>
<td>460000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010750</td>
<td>Floyd OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 32 LOCS IN FLOYD COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>32 Numbers</td>
<td>229216</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010750</td>
<td>Floyd OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 32 LOCS IN FLOYD COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>32 Numbers</td>
<td>229216</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010784</td>
<td>Emanuel Off-System Safety Improvements - SEV LOCs In Emanuel County</td>
<td>Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>140 Miles</td>
<td>450000</td>
<td>450000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012691</td>
<td>DeKalb CR 5160/N Druid Hills@1 LOC - Off-System Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Pavement markings - refresh existing pavement markings</td>
<td>4 Miles</td>
<td>397820</td>
<td>397820</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010860</td>
<td>All Safe Routes To School Resource Center (Coordinators and Website)</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>260000</td>
<td>260000</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Creating more effective processes and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006416 Gordon, Pickens SR 53 FM E OF CR 269/RYO MOUNTAIN RD TO W OF CR 178/DAVIS RD</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>39000</td>
<td>39000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010849 Colquitt SR 35/US 319 @ CR 89 INDIAN LAKE DRIVE</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011730 - Liberty County US 84/SR 38/Oglethorpe Hwy @ Old Sunbry Rd</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011741 DeKalb SR 155 FM I-285 TO CR 442/COLUMBIA DRIVE/CLIFTON</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011832</td>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>26 FROM MCKENZIE STREET TO TYBRISA STREET @ 15 LOC - RRFB-PED UPGRADE</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>35000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012689</td>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>I-516/SR 21 FM CS 1074/MONTGOMERY ST TO CR 975/VETERANS PKWY</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012754</td>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>SR 3 @ CR 8/CEDARCREST ROAD/AWTREY CHURCH ROAD</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400000</td>
<td>400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011651</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>ROAD SAFETY AUDITS - PHASE I</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Road safety audits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>150000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Non-infrastructure</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Non-infrastructure</th>
<th>Non-infrastructure</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Non-infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>HSIP Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012756 Fulton SR 139 FM SR 280 TO CS 2744/BOLTON ROAD - ROAD SAFETY AUDIT</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Road safety audits</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007475 ALL GEORGIA COMPREHENSIVE HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Transportation safety planning</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>74900</td>
<td>74900</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011654 All DISTRICT OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY COORDINATOR - DISTRICT 5 - PH III</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Transportation safety planning</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Number of Miles</td>
<td>Milepost</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011659 All District Off-System Safety Coordinator - District 3 - PH III</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Transportation safety planning</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009445 Bibb City of Macon Elementary Schools &amp; Appling Middle - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Install sidewalk</td>
<td>2.46 Miles</td>
<td>148428 4.91</td>
<td>148428 4.91</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFE-T EA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009448 Haralson H A Jones Elementary School - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Install sidewalk</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>406737.92</td>
<td>406737.92</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFE-T EA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009449 Jefferson Louisville Academy - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Install sidewalk</td>
<td>1.8 Miles</td>
<td>350971.95</td>
<td>350971.95</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFE-T EA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010012 Baker</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Install</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>80642.8</td>
<td>80642.8</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFE-T EA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>HRRRP (Safety EA-LU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEARS WAY - SRTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarke BARROW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - SRTS</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Nubbers 365175.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009447</td>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>KINGSLEY CHARTER ELEMENTARY - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Nubbers 318409 HRRRP (SAFETY EA-LU) Varies</td>
<td>0 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010015 Fulton</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOVE NOLAN; SANDTOWN MIDDLE &amp; SEABORN LEE ELEMENTARY - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Nubbers 424500 HRRRP (SAFETY EA-LU) Varies</td>
<td>0 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010016 DeKalb</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>SR 13 FM CS 434/LENOX RD TO CR 1645/AFTON LN -</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Modify existing crosswalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Nubbers 359591 HRRRP (Section 148) Varies</td>
<td>0 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED UPGRADE</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>State/Loc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010011 Glynn CROSSWALK UPGRADES AT 5 SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Modify existing crosswalk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129376.94</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007457 Franklin/Hart/Madison on I-85; SR 8; SR 17; SR 59 &amp; SR 72 @ 12 LOCS-PED UPGRADE</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Modify existing crosswalk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>449 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011759 Rockdale OFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 10 CR LOCS IN ROCKDALE CO</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier-metal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115356</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006476 Dodge, Laurens SR 117 FM EASTMAN CITY TO SR 29/US 441 S OF</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier-metal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2348582</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>532 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M004589 Douglas I-20 FROM CARROLL COUNTY LINE TO SR 5 - PE ONLY</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>103542</td>
<td>103542</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010905 Brantley/Charlton SR 94 FM FLA LINE TO FLA LINE &amp; SR 110 FM CAMDEN CO TO SR 32</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>610150</td>
<td>620150</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010905 CAMDEN SR 94 FROM FLA LINE TO SR 110 FROM CAMDEN COUNTY TO SR 32</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>620150</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010910 TOOMBS SR 147 @1 LOCATION AND SR</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>2 Numbers</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>354090</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>leaving the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 @ 1 LOCATION</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>344090</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010910 Toombs/Montgomery SR 147; SR 297 &amp; SR 298 @ 3 LOCS IN MONTGOMERY &amp; TOOMBS</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>3 Nombres</td>
<td>344090</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010911 Telfair/Wheeler SR 149 @ 4 LOCS &amp; SR 149 CONN @ 1 LOC IN TELFAIR &amp; WHEELER</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>735943</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010911 WHEELER/ TELFAIR SR 149 @ FOUR LOCATIONS AND SR 149 CONN @ ONE LOCATION</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HSIP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010426 Appling CR 537/TEN MILE ROAD @ THREE</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>582686</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Rural Major</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Highway</td>
<td>Minimizing the consequences of leaving the road</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATIONS IN APPLING COUNTY</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>ers</td>
<td>n 148)</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>nces of leaving the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591/BEN CARTER RD FROM SOF DUNNS LAKE RD TO TEN MILE CREEK</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>719558</td>
<td>719558</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>1568</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>5888</td>
<td>5888</td>
<td>5094</td>
<td>4082</td>
<td>3807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.58</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

- **# Serious Injuries:** 1566, 1472, 1377, 1298
- **# Fatalities:** 1650, 1680, 1680, 1550, 1500

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

Years

Serious Injuries Rate (per HMVMT)

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>74</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.31</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>94</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>CI Lower</td>
<td>CI Upper</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>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.3</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>117</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.01</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>
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing the number of serious injuries by roadway functional classification from 2008 to 2012 in Georgia. The x-axis represents different types of roadways, and the y-axis shows the number of serious injuries. The chart displays data for each year, with bars in orange for 2008, blue for 2009, red for 2010, and green for 2011 and 2012.]
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Road or Street (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Freeways and Expressways (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fatality Rate (per HHVHT)
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification:
- Principal Arterial
- Principal Arterial - Other
- Principal Arterial - Interstate
- Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways
- Minor Arterial
- Minor Arterial - Other
- Local Road or Street
- Other

Legend:
- 2008
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
## 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>642</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PUBLIC       INSTRUMENTALITY (E.G. AIRPORT, SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN TRIBE NATION</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>
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Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

As a footnote to the data that is provided; Georgia is aggressively working to resolve some data relationship challenges. Historically, we have used a linear referencing method (LRM) to tie our crash locations to our functional classification and ownership data. Because manually locating our crash data using an LRM was extremely expensive, we worked with our Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS) and local law enforcement to start locating crashes using latitude and longitude. We are currently working with the University of Georgia's Information Technology Outreach Services (ITOS) to evaluating the accuracy of the coordinates and establish an index of confidence for each crash location. Following the analysis, we will establish an approach to resolve all identified crash locations that yield a low level of confidence. Until we have an acceptable level of confidence and have resolved the erroneous locations, we will use our historic crash data to establish functional classification and ownership proportions and applied that distribution to our annual fatalities and serious injuries.

**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>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[
((\text{total state pop} \times \text{percent pop over 65}) \times (\text{driver fatalities over age 65} + \text{ped fatalities over age 65})*100 = \text{fatality rate (per capita)}
\]

\[
((\text{total state pop} \times \text{percent pop over 65}) \times (\text{driver si over age 65} + \text{ped si over age 65})*100 = \text{si rate (per capita)}
\]
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?

☐ 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.

The State DOT has moved the bicycle and pedestrian program from the planning programming area into safety programming. This has improved the use of crash data and engineering to start evaluating the existing program for both state highways and local roads.
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>Teen Drivers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring drivers are licensed and fully competent</td>
<td>Driver condition</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining proficiency in older drivers</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbing aggressive driving</td>
<td>Speed-related</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing impaired driving</td>
<td>Driver Condition</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping drivers alert</td>
<td>Contributing Factors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing driver safety awareness</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>Project Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>FY 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing seat belt use and improving airbag effectiveness</td>
<td>Safety Equipment</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making walking and street crossing easier</td>
<td>Vehicle/pedestrian</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring safer bicycle travel</td>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving motorcycle safety and increasing motorcycle awareness</td>
<td>2 wheel motorized vehicle</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making truck travel safer</td>
<td>Truck-related</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing safety enhancements in vehicles</td>
<td>Safety Equipment Use (none)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing vehicle-train crashes</td>
<td>vehicle/train</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing the consequences of</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving the Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving design and operation of</td>
<td>failure to yield at signal or stop sign or improper turn</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highway intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing head-on and across-median</td>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crashes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing safer work zones</td>
<td>all work zones</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing emergency medical capabilities</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>Enhancing emergency medical capabilities</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 information and decision</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>Local Safety</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>Vehicle/pedestrian</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural State Highways</td>
<td>All crash types on non-Interstate rural state routes</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Barrier</td>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Corridor</td>
<td>All type on state routes</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>3648</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Light Running Prevention</td>
<td>Disregard signal or stop sign</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn Crash</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.22</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>Intersection</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Curve</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle Crash</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>Clear Zone Improvements</td>
<td>Utility Poles &amp; Trees not Speeding</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Edge</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Median Barriers</td>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal</td>
<td>disregard stop sign or signal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Guard Rails</td>
<td>Run-off-Road w/o guard rails</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Distracted Drivers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Pavement</td>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking and/or Delineation</td>
<td>Install/Improve Lighting</td>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.64</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements
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# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type

2008  | 2009  | 2010  | 2011  | 2012
---|---|---|---|---
All  | Angle  | Cross median  | Fixed object  | 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  |
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012
Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

Georgia highway fatalities have declined each year since 2005. The 2012 total was 1,199; by comparison, 2005 deaths were a record high 1,748. Nationally, highway fatalities increased five percent in 2012 to approximately 36,200. The aggressive safety emphasis by Georgia DOT, the Department of Public Safety and the Governor’s Office of Highway Safety, however, kept the state’s numbers trending downward.

The state has aggressively worked to promote highway safety through education, emergency response, enforcement and engineering. GDOT has made key engineering changes to support the HSIP and the state's safety goals. With the release of the new 31 inch guardrail standard and the safety edge design standard approved in March of 2005, later mandated in 2012, the department has been working to upgrade all locations on the state route network within our construction and maintenance programs. Additionally, the state has concluded the first round of median cable barrier installation on 320 miles of state highways. The Interstate corridors and freeways that showed the greatest occurrence of median crossovers were identified and treated. Going forward, we will target + 60 miles of limited access facilities per year to install cable barriers over the next three to five years. The impact that these programs will have on fatalities and serious injuries will not be evident for another one to two years. Nevertheless, the data will be closely monitored to identify valid deviations in median crossover and lane departure crashes.

The Office of Traffic Operations completed 9 full signal upgrades and 263 signal modifications as part of our systemic signal safety program. Additionally, we began the analysis of the flashing yellow left turn arrow and anticipate the revision to the state signal manual to be in place for FY 2014.
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>0008534 Peach SR 247 CONN @ CR 189/JOHN E SULLIVAN ROAD/WALKER ROAD - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Optional Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Files Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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.