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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During State FY 2013, the Nebraska Department of Roads increased the emphasis of its HSIP program from planning projects at individual sites to systemic improvements. The impetus for these projects was the fact that Nebraska had been falling behind in obligating its HSIP funds. Systemic projects let this year included countdown pedestrian signal heads and durable pavement markings on multi-lane highways. More of these types of projects are being planned for future years including bridge anti-icing systems, guardrail replacement, durable pavement markings on 2-lane highways, shoulder rumble strips, and adaptive signal systems. The expectation is that more of these kinds of projects will be developed in the future. Projects at individual locations are still an important part of the HSIP and include roundabouts, intersection improvements, overtime enforcement, etc. The Department continues to sponsor a High Risk Rural Roads committee and these types of projects will still be developed when they can be identified.
Introduction

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

Program Structure

Program Administration

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

☑ Central
☐ District
☐ Other

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

Local road projects are regularly funded under the HSIP. City governments are encouraged to submit potential projects to the NDOR for consideration for HSIP funding. Representatives of the state's two largest cities, Omaha and Lincoln, regularly attend Safety Committee meetings and officials from the smaller cities are always welcome. Representatives from the Nebraska LTAP Center and the Nebraska Highway Superintendents Association sit on the High Risk Rural Road committee. The number of projects built on local roads varies from year to year. During State FY 2013, two HSIP projects let were on local roads. In addition, most of Nebraska's High
Risk Rural Roads projects have been built on local roads. Many local projects, especially intersection improvements in Omaha and Lincoln, are not listed here because they are located on state highways.

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

- Design
- Planning
- Operations
- Governors Highway Safety Office
- Other: Other-Traffic Engineering
- Other: Other-Highway Safety
- Other: Other-Local Projects
- Other: Other-Program Management
- Other: Other-Rail & Public Transportation

**Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.**

All of the above named disciplines play a role in the HSIP process. Highway Safety prepares collision diagrams, spot maps, or lists of high accident locations and presents them to committee members at their monthly meetings. They coordinate with the engineering divisions to get estimated project costs, from which they calculate benefit-cost ratios. They also complete evaluations of completed projects and present them to the group for use in making future decisions. All HSIP projects are approved by either the NDOR Safety Committee or the Strategic Safety Infrastructure Team. The usual procedure is for an approved HSIP project to be assigned to Roadway Design Division, Traffic Engineering Division, or the Local Projects Section of Materials and Research Division as the lead element, depending on the type of project and whether or not it is on a local road. These units work with Project Management to get the
project scheduled and to make sure it is progressing adequately through the steps in the Clarity software, which is used for project programming. This includes the important step of working with the Environmental Section to make sure all environmental concerns are met. The lead units either design the project or oversee the design of a consultant and prepare the project for letting. If railroad property is involved in the project, Rail & Public Transportation Division must also be consulted. The Operations Division has taken the lead on projects involving bridge anti-icing systems, adaptive signal control, and dynamic message signs, which require systems engineering analysis. The NDOR has begun using the Highway Safety Manual procedures in the analysis and evaluation of some HSIP projects.

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

☐ Metropolitan Planning Organizations
☒ Governors Highway Safety Office
☒ Local Government Association
☒ Other: Other-City of Omaha Public Works Department
☒ Other: Other-City of Lincoln Public Works Department
☒ Other: Other-FHWA Division Office

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

☐ Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee
☒ Other: Other-None
Describe any other aspects of Highway Safety Improvement Program Administration on which you would like to elaborate.

None.

Program Methodology

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

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

- Intersection
- Bicycle Safety
- Crash Data
- Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- Pedestrian Safety
- Shoulder Improvement
- Sign Replacement And Improvement
- Red Light Running Prevention
- Rural State Highways
- Safe Corridor
- Roadway Departure
- Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- Sign Replacement And Improvement
- Red Light Running Prevention
- Rural State Highways
- Safe Corridor
- Intersection
- Bicycle Safety
- Crash Data
- Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- Pedestrian Safety
- Shoulder Improvement
- Sign Replacement And Improvement
- Red Light Running Prevention
- Rural State Highways
- Safe Corridor

Program: Intersection

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

- Crashes
  - All crashes
  - Fatal crashes only
  - Fatal and serious injury
- Exposure
  - Traffic
  - Volume
  - Population
- Roadway
  - Median width
  - Horizontal curvature
  - Functional classification
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane miles</td>
<td>☒ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside features</td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Land Use</td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Median Type</td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Number of Lanes</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
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 3
- Available funding 2
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Cost Effectiveness
- Design and Project Development Time 1

Program: Roadway Departure
Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?
**Crashes**
- ☑ All crashes
- ☑ Fatal crashes only
- ☑ Fatal and serious injury crashes only
- ☑ Other

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

**Roadway**
- ☑ Median width
- ☑ Horizontal curvature
- ☑ Functional classification
- ☑ Roadside features
- ☑ Other-Land Use
- ☑ Other-Median Type
- ☑ Other-Number of Lanes

---

**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 3
☐ Available funding 2
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Cost Effectiveness
☒ Design and Project Development Time 1

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

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

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- Engineering Study
- Road Safety Assessment
- Other:

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

During the past year, Nebraska began using the Highway Safety Manual methodology for calculating some benefit-cost ratios and other safety measures. Although we used the systemic approach in the past, this year we greatly increased our use of it, as seen in the increase in the percentage of total HSIP funds used for systemic projects from 11% to 86%.

### Progress in Implementing Projects

**Funds Programmed**

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Programmed*</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSIP (Section 148)</strong></td>
<td>18874842</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRR Special Rule</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</strong></td>
<td>6204754</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive Grants - Section 163</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive Grants (Section 406)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Local Funds</strong></td>
<td>1758972</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>26838568</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?**

$2,137,468.00

**How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?**

$988,272.00
How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?

$1,776,330.00

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

$1,768,682.00

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

$6,204,754.00

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.

Previous problems with obligating local projects and getting local projects through the NEPA process in a timely manner have largely been resolved. Now the major impediment is the amount of time needed to get through all the steps in the federal process.

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

None.
### General Listing of Projects
List each highway safety improvement project obligated during the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Improvement Category</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>HSIP Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00877</td>
<td>Statewide Highway Countdown Pedestrian Heads</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Pedestrian signal - install new at intersection</td>
<td>110 Numbers</td>
<td>280152</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Making walking and street crossing easier</td>
<td>Provide pedestrians with better information at signalized intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00887A</td>
<td>Statewide &quot;Click It or Ticket&quot; Mobilization</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>111600</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Increasing seat belt use and improving airbag effectiveness</td>
<td>Conduct seat belt enforcement campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00887B</td>
<td>&quot;You Drink, You Drive, You Lose&quot;</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>202500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Reducing impaired driving</td>
<td>Increase number of DUI checkpoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>150103</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Increasing driver safety awareness</td>
<td>Educate highway users on safety issues</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>00887C NDOR Safety Education Commercials</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>350000</td>
<td>350103</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Increasing seat belt use and improving airbag effectiveness</td>
<td>Conduct seat belt enforcement campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00887D &quot;Click It or Ticket&quot; Mobilization</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>250103</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Reducing impaired driving</td>
<td>Increase number of DUI checkpoints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00887F NSP Overtime for Safety Demos</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>35750</td>
<td>35853</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Increasing driver safety awareness</td>
<td>Educate highway users on safety issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00887G Nebraska</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Number</td>
<td>68832</td>
<td>76583</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Increasing driver safety</td>
<td>Educate highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Funding Authority</td>
<td>MILEAGE</td>
<td>CIRCUIT</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>DESIGN.ACTION</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>IMPACT SUMMARY</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>Safety Center - Kearney -- PI&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00887H Enforcement Grants for &quot;You Drink, You Drive, You Lose&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00887J PI&amp;E for Targeted Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12928 Lincoln -- NB I-180 Ramp at Superior Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12928 Lincoln -- NB I-180 Ramp at Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street (2)</td>
<td>lane</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100 Miles</td>
<td>2604424</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>ns</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>13226 District 1 - Districtwide</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>1716990</td>
<td>100 Miles</td>
<td>2604424</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td>Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22371 Omaha - F St./16th St. &amp; Spring Lake Drive</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - traffic signal to roundabout</td>
<td>531467</td>
<td>633713</td>
<td>531467</td>
<td>633713</td>
<td>6692</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Replace signalized intersections with roundabouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22429 Omaha - 84th &amp; L Street (1)</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>45536</td>
<td>46152</td>
<td>45536</td>
<td>46152</td>
<td>69572</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Provide additional left-turn lanes at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22429 Omaha - 84th &amp; L Street (2)</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn</td>
<td>1347958</td>
<td>1352402</td>
<td>1347958</td>
<td>1352402</td>
<td>69572</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway</td>
<td>Provide additional left-turn lanes at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Project</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>22448</td>
<td>Scribner North</td>
<td>Roadside barrier</td>
<td>4 Numbers</td>
<td>302433</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Minimizing the consequences of leaving the road</td>
<td>Upgrade outdated bridge rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22461</td>
<td>Omaha - 30th &amp; McKinley Street</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>355945</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Re-align approaches to provide better sight distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22496</td>
<td>Omaha - Pedestrian Countdown Signals - Phase 2</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>456805</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Making walking and street crossing easier</td>
<td>Provide pedestrians with better information at signalized intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22552</td>
<td>District 2 - Districtwide</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>82 Miles</td>
<td>2090343</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td>Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neunoa, 0 of Columbus - Jct. of US-81 &amp; N-22</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - modify right-turn lane offset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157186</td>
<td>244429</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>9670</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</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>32203 District 3 - Districtwide</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>82 Miles</td>
<td>270859</td>
<td>195527</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td>Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42734 District 4 - Districtwide</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>93 Miles</td>
<td>328866</td>
<td>234258</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td>Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51523 District 5 - Districtwide</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>83 Miles</td>
<td>267755</td>
<td>181125</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td>Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61576</td>
<td>District 6 - Districtwide</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>30 Miles</td>
<td>853165</td>
<td>949072</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keeping vehicles in the roadway</td>
<td>Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress in Achieving Safety Performance Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures*</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>9.35</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

![Graph showing the number of fatalities and serious injuries for the last five years. The graph indicates a decrease in fatalities and serious injuries over the years.](image-url)
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

![Bar chart showing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries per HMVMT for the years 2008 to 2012. The chart shows a downward trend in the rate of fatalities and a steady rate of serious injuries, indicating improved safety on Nebraska highways.](chart.png)
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>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Injury Rate</td>
<td>Fatality Rate</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>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Minor Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>9.04</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>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing fatal accidents by roadway functional classification for different years.](chart_image)

**Roadway Functional Classification**
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar Chart: # of Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification]

- **Y-axis:** Number of Serious Injuries
- **X-axis:** Roadway Functional Classification
- Colors represent years: 2008 (Orange), 2009 (Blue), 2010 (Maroon), 2011 (Red), 2012 (Green)

**Legend:**
- Local Collector (U)
- Local Collector (R)
- Major Collector (U)
- Major Collector (R)
- Principal Arterial (U)
- Principal Arterial (R)
- Minor Arterial (U)
- Minor Arterial (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other (U)
- Principal Arterial - Other (R)
- Other Freeways and Expressways (U)
- Other Freeways and Expressways (R)
- Principal Arterial - Interstate (R)
- Principal Arterial - Interstate (U)
- Minor Collector - Other (U)
- Minor Collector - Other (R)
- Other (R)
- Other (U)
- Local Road or Street (U)
- Local Road or Street (R)
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

2008 2009 2010 2011 2012
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification
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- 2009
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- 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>108</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>18.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>10.14</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>Category</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership
Fatality Rate by Roadway Ownership
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Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

Total fatalities dropped to 181 in 2011, the fewest in the state since 1944. This continued a two-year span of significant decreases in fatalities. Since then, however, fatalities have increased to over 200, 212 in 2012. So far in 2013 fatalities are slightly above the 2012 totals. The number of serious injuries and total crashes continue to trend downward.

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>2.04</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Calculation method:

Number of casualties (fatalities, A-injuries, or fatalities + A-injuries) for each year/

Nebraska population age 65 & up for each year x

10,000

= 

Casualties per 10,000 population
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
- [x] Other: Other-Switching the emphasis from individual locations to systemic projects.
Briefly describe significant program changes that have occurred since the last reporting period.

We have begun concentrating on more expensive systemic projects to improve a larger portion of the highway system and to obligate more of our HSIP funds.
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>Younger driver crashes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing impaired driving</td>
<td>Impaired driving crashes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing seat belt use and improving airbag effectiveness</td>
<td>Unbelted occupant injuries</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.28</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>89</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the design and operation of highway intersections</td>
<td>Intersection crashes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing head-on and across-median crashes</td>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by SHSP Emphasis Area
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Number of Serious Injuries by SHSP Emphasis Area
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Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area
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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>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Roadway departure crashes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Intersection crashes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects
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Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects
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Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type: Air, Angle, Cross-median, Fixed Object, Sideswipe, Head on, Left-turn, Night-time, Non-intersection, Rear-end, Right-turn, Run-off-road, Speed-related, Truck-related, Vehicle/animal, Vehicle/bicycle, Wet road

Rate of Serious Injury: -0.6 to 0.6
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>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012

![Bar chart showing fatalities by target crash type from 2008 to 2012 in Nebraska. The chart displays the number of fatalities for each crash type across different years, with clear distinctions for each year: 2008 (blue), 2009 (red), 2010 (green), 2011 (purple), and 2012 (orange). The x-axis represents the target crash type, and the y-axis represents the number of fatalities.]
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear-end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/animal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet-road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2008 to Year 2012

Target Crash Type
Improvement types with blank crash data totals are either too new to have data or still in the planning phase.

The data included is the annual number of crashes, not a 5-year running average.
Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

Evaluations completed for HSIP projects have nearly always shown a positive result.
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>Lincoln - Cornhusker Highway</td>
<td>Urban Principal</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(US-6) &amp; L55X</td>
<td>Arterial - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha - 42nd &amp; L Street (US-</td>
<td>Urban Principal</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275)</td>
<td>Arterial - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha - 40th &amp; Dodge Street</td>
<td>Urban Principal</td>
<td>Intersection traffic</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(US-6)</td>
<td>Arterial - Other</td>
<td>control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln - 27th Street &amp; N-2</td>
<td>Urban Principal</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>20.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>20.19</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>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide - 2-Lane Highways</strong></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Optional Attachments

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