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 total Highway Safety Improvement Program allocated approximately $73,827,460 in highway safety funds during Fiscal Year 2014. This past year represented the eighth consecutive year of lower fatalities after reaching a 32-year high in 2005. Georgia’s total number of fatalities decreased 1.0% from the previous year. Despite no discernible change in statewide travel, Georgia’s statewide fatality rate continues to decrease. 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 divided roadways, 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 2014 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

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: Other-GDOT and GOHS have a new cooperative agreement that runs until the end of the
Federal fiscal calendar. The agreement supports HSIP and SHSP development and program maintenance. All other HSIP practices have remained in place through the reporting

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

Over the past year Georgia DOT has worked to improve our crash location data. This work is a critical part of our program administration. Having improved crash location information will allow Georgia to better manage the HSIP program and improve our responsiveness in selecting the appropriate safety countermeasures.

In the coming year, Georgia will select a vendor to house and coordinate our crash reporting. The lessons learned over the past five years will be instrumental in guiding our data base design and quality assurance in the next contract. Some of the items that we will focus on in the latest contract with Appriss will be:

Geo Coding crash locations

Cross referencing FARS

Establishing separate production and reporting databases

Develop graphical QA tools

Program Methodology

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

- Median Barrier
- Horizontal Curve
- Skid Hazard
- Roadway Departure
- Local Safety
- Intersection
- Bicycle Safety
- Crash Data
- Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- Pedestrian Safety
- Safe Corridor
- Rural State Highways
- Red Light Running Prevention
- Sign Replacement And Improvement
- 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>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

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
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- Ranking based on B/C  2
- Available funding  1
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other

Program:  Intersection

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
- 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 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
Other
minimum severity index 1

Program: Safe Corridor
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

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
- Other

Program: Horizontal Curve

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>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
Beam 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
- Other
- Severity index

Program: Bicycle 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 - Bicycle Crashes</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?
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 1
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other

Program: Rural State Highways

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?

- [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 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?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] 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
- Other

Program: Skid Hazard

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

Program: Crash Data

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes

Exposure

Roadway

All crashes
Traffic
Median width

Fatal crashes only
Volume
Horizontal curvature
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

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?

☒ 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
☐ Other

Program: Red Light Running Prevention
Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

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-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
- 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
- Other
Program: Roadway Departure

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

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
- Lane miles
- 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

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Other
Program: Low-Cost Spot Improvements

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ All crashes</td>
<td>✓ Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Volume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Fatal and serious injury crashes only</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>☐ Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>☐ Lane miles</td>
<td></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 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 1

Available funding
Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

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-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
- Other

Program: Local Safety
Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

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 1
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Other

Program: Pedestrian Safety
Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

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

☐ 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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Description</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on B/C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental B/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on net benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Right Angle Crash

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

☐ Other ☐ Lane miles ☐ Roadside features

☐ Other ☐ 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
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
- Other

Program: Left Turn Crash

Date of Program Methodology: 7/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?
2014  Georgia  Highway Safety Improvement Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

☑ Yes
☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☑ Selection committee
☐ Other

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☑ Rank of Priority Consideration

☑ Ranking based on B/C 1
☐ Available funding
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Other

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

Over the past year we started using the latest data for the value of statistical life (VSL) of 9.1 million with an estimate growth of 1.07 percent. We used this new base to calculate our benefit cost ratios.
## 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>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>60000000</td>
<td>58349688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>3500000</td>
<td>1730000</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>
2014 Georgia Highway Safety Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>63500000</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>60079688</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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?
$8,315,281.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$450,000.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$847,980.00

How much funding was transferred in to 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.

Safety is a core responsibility of Georgia DOT. We build safety into all of our programs. HSIP is only a part of the Department’s total program and safety effort. Each year the available funding for HSIP has been increased. In addition we are investigating ways to partner our program areas; for example maintenance and HSIP.

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

There are no other comments on HSIP
### 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>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0006026CarrollSR 5 @ SR 16/US 27 ALT - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013197WayneCR 396/RAYONIER ROAD @ CR 392/SPRING GROVE ROAD - HRRR</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometrics - modify skew angle</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>HRRR (SAFE TEA-LU)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009918ScrevenSR 73 LOOP @ CR 248/BUTTERMILK ROAD/SINGLETON ROAD - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009949LumpkinSR 9 @ SR 52-Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>State Highw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control - Modifications to Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control - Modifications to Roundabout</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Arterial Agency</td>
<td>Interection</td>
<td>Type/Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009928Newton SR 11 @ SR 142 - Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>40000 0</td>
<td>40000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>44 20</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008884Monroe SR 18 @ SR 87</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>23000 0</td>
<td>23000 0</td>
<td>HRRP (SAFE TEA-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>45 40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009576Bibb SR 22 @ Holley Road - Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>18336 27.11</td>
<td>18336 27.11</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>52 80</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007126Thomas SR 3/US 19 FM N of Florida State LN to S of CR 219 - 19 Locs</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>19 Numbers</td>
<td>60412 7.94</td>
<td>60412 7.94</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>54 70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008375Douglas SR 8/US 78@ CR 268/Mann Rd/Mason Creek Rd &amp; @ CR 808/Post</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection</td>
<td>1 Num</td>
<td>37100 00</td>
<td>37100 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>55 90</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>RD/</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Significant Crash Type/Intersection</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000409SpaldingSR 16 @ CR 496/688/OLD 85 CONNECTOR/HOLLONVILLE RD - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>16470 72.37 16470 72.37</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>66 00</td>
<td>State Highway Agency Intersections Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000409SpaldingSR 16 @ CR 496/688/OLD 85 CONNECTOR/HOLLONVILLE RD - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>45000 45000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>66 00</td>
<td>State Highway Agency Intersections Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000409SpaldingSR 16 @ CR 496/688/OLD 85 CONNECTOR/HOLLONVILLE RD - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>60000 60000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>66 00</td>
<td>State Highway Agency Intersections Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008420LowndesSR 38/US 84 @ CR 439/CLAY ROAD/CS 1271/HOLLYWOOD STREET - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometrics - realignment to align offset cross streets</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>48945 48945</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>73 10</td>
<td>State Highway Agency Intersections Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Design Year</td>
<td>HSIP Section</td>
<td>Section Type</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type/Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008420</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometrics - realignment to align offset cross streets</td>
<td>LowndesSR 38/US 84 @ CR 439/CLAY ROAD/CS 1271/HOLLYWOOD STREET - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>68000 0</td>
<td>68000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>73 10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009846</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>ColquittSR 33/US 319 @ SR 33 SO - ROUNDABOUT</td>
<td>49000 0</td>
<td>49000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>73 40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012681</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>JacksonSR 11BU @ CS 936/OLD PENDERGRASS ROAD</td>
<td>31405 0 33</td>
<td>31405 0 33</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>76 60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010364</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>BullochSR 26 @ CR 585/BURKHALTER ROAD</td>
<td>51000 0</td>
<td>51000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>79 20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000410</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>SpaldingSR 362 @ CR 507/ROVER-WILLIAMSON ROADS-TURN LANES</td>
<td>92000 0</td>
<td>92000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>85 70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Crash Type/Intersection</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007311 Fulton</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>CR 72/Boles</td>
<td>Intersection controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 3266/Bell Road @ CR 72/Boles Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>97500 0</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009218 Paulding</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>Paulding</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Paulding</td>
<td>SR 61/Mayfield</td>
<td>Intersection controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 61 @ NEBO ROAD/MAYFIELD ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>17400 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232330 Newton</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometrics - realignment to align offset cross streets</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>SR 36/Henderson</td>
<td>Intersection controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 36 @ CR 181/FLAT SHOALS/STEELE RD &amp; CR 506/HENDERSON MILL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>10000 0</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232330 Newton</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometrics - realignment to align offset cross streets</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>SR 36/Henderson</td>
<td>Intersection controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 36 @ CR 181/FLAT SHOALS/STEELE RD &amp; CR 506/HENDERSON MILL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>58000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Type/Intersec Type/Intersection</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometries - realignment to align offset cross streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13043</td>
<td>13043</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulloch</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10533</td>
<td>10533</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometries - realignment to align offset cross streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32223</td>
<td>32223</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometries - realignment to align offset cross streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Highway Agency: 99 20 45 20 45 55 55 55 55 55

Intersections: 99 20 45 20 45 55 55 55 55 55

Serious Crash Type/Intersection: 99 20 45 20 45 55 55 55 55 55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Modification Details</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Crash Type/Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0009931 Barrow SR 11 @ SR 211 - Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>40000 0 40000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>14 04 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009971 Fayette SR 92 @ CR 149/Antioch Road &amp; CR 308/Lockwood Road - Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>30000 0 30000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>16 14 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009972 Fayette SR 92 @ CR 138/Seay Road &amp; CR 129/Harp Road - Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>30000 0 30000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>16 14 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008457 Lee SR 3/US 19 @ CR 101/Century Road - Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>28000 0 28000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>16 61 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006864 Fulton SR 154 @ CR 1376/Cedar Grove Road &amp; CR 1374/Ridge Road - Roundabout</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>39448 79.23 39448 79.23</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>24 59 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type/Intersection Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008947</td>
<td>Cherokee SR 20 FM BARTOW TO FORSYTH &amp; SR 140 FM BARTOW TO FULTON</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Roadway Delineation - Other</td>
<td>20.7 Miles</td>
<td>12633 82.05</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013174</td>
<td>DeKalb SR 12 @ CR 700/YOUNG ROAD</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Roadway Delineation - Other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>20000 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013194</td>
<td>Fulton SR 9/US 19 @ CS 351/GLENRIDGE DRIVE - REALIGNMENT</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection Geometry - Realignment to Align Offset Cross Streets</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>75000 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532780</td>
<td>Chatham SR 204/ABERCORN ST @ LARGO DRIVE IN SAVANNAH</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection Geometry - Miscellaneous/Other/Unspecified</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>64031 3.47</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006664</td>
<td>Districts 2 and 3 SIGNAL HEAD</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control Modify</td>
<td>33 Numbers</td>
<td>11502 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014 Georgia Highway Safety Improvement Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REReplacement @ VAR LOCATIONS IN SEVERAL DISTRICTS</th>
<th>traffic signal - modernization/replacement</th>
<th>bers</th>
<th>47.96</th>
<th>47.96 on 148)</th>
<th>locatio ns have varying FC</th>
<th>ay Agency</th>
<th>ctions</th>
<th>Type/Inter section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0006664Districts 2 and 3 SIGNAL HEAD REPLACEMENT @ VAR LOCATIONS IN SEVERAL DISTRICTS</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>35 Numbers</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>40000 HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multiplo locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agenc y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013094AIICRASH REPORTING VALIDATION &amp; LOCATING</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Data/traffic records</td>
<td>1625000 Numbers</td>
<td>27198</td>
<td>27198 HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multiplo locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agenc y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012908AIISAFETY INFOMERCIALS TOWARDS ZERO DEATHS - SHSP</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Outreach</td>
<td>12 Numbers</td>
<td>12600</td>
<td>12600 HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multiplo locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agenc y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008332ALLSAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL RESOURCE CENTER (COORDINATORS AND WEBSITE)</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Outreach</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>45000</td>
<td>45000 HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multiplo locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agenc y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008332ALLSAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL RESOURCE CENTER (COORDINATORS AND WEBSITE)</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Outreach</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>45000</td>
<td>45000 HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multiplo locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agenc y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008332ALLSAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL RESOURCE CENTER (COORDINATORS AND WEBSITE)</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Outreach</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>45000</td>
<td>45000 HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multiplo locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agenc y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Y</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013099CobbSR 280/SOUTH COBB FM CR 2236/MANER ROAD TO SR 3 - ROAD SAFETY AUDIT</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Road safety audits</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009400DeKalbSR 13 FROM AFTON LN TO SHALLOWFORD TERRACE - PHASE II</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Medians and pedestrian refuge areas</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>72000</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M005115ChathamSR 21 From SR 204 to SR 25</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>3.62 Miles</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009444GwinnettLAWRENCE VILLE &amp; MARGARET WINN HOLT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>83418</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Non Motorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009446CITY OF GAINESVILLE SAFE PASSAGE @ 5 SCHOOLS - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>54367 2.94</td>
<td>54367 2.94</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Non Motorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010400CITY OF CORNELIA</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>93868 6.67</td>
<td>93868 6.67</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Non Motorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009439CHATTAHOOCHEE COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>32041 6.16</td>
<td>32041 6.16</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Non Motorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010013COWETA NEWNAN CROSSING ELEMENTARY -</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 Num</td>
<td>68758 .83</td>
<td>68758 .83</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Non Motorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locations have varying FC</td>
<td>Agency</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>
<tr>
<td>0010452CrawfordCITYOF ROBERTA - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>30353 4.84</td>
<td>30353 4.84</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010018TiftG.O. BAILEY SCHOOL - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>23268 0.85</td>
<td>23268 0.85</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010379LowndesJ L NEWBERN MIDDLE SCHOOL - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>27900 0</td>
<td>27900 0</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>26181</td>
<td>26181</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</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>0010398LaurensSUSIE DASHER &amp; SAXON HEIGHTS - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>26181 2.2</td>
<td>26181 2.2</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010399WhitfieldDALTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>72911 2.76</td>
<td>72911 2.76</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010014DekalbFIVE SCHOOLS IN CITY OF DECATUR - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>41829 3.29</td>
<td>41829 3.29</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010019ForsythVICKERY CREEK ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>58317 7.25</td>
<td>58317 7.25</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number of Pedestrians</td>
<td>Number of Bicyclists</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multiplcations have varying FC</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010021</td>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>FOUR SCHOOLS IN MARIETTA - SRTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>50465 8.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010023</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>PALMETTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - SRTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>53785 2.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010394</td>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>DEKALB PUBLIC WORKS 5 SCHOOLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>61026 5.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010401</td>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>KINCAID &amp; CHEATHAM ELEMENTARY -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>65673</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>69120 2.81</td>
<td>69120 2.81</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</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>0010403FultonBETHUNE ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>45773 0.12</td>
<td>45773 0.12</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010017GwinnettGRAYSON CITY SCHOOLS - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>23535 0.68</td>
<td>23535 0.68</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location ID</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Locations Have Varying FC</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010392MuscogeeCLUBVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>0010392</td>
<td>16756</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>16756</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010393Henry6 SCHOOLS IN HENRY COUNTY</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>0010393</td>
<td>67495</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>67495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010396CherokeeCHEROKEE CTY SCHOOL DISTRICT @ 5 SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>0010396</td>
<td>33471</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>33471</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010397NewtonNEWTON COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM @ 5 SCHOOLS - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>0010397</td>
<td>56625</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>56625</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>County/Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>FC Numbers</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Multiplc locations have varying FC</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Non-Motorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010451</td>
<td>Lanier County Primary, ELEM &amp; MIDDLE - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists, Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>13156</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010453</td>
<td>Barrow City of Statham - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists, Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>39494</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010454</td>
<td>Columbia Lewiston Elementary School - SRTS</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists, Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>15064</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006294</td>
<td>All Pedestrian Improvements @ 10 SR Locations in District 6</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists, Pedestrian signal</td>
<td>10 Numbers</td>
<td>97000</td>
<td>97000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Non Motorized</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>
<tr>
<td>0006463</td>
<td>District 2 Pedestrian Upgrades @ 24 Intersections in District 2-Ped Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007457</td>
<td>Franklin/Hart/Madison I-85; SR 8; SR 17; SR 59 &amp; SR 72 @ 12 Locs-Ped Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007495</td>
<td>Lumpkin/Towns/Union/White Pedestrian Upgrades @ 20 SR Locations in District 1-Ped Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007495</td>
<td>Lumpkin/Towns/Union/White Pedestrian Upgrades @ 20 SR Locations in District 1-Ped Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Multiplied Location(s)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013171</td>
<td>Pedestrian upgrades @ 35 locs in District 1</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013173</td>
<td>Pedestrian upgrades @ 59 locs in District 6</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009982</td>
<td>District 1 &amp; 2 @ sev locs - guardrail anchor replacement</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009727</td>
<td>Fulton SR 8 from Marietta Blvd to Strong St/Northyard Dr (Utility Relocations)</td>
<td>Roadside Removal of roadside objects (trees, poles, etc.)</td>
<td>1.50 Mile</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009997</td>
<td>Sharp curve treatments @ sev locs in</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>bers</td>
<td>148)</td>
<td>ns have varying FC</td>
<td>Agenc</td>
<td>ure</td>
<td>Roadw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011650FloydOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @14 CR LOCS IN FLOYD CO</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>14 Numbers</td>
<td>42855 5</td>
<td>42855 5</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011813McIntoshOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 13 CR LOC IN MCINTOSH COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>13 Numbers</td>
<td>34200 0</td>
<td>34200 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011834BartowOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 9 CR LOCS IN BARTOW COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>9 Numbers</td>
<td>23358 1</td>
<td>23358 1</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011839BartowOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 10 CS LOCS IN CARTERSVILLE</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>10 Numbers</td>
<td>93862 .68</td>
<td>93862 .68</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Crash Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012654</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</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>
<tr>
<td>0012656</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</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>
<tr>
<td>0012657</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</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>
<tr>
<td>0012679</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Implementation Type</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Sect.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Multipla</td>
<td>Locs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012680LowndesOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 9 LOCS IN LOWNDES COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14249</td>
<td>14249</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012697MurrayOFF-SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS @ 48 CR LOCS IN MURRAY COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20232</td>
<td>20232</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012725PierceOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 15 LOCS IN PIERCE COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26800</td>
<td>26800</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012726HancockOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ VAR LOCS IN HANCOCK COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48000</td>
<td>48000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012727TaliaferroOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ VAR LOCS</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section</td>
<td>Locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway Type</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</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>
<tr>
<td>Taliaferro</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement @ Var Locs in Eatonton</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Off</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ Var Locs in Eatonton</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Off</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ Var Locs in Covington</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene Off</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ Var Locs in Greensboro</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes Off</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ Var Locs in Washington City</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Multiplc locations have varying FC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Crash Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0012732BurkeOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ VAR LOCS IN WAYNESBORO</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>5 Numbers</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012733JenkinsOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ VAR LOCS IN MILLEN</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>3 Numbers</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012734MorganOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ VAR LOCS IN MADISON CITY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>6 Numbers</td>
<td>22500</td>
<td>22500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012735JasperOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ VAR LOCS IN MONTICELLO</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>5 Numbers</td>
<td>22500</td>
<td>22500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Multipl. locs have varying FC</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012768 Montgomery</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 18 LOC IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31000 0</td>
<td>31000 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012775 Brooks</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 9 CR LOCS IN BROOKS COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16614 5</td>
<td>16614 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012776 Miller</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 8 CR LOCS IN MILLER COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12729 1.5</td>
<td>12729 1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012799 Clarke</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 39 LOCS COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25000 0</td>
<td>25000 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012844 Evans</td>
<td>SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 32</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77000</td>
<td>77000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- other</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCS IN EVANS COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>6 Numbers</td>
<td>25000 0</td>
<td>25000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</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>0012849RabunOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 6 LOCS IN RABUN COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>6 Numbers</td>
<td>78262 .75</td>
<td>78262 .75</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012890ClayOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 6 LOCS IN CLAY COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>4 Numbers</td>
<td>74478</td>
<td>74478</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012891LeeOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 4 CR LOCS IN LEE COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>28 Numbers</td>
<td>25000 0</td>
<td>25000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locations have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>FC Numbers</td>
<td>HSIP Section</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012906RandolphOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 5 CR LOCS IN RANDOLPH COUNTY</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>5 Numbers</td>
<td>13036 6 13036 6</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012907SeminoleOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>10859 6.25 10859 6.25</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012909CrispOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 8 CR LOCS IN CRISP COUNTY</td>
<td>Crisp</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>8 Numbers</td>
<td>15856 0.5 15856 0.5</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012910TiftOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 11 LOCS IN TIFT COUNTY</td>
<td>Tift</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>11 Numbers</td>
<td>11384 6 11384 6</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>System Description</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>HSIP (Secti</td>
<td>Multipl</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>on 148)</td>
<td>e locatio</td>
<td>on 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012940DecaturOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 13 LOCs IN DECATUR COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>13 Numbers</td>
<td>13841 3</td>
<td>13841 3</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012941ThomasOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 9 LOCs IN THOMAS COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>9 Numbers</td>
<td>17986 5</td>
<td>17986 5</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013045BarrowOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 20 LOCs IN BARROW COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>20 Numbers</td>
<td>27500 0</td>
<td>27500 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013049Ben HillOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 10 CR LOCs IN BEN HILL CO</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>10 Numbers</td>
<td>58742 .25</td>
<td>58742 .25</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013050ColquittOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>1 Num</td>
<td>16449 5.25</td>
<td>16449 5.25</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Roadway Type</td>
<td>Roadway Type</td>
<td>Section Number</td>
<td>Crash Type</td>
<td>Multiplier Locations</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>State Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013153MitchellOFF-SYSTEM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS @ 7 LOCS IN MITCHELL</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>7 Numbers</td>
<td>10040 6</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771210-ClaytonCR 1350/ANVIL BLOCK FM LUNSFORD RD TO BOULDERCREST RD - GRTA</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - restripe to revise separation between opposing lanes and/or shoulder widths</td>
<td>0.64 Miles</td>
<td>26485 05</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010350FultonSR 8/SR 10 FROM CS 1860/PIEDMONT AVE TO SR 42-PED UPGRADE</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway narrowing (road diet, roadway reconfiguration)</td>
<td>1.89 Miles</td>
<td>60000 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013061FultonSR 42/MORELAND AVE FROM MANSFIELD AVE TO DEKALB AVE - PED UPGRADE</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway narrowing (road diet, roadway reconfiguration)</td>
<td>0.53 Miles</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>0004638Clayton/HenryANVIL BLOCK FM BOULDERCREST/CLAYTON TO ALLEN DR/HENRY-GRTA</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>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>0.64 Mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45350000</td>
<td>45350000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Multipl e locatio ns have varying FC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agenc y</td>
<td>Lane Depart ure</td>
<td>Serious Crash Type</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>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>5301</td>
<td>4655</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>3468</td>
<td>2974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</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

- **2009**: 1580 Fatalities, 1500 Serious Injuries
- **2010**: 1432 Fatalities, 1400 Serious Injuries
- **2011**: 1388 Fatalities, 1300 Serious Injuries
- **2012**: 1298 Fatalities, 1200 Serious Injuries
- **2013**: 1238 Fatalities, 1100 Serious Injuries
Rate of Fatalities and Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years

![Graph showing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries from 2009 to 2013.](Image)

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

### Year - 2013

<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>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.77</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>97</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.6</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>52</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing the number of fatalities by roadway functional classification for years 2009 to 2013.](chart.png)
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification
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Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

Fatality Rate (per HMOVNT)
# Year - 2013

<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>736</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.86</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>145</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.75</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>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>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership

Roadway Functional Classification

# of Serious Injuries

- 2009
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- 2011
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Fatality Rate by Roadway Ownership
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Roadway Functional Classification

Fatality Rate (per HMVT)
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Ownership

Roadway Functional Classification

Serious Injury Rate (per HWMT)
Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

n/a

**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>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[
\text{(F+SI 65+ 2011/2011 population figure)+(F+SI 65+ 2010/2010 pop. Figure)+...}/5
\]

The equation and it looks like this:

2008 - 2012 \( \frac{(331/101)+(367/103)+(332/106)+(284/110)+(391/115)}{5} = 3.19 \)

2006-2010 \( \frac{(456/97)+(463/99)+(331/101)+(367/103)+(332/106)}{5} = 3.87 \)
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: Other - Annual reduction in the overall number of fatalities for the past several years.

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.

n/a
**SHSP Emphasis Areas**

For each SHSP emphasis area that relates to the HSIP, present trends in emphasis area performance measures.

### Year - 2013

<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>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013

SHSP Emphasis Area
Number of Serious Injuries by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013

SHSP Emphasis Area
Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013

SHSP Emphasis Area

Rate of Serious Injury
Groups of similar project types
Present the overall effectiveness of groups of similar types of projects.

Year - 2013

<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>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Light Running Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural State Highways</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>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

**Year 2009 to Year 2013**

- **2009**
- **2010**
- **2011**
- **2012**
- **2013**

**Target Crash Type**

- All
- Angle
- Cross median
- Pedestrian
- Sidewalk
- 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

**# of Fatalities**
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# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Rate of Fatalities

Target Crash Type

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

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type
Systemic Treatments
Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

**Year - 2013**

<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>Cable Median Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

## 2009
## 2010
## 2011
## 2012
## 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</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>Sideswipe</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>
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

- **2009**
- **2010**
- **2011**
- **2012**
- **2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</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>Overtake object</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>Right-turn</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>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 2009 to Year 2013

- Rate of Fatalities

Target Crash Type

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

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Rate of Serious Injuries

Target Crash Type

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

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 application 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 continued the median cable barrier installation program by establishing projects for an additional $4,000,000 of treatment on our state highways. The Interstate corridors and freeways that showed the occurrence of median crossovers were identified and prioritized. Going forward, we will continue to target limited access facilities and other applicable divided highways to install cable barriers. The impact that these programs will have on fatalities and serious injuries will not be evident for another one to two years following the installation. Nevertheless, the data will be closely monitored to identify valid deviations in median crossover and lane departure crashes.

The Office of Traffic Operations completed 41 full signal upgrades and 87 signal modifications as part of our systemic signal safety program. Additionally, we began the installation of the flashing yellow left turn arrow and reflectorized back plates. The revision to the state signal manual has been 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>GA 7/US 341 at SR 74 Monroe County, GA</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson Forrest Rd. at Lumpkin Campground Rd. Dawson County, GA</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - modifications to roundabout</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></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.