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 Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) continues to work on enhancing the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) for all public roadways in Idaho. ITD had recently developed a planning and prioritization tool, the Highway Safety Corridor Analysis (HSCA), examines and prioritizes safety on a corridor approach. This process uses key concepts from the Highway Safety Manual and has been used to select projects for the 2015 STIP. Automation of many of the steps in the HSCA tool is now being develop to enhance the effectiveness of the too. At the local level, work continues by the Idaho Local Highway Technical Advisory Council (LHTAC) to plan and prioritize highway safety projects at the local level. LHTAC continues to enhance their process based on the fatal and serious injuries to determine what jurisdiction have priority for HSIP funding.

Finally, ITD continues the use of HSIP funds for the behavior programs. This is an effective use of the money as Idaho continues to balance the safety program by utilizing the contributes of engineering, education, enforcement and emergency response.
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.

Currently local roads are being addressed by the following resolution that was implemented by ITD in August of 2010.

WHEREAS, on August 10, 2005 the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) created the core Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) for utilization by the states; and WHEREAS, Idaho shall develop, implement, and evaluate on an annual basis a HSIP that has the overall objective of significantly reducing the occurrence of and the potential for fatalities and serious injuries resulting from crashes on all public roads; and WHEREAS, discussions have
been held with the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) regarding the application of the HSIP to the local roads level in order to meet the intent of SAFETEA-LU; and WHEREAS, it is recognized that the majority of the local highway system does not have the exposure (volumetric) data in order to perform an equitable analysis to determine appropriate safety project selection on a statewide basis.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Idaho Transportation Department supports the allocation of a portion of HSIP funding to LHTAC in order to fulfill the intent of SAFETEA-LU; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Department shall accomplish the expansion of the HSIP to the local level by:

1) Working with LHTAC to analyze existing crash data to determine the top crash locations based on frequency and severity recognizing this methodology is acceptable to the Federal Highway Administration.

2) Not limiting HSIP funding only to the state highway system.

3) Establishment of the Safe Highway and Facilities Team to evaluate and balance the HSIP. LHTAC would be Granted a seat on this team and the Districts and LHTAC would be responsible for individual project selection and management of their projects and associated funds within the HSIP.

4) Requiring LHTAC to follow all the HSIP criteria as established by FHWA. This would include the instruction given in the Capital Investment Program update for the latest Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

5) Supporting and assisting where possible LHTAC in the establishment of a program for the collection of exposure (volumetric) data to support this program and to further meet the requirements of SAFETEA-LU. This includes a local road base map. Once local exposure data can be determined and collected and the local road base map is complete, proportional distribution of funding can be better refined and incorporated into the HSIP. In accordance with the resolution, a formula was created to determine the proportion of the HSIP funding that will be distributed for the state highway system and for the local system. This formula is based on road lane mileage, average daily traffic counts and the percentage of fatalities and serious injuries on each system. The distribution of funding is reflected in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program approved by the ITD board. Funding will begin with the Federal Fiscal Year 2014.

About 40% of the HSIP funding is designated for the local roads. The local highway technical assistance council (LHTAC) is currently evaluating the local road system and soliciting bids from local highway districts for projects. Additional money was transferred to the HSIP program thru the 164 penalty transfer. None of this 5.5 million was used for local roads so the actual % for 2014 was 21%.

Item #3 in the policy discusses having a team to evaluate and balance the HSIP. This team was briefly in existence but now has been changed. The new procedure is addressed in Chief Operations Officer Memo 2. The following information is directly from the memo:

- Projects must be consistent with the strategies in the SHSP
- Projects align with the project criteria outlined in MAP-21
- Projects must be safety data utilized.

Projects are required to correct or improve highway safety in an identified highway safety corridor, specific location or address highway safety problem utilizing a systematic approach. The Districts and
the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) are responsible to scope and develop safety projects for insertion into the HSIP. Projects will be combined by the Office of Transportation Investment (OTI) for review and final acceptance by the Division of Highways. A copy of the memo is attached for reference.

Item #5 in the policy addresses establishing a program to help the LHTAC collect volume data. Although there has been some informal discussion on this, nothing formal has been done at this time.

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

- Design  
- Planning  
- Maintenance  
- Operations  
- Governors Highway Safety Office  
- Other: Other-Office of Highway Safety  
- Other: Other-Local Highway Technical Assistance Council

Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.

Program Features:
The primary features of the HSIP include the requirement for a comprehensive, data utilized, SHSP that defines State safety goals and describes a program of strategies to improve safety. To obligate HSIP funds Idaho has developed and implemented a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) that outlines strategies to address identified safety problems, and evaluate the progress on a regular basis.

Idaho has updated the SHSP and the latest version was approved by the Idaho Transportation Board and signed by Director Ness on April 10, 2013. This meets the requirements of MAP-21. Work has started with FHWA (pilot project) on evaluating the SHSP and this project should be completed by the end of 2014.
HSIP Project Identification:
Idaho generated Chief Operations Officer Memo 2 to the attention of the District Engineers for the purpose to outline management of the HSIP. The primary instruction is:
1. Projects must be consistent with the strategies in the SHSP
2. Projects align with the project criteria outlined in MAP-21
3. Projects must be safety data utilized.

Projects are required to correct or improve highway safety in an identified highway safety corridor, specific location or address highways safety problems utilizing a systemic approach. The Districts and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) are responsible to scope and develop safety projects for insertion into the HSIP. Projects will be combined by the Office of Transportation Investment (OTI) for review and final acceptance by the Division of Highways. A copy of the memo is attached for reference.

HSIP Management:
The Office of Highway Safety will review the defined highway safety corridors after previous years crash data is published to update and again in late spring to balance the program prior to submission to OTI for inclusion into the STIP.

See attachments for COO #2

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

☐ Metropolitan Planning Organizations
☐ Governors Highway Safety Office
☐ Local Government Association
☒ Other: Other-Local Highway Technical Assistance Council-representing all local highway districts

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

☐ Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee
Describe any other aspects of Highway Safety Improvement Program Administration on which you would like to elaborate.

Below is an excerpt from Idaho’s FY 15 Program Update Document. It shows the emphasis on a data driven approach and alignment with the SHSP.

A “Highway Safety Improvement Project” includes strategies, activities, and projects on a public road that are consistent with a SHSP and

- Correct or improve a hazardous road location or feature; or
- Address a highway safety problem.

Data-driven process:

Highway safety improvement projects must be identified on the basis of crash experience, crash potential, crash rate, or other data-supported means. (23 USC 148(c)(2)(B)). The general framework for the identification and analysis of highway safety problems and counter-measure opportunities is defined in 23 U.S.C. 148(c)(2). This framework is consistent with general roadway safety management practices in that States should:

- Identify safety problems either through a site analysis or systemic approach;
- Identify countermeasures to address those problems;
- Prioritize projects for implementation; and
- Evaluate projects to determine their effectiveness.
The Idaho Transportation Department’s use of the Highway Safety Corridor planning and prioritization process should be utilized to identify locations for highway safety projects.

**Program Methodology**

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

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

---

**Program:** Other-Highway Safety Corridor

**Date of Program Methodology:** 1/1/2013

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

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

- **Exposure**
  - Traffic
  - Volume
  - Population

- **Roadway**
  - Median width
  - Horizontal curvature
  - Functional classification
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☐ 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 SPFs

☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

☐ Probability of specific crash types

☐ Excess proportions of specific crash types

☐ Other

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

**How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?**

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

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

- [x] Ranking based on B/C
- [ ] Available funding
- [ ] Incremental B/C
- [ ] Ranking based on net benefit
- [ ] Other

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

20%

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

- [ ] Cable Median Barriers
- [ ] Rumble Strips
- [ ] Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation
- [ ] Pavement/Shoulder Widening
- [x] Install/Improve Signing
- [x] Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation
What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- Engineering Study
- Road Safety Assessment
- Other: Other-Highway Safety Corridor Analysis process

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

- Highway Safety Manual
- Road Safety audits
- Systemic Approach
- Other:
Describe any other aspects of the Highway Safety Improvement Program methodology on which you would like to elaborate.

Our Highway Safety Corridor Analysis (HSCA) program was utilized during this fiscal year. Numerous districts used the information from the output of the process to program projects into the STIP. A few of the districts are hoping to continue to use the list for future projects and other districts are ready for a new list. We are currently working on automating as much of the system as possible so the lists can be produced in a more timely manner.

The HSCA uses rates and frequency of fatal and serious injuries to determine priority areas. Once the priority areas are selected, countermeasures are determined for each of the road section. A cost/benefit analysis of the priority areas is then used to determine which projects would have the best benefit.
## Progress in Implementing Projects

### Funds Programmed

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

- [ ] Calendar Year
- [ ] State Fiscal Year
- [x] 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>20247817</td>
<td>12355063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>5462183</td>
<td>5462183</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>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
$4,185,000.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
$3,869,181.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$1,000,000.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$581,882.00

How much funding was transferred in to the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period?
$5,400,000.00
How much funding was transferred out of the HSIP to other core program areas during the reporting period?

$7,939,711.00

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

ITD is currently obligating the funds for both state system and local system projects. One minor impediment is ensuring that data is available for analysis to ensure the projects are chosen using a data driven method. The Highway Safety Corridor Analysis process can take time and resources are not always available to produce the lists of possible projects to be evaluated. ITD is currently working on automating as much of our HSCA process as possible to help reduce the time needed. In the past, money has been transferred out of the HSIP into other programs. This will not be a problem in future years as the Districts and LHTAC will review the projects currently in the ITIP and take credit for work items that would qualify for HSIP funding.

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

I've copied a letter that was sent to the FHWA Division Administrator-Idaho Division that discusses some future changes in Idaho's HSIP process.

April 18, 2014

Mr. Peter Hartman

Division Administrator – Idaho Division

Federal Highway Administration

3050 Lake Harbor Lane, #126

Boise, ID 83703

Re: Highway Safety Improvement Program

Dear Mr. Hartman:
Highway safety remains as one of the primary objectives of the Idaho Transportation Department. Plans are now underway to populate the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) with projects selected by the Districts and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) that utilizes highway safety data, aligns with the SHSP and fulfills the requirements of MAP-21. By meeting this objective, there will be no need in the future to transfer HSIP funds to other highway programs. For program years FY 15 to FY 18, the Districts and LHTAC will review the projects currently in Idaho Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) to take credit for work items that would qualify for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding. The Department also will take advantage of opportunities to program or advance HSIP projects in FY 15 to FY 18 as these opportunities arise. For projects in FY 19 and beyond, the process illustrated in Figure 1 will be utilized.

**Program Features:**

The primary features of the HSIP include the requirement for a comprehensive, data-utilized, SHSP that defines State safety goals and describes a program of strategies to improve safety. To obligate HSIP funds Idaho has developed and implemented a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) that outlines strategies to address identified safety problems, and evaluate the progress on a regular basis.

Idaho has updated the SHSP and the latest version was approved by the Idaho Transportation Board and signed by Director Ness on April 10, 2013. This meets the requirements of MAP-21. Work has started with FHWA (pilot project) on evaluating the SHSP and this project should be completed by the end of 2014.

**HSIP Project Identification:**

Idaho generated Chief Operations Officer Memo 2 to the attention of the District Engineers for the purpose to outline management of the HSIP. The primary instruction is:

Projects must be consistent with the strategies in the SHSP

- Projects align with the project criteria outlined in MAP-21
- Projects must be safety data utilized.

Projects are required to correct or improve highway safety in an identified highway safety corridor, specific location or address highway safety problem utilizing a systematic approach. The Districts and the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) are responsible to scope and develop safety projects for insertion into the HSIP. Projects will be combined by the Office of Transportation Investment (OTI) for review and final acceptance by the Division of Highways. A copy of the memo is attached for reference.
HSIP Management:

The Office of Highway Safety will review the defined highway safety corridors after previous years crash data is published to update and again in late spring to balance the program prior to submission to OTI for inclusion into the STIP.

At its April meeting, the Idaho Transportation Board approved the creation of the Strategic Initiatives Program beginning in Fiscal Year 2019. A copy of the presentation is included with this letter. This program is the receptacle for all projects which address safety, mobility and economic opportunity. HSIP and other safety projects will be programmed in this area. There is a set aside or minimum guarantee to each district of $1 million per fiscal year, and an additional $13 or more in funds will be made available on a competitive basis that provides the best return on investment for safety, mobility and economic opportunity. Using planning and evaluation tools such as the Transportation Economic Development Impact System (TREDIS) and Investment Corridor Analysis Planning System (ICAPS) management systems, we factor reduction in fatalities and serious injuries as over 50% of the criteria for project selection and weight to ensure that we are providing adequate importance to the safety component of project selection.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact me at 334-8802.

Sincerely,

Dave Jones, P.E.

Chief Engineer

Cc:  Brent Jennings, P.E.

Highway Safety Manager
## General Listing of Projects

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Improvement Category</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>HSIP Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMA-7535, UPRIVER DR &amp; W RIVER VIEW SAFETY AUDIT</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Road safety audits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31000</td>
<td>33000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 90, WA ST LN TO MT/ID ST LN, KOOTENAI CO</td>
<td>Lighting - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88000</td>
<td>88000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D3 SIGN UPGRADES</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Sign sheeting - upgrade or replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19100</td>
<td>20600</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D3 RWIS (3 LOCATIONS)</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Advanced technology and ITS - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28900</td>
<td>31100</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 55, EAGLE RD; I 84 TO FRANKLIN</td>
<td>Roadway widening - travel lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10990</td>
<td>11870</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB, MERIDIAN</td>
<td>SMA-7943, HOMEDALE RD INT IMPR, CALDWELL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69000</td>
<td>74000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL, SIGNAL TIMING IMPR, ACHD</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - add additional signal heads</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185000</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26, JCT SH 46 TRAFFIC SIGNAL, GOODING</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>856000</td>
<td>856000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial and Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 30, 3400 E RD TURN LANE, TWIN FALLS CO</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D4 DISTWIDE GUARD RAIL UPGRADE</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier- metal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>175000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D4 DISTWIDE SIGNAL UPGRADES</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC-2754, GOLF COURSE RD SAFETY IMPR, JEROME HD</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11400</td>
<td>12300</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC-2715, 4100 N INT IMPR, FILER HD</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC-2752, 3900 N INT IMPR, TWIN FALLS HD</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37000</td>
<td>39000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA 7042, FALLS AVE INT IMPR, TWIN FALLS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA-7122, ADDISON AVE &amp; CARRIAGE</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41200</td>
<td>44500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector and Minor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Details</td>
<td>Cost (Estimate)</td>
<td>Cost (Funded)</td>
<td>Arterial Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Implementation Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN, TWIN FALLS</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D4 ISP WORKZONE PATROL</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs and traffic control - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51200</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 15B, INT 5TH AVE &amp; CARTER SIGNAL, POCATELLO</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48300</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - other, Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY13/14 D5 &amp; D6 PAVEMENT STRIPING</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57100</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINGHAM CO</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Sign sheeting - upgrade or replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66000</td>
<td>66000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural and Urban Local Roads</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL, SIGNAGE IMPR, POWER CO HD</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1265000</td>
<td>1365000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 33, VICTOR MAIN ST IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>404000</td>
<td>437000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D6 DURABLE PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>Animal-related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>670000</td>
<td>726000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Animal (Lane Departure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 15, FY14 D6 CONTROLLED ACCESS FENCING</td>
<td>Animal-related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>287000</td>
<td>311000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Animal (Lane Departure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D6 SIGN</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Sign sheeting -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPGRADES</td>
<td>upgrade or replacement</td>
<td>n 148</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, 1 15 AND US 20 RAMP IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10670 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 D6 ISP WORKZONE PATROL</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32000</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 CCTV STATEWIDE</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Advanced technology and ITS - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62600 0</td>
<td>67500 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 BEHAVIORAL SAFETY</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Educational efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95500 0</td>
<td>10300 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>All emphasis areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 TRAVELER INFORMATION SERVICES</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Advanced technology and ITS - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23600 0</td>
<td>25500 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>All emphasis areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 ITS OPERATIONS</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Advanced technology and ITS - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17990 00</td>
<td>19420 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>All emphasis areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL, FY14 LHTAC PRE</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Transportation safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48000</td>
<td>52000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT PLANNING</td>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, FY14 26 RWIS SITES</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61000</td>
<td>66000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE, ECONOMICS OF CRASHES STUDY</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Data/traffic records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 84B, INT OLD HWY 30, MOUNTAIN HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37000</td>
<td>39500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</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>250</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

![Graph showing number of fatalities and serious injuries from 2009 to 2013.](image)


Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

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

**Year - 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>23.6</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.69</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>43.8</td>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2014 Idaho Highway Safety Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>299.8</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

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

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

Roadway Functional Classification

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

# of Serious Injuries
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

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

Fatality Rate (per HMVNT)

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

2014 Idaho Highway Safety Improvement Program
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing serious injury rates by roadway functional classification for 2009 to 2013.](chart.png)
### Year - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PARK, FOREST, OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PARK, FOREST OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATE AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL AGENCY</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>9.49</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

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

# of Serious Injuries

Roadway Functional Classification
Fatality Rate by Roadway Ownership

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

Roadway Functional Classification

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

- 2009
- 2010
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Serious Injury Rate (per HWVMT)

Roadway Functional Classification:
- State
- County
- Town
- City
- State Park
- Other Local
- Other State
- Private
- Railroad
- State Toll
- Local Toll
- Other
Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

The five year average for fatalities has continued to decrease although we have had an increase in fatalities this year compared to last year.

**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>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Calculate Rate for 2012**

1. \[
   (\text{F+SI 2012 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2012 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2011 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2011 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2010 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2010 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2009 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2009 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2008 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2008 \text{ Population Figure}) / 5
   \]

**Calculate Rate for 2010**

2. \[
   (\text{F+SI 2010 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2010 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2009 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2009 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2008 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2008 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2007 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2007 \text{ Population Figure}) + (\text{F+SI 2006 Drivers and Pedestrians 65 years of age and older}/2006 \text{ Population Figure}) / 5
   \]
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
- [x] Policy change
- [x] Other: Other-The continued push to select projects based on a data driven approach.

**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
- [x] None
- [ ] Other:

**Briefly describe significant program changes that have occurred since the last reporting period.**

Idaho continues to enhance the Highway Safety Corridor Analysis (HSCA) program to ensure data used for the selection of safety projects is up to date. Currently Idaho is working towards automating portions
of the HSCA process so the analysis is available sooner. Also policies have been changed to ensure HSIP money is not transferred out of the program. This information was include in question #29.
### 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>Intersections</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>487.8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Vehicle/pedestrian</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>227.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>Vehicle/Motorcycle</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>165.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td>work zone crashes</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>622.8</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>428.6</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Restraints</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>286.2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>258.2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthful Driver</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>242.8</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Driver</td>
<td>Truck-related</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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><strong>Single Vehicle Run</strong></td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>431.8</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head On/Side</strong></td>
<td>Head On/Side Swipe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swipe Opposite</strong></td>
<td>Opposite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Fatalities by SHSP Emphasis Area**

*Year 2009 to Year 2013*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHSP Emphasis Area**
Number of Serious Injuries by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013
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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>Other-Highway Safety Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>8.5</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
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Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects
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Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects
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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>Upgrade Guard Rails</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Signing</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>8.5</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
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# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-turn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed-related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck-related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Serious Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Serious Injuries</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2500</th>
<th>3000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Note: The diagram represents the number of serious injuries by target crash type from 2009 to 2013.*
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013
Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type

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

Safety continues to be a priority for Idaho. The HSIP increased awareness that the use of low cost measures can enhance the safety of the roadways.
Provide project evaluation data for completed projects (optional).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Improvemen t Category</th>
<th>Improvemen t Type</th>
<th>Bef-Fatal</th>
<th>Bef-Seriou s Injury</th>
<th>Bef-Other Injur y</th>
<th>Bef-PDO</th>
<th>Bef-Total</th>
<th>Aft-Fatal</th>
<th>Aft-Seriou s Injury</th>
<th>Aft-Other Injur y</th>
<th>Aft-PDO</th>
<th>Aft-Total</th>
<th>Evaluation Results (Benefit/Cost Ratio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>all roadways</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>308159</td>
<td>138569</td>
<td>174349</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>3842</td>
<td>293561</td>
<td>127591</td>
<td>161353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Optional Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Files Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Structure: Program Administration</td>
<td>COO Memo No 2 - 12 23 13 - HSIP Instructions Signed Final.pdf</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.