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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As required under 23 U.S.C. § 148(h), the following is the annual report to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) from the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014. The content of this report combines information regarding the implementation status of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and associated sub-programs including the High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP). This combined HSIP report, does not include the annual rail-highway crossing safety report as required under 23 U.S.C. § 130(g). INDOT is exercising the option provided to the states by 23 U.S.C. § 148 guidance, of preparing and submitting to FHWA separate reports.

The format of the annual HSIP report is in accordance with the FHWA online reporting tool. The focus of the report centers on development and implementation of the core federal aid safety program and associated safety spending in Indiana for FFY 2014, beginning October 1, 2013 and ending on September 31, 2014. In addition to the core safety programs, this report discusses the ongoing evolution of the INDOT asset management program mechanism for setting spending priorities for all projects on roads under INDOT jurisdiction.

In 2013, the estimated vehicle miles of travel increased 0.90% above 2012, while the number of fatalities and incapacitating (serious) injuries dropped by 6.27%. As a result, the 5-year rolling average rate of combined fatalities and serious injuries dropped to a rate of 0.97 per VMT in 2013 compared to a rate of 1.01 in 2012.

In FFY 2014, the expected obligation of federal safety program funds from all programs will be about $57.7 million dollars (by September 30, 2014). An improved level of obligation given changing program priorities under the INDOT asset management system was expected.

All projects approved for funding in HSIP or HRRRP programs are required to address at least one of the emphasis areas defined in the Indiana Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) document. The selection and prioritization of all safety projects on roads under INDOT jurisdiction, including those funded with HSIP and HRRRP funds utilize asset management processes. The submission of the documents that describe INDOT’s countermeasure selection methodology originally took place in September of 2008 with the submission of the FFY 2008 HSIP/HRRRP report. The document titled “Highway Safety Improvement Program Local Project Selection Guidance,” issued on December 1, 2010 and “Special Rules for Eligibility of Highway Safety Improvement Projects,” issued August 1, 2013, describes the selection methodology for local HSIP projects.

For roads under INDOT jurisdiction, an established selection process for safety projects regardless of funding program, prioritizes locations of highest need in terms of reducing the
severity and frequency of crashes, and to select the most appropriate and cost effective countermeasures available. The INDOT Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) ensures that each candidate safety project has a cost effective choice of proposed solution(s), the eligibility for federal safety program funding is determined and the relative priority of the candidate project’s needs is established. All safety program projects address one or more of the emphasis areas enumerated in the Indiana SHSP.

INDOT fiscal policy is to make one-third of its total FHWA apportionment from HSIP available to local public agencies for safety projects on local system roads. Individual Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), receive annual apportionments of obligation authority, while predetermined amounts of obligation authority are set-aside for the use of rural public highway agencies. The “Highway Safety Improvement Program Local Project Selection Guidance,” provides local agencies guidance on the structure and content of applications for HSIP and HRRRP project funding. INDOT maintains a web-based information source on the various state and local safety programs, which is accessible at, http://www.in.gov/indot/2357.htm.
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.

In the State of Indiana, Local Public Agencies (LPAs) operate and maintain all local public roads. INDOT policy is to make one third of its total annual apportionment of HSIP funding available to local public agencies for safety projects on local system roads. An annual apportionment of obligation authority is assigned to each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) serving Group 1 and Group 2 urban areas. A standardized population formula is used to determine the assigned funding made available to individual MPOs. For public agencies in rural (non MPO area) group 3 (incorporated cities and towns) and rural Group 4 (counties and unincorporated towns), a predetermined amount of HSIP funds are made available for funding eligible projects. The aforementioned population formula is also used to determine the total...
amount of the HSIP allotted for projects located in rural areas.

Rules have been established allowing LPAs to apply to INDOT for determination of project eligibility to utilized HSIP funds. These rules are contained in the INDOT guidance document titled, *Highway Safety Improvement Program Local Project Selection Guidance*. The latest INDOT version of this guidance document was approved by INDOT’s Highway Safety Advisory Committee on December 10, 2010, and is on file at the FHWA Indiana Division Office. This document is also posted on the INDOT web site at: http://www.in.gov/indot/files/LocalHSIPProjectSelectionGuidance.pdf

Guidance and outreach efforts are routinely made by INDOT and the Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP), in regard to selection of HSIP and HRRRP projects. INDOT’s guidance to LPAs advocates the value of low cost systemic safety improvements to proactively address the risk of severe crashes on their entire roadway system, along with the treatment of locations with high risk of frequent severe crashes involving fatality or incapacitating (Class A) injury. Systemic projects are gaining increasing acceptance by LPAs. Notably, many applications have been submitted by LPAs to assist them in funding systemic projects to upgrade the retro-reflectivity of local regulatory and warning signs.

In urban areas, the MPOs serving Group 1 and 2 urban areas are tasked to perform initial screening of proposed safety improvements and select candidate projects subject to INDOT determination of HSIP eligibility. To provide a similar level of planning support to rural public agencies, INDOT has collaborated with the Indiana Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP). INDOT sponsors an ongoing program with LTAP called the *Hazard Elimination Project for Local Roads and Streets* (HELPERS) Program. The HELPERS Program coordinates with rural planning organizations (RPOs) as well as rural counties, cities and towns to assist them in identifying, analyzing and prioritizing their needs in regard to severe crash reduction.

The HELPERS Program advises LPAs regarding management of safety risks and assists rural area LPAs in submitting project level funding proposals to INDOT for determination of HSIP project eligibility. The INDOT Office of traffic Safety makes a determination of eligibility for all applications to utilize HSIP or HRRRP funding.

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

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

☑ Other: Other-Local Agency Assistance Division and Budget & Project Accounting Division

☑ Other: Other-Capital Asset Management

Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.

The INDOT Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) leads INDOT’s coordinated efforts to identify locations with safety needs, plan improvements, prioritize and program traffic safety improvement projects on the Indiana State system of highways. OTS works with each of INDOT’s district offices, and the divisions of Design, Planning, Traffic Engineering, LPA & Grant Administration, Capital Asset Management Office and Budget Divisions.

In the areas of finance, budget and project prioritization/programming, the Manager of the OTS acts as the chair to the INDOT Traffic Safety Asset Management Team to prioritize all proposed safety projects located on the INDOT system of highways. The six INDOT district traffic engineering offices act as voting members of the team and the INDOT Office of Capital Project Funds Management provides coordination with INDOT's other asset teams and upper management. The Traffic Safety Asset Management Team acts to deliberate the relative need and priority of proposed traffic safety projects on INDOT managed roadways. The overall budgeting of obligation authority for safety projects on both the state and local road systems is coordinated with the Division of Budget and Project Accounting.

For approved safety projects on the state highway system, the relevant INDOT district office is responsible for project programming and entry of the project into the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) and any relevant local Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). They also manage design and construction projects in coordination with INDOT Design and Construction Divisions, via a project manager assigned to the project to coordinate all project development tasks.

Regarding internal coordination of local safety projects, the OTS performs review of all proposed projects for compliance with eligibility requirements as defined in Indiana’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Eligible projects are recommended to the INDOT Division of LPA & Grant Administration for funding approval and inclusion in the STIP and relevant TIP document. The LPA & Grants Division also develops an interagency agreement with the LPA to guide project development. The relevant INDOT district then assigns a project manager to coordinate development of the construction project.
In addition, OTS consults with Design Division regarding new safety improvement design practices and the Office of Traffic Engineering Administration, regarding new Standards and Specifications. OTS also coordinates with the Research Division regarding the approval of safety related research efforts under the Joint Transportation Research Project (JTRP) and to plan implementation of successful research products.

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

- [x] Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- [x] Governors Highway Safety Office
- [ ] Local Government Association
- [x] Other: Other-Local Technical Assistance Program

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

- [ ] Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee
- [x] Other: Other-Project administration and funding approval resides with Division of Local Public Agencies and Grants Adminisration

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

In response to the increased HSIP apportionments under MAP-21, INDOT has engaged in new strategies to increase the obligation of funds to construct worthy safety improvement projects.
The number of systemic improvement types has been expanded along with expanded selection of hot spot safety improvement projects. One third of the total percentage of HSIP funds is made available to local agencies, resulting in more opportunity to combat severe crash risk in both urban and rural areas.

Regarding the process used by INDOT to conduct HSIP eligibility review for proposed local safety projects; urban LPAs must first submit to their local Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) for preliminary selection and funding prioritization. Rural group 3 and group 4 LPAs first submit their proposed projects to the LTAP HELPERS Program for compliance review, prior to INDOT determination of eligibility for HSIP or HRRRP funding. INDOT determines eligibility in accordance with the emphasis area defined in the Indiana SHSP and HSIP Local Project Selection Guidance documents. If a proposed local project is found to be eligible for HSIP or HRRRP funding, the Division of LPA and Grant Administration provides oversight of project agreements between INDOT and the LPA to govern project development. The LPA and Grant Administration Division also supports the programming of safety projects by administering inclusion of projects on Local and State Transportation Improvement Plans and authorizing funding year for, scheduling of plan development and construction contract letting. Once a project is placed in Active status on the INDOT scheduling system, the INDOT district office assigns a project manager to coordinate the design and environmental documentation with the project sponsor agency, designer, and various INDOT Divisions and offices in order to bring the project to a construction contract letting.

**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-Centerline and Edgeline Rumble Stripes
- [ ] Other: Other-Traffic Signal Visibility Improvement
Program: Median Barrier

Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2010

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

☑ Crash frequency

☑ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

☑ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

☑ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

☑ Relative severity index

☑ Crash rate

☑ Critical rate

☑ Level of service of safety (LOSS)
Excess expected crash frequency using 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
Program: Intersection

Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2010

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-roadway conditions and sight distance

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

- Ranking based on B/C
- Available funding
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Cost Effectiveness 50
- Weighted factors addressing safety need and cost effectiveness 50

Program: Horizontal Curve
Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

**Exposure**
- Traffic
- Volume

**Roadway**
- Median width
- Horizontal curvature
- Functional classification
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Lane miles</th>
<th>Roadside features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
- [ ] 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
- [x] 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?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

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

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

- Competitive application process
- Selection committee
- Other

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

- Ranking based on B/C
- Available funding
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Cost Effectiveness 50
- Weighted Factors including safety need, roadway geometry and cost effectiveness 50

Program: Rural State Highways

Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2010
What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ All crashes</td>
<td>■ Traffic</td>
<td>■ Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>■ Volume</td>
<td>■ Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Fatal and serious injury</td>
<td>■ Population</td>
<td>■ Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crashes only</td>
<td>■ Lane miles</td>
<td>■ Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Other</td>
<td>■ Other</td>
<td>■ Other</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?
How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

- Competitive application process
- Selection committee
- Other

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

- Ranking based on B/C
- Available funding
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Cost Effectiveness 50
- Weighted factors based on safety need and cost effectiveness 50

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

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

☒ Yes
☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☐ Selection committee
☐ Other

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

☒ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2010

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

Other

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C

Available funding
Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Cost Effectiveness

Weighted factors based on safety need and cost effectiveness

Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2010

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-Geometric Features

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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

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

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

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

Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C
Available funding
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit
Cost Effectiveness 100

Program: Local Safety
Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2010

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-Geometric Features, marking and signs

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
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>Ranks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Ranking based on B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Available funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Incremental B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Ranking based on net benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Weighted scoring based on safety need and cost effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program:** Pedestrian Safety

**Date of Program Methodology:** 10/1/2010

**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>
</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'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

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

- Competitive application process
- Selection committee
- Other

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

- Ranking based on B/C
- Available funding
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Cost Effectiveness 50
- Weighted factors using safety need and cost effectiveness 50

Program: Other-Centerline and Edgeline Rumble Stripes
**Date of Program Methodology:** 10/1/2012

**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-Paved Shoulder Width</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

☑ Crash frequency
☑ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
☑ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
☑ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
☑ Relative severity index
☑ Crash rate
☐ Critical rate
☐ Level of service of safety (LOSS)
☐ Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
☐ Probability of specific crash types
☑ Excess proportions of specific crash types
Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☐ Selection committee
☐ Other

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☐ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☐ Available funding
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Cost Effectiveness 50
Weighted factors using safety need and cost effectiveness

Program: Other-Traffic Signal Visibility Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

ϖ Crash frequency

☐ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

☐ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

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

32

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.

- Highway Safety Manual
- Road Safety audits
- Systemic Approach
- Other: Other-No Change

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

INDOT is seeking to achieve a balance between obligations of HSIP funds towards implementation of systemic improvements and supporting safety improvements at individual locations with high incidence or risk of severe crash outcomes. Project identification methods include conducting system wide analysis to identify both individual locations with high potential for severe crashes or wide spread needs for systemic improvements. Also, projects may be programmed as a result of identification by other means such as public complaints filtered through one of the INDOT district offices.
Candidate locations on roads under INDOT jurisdiction are subject to an initial engineering review process similar to a road safety assessment (RSA), in order to identify safety needs and appropriate countermeasures. The INDOT Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) conducts these reviews with support of the INDOT district offices.

The process used to program traffic safety projects on INDOT system roads requires selection and prioritization by state fiscal year. Traffic Safety Asset Management (TSAM) Team produces a proposed list of safety improvement projects for programming in each fiscal year. A uniform scoring process is utilized to provide proposed projects with weighted scores that utilize the history of crashes and their severity, traffic volume and road inventory data to a uniform set of criteria in order to assess the relative intensity of safety needs. The process also considers the cost effectiveness of the proposed solution and other factors to generate a weighted score that encompasses the relative need and effectiveness of a proposed safety improvement project. The TSAM team then reviews and deliberates the relative priority of each proposed project and assigns a priority grade for targeted fiscal year of construction. An Executive Finance Committee later considers the proposed projects and then ratifies the safety program for the target year of the TSAM Team.

In regard to candidate projects on the local road system, OTS makes all eligibility determinations for HSIP and HRRRP funding. The necessary information to determine eligibility for HSIP/HRRRP funding typically consists of a Road Safety Audit (RSA) report. An exception is the submission of eligibility information for certain approved systemic project types that may be provided via an INDOT approved form. Projects located in metropolitan planning areas must first be selected by the relevant MPO prior to eligibility review by INDOT. Rural LPAs are asked to first work with the LTAP HELPERS Program that acts to advise the LPA and pre-screen applications for compliance with federal and state regulations. The HELPERS Program often provides valuable advice to the LPAs regarding best practices for traffic safety and facilitates the conduct of appropriate RSA procedures.
## 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>39283347</td>
<td>36294681.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>1901999</td>
<td>516448.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR Special Rule</td>
<td>48996</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>10846546</td>
<td>20937644.5</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>
Obligated total includes planned transfers from Advance Construction to the 164-HE program planned to occur before October 1, 2014.

How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
$15,251,332.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
$20,208,686.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$207,208.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$207,208.00
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?

$6,972,168.00

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

MAP-21 makes it clear that cost effectiveness is to be considered in project selection decisions, and it’s recognized that this may become a future requirement for most federal aid funding decisions. However, guidance under MAP-21 is currently unclear as to how the risk of future crashes can be accommodated under current cost effectiveness methodologies. The determination of project eligibility to utilize HSIP funds in a cost effective manner is typically based on past history of crashes. However, crash past history is not a perfect indicator of future crash risk under changing traffic demand. Also, useful predictive functions in the Highway Safety Manual, they are still limited to specific situations. As a result safety improvement projects that are seemingly promising candidates for HSIP funding are rejected due to an inability to meet cost effectiveness criteria. The lack of guidance regarding the application of risk factors relative to cost effectiveness has had the effect of stifling innovation in regard to trying new types of crash countermeasures. Improved guidance by FHWA would be welcome in regard to assessment of future traffic safety risk, in assessing changing land use and changing travel demand.

The High Risk Rural Roads Program is ineffective and should be abandoned. It’s far more likely that HSIP funds are used to make safety improvements on rural local roads. The requirement that ties safety improvement funds to roadway functional class is not an element that rural local agencies typically consider when prioritizing safety improvements, therefore proposed projects often do not qualify for this funding program. In addition, many local roads lack accurate volume data, making a comparison of crash rate averages a difficult task. Analysis of current severe crash trends has not indicated a difference that can be directly attributed to functional class. Improved response to severe crash risk on rural local roads could be achieved by dedicating a percentage of HSIP funding to safety improvements on rural roads found to have a higher than nominal crash history regardless of functional class.
At a minimum state DOT’s should be permitted to conduct the calculation of the current special rule requirement. State DOTs are more familiar with current status of roadway functional class and changing urban/rural boundaries. The current calculation conducted by NHTSA is dependent on data from the FARS system that has an inherent time lag and the functional class definitions and urban/rural boundaries don’t always match with current data.

In regard to rural road safety, INDOT plans to engage with LTAP and interested LPA agencies to look for improved data analysis and project selection methods to address risk on mid to high speed local roads. In addition we are hopeful that new guidance regarding the application of crash risk will result in new methodologies to address cost effectiveness analysis and allow for more flexibility regarding determination of project eligibility.

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

INDOT has developed an Asset Management system to address the need for safety improvement actions and to prioritize potential safety improvement projects and actions that improves INDOTs ability to select and produce high value safety projects. Candidate safety projects undergo weighted scoring that emphasizes the need to address high severity crash locations with the construction of cost effective crash countermeasures.

The primary program goal for the Traffic Safety Asset Class is the reduction in the frequency of severe (fatal and incapacitating injury) crashes. Current available analysis tools are designed to consider all injury crashes to be serious so fatal and injury crashes are used for prioritization of countermeasure proposals. For most crash studies conducted at specific locations (sites) property damage data is also used to reveal a complete picture of prevailing crash patterns. For sites on the INDOT system and in most local urban areas, traffic volume data is available to establish nominal and substantive crash rates. Unfortunately, most rural local roads lack recent volume data so a crash loss index was developed under a joint transportation research project with Purdue University. Socioeconomic data and road characteristics are used to develop a local expected road crash loss and crash loss density that is compared to existing crash history to determine relative safety need at a site or road segment. Prior to project programming a site investigation is performed for all crash studies using Road Safety Audit principles to determine if or how the road’s design and maintenance characteristics influence crashes and to establish an appropriate and effective set of countermeasures.
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>14000</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>3.93 Miles</td>
<td>1020191 .74</td>
<td>1500642 .79</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100785</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs and traffic control - other</td>
<td>0.01 Miles</td>
<td>746400 .17</td>
<td>2001535 .17</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201391</td>
<td>Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>0.52 Miles</td>
<td>2400561 .18</td>
<td>2901026 .33</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301112</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - miscellaneous</td>
<td>1.56 Miles</td>
<td>3366213 .46</td>
<td>3366213 .46</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Intersection Type</td>
<td>Project Agency</td>
<td>Action Type</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>40108</td>
<td>Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3909335</td>
<td>4147840</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80102</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>83.07</td>
<td>232288.94</td>
<td>232288.94</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve Mrkg Visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81011</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>54696</td>
<td>290377.14</td>
<td>290377.14</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve Mrkg Visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81015</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>17973</td>
<td>165779.95</td>
<td>165779.95</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve Mrkg Visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90129</td>
<td>Interchange design</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3017366.31</td>
<td>3363097.72</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Separate Traffic Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>2629161.77</td>
<td>3581305.4</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer</td>
<td>Urban Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Redesign Int Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Redesign Intake</td>
<td>Description</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>10065 55</td>
<td>Interchange design Interchange design - other</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>199405.63</td>
<td>221561.81</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>362 50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10066 32</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Congestion detection / traffic monitoring system</td>
<td>12 Numbers</td>
<td>347490.33</td>
<td>347490.33</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>100 00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11721 73</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>3773 Numbers</td>
<td>745274.5</td>
<td>745274.5</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>850 00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11721 91</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Raised pavement markers</td>
<td>171 Miles</td>
<td>249774.55</td>
<td>249774.55</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>850 00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11734 41</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Raised pavement markers</td>
<td>19890 Numbers</td>
<td>203682.16</td>
<td>203682.16</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>850 00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11734 62</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>3 Numbers</td>
<td>367152</td>
<td>367152</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>850 00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length (Miles)</td>
<td>Cost (2013 $)</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer</td>
<td>Location Code</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Other</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>11736</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>639380.43</td>
<td>639380.43</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>290 09</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install cable barrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11736</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>1341384.74</td>
<td>1358051.41</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>311 95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install cable barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11736</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>400158.55</td>
<td>412158.55</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>139 78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install cable barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12961</td>
<td>Roadway delineation - other</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>756003.57</td>
<td>756003.57</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>850 00</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install rumble stripes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12962</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>640374.67</td>
<td>654769.11</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>352 63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install cable barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Number</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>1296287</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>211564.61</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>31700</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install cable barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296292</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>32 Numbers</td>
<td>362603.5</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>85000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Increase signal visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296293</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>323332.93</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td>Install rumble stripes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296329</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>323219.91</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>51800</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install rumble stripes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296915</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>442267</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>85000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install rumble stripes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297604</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1641692.19</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>35076</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Surface Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Start Mile</td>
<td>End Mile</td>
<td>Contract No.</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Departure</td>
<td>Surface Treatment</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>1297605</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>415414.08</td>
<td>460889.08</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>5196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297610</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1025847.81</td>
<td>1138146.42</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>9047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297626</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1471529.75</td>
<td>1632616.75</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>9044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297627</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1399469.25</td>
<td>1405469.25</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>13938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298212</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Systemic improvements - signal-controlled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121418.61</td>
<td>122667.61</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>12682</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382014</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34360</td>
<td>315354.45</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>6550</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Improve Traffic Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13825 38</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>9 Numbers</td>
<td>147747.08</td>
<td>1480597.08</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13827 77</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>103939.25</td>
<td>103939.25</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828 72</td>
<td>Roadside Roadside - other</td>
<td>0.37 Miles</td>
<td>117720.24</td>
<td>117720.24</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13829 11</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>4.85 Miles</td>
<td>388241.55</td>
<td>429224.88</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13829 14</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Raised pavement markers</td>
<td>43748 Numbers</td>
<td>271024.29</td>
<td>271024.29</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14010 53</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>33696</td>
<td>37440</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Other Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Numb</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - miscellaneous</td>
<td>2.41 Miles</td>
<td>879603.3</td>
<td>1339735.88</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>198.60</td>
<td>35</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>14011 00</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>104347</td>
<td>115941.11</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>550.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14011 05</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>112500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>550.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14011 16</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>80000</td>
<td>88889</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>550.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14011 25</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>47012</td>
<td>52236</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>550.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81029 4</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1269086.17</td>
<td>1457359.85</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>800.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81029 8</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>2000335.8</td>
<td>2225928.67</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>124.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810299</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>0.2 Miles</td>
<td>995391.69</td>
<td>1105990.77</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency Improve geometrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006047</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>0.5 Miles</td>
<td>253476.9</td>
<td>281641</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency Improve geometrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006057</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>122 Numbers</td>
<td>40500</td>
<td>45000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency Improved signage Improved signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006063</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>243 Numbers</td>
<td>40250.58</td>
<td>40250.58</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Town or Township Highway Agency Improved signage Improved signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006069</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection flashers - add overhead</td>
<td>2 Numbers</td>
<td>26884.57</td>
<td>29871.74</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Town or Township Install a flashing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Road Type</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Improvements</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>1006094</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>446491.02</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Town or Township Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve geometrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006112</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>3209</td>
<td>1064478.74</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETA-LU)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006476</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection flashers - add overhead (continuous)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>281032.26</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Install a flashing beacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1173043</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>399496.84</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1173078</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>91454.4</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/uns pecified</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Type of Improvements</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</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>11731 11</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/uns pecified</td>
<td>0.11 Miles</td>
<td>139403.49</td>
<td>154892.78</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>550 0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11731 15</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/uns pecified</td>
<td>0.1 Miles</td>
<td>482965.82</td>
<td>536628.7</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>550 0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11731 16</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/uns pecified</td>
<td>0.1 Miles</td>
<td>288235.12</td>
<td>320261.26</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>550 0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11731 65</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/uns pecified</td>
<td>0.1 Miles</td>
<td>173927.52</td>
<td>193252.81</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>550 0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11731 69</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - add emergency vehicle preemption</td>
<td>18 Numbers</td>
<td>352670.84</td>
<td>391856.5</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>550 0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length (Miles)</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Roadway Type</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Action</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>1173227</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - metal</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Install guardrail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1173288</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td>123369</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>Town or Township Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297291</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>51180.03</td>
<td>HRRRP</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297753</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - metal</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>233884.52</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Install guardrail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298004</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs and traffic control - other</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>22250</td>
<td>HRRRP</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Sign inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382200</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>225000</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve geometrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Improvement Target</td>
<td>Improvement Type</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>13827</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Modify existing crosswalk</td>
<td>0.1 Miles</td>
<td>212432.4</td>
<td>252362</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13827</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>2813 Numbers 3</td>
<td>697463.3</td>
<td>697463.3</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improved signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13827</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs and traffic control - other</td>
<td>34 Numbers</td>
<td>254130</td>
<td>282367.25</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improved signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Systemic improvements - signal-controlled</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>104400</td>
<td>116000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Install traffic signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13828</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>1172 Numbers 08</td>
<td>388819.08</td>
<td>432021.21</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improved signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13829</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs</td>
<td>407 Numbers</td>
<td>135000</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Urban Local</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal</td>
<td>Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>Nbr</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Inventory</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>1383062</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>513518</td>
<td>HSIP (Sect 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383085</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>254148</td>
<td>HSIP (Sect 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Other Local Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383189</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/uns specified</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>778761</td>
<td>HSIP (Sect 148)</td>
<td>Various road class</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006120</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/uns specified</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>54360</td>
<td>HRRR Special Rule</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297140</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>628703</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETYA-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(HRRRP = Highway Safety Improvement Program)
Projects with the Improvement Category of Miscellaneous consist of non-infrastructure improvements to traffic safety data systems or traffic safety planning and education efforts undertaken by metropolitan planning organizations as part of their Unified Planning Work Programs.
### 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>850</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td>3098</td>
<td>3086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.99</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

- Fatalities:
  - 2009: 850
  - 2010: 783
  - 2011: 759
  - 2012: 751

- Serious Injuries:
  - 2009: 3000
  - 2010: 813
  - 2011: 783
  - 2012: 759
  - 2013: 751
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

![Bar chart showing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries from 2009 to 2013. The chart displays a decrease in the rate of serious injuries and a decrease in the fatality rate over the years.]
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>41</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.16</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>61</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.05</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</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - OTHER FREeways AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing fatalities by roadway functional classification from 2009 to 2013.](image)

Roadway Functional Classification:
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Functional Classification</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR COLLECTOR (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR COLLECTOR (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL ROAD OR STREET (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR COLLECTOR (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR COLLECTOR (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSTATE (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Serious Injuries
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Serious Injury Rate (per HHWMT)
### 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>393</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.94</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>1150</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PARK, FOREST, OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</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>6</td>
<td>34</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
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**Source:** 2014 Indiana Highway Safety Improvement Program
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Ownership


Serious Injury Rate (per HWVMT)

Roadway Functional Classification

State, County, Town, City, State Park, Other State, Other Local, Private, Railroad, State Toll, Local Toll, Other
At present INDOT does not separate crash or VMT data to differentiate between Interstate Freeways and Other Freeways. Also data for Urban Major and Minor Collectors are not separated into the two classifications.

Statewide Crash data at present does not sufficiently differentiate between incorporated municipalities designated cities and towns and unincorporated towns. For this reason all crashes in these areas are listed under Cities and Municipal areas.
Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

In 2013, the estimated vehicle miles of travel increased 0.90% above 2012, while the number of police reported fatalities and incapacitating (serious) injuries dropped by 6.27%. As a result, the 5 year rolling average rate of combined fatalities and serious injuries dropped to a rate of 0.97 per VMT in 2013 from a rate of 1.01 in 2012.

Statewide 2013 crash data shows that Indiana did not exceed the four performance goals outlined in the SHSP, the 5 year rolling average of Fatalities, Severe (Incapacitating) Injuries, Fatality Rate and Severe Injury Rate. The spike in severe crashes on rural roads that was experienced in 2012 was not repeated in 2013.

Crashes resulting from vehicle departure from the travel lanes (including roadway departure, head-on and opposite direction sideswipe) continue to be the most numerous harmful events. For 2013 the 5 year rolling average percentage of fatalities resulting from single vehicle lane departures make up 48.7% of all Indiana motor vehicle fatalities, compared to the 5 year average of 49.6% calculated in 2012. As a result, INDOT has developed several systemic improvement types aimed at reducing the incidence and consequences of lane departure crashes.

Fatalities as a result of intersection crashes make up the second worst type of harmful event. In 2013 the 5 year average of intersection fatalities contributed 24.2% of total traffic fatalities, similar to the 24.6% average from 2012. INDOT is advancing systemic improvements to increase the visibility of both signalized and unsignalized intersections. INDOT is also placing increased emphasis on timely modernization of traffic signals, and increased use of innovative intersection types to reduce traffic conflicts; such as Roundabouts, J Turns and Michigan Left Tum designs.

Indiana is also concerned with the incidence of fatalities involving vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, bicycle and motorcycle riders, and is working with our partners on education efforts. In 2013 the 5 year rolling average of pedestrian fatalities rose to 8.2%, from the 7.8% average in 2012. The 5 year average percentage of fatalities that involve bicyclists held steady at 1.7%. The number of motorcycle and moped crashes was lower in 2013 compared to 2012, but it should be noted that nationally motorcycle/moped crashes were unusually high. On the basis of 5 year rolling averages motorcycle and moped fatalities accounted for 17.0% in 2012 and held relatively steady at 16.9 for 2013.

**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</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>0.746</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td>1.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>2.424</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td>1.934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Fatality Rate using FARS (drivers & pedestrians over 65 per 1,000 population)

\[
\text{FARS Fatalities / FHWA # over 65 per capita} = \text{Fatality (F) Rate}
\]

Serious Injury Rate using Indiana ARIES (drivers & pedestrians over 65 per 1,000 population)

\[
\text{ARIES Incapacitating (Serious Injuries) / FHWA # over 65 per capita} = \text{Serious Injury (SI) Rate}
\]

Combined Fatal and Serious Injury Rate (drivers & pedestrians over 65 per 1,000 population)

\[
\frac{\text{(Fatalities + Serious Injuries) / FHWA # over 65 per capita}}{\text{Combined F + SI Rate}}
\]

CALCULATE RATE for 2009

\[
\frac{2.29 + 2.31 + 2.50 + 2.44 + 2.86}{5} = 2.48, \text{ Rounded 2.5}
\]

CALCULATE RATE for 2011

\[
\frac{2.57 + 2.45 + 2.29 + 2.31 + 2.50}{5} = 2.42, \text{ Rounded 2.4}
\]
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
- [ ] Other:

What significant programmatic changes have occurred since the last reporting period?

- [ ] Shift Focus to Fatalities and Serious Injuries
- [ ] Include Local Roads in Highway Safety Improvement Program
- [x] Organizational Changes
- [ ] None
- [ ] Other:

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

Due to organizational changes at INDOT that place administration of all local project under the Division of LPA & Grant Administration, greater emphasis has been placed on
MPOs to make good choices in selecting safety improvements for HSIP funding. As a result INDOT has requested each of the Indiana MPOs to submit a document describing the data driven process that will be used by the MPO to select candidate projects. The submitted procedures are reviewed for approval by the multi-agency Highway Safety Advisory Committee (HSAC). These individual MPO developed process documents will give the local agencies a clear set of criteria when applying for funding, at the same time allowing for local input into the project selection process, and improving the ability of INDOT or FHWA to conduct future process reviews.
**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>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>210.8</td>
<td>691.8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Vehicle/pedestrian</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>Motorcycle &amp; Moped</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>508.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td>Work Zone</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHSP Emphasis Area</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Serious Injuries by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013
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Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013
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Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Rate of Serious Injury
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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>Intersection</td>
<td>Intersection Crashes</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Barrier</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Traffic Signal Visibility Improvement</td>
<td>Intersection Crashes</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Centerline and Edgeline Rumble Stripes</td>
<td>Run-off-road &amp; Head On</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>Vehicle/pedestrian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>Local Roads</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Replacement And Improvement</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural State Highways</td>
<td>Rural State Highways</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2009 - 2013
In regard to the subprograms for Rural State Highways and Local Safety, the rates for fatalities and serious injuries are calculated using the INDOT estimate of Vehicle Miles of Travel (HMVMT) broken down to subcomponents for Rural State Highways and for Local Roads respectively. All other subprograms crash rates are calculated using INDOT estimated HMVMT for All Roads.
## 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>Install/Improve Signing</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Median Barriers</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Run-off-road &amp; Head On</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Intersection Crashes</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Guard Rails</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Intersection Crashes</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.44</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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Target Crash Type

<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>Phantom object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</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>
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[Bar chart showing serious injury rate by target crash type for each year from 2009 to 2013, with different colors for each year.]
Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

The combined efforts of Indiana’s engineering, education, law enforcement, and emergency medical communities are contributing to an overall decline in serious crash outcomes. A trend of fewer severe crashes and increasing percentage of property damage crashes has occurred since the beginning of the HSIP. The extent of contribution by HSIP projects to improved safety is difficult to quantify with current data sources and analysis capabilities, but it’s clear that safety programs are a factor influencing the downward trend in severe crash outcomes. Fatal and injury crash trends experienced a somewhat consistent rate between the start of SAFTEA-LU in 2005 through 2007 then experienced a larger downward trend in 2008 and 2009 as VMT declined. Since 2010 through 2013, VMT has resumed its previous growth trends but a lower incidence of severe outcome crashes in most of the monitored emphasis areas continues in calendar year 2013.

When comparing 2013 to 2012, the estimated vehicle miles of travel increased by 0.91%. Over the same period, the total number of crashes reported increased by 4.63%; but incapacitating injuries dropped 10.14% and fatalities also decreased slightly by 0.26%. 
Provide project evaluation data for completed projects (optional).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Function Class</th>
<th>Improvements 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-Tot</th>
<th>Aft-Fatal</th>
<th>Aft-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Aft-Other Injury</th>
<th>Aft-PDO</th>
<th>Aft-Tot</th>
<th>Evaluation Results (Benefit/Cost Ratio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0101055 US 31, Miami County Line to Fulton County Line</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Roadside</td>
<td>Roadside grading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300179 ST 1006, Washington Street at Defenbaugh Street in Kokomo</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - extend existing left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400309 18th Street @ Kossuth Street</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300432 Landin Road and North River Road</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yr 1</td>
<td>Yr 2</td>
<td>Yr 3</td>
<td>Yr 4</td>
<td>Yr 5</td>
<td>Yr 6</td>
<td>Yr 7</td>
<td>Yr 8</td>
<td>Yr 9</td>
<td>Yr 10</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987189A US 31, At SR 4</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977190A US 31, At New Rd, 2.0 miles N of SR 4</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500670 SR 46 @ E Pearl Street</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0014090 SR 49, SW diagonal ramp at interchange with SR 49 (incl Safety Revisions)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9620730 SR 57, At Boonville/New Harmony Rd</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add two-way left-turn lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982073A SR 57, At Boonville/New Harmony Rd</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200721</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - extend acceleration/deceleration lane</td>
<td>1002, 6th Street and Fisher Street intersection, 3900 feet N of US 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500181</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>1029, SR 15 (Main St) to 9th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9800730</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>US 136, At Hendricks/Marion County Line (Raceway Rd), 2.2 miles W of SR 134</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990073A</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>US 136, At Marion/Hendricks Co Line (Raceway Rd)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600543</td>
<td>Rural Minor Roadside Roadside grading</td>
<td>US 150, At W Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Trafficnarternary</td>
<td>Countermeasure</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</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>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401232 US 231, At Stardust Road (925 S.), 0.50 mile S of I-70 (incl. channelization)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/ unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300965 US 24, US 24 from SR 13 to S jct of SR 9</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - restripe to revise separation between opposing lanes and/or shoulder widths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401315 US 30, Pavement Marking - SR 5 to I-69</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Rumble strips - center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9901910 US 35, At Rosser Dr, 0.8 mile S of SR 119</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600466 US 421, At Michigan Road</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Data1</td>
<td>Data2</td>
<td>Data3</td>
<td>Data4</td>
<td>Data5</td>
<td>Data6</td>
<td>Data7</td>
<td>Data8</td>
<td>Data9</td>
<td>Data10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0401026 IR 1004, CR 200E (Airport Road) at &quot;S&quot; curve, .25 mi N of CR 300S</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial Roadway</td>
<td>Superelevation / cross slope</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9901440 SR 103, From 2.56 km N of US 40 to 3.04 km N of US 40</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector Roadside</td>
<td>Roadside grading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300010 SR 64, At SR 135</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9902630 SR 64, At SR 135</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9901090 SR 8, At CR 500E</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector Roadside</td>
<td>Barrier - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400648 ST 1014, At Township Line Road</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500960 ST 1018, 17th at</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - miscellaneous/other/unspe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Lane</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>cified</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0002700 US 20 at Quince Road</strong></td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8351230 US 20 at Quince Road</strong></td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9902610 US 50, At Deer Creek Rd (CR 75E)</strong></td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0600216 US 52, CR 250 W/McCormick Road - Commision # 01-079-132</strong></td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - miscellaneous/other/unspe cified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0600201 IR 1001, Programmatic signing for Martin County</strong></td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>Sign sheeting - upgrade or replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9136320 SR 114, At N Cullen St, 3.5 miles E</strong></td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Operation Description</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</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>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500107 SR 25, Intersection with CR 375W</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - extend existing left-turn lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800324 SR 28, At SR 213 (Parcel 4) remove house basement, garage, well and septic</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0501052 IR 1001 (N Railroad St/ Washington Ave &amp; Adams Ave), Programmatic Sign Improvement in Town of Fowler</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>Sign sheeting - upgrade or replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Optional Attachments

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