Protection of Data from Discovery & Admission into Evidence

23 U.S.C. 148(h)(4) states “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for any purpose relating to this section [HSIP], shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location identified or addressed in the reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or other data.”

23 U.S.C. 409 states “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential accident sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings, pursuant to sections 130, 144, and 148 of this title or for the purpose of developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented utilizing Federal-aid highway funds shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.”
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Executive Summary

Maine has a data driven approach for HSIP project selection, assessing various aspects of crash performance. Before and After crash results comparsion have consistently shown performance improvement over the years. HSIP selection process is re-evaluated each year to see if there opportunities for enhancement and for improved alignment for the state's SHSP.

Supplemental safety projects that are more systemic in nature, like centerline rumble strips are also funded.
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?

- [x] Central
- [ ] District
- [ ] Other

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

Local roads are included with the state-wide project candidates. Maine does capture crash and roadway data for Local roads and so is able to evaluate all locations within the state based on similar crash performance comparisons. Local requests are also received based on crash concerns and are reviewed as part of the candidate screening process.

Identify which internal partners are involved with Highway Safety Improvement Program planning.
Design
Planning
Maintenance
Operations
Governors Highway Safety Office
Other:

**Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.**

Executive, Planning (including local roads and bike/ped), Traffic Engineering, Project Development, all play a part in safety planning. MaineDOT continues to enhance its Work Plan approach to integrate safety into the planning process, looking to get safety in the planning thought process early on to consider not just stand-alone safety needs, but also opportunities that would complement upcoming paving and construction projects. Safety Office is able to review corridor project candidates in advance to identify safety needs that might align with other work.

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

Metropolitan Planning Organizations
Governors Highway Safety Office
Local Government Association
Other:
Identify any program administration practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.

☐ Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee
☒ Other: Other-Continuing adjustments to improve approach.

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

None

Program Methodology
Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

☐ Median Barrier ☒ 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-Median Barriers funded through MaineDOT capital pr
Program: Intersection

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

**Crashes**
- [x] All crashes
- [ ] Fatal crashes only
- [ ] Fatal and serious injury crashes only
- [ ] Other

**Exposure**
- [x] Traffic
- [x] Volume
- [ ] Population
- [ ] Lane miles
- [ ] Other

**Roadway**
- [ ] Median width
- [ ] Horizontal curvature
- [x] Functional classification
- [x] Roadside features
- [ ] Other-MaineDOT's Highway Corridor Priority classifications

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- [x] Crash frequency
- [ ] Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- [ ] Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- [ ] EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- [ ] Relative severity index
- [x] Crash rate
- [x] 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?

Yes

No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

Other-Benefit to Cost

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C 1

Available funding 2

Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Horizontal Curve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Program Methodology:</td>
<td>8/1/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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></td>
<td>✗ Volume</td>
<td>✗ Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Fatal crashes only</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗ Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Fatal and serious injury crashes only</td>
<td>✗ Population</td>
<td>✗ Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗ Crash frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Relative severity index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Crash rate</td>
<td>✗ Critical rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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-Benefit to Cost ranking

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: Bicycle Safety
Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

Roadway
- Median width
- Horizontal curvature
- Functional classification
- Roadside features
- Other

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

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

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 2

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit 1

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes

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

Exposure

- Traffic
- Volume
- Population
- Lane miles
- Other

Roadway

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

Crash frequency
Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

Relative severity index

Crash rate

Critical rate

Level of service of safety (LOSS)

Excess expected crash frequency using SPF

Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring  
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Skid Hazard
Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

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>
</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Weight/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on B/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available funding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental B/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on net benefit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Crash Data

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crashes</td>
<td>☒ All crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>☐ Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>☐ Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal and serious injury crashes only</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Lane miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Weight in Scoring</th>
<th>Rank of Priority Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on B/C</td>
<td>Available funding 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incremental B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking based on net benefit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Roadway Departure

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014
What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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

No

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 2

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit 1

Other
2014 Maine Highway Safety Improvement Program

Program: Low-Cost Spot Improvements

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- 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 2

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit
Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Relative severity index
- Crash rate
- Critical rate
- Level of service of safety (LOSS)
Excess expected crash frequency using 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?
Y: Yes
N: No

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
C: Competitive application process
S: Selection committee
O: 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).

R: Relative Weight in Scoring
P: Rank of Priority Consideration
Ranking based on B/C

Available funding: 2

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit: 1

Other

Program: Local Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

**Crashes**

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

**Exposure**

- Traffic
- Volume
- Population
- Other

**Roadway**

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
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—Usually work with MaineDOT's Local Roads unit

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

Program: Pedestrian Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
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-These projects are normally coordinated through MaineDOT's Bike/Ped coordinator
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 2
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit 1
- Other

Program: Right Angle Crash
Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

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>
</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-Benefit to Cost ranking

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Weight/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on B/C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available funding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental B/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on net benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Left Turn Crash
Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

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>
</tbody>
</table>
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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

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

☑ Yes
☐ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☐ Selection committee
☑ Other-Benefit to Cost prioritization

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☑ Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Shoulder Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014
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 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-Benefit to Cost ranking

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C 1

Available funding 2

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Other
Program: Segments

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2014

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>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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-Benefit to Cost ranking

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C  1
Available funding  2
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit
Program: Other-Median Barriers funded through MaineDOT capital pr

Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2010

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>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>☑ Lane miles</td>
<td>☐ Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Other-Divided limited access</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways - mostly interstate</td>
<td></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 - Systemic approach for all narrow medians - less than 50' wide

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
Competitive application process
Selection committee
Other
Other - Only one pending median section remains for treatment - to be completed in 2014

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

10

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
- Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation
- Upgrade Guard Rails
- Safety Edge
- Add/ Upgrade/ Modify/ Remove Traffic Signal

- Rumble Strips
- Pavement/Shoulder Widening
- Other Other-Wrong Way Driver interstate ramp improvements, rapid flashing beacons for ped crossings,
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-Have HSM calibration work completed for sections, now working on intersections; work underway on prioritizing additional centerline rumble strip needs.

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

Coordination between MaineDOT project planning and safety continue to deepen, as we look to coordinate construction and paving projects with appropriate safety mitigation needs.
## Progress in Implementing Projects

### Funds Programmed

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Programmed*</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSIP (Section 148)</strong></td>
<td>9673563</td>
<td>95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR Special Rule</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Grants - Section 163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Grants (Section 406)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?

0 %

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?

0 %

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

5 %

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

5 %

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

0% 

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

No impediments seen. Safety Office continues to work with Exec., Planning and Regions to improve safety planning coordination/integration.

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

Continue to focus more on Lane Departure needs. Maine experiences 70% of fatalities in this category. Looking to achieve a better funding balance that is reflective of SHSP priorities - median cable barrier needs already met; increasing installations on centerline rumble strips.
### 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>12757</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>577016</td>
<td>654463</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16336. 1</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data/traffic records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17057. 3</td>
<td>Roadside Removal of roadside objects (trees, poles, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35303</td>
<td>39225</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17057. 5</td>
<td>Roadside Removal of roadside objects (trees, poles, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36120</td>
<td>40133</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17237</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5867.69</td>
<td>6519.66</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Notes</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>17239</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>18500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17241</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>697923.07</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>6161</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17258</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93406</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17259</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131222</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>7989</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17261</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225404</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17294.1</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12752.62</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Varied Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17334</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25835</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>10480</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway or Roadside - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123092</td>
<td>136769</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17516.03</td>
<td>19000</td>
<td>1 Miles</td>
<td>65642</td>
<td>72936</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>19001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>13660</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal timing - signal coordination</td>
<td>19007</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>99000</td>
<td>878503</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>19009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24579.14</td>
<td>46703.87</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>21768</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>19010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71100</td>
<td>79000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>11081</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Curve-related warning signs and flashers</td>
<td>19011</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>12366</td>
<td>13741</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Town or Township Highway</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>roadway signs and traffic control Curve-related warning signs and flashers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9446</td>
<td>10496</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19016</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Curve-related warning signs and flashers</td>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>125700</td>
<td>139666</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19021</td>
<td>Interchange design - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103647</td>
<td>115163</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19036</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Curve-related warning signs and flashers</td>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>63239</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19070</td>
<td>Roadway delineation - Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1778322.78</td>
<td>14544788.85</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19085</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13691</td>
<td>16712</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>18630</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19119</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control - modernization/replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>366458.84</td>
<td>469291.06</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</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>19431</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33642.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145835.31</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>1125 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19435</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32385.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216992.51</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>4419 25</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19515</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier- metal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92276</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20442.1</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20541.14</td>
<td>Work Zone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of General Safety Trends

Present data showing the general highway safety trends in the state for the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures*</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>931.6</td>
<td>875.6</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>852.8</td>
<td>851.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

![Graph showing the number of fatalities and serious injuries from 2009 to 2013. The graph indicates a decrease in fatalities and a decrease in serious injuries over the years.]
Rate of Fatalities and Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years

![Graph showing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries per HMVMT from 2009 to 2013. The graph indicates a decrease in both categories over the years.](image)

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

**Year - 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function Classification</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Value1</td>
<td>Value2</td>
<td>Value3</td>
<td>Value4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREeways AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing fatalities by roadway functional classification for 2009-2013 in Maine.](chart.png)
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing the number of serious injuries by roadway functional classification for different years (2009-2013).](chart)

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

**Roadway Functional Classification**
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

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

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
### 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>83.2</td>
<td>487.8</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>152.6</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PARK, FOREST, OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PARK, FOREST OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATE AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE (OTHER THAN RAILROAD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAILROAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PUBLIC INSTRUMENTALITY (E.G. AIRPORT, SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN TRIBE NATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE AID</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>187.6</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by Roadway Ownership

Roadway Functional Classification

# of Fatalities

- STATE
- COUNTY
- TOWN
- CITY
- LOCAL PARK
- OTHER STATE
- PRIVATE
- RAILROAD
- STATE TOLL
- LOCAL TOLL
- OTHER
Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

# of Serious Injuries

Roadway Functional Classification

- STATE
- COUNTY
- TOWN
- CITY
- LOCAL PARK
- OTHER
- PRIVATE
- RAILROAD
- STATE TOLL
- LOCAL TOLL
- OTHER
Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

Overall fatality trends have been positive and continue to improve. Maine has aggressively worked with Police agencies to make sure there has been complete reporting submissions. We have identified limited departments that have had issues with successful electronic report exporting.

Maine's lead crash concern is lane departure. While overall numbers are trending down, it still represents 70% of the state's fatalities.

Application of Special Rules

Present the rate of traffic fatalities and serious injuries per capita for drivers and pedestrians over the age of 65.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older Driver Performance Measures</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Methodology:

Queried in Maine's Crash Reporting database all crashes resulting in fatality or serious injury when fatality occurred to Crash Report Person Type: Driver, Driver Owner or Pedestrian over 65 years old.

Using those crash ID's, summed all resulting crash serious injuries by year. Obtained fatal numbers through Maine's FARS analyst.

Developed rates based on Section 148: Older Drivers and Pedestrians Special Rule Interim Guidance; Attachment 2: Number of People 65 Years of Age and Older (Per 1,000 Total Population) Maine population #s.
Does the older driver special rule apply to your state?

Yes

If yes, describe the approach to include respective strategies to address the increase in those rates in the State SHSP.

Main focus will be working with Maine's Mature Driver Safety working group that is looking to enhance public outreach to mature drivers, family members, clinicians and other support services to emphasize importance of driver assessments and provide guidance on appropriate driver interventions when demonstrated skills are diminishing. Mature Drivers is a focus area.
in Maine's current SHSP and has been updated in the upcoming 2014 SHSP edition. </p>
Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Improvements (Program Evaluation)

What indicators of success can you use to demonstrate effectiveness and success in the Highway Safety Improvement Program?

- None
- Benefit/cost
- Policy change
- Other:

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

- Shift Focus to Fatalities and Serious Injuries
- Include Local Roads in Highway Safety Improvement Program
- Organizational Changes
- None
- Other: Other-Maine's new SHSP, due out in 60 days now also references serious injuries
- Other: Other-MaineDOT's safety office now reports to MaineDOT's Employee Development Office

Briefly describe significant program changes that have occurred since the last reporting period.
No significant changes in Maine's program. Here are some items currently underway:

We are in the process of updating the State's SHSP that is more closely coordinated with HSP and other safety efforts.
Expanding installation of centerline rumble strips.
Coordination of planning (Paving and construction work) with safety needs continues to see process improvement.
**SHSP Emphasis Areas**
For each SHSP emphasis area that relates to the HSIP, present trends in emphasis area performance measures.

**Year - 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP-related SHSP Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td>Head On + Went Off Road</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>446.6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>174.4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.9</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

- Lane Departure
- Roadway Departure
- Intersections
- Pedestrians
- Bicyclists
- Older Drivers
- Motorcyclists
- Work Zones

SHSP Emphasis Area

# of Fatalities

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
Number of Serious Injuries 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>Lane Departure</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013

SHSP Emphasis Area

Rate of Serious Injury

Lare Departure
Roadway Departure
Intersections
Pedestrians
Bicyclists
Older Drivers
Motorcyclists
Work Zones
Groups of similar project types
Present the overall effectiveness of groups of similar types of projects.

**Year - 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP Sub-program Types</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of Fatalities</th>
<th>Number of Serious Injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other-Median Barriers funded through MaineDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital pr</td>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type

- All
- Angle
- Cross median
- Sideswipe
- Head on
- Left-turn
- Night-time
- Non-intersection
- Rear end
- Right-turn
- Run-off-road
- Speed-related
- Truck-related
- Vehicle/animal
- Vehicle/bicycle
- Wet/road

# of Fatalities

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
#Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2009 to Year 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type
Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Rate of Serious Injuries

Target Crash Type
**Systemic Treatments**

Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

**Year - 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic improvement</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

Target Crash Type
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear-end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/animal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/bicyclist</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>

# of Serious Injuries
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type
Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Rate of Serious Injurie

Target Crash Type

Air, Angle, Cross median, Fixed object, Sideswipe, Head-on, Left-turn, Night-time, Non-intersection, Rear-end, Right-turn, Run-off-road, Speed-related, Truck-related, Vehicle/animal, Vehicle/bicycle, Vehicle/pedestrian
Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

Maine has provided median cable barrier installations on almost all narrow (<50-60' wide) interstate medians. MaineDOT does plan to automate that feature in its inventory to be enable easier monitoring of performance in the future. Only one short section remains to be installed on I-195 - Saco, expected to be completed later in 2014. No fatalities have occurred on sections where median cable barrier has been installed, but incidental barrier/guardrail hits have increased. Maine experienced 4 interstate median crossover fatalities from 2005 to 2009, none since

Centerline Rumble strips were added to three selected corridors in late 2013, two more are planned for later 2014 (which will bring Maine's total to 10 sections of non-interstate Centerline Rumble Strip installations), and new candidates are being considered for 2015-17. No head-on fatalities have occurred on corridors where installed.
Provide project evaluation data for completed projects (optional).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Improvement Category</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Bef-Fatal</th>
<th>Bef-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Bef-Other Injury</th>
<th>Bef-PDO</th>
<th>Bef-Total</th>
<th>Aft-Fatal</th>
<th>Aft-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Aft-Other Injury</th>
<th>Aft-PDO</th>
<th>Aft-Total</th>
<th>Evaluation Results (Benefit/Cost Ratio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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>See</td>
<td>attached</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>
</tbody>
</table>
## Optional Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Files Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5 year rolling average means the average of five individual, consecutive annual points of data (e.g. annual fatality rate).

Emphasis area means a highway safety priority in a State’s SHSP, identified through a data-driven, collaborative process.

Highway safety improvement project means strategies, activities and projects on a public road that are consistent with a State strategic highway safety plan and corrects or improves a hazardous road location or feature or addresses a highway safety problem.

HMVMT means hundred million vehicle miles traveled.

Non-infrastructure projects are projects that do not result in construction. Examples of non-infrastructure projects include road safety audits, transportation safety planning activities, improvements in the collection and analysis of data, education and outreach, and enforcement activities.

Older driver special rule applies if traffic fatalities and serious injuries per capita for drivers and pedestrians over the age of 65 in a State increases during the most recent 2-year period for which data are available, as defined in the Older Driver and Pedestrian Special Rule Interim Guidance dated February 13, 2013.

Performance measure means indicators that enable decision-makers and other stakeholders to monitor changes in system condition and performance against established visions, goals, and objectives.

Programmed funds mean those funds that have been programmed in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to be expended on highway safety improvement projects.

Roadway Functional Classification means the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide.

Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) means a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary plan, based on safety data developed by a State Department of Transportation in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 148.

Systemic safety improvement means an improvement that is widely implemented based on high risk roadway features that are correlated with specific severe crash types.

Transfer means, in accordance with provisions of 23 U.S.C. 126, a State may transfer from an apportionment under section 104(b) not to exceed 50 percent of the amount apportioned for the fiscal year to any other apportionment of the State under that section.