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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In February 2014 the New Mexico Department of Transportation, Traffic Technical Support bureau, HSIP unit issued a statewide call for proposed safety project or non-construction safety program applications with documented evidence of safety hazards to justify funding the requested project of program with safety funds. During February 2014 through June 2014 this unit reviewed new proposed safety project applications submitted by the following: Metropolitan Planning Organizations for metropolitan area local governments; regional transportation Planning Organizations for all other local government cities, counties and tribes from non-metropolitan regions; from NMDOT regional design offices; from six NMDOT District Offices, NMDOT Rail and Transit Bureau, from NMDOT ITS Bureau, and from the NMDOT Traffic Records Section. On May 2, 2014 the NM Safety Project Selection Committee met and studied reviews and recommendations concerning the safety project applications. This meeting was the first of a new series of reviews and actions taken regarding proposed safety projects that will be conducted every ninety days. The next such meeting was scheduled for August 1, 2014. The committee selected which applications to approve or reject including direct applications to perform a road safety audit. Projects, programs, or road safety audits that were recommended for approval were forwarded to the FHWA NM Division Office requesting concurrence for federal HSIP funding. For all the projects that received concurrence, they were then programmed in appropriate metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs and the New Mexico State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to begin the HSIP safety project or safety program development and implementation phase.
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.

Answer:

Local city streets, county roads, and tribal roads are addressed in the same fashion as state highways.

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

In February 2014 the New Mexico Department of Transportation, Traffic Technical Support bureau, HSIP unit issued a statewide call for proposed safety project or non-construction safety program applications with documented evidence of safety hazards to justify funding the requested project of program with safety funds. During February 2014 through June 2014 this unit reviewed new proposed safety project applications submitted by the following: Metropolitan Planning Organizations for metropolitan area local governments; regional transportation Planning Organizations for all other local government cities, counties and tribes from non-metropolitan regions; from NMDOT regional design offices; from six NMDOT District Offices, NMDOT Rail and Transit Bureau, from NMDOT ITS Bureau, and from the NMDOT Traffic Records Section. On May 2, 2014 the NM Safety Project Selection Committee met and studied reviews and recommendations concerning the safety project applications. This meeting was the first of a new series of reviews and actions taken regarding proposed safety projects that will be conducted every ninety days. The next such meeting was scheduled for August 1, 2014. The committee selected which applications to approve or reject including direct applications to perform a road safety audit. Projects, programs, or road safety audits that were recommended for approval were forwarded to the FHWA NM Division Office requesting concurrence for federal HSIP funding. For all the projects that received concurrence, they were then programmed in appropriate metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs and the New Mexico State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to begin the HSIP safety project or safety program development and implementation phase.

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

☒ Metropolitan Planning Organizations
Governors Highway Safety Office

Local Government Association

Other: Other-NMDOT Traffic Safety Division; Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO); Regional Planning Organizations (RPO); Tribal Governments; Municipalities; and Counties.

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-NMDOT General Office began a new procedure to solicit statewide for proposed conceptual safety projects or programs that would be reviewed and acted on by the NM Safety Project selection Committee every 90 days instead of just once per year.

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

No further information.

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
Program: Median Barrier
Date of Program Methodology: 8/31/2012

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- □ Crash frequency
- □ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- □ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

Relative severity index

Crash rate

Critical rate

Level of service of safety (LOSS)

Excess expected crash frequency using SPF 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

Other-Systemic Improvements based on national research that median barriers can reduce cross median crashes by nearly 100%.

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-NMDOT State Traffic Engineer approves automatically all reasonable freeway narrow median barrier system proposed safety projects immediately and forwards to FHWA NM Division for concurrence.

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 100
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other

**Program:** Intersection

**Date of Program Methodology:** 8/31/2013

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

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

**Exposure**
- Traffic
- Volume
- Population

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

- Other-Pedestrian Volume and Bicyclist Volume
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

- Ranking based on B/C
- Available funding 100
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other

Program: Bicycle Safety
Date of Program Methodology: 8/31/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All crashes</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal and serious injury</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Functional classification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2014 New Mexico Highway Safety Improvement Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes only</th>
<th>Lane miles</th>
<th>Roadside features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Other-Bicyclist involved crashes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Other-Bicyclist volume</td>
<td>☒ Other-Current roadway lane width and bicycle lanes and designated bicycle routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Other-Observed Bicyclist traffic from safety studies</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

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

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

Yes

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

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

Available funding  100

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Other
Program: Rural State Highways

Date of Program Methodology: 8/31/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

**Roadway**
- Median width
- Horizontal curvature
- Functional classification
- Roadside features
- Other-High Risk Rural Road Network

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 100
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
Program: Roadway Departure

Date of Program Methodology: 8/31/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

☐ Probability of specific crash types

☐ Excess proportions of specific crash types

☐ Other

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

☒ Yes  ☐ No

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

☒ Yes  ☐ No

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

☐ Competitive application process

☒ Selection committee  ☐ Other

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

☒ Relative Weight in Scoring  ☐ Rank of Priority Consideration
Ranking based on B/C
- Available funding
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other

Program: Low-Cost Spot Improvements

Date of Program Methodology: 8/31/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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 100

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Other

Program: Local Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 8/31/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes

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

Exposure

- Traffic
- Volume
- Population
- Lane miles
- Other

Roadway

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Weight in Scoring</th>
<th>Rank of Priority Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking based on B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Available funding</td>
<td>100</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>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Pedestrian Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 8/31/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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 100
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Other

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

☒ Cable Median Barriers
☒ Rumble Strips
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Pavement/Shoulder Widening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Signing</td>
<td>Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Guard Rails</td>
<td>Clear Zone Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Edge</td>
<td>Install/Improve Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Other Other-Rumble stripes, pavement markings on top of existing shoulder rumble strips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Other-Install improved signs and striping on freeway exit ramps to reduce wrong way travel crashes on freeways</td>
<td>Other Other-Install ITS Type improvements on select regional work trip commuter corridors to reduce secondary crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Other-Upgrade regular Yellow warning signs, chevrons, and Large Arrow signs on horizontal curves with fluorescent yellow signs.</td>
<td>Other Other-30% of programmed HSIP funds in this reporting period address systemic improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Other-Various analyses of the New Mexico surface transportation network are employed, where observations of current transportation operations, including current physical attributes, combined with various types of data including person trips, traffic volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Other-Resultant analyses may determine such statistics as crash frequency, crash rate or observed hazardous traffic conditions as a result of performance of an engineering safety study or road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identify any program methodology practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.

☐ Highway Safety Manual
☒ Road Safety audits
☒ Systemic Approach
☐ Other:

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

No additional information.
## 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><strong>HSIP (Section 148)</strong></td>
<td>19015223</td>
<td>13501533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71 %</td>
<td>66 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRR Special Rule</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</strong></td>
<td>5873407</td>
<td>5404738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 %</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive Grants - Section 163</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive Grants (Section 406)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Local Funds</strong></td>
<td>1977335</td>
<td>1502053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?

$5,020,614.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?

$3,155,614.00

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

$0.00

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

$0.00

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

$0.00
How much funding was transferred out of the HSIP to other core program areas during the reporting period?

$0.00

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

The primary impediment to implementing potential safety countermeasure strategies is always the associated cost and available funds. Although they cannot be determined until strategies are proposed, the NMDOT anticipates the following general impediments or difficulties (in addition to cost/ funding impediments) to successfully implementing potential safety strategies:

- Lack of favor or desirability with certain stakeholder groups such as the public or with particular road users’ interest groups that could limit or result in non-approval of the implementation of a strategy
- Need for multi-agency coordination and cooperation
- Law enforcement prioritization processes and personnel shortages
- Inability to implement a safety strategy due to environmental impacts
- Incomplete and inaccurate crash reports and traffic volume counts for the off system county roads and tribal roads

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

No further information is available about which New Mexico would like to elaborate.
**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>Dummy Project</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Transportation safety planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis Area</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 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>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>1624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>6.27</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 2006 to 2011. The number of fatalities decreased from 413 in 2006 to 351 in 2011, while the number of serious injuries remained relatively stable.](image-url)
Rate of Fatalities and Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years

- **Serious Injuries Rate (per HMVMT):**
  - 2007: 6.5
  - 2008: 6.2
  - 2009: 6.0
  - 2010: 5.7
  - 2011: 5.4
- **Fatality Rate (per HMVMT):**
  - 2007: 1.62
  - 2008: 1.48
  - 2009: 1.47
  - 2010: 1.44
  - 2011: 1.36

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

**Year - 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function Classification</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERTIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL FUNCTIONAL CLASSES COMBINED</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

![Graph showing the number of serious injuries by roadway functional classification for different years (2009-2013).](image-url)
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

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

Fatality Rate (per HMVT)

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

Roadway Functional Classification

- Major Collector (U)
- Minor Collector (R)
- Local Road or Street (R)
- Principal Arterial (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways (R)
- Minor Arterial - Other (U)
- Interstate (U)
- Other Freeways and Expressways (U)
### Year - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PARK, FOREST, OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PARK, FOREST OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATE AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE (OTHER THAN RAILROAD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAILROAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PUBLIC INSTRUMENTALITY (E.G. AIRPORT, SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL PUBLIC ROADWAYS</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by Roadway Ownership

- **2009**: Orange
- **2010**: Blue
- **2011**: Red
- **2012**: Pink
- **2013**: Green

**Roadway Functional Classification**

- State
- County
- Town/City
- Local Park
- Other
- Private
- Railroad
- State Toll
- Other Toll

**# of Fatalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Town/City</th>
<th>Local Park</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Railroad</th>
<th>State Toll</th>
<th>Other Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership

Roadway Functional Classification

# of Serious Injuries

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
Fatality Rate by Roadway Ownership

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013

Roadway Functional Classification:
- State
- County
- Town
- City
- Local Park
- Other State
- Private
- Railroad
- State Toll
- Local Toll
- Other
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Ownership

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013

Roadway Functional Classification

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

No further information.

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>0.24</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older Driver Perf. Measures</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate Per Capita</td>
<td>0.422764</td>
<td>0.30469</td>
<td>0.20455</td>
<td>0.2803</td>
<td>0.2331</td>
<td>0.2574</td>
<td>0.1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A Inj. Rate Per Capita</td>
<td>1.772358</td>
<td>0.98438</td>
<td>1.12121</td>
<td>1.0909</td>
<td>1.2857</td>
<td>1.0074</td>
<td>1.0638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal + Inj. Rate Per Capita</td>
<td>2.195122</td>
<td>1.28906</td>
<td>1.32576</td>
<td>1.3712</td>
<td>1.5188</td>
<td>1.2647</td>
<td>1.2057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class K, Fatalities Age 65+</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A, Injuries Age 65+</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum K + A</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+ Pop./1000 Pop.=Capita</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+ (K+A)/ Capita</td>
<td>0.017847</td>
<td>0.01007</td>
<td>0.01004</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Rolling Average</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the older driver special rule apply to your state?

No
Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Improvements (Program Evaluation)

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

- None
- Benefit/cost
- Policy change
- Other: Other-Five-year trend in statewide reduction of number of fatalities and serious injuries.

In New Mexico, as in other states, it is estimated that roadway environment issues that can be mitigated through engineering type countermeasures are the primary contributing factor in only a small percentage (5% to 20%) of typical motor vehicle crashes. Issues of driver, pedestrian, and bicyclist behavior are the primarily contributing factor to 80 - 95 % of all crashes. Consequently, education and enforcement related safety projects and programs have the greatest potential to reduce serious crashes and fatalities in NM, but engineering type safety projects still play a vital role. It is estimated that the combination of engineering type stand-alone safety projects, pavement condition restoration projects, and capacity enhancement projects have contributed 5 -10 % of New Mexico’s recent reduction in fatalities.

In terms of site specific effects caused by the implementation of HSIP safety countermeasure projects in New Mexico the evidence is limited. However, two of the HSIP related strategies, reduced crashes by fatigued and distracted drivers and reduced lane departure crashes, appear to be making progress in performance, based on documentation of the growing coverage of New Mexico’s rural highway paved shoulders with shoulder rumble strips.

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

The planning safety project/program review phase of the New Mexico Highway Safety Improvement Program (NM HSIP) is now a continuous year-round program with no set deadlines for submitting applications. Every 90 days (or in case of an urgent need for quicker reviews even more frequently) the NM HSIP Safety Project Selection Committee will review and take action on each application that have been received during that time period by the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) General Office, Traffic Technical Support Bureau.

Also, the NM HSIP will now accept direct applications for road safety audits under established guidelines using Federal HSIP funds to further study specific roadway locations for significant evidence of traffic hazard exposure that could justify a follow-up application for an appropriate safety countermeasure project or program.

Also, there are new members added to the NM HSIP Safety Project Selection Committee. Rotating every 90 days by a method that each of three groups can choose amongst themselves are the 6-member NMDOT District Traffic Engineers group, the 5-member Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) group, and the 9-member Regional Non-metropolitan Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) group. Each group can name one voting representative member to serve on the Committee for the next 90 day period.
**SHSP Emphasis Areas**

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

**Year - 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP-related SHSP Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</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

# of Fatalities

<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>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</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>
Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013

SHSP Emphasis Area

Rate of Fatalities

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

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013
Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Rate of Serious Injuries

SHSP Emphasis Area

Lane Departure  | Intersections  | Pedestrians  | Bicycles  | Older Drivers  | Motorcyclists  | Work Zones  | Data

2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013
Groups of similar project types

Present the overall effectiveness of groups of similar types of projects.

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2009 to Year 2013

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

Year 2009 to Year 2013

![Graph showing the number of serious injuries by target crash type for years 2009 to 2013. The x-axis represents target crash type, and the y-axis represents the number of serious injuries. The graph includes a legend for the years 2009 to 2013.]
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type

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

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Rate of Serious Injuries

Target Crash Type

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013
**Systemic Treatments**

Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2009 to Year 2013

Target Crash Type

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

Year 2009 to Year 2013
Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

No additional information.
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>Dummy Location</td>
<td>Urban Local Road or Street</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>Transportation safety planning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Optional Attachments

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