Disclaimer

Protection of Data from Discovery & Admission into Evidence

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

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

The Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT) through the Bureau of Transportation Planning and Modal Programs, Office of Safety Operations (OSO) is responsible for the administration of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The goal for the OSO is to provide the tools, processes and guidance necessary to promote highway safety efforts that lead to a reduction in the number and severity of crashes for all public roads in Alabama.

The HSIP projects are consistent with the Alabama Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) 2nd Edition, version 2012. The SHSP is scheduled to begin updating in 2015. The next version of the Alabama SHSP will focus on implementing regional SHSPs in the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Rural/Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs). Specific emphasis areas will be identified by local stakeholders to develop performance measures with proven countermeasures.

The current focus of Alabama’s SHSP is the “Toward Zero Deaths” initiative. Additionally, Alabama has adopted the goal of reducing fatalities by 50% within a 20-year time period. Fatal crashes have dropped significantly over the past decade from 2003 to 2012. Alabama has seen a steady decline in the number of fatalities and the fatality rate during this same period.

The SHSP has five key focus areas: Driver Behavior, Infrastructure Countermeasures, Legislative Initiatives, Traffic Safety Information Systems and Safety Stakeholders Community. The SHSP was developed in conjunction with the Alabama Department of Economic and Communities Affairs (ADECA) and multiple agencies and organizations. ADECA is responsible for the implementation of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) programs. The human behavioral aspects of the SHSP incorporate ADECA’S Statewide Highway Safety Plan which addresses the safety program behavioral elements related to occupant restraint use, impaired driving, distracted driving, speed, young drivers, motorcycles, and pedestrians.

HSIP projects have focused on the three (3) areas: Infrastructure Countermeasures (construction/supportive programs), Driver Behavior (safety outreach campaigns and overtime enforcement efforts), and Traffic Safety Information Systems (crash data analysis).

HSIP Infrastructure projects are developed through safety and operational analysis using crash data statistics, crash patterns, and benefit-cost engineering analysis. The projects have been more systemic in recent years and target more specific needs identified through data analysis such as Interstate Median Barrier, Shoulder Widening Program, and Horizontal Curve Safety Program.

**HSIP Infrastructure projects/tool development**
The Interstate Median Barrier program and the Shoulder Widening Program are safety programs which were established in 2002 and 2006, respectively. The Interstate Median Barrier program addresses median cross over crashes by installing median cable along selected sections of interstate with a high pattern of median cross over crashes. The shoulder widening program addresses the addition of two (2) feet of shoulder during maintenance resurfacing along state routes (where feasible).

In 2015, the Horizontal Curve Safety Program (HCSP) is the next systemic HSIP project in development. This program will evaluate horizontal curves on state maintained roads and will develop recommendations for traffic signing and pavement marking in accordance with the MUTCD 2009. In addition, high crash sites and roadway departure locations will undergo road safety assessments (RSAs) to determine appropriate safety enhancements and countermeasures.

OSO collaborates with various University Research Centers to identify and develop data and analytical tools and manuals such as ALSAFE: Development of an Alabama Specific Planning Level Safety Tool and Alabama Roundabout Guide.

ALSAFE will be a version of PlanSafe. PlanSafe is a safety forecasting tool for analysis at the Traffic Analysis Zone level which is a common metric used by planners. ALSAFE will work similar to PlanSafe in that regard and will be a statewide planning level safety software tool which will aid ALDOT, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs). These tools will be vital in the planning and selection process of addressing potential safety problems and countermeasures for human factors or needs that are identified.

In the past few years, Alabama has been implementing conceptual designs for roundabouts. In order to maintain design consistency and to provide guidance, there was a need for the development of guidance for Alabama roundabouts. The Development of the Alabama Roundabout Guide will serve as a guide to the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of roundabouts in Alabama.

Alabama is developing a process and procedures to implement the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) to provide a tool to assist in selecting and evaluating safety projects. The Center for Advanced Public Safety (CAPS) is contracted to develop Safety Performance Factors (SPF) for state route segments and intersections while the University of South Alabama has a pending project to develop SPFs for rural roads. The SPFs will be specific for Alabama by applying Highway Safety Manual (HSM) methodology during their development. By using these tools, the project selection and evaluation process will be enhanced.

**Local Roads**

Local roads safety programs are included in the HSIP program of projects. The Alabama Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) through Auburn University provides both training and practical application of safety principles to educate local entities. Other tools and equipment, such as the HSIP Manual of Guidelines also provide guidance on how to apply for HSIP funds. OSO purchased
GPS enabled horizontal curve ball bank equipment to determine the need for and the proper speed for horizontal series warning signs. The equipment and training was provided not only to ALDOT Region personnel but also to the County Engineers.

OSO in conjunction with FHWA also hosted the first annual Rural Road Safety Conference September 29 to October 1, 2014 in Guntersville, AL. The Conference focused on local safety issues and provided training on various topics including Road Safety 365, given by the FHWA Safety Resource Center.

Non-Infrastructure Safety Efforts

Non-Infrastructure Safety Efforts of Driver Behavior and Traffic Safety Information Systems areas of Alabama’s current SHSP are managed by the Safety Management Section (SMS) in the ALDOT’s Bureau of Transportation Planning and Modal Programs.

Law enforcement agencies are invited to participate in HSIP development committees such as the development of the Speed Management Manual and Road Safety Assessments (RSA). Their perspective and experience play an important role in targeting effective countermeasures for the safety of the traveling public.

Safety outreach initiatives are coordinated with the ALDOT’s Media and Community Relations Bureau, the Alabama State Law Enforcement Agency (formerly the Alabama Department of Public Safety), and ADECA. “Driver Sober or Get Pulled Over”, “Click It or Ticket it” and “Work Zone Safety” are examples of the safety campaigns implemented annually. This partnership is effective in providing safety information to the public. Its focus is to reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries that occur, especially during various holiday seasons.

ALDOT Media and Community Relations conducted a safety public education and awareness program that addressed the behavioral safety elements related to seatbelts, speeding, impaired and distracted driving, work zones, rail crossings and motorcycles. Working with the Governor’s Office, May was proclaimed Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month, and July was proclaimed Distracted Driving Awareness Month by Alabama Governor Robert Bentley. Using varied communication channels and events, the ALDOT public education programs reached across the state of Alabama and generated news articles, advertisements and other marketing pieces that were viewed by our target audiences more than 35 million times.

Alabama crash data is maintained and accessed through the Critical Analysis Reporting Environment (CARE) software and its supporting data is maintained by the Center for Advanced Public Safety (CAPS) at the University of Alabama. This interface is used for crash analysis by both ALDOT and local agencies. This data system is used to assist in the preparation of this report as well as the SHSP. The CARE program is critical in the development of the HSIP for assessing safety information.

ALDOT has made great strides to develop and implement safety programs and provide public awareness but more efforts are needed to continue the efforts to meet the “Toward Zero Death”
Initiatives. This is a corporative effort through partnerships with other agencies and addressing safety elements through the SHSP to reduce fatalities and serious injuries throughout the state of Alabama.
Introduction

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. As per 23 U.S.C. 148(h) and 23 CFR 924.15, States are required to report annually on the progress being made to advance HSIP implementation and evaluation efforts. The format of this report is consistent with the HSIP MAP-21 Reporting Guidance dated February 13, 2013 and consists of four sections: program structure, progress in implementing HSIP projects, progress in achieving safety performance targets, and assessment of the effectiveness of the improvements.

Program Structure

Program Administration

How are Highway Safety Improvement Program funds allocated in a State?

☑ Central

☐ District

☐ Other

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

Local Roads are addressed through the HSIP by using crash data analysis and safety and operations analysis. Alabama is proactive in the development of safety tools and manuals for use of the analysis of local roads.

ALDOT has updated the HSIP Manual which provides an overview of the HSIP program. This manual will provide aid for local agencies, MPOs/RPOs, and local ALDOT Region Personnel with a focus on the eligibility and funding requirements for HSIP projects. HSIP funds are available to local agencies for low
cost safety improvements such as striping, markings, signage, traffic signal upgrades, etc. Project selections are based upon a benefit to cost analysis. Training has been provided on the new HSIP manual and future training is being scheduled for the HSIP application process.

Other local tools under development are the United States Road Assessment Program (usRAP), and the purchase of horizontal curve assessment devices. usRap is sponsored by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety and is intended to encourage highway agencies to make safety decisions in the management of road networks based on national assessment of risk as well as to develop roadway Star Ratings and Safer Road Investment Plans. usRap can be used for risk mapping of crashes, safety performance tracking, and provides a star rating (based on inspection of roads to examine how well they protect used from involvement in crashes and from deaths and serious injuries when crashes occur.)

The development of Safety Performance Functions (SPFs) for rural two-lane roads of the HSM will assist in the analysis process for local roads. ALDOT is currently developing a Road Safety Assessments (RSAs) program. RSA is a formal safety performance examination of existing and proposed roadways by an independent and multi-disciplinary team. This program will be available to both state and local government projects.

SMS provides cities, counties and other municipalities with annual crash data summaries, high crash information locations, individual crash reports, and other crash-related information as needed. This crash data provides information to help identify immediate or potential safety needs. This data is also helpful in the selection process for safety program funding.

State and local agency personnel are presented opportunities to receive crash analysis training for the Critical Analysis Reporting Environment (CARE) program. CARE provides an analytical process to assess crash data for trends and use as needed. CARE training is provided several times during the year.

In September 2014, ALDOT in cooperation with FHWA and LTAP hosted its first annual Local Rural Road Safety Workshop and Conference. The Conference agenda was developed to emphasize the implementation of the safety process through all stages of roadway planning, design and operations through practical guidance specifically geared to local/rural roads. Over 150 participants attended to learn from various subjects including the Road Safety 365 workshop, which was a one day training session designed to provide local and rural agencies with practical and effective ways to implement safety solutions into their day-to-day activities and project development process. Participants also learned how to use the CARE system, to develop countermeasures for Stop-Controlled Intersections, Work Zone Safety for Local Roads, etc. The workshop and conference was very successful and another one is scheduled for October 2015.

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

☐ Design
☐ Planning
Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.

OSO has several safety program partnerships with the ALDOT Maintenance Bureau. The initial safety program was developed between the OSO and ALDOT’s Maintenance Bureau to implement the statewide shoulder widening projects on resurfacing projects. The program addresses road departure crashes along rural state routes. This program coordinates with the state’s resurfacing program and provides two (2’) foot shoulders along routes with shoulder scoring, where feasible. HSIP funds are utilized to implement the improvements. The ALDOT Maintenance Bureau administers the program and assists OSO in the identification of state routes that are being widened.

Additionally, ALDOT’s Maintenance Bureau has been given the task of upgrading signage to meet the current MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices). As an effort to improve safety, OSO is collaborating by identifying high crash horizontal curve locations for enhanced signage upgrades. HSIP funding will be used to implement this program this portion of the overall program.

In 2012, OSO initiated a pilot project for a potential statewide inventory of traffic control devices at signalized intersections. The pilot provided a mixture of urban and rural collections of traffic data inventory. The purpose of this study would be to collect data at each location for both the OSO and the ALDOT Maintenance Bureau. OSO used would be for the safety performance functions (SPFs) perform of Highway Safety Manual and the purpose of the Maintenance Bureau would be to populate the data fields include in the Maintenance Bureau Traffic Signal Inventory GIS Database (TSID). The project has now expanded statewide and ALDOT Computer Services will develop a database for the use of ALDOT Region personnel also.
OSO has had other similar partnerships with ALDOT’s County Transportation Bureau. This partnership was initially developed with the High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP) and has expanded. Now ALDOT’s County Transportation Bureau is active in the HSIP review committee of county applications and provides valid input on the development of other efforts to educate locals on safety issues. For instance, ALDOT’s County Transportation Bureau assisted and participated in the Local Rural Roads Conference which was held in September 2014 and the upcoming conferenced scheduled for October 2015. This "hands on" approach has been successful in addressing Alabama’s local roads safety needs and is beneficial in obligating HRRR and HSIP funds.

Another essential partnership is with the ALDOT’s development of an Enterprise GIS (EGIS) system. ALDOT’s Enterprise GIS (EGIS) is comprised of a LinearReferencing System for all the roads in the state of Alabama and its associated data attributes. EGIS’s primary function has been to help process inventory data required for FHWA’s Highway Performance Monitoring System’s (HPMS) submittal. OSO has a representative on the EGIS committee and who gives a perceptive of the Safety Data related needs. OSO has submitted an extensive list of Model Inventory of Roadway Elements (MIRE) data elements to the committee for consideration in the ALDOT’s Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data collection process.

Also, ALDOT is converting its current Link-Node system to GPS coordinates. Theses coordinates will be put into the CARE system and will allow past crash reports to have a GPS coordinate. The University of Alabama is leading this project and were initially tasked with translating ALDOT’s digital copies of the Link Node maps drawn in MicroStation into a GIS format. Now that ALDOT’s Enterprise GIS (EGIS) Linear Referencing System (LRS) has come into being, the university has been tasked with conflating the Link Node data to the new LRS system. Four counties have been selected for the development of the conflation process and then the university will then complete the final 63 counties. Lastly, the university has also been charged with developing an interactive Viewer/Editing program for the Links and Nodes and future changes to the data.

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

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- Governors Highway Safety Office
- Local Government Association
- Other: Other-County and Local Govt
- Other: Other-Ala Dept of Public Health
- Other: Other-Ala Dept of Public Safety
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-Implementing HSIP/Safety Operations Manual

☒ Other: Other-Pending Development of SPF/CMFs for use of HSM

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

The Office of Safety Operations’ vision is to develop and provide tools, processes, and guidance necessary to focus on reducing the number and severity of crashes for all public roads in Alabama. OSO provides infrastructure road safety initiatives and strategies and provides rapid review, response, and resolution to roadway safety concerns.

OSO administers the HSIP program by developing innovative and progressive programs consistent with the Alabama Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). The programs are planned by fiscal year with available HSIP funding. OSO works closely with the FHWA Division Office Safety personnel to expedite obligating HSIP funds in a timely manner.

Implementing a proactive approach in administration, planning and coordinating HSIP projects, OSO manages HSIP funds in a more progressive manner.

Program Methodology
Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.
Program: Median Barrier

Date of Program Methodology: 7/29/2003

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-Use of HSM methodology
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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

- Yes
- No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☐ Available funding 50
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Other
☒ Projects are ranked by priority 50

Program: Intersection
Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2000

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
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
- 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?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

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

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

☐ Competitive application process
☐ Selection committee
☐ Other
☐ Other - Safety and Operations Analysis
☐ Other - ALDOT Region selection of Candidates

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: Horizontal Curve

Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2012

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 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

No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

Other-Program is being developed

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

Methodology being developed  100
**Program:** Bicycle Safety

**Date of Program Methodology:** 1/1/2014

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 SPF's |
|☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment |
|☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments |
|☐ Probability of specific crash types |
Excess proportions of specific crash types

☐ Other

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process

☐ selection committee

☒ Other-Recently authorization project for Vulnerable Users Handbook

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: Rural State Highways

Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2006

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-No of lanes

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☒ Selection committee
☐ Other

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

☒ Relative Weight in Scoring
☐ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☒ Available funding 50
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☒ Cost Effectiveness 50
**Program:** Skid Hazard  
**Date of Program Methodology:** 1/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

Other—Program is being developed

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C

Available funding 50

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Cost Effectiveness 50
### Program: Alabama Highway Safety Improvement Program

**Date of Program Methodology:** 1/1/1996

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

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

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
Program: Roadway Departure
Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

**Roadway**
- [ ] Median width
- [x] Horizontal curvature
- [ ] Functional classification
- [x] Roadside features
- [x] Other-Existing Shoulder if applicable

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
☐ Crash rate
☐ Critical rate
☐ Level of service of safety (LOSS)
☐ Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
☐ Probability of specific crash types
☐ Excess proportions of specific crash types
☐ Other

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
☐ Competitive application process
☒ selection committee
☒ Other-In conjunction with Resurfacing Maintenance Program

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

☒ Relative Weight in Scoring
☐ Rank of Priority Consideration
Ranking based on B/C

Available funding  50

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Cost Effectiveness  50

Program: Low-Cost Spot Improvements

Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/1993

What data types were used in the program methodology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All crashes</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Median width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Horizontal curvature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal and serious injury</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Functional classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crashes only</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadside features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Lane miles</td>
<td></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
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  50
- Available funding  50
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other

Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/2006

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

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Local Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 2/1/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

- Exposure
  - Traffic
  - Volume
  - Population

- Roadway
  - Median width
  - Horizontal curvature
  - Functional classification
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: 25
- Available funding: 50
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Cost Effectiveness: 25

Program: Pedestrian Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 1/1/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes
Exposure
Roadway
### 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
How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

- Competitive application process
- Selection committee
- Other-Recently authorized project_Vulnerable User Handbook

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: Shoulder Improvement

Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?
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?
How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☒ Selection committee
☐ Other

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Segments

Date of Program Methodology: 1/3/1993

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?**
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
☐ Other-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
☐ Available funding 50
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Cost Effectiveness 50
What proportion of highway safety improvement program funds address systemic improvements?

50

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

- [x] Cable Median Barriers
- [ ] Rumble Strips
- [ ] Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation
- [ ] Pavement/Shoulder Widening
- [ ] Install/Improve Signing
- [ ] Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation
- [ ] Upgrade Guard Rails
- [ ] Clear Zone Improvements
- [ ] Safety Edge
- [ ] Install/Improve Lighting
- [ ] Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal
- [x] Other Other-Horizontal Curve Signing and Marking Program

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- [x] Engineering Study
- [x] Road Safety Assessment
- [ ] Other:
Identify any program methodology practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.

- Highway Safety Manual
- Road Safety audits
- Systemic Approach
- Other:

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

The Office of Safety Operations’ methodology for development of the HSIP Programs is directly related to the correlation with the goals and elements in the Alabama Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Program elements are focused toward reducing the number of fatalities and severe injuries in Alabama.

ALDOT is making great strides toward implementing more systemic programs and providing safety tools for analysis for within the department as well as external partners. The goal for the updated SHSP is to target more local entities to assist in the TZD initiative for the state.
## 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>16313304</td>
<td>33324160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163898</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></td>
<td></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>76402350</td>
<td>124552303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Local Funds</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Alabama Highway Safety Improvement Program

| Totals     | 92715654 | 100% | 158040361 | 100% |

How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
0 %

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
1 %

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
0 %

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
2 %

How much funding was transferred in to the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period?
0 %
How much funding was transferred out of the HSIP to other core program areas during the reporting period?

20 %

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

At this time, there are no obligation impediments of HSIP funds in Alabama.

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

None at this time
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 Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-255 FROM MP 0 TO MP 2.375, MADISON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>190336</td>
<td>1464125.93</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways</td>
<td>48690</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-132 FROM MP 9.74 TO MP 17.44, ETOWAH COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8 Miles</td>
<td>472802</td>
<td>2781188.65</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-7 FROM MP 215.34 TO MP 223.95, DEKALB COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or</td>
<td>9 Miles</td>
<td>399599</td>
<td>2219993</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>3368</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Treatment Type</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Milepost</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-7 FROM MP 192.41 TO MP 208.24, ETOWAH COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>911096</td>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>3796235</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-2(US-72) FROM MP 102.748 TO MP 105.65, MADISON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>396941</td>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>2089163</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-1(US 431) FROM MP 321.24 TO MP 327.14, MADISON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>805637</td>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>3836365</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUNDBOUT AT SR-53(US 231) AND SR-25(US-411)/CR-33 IN ST. CLAIR, PE BUDGET</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- NHPP: National Highway Performance Program
- STP: Surface Transportation Program
- HSIP: Highway Safety Improvement Program
- Other Federal-aid Funds: Includes STP, NHPP, and other sources.
- Urban Principal Arterial: Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e., STP, NHPP)
- Rural Principal Arterial: Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e., STP, NHPP)
- Multiple Classes: State Highway Agency
- Designations: Roadway Departure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>1 Numbers</th>
<th>HSIP (Section 148)</th>
<th>Multiple Classes</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Intersection Treatments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROUNDABOUT AT SR-79 AT SR-160, BLOUNT COUNTY, PE BUDGET</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modification to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>115385</td>
<td>115385</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESURFACING, CROSS SLOPE CORRECTION, GUARDRAIL AND GUIDERAIL INSTALLATION ON I-59 FROM MP 174.75 TO MP 181.056, ETOWAH AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>492609</td>
<td>14274592</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-2 (US 72) AT SR-17 (US 43, 11TH AVE, JACKSON HWY),</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>294067</td>
<td>294067</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLBERT COUNTY</td>
<td>control - other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN CROSSOVER PROTECTION ON I-65 IN CULLMAN, MORGAN, AND LIMESTONE COUNTIES, FROM MP 313.10 TO MP 341.50</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>29 Miles</td>
<td>519389</td>
<td>1630500</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>30520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-20 FROM MP 29.04 TO MP 29.32, COLBERT COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add acceleration lane</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>1006732</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>16700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-4(US-78) FROM MP 105 TO MP 111.716, JEFFERSON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>7 Miles</td>
<td>691894</td>
<td>4612625</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>23920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 FROM MP 188 TO MP</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier -</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8350</td>
<td>25050</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds</td>
<td>Rural Principal</td>
<td>35520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205, CALHOUN AND CLEBURNE COUNTIES, PE BUDGET</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>10 Miles</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-9 FROM MP 203.168 TO MP 213.592, CLEBURNE COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>9 Miles</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-49 FROM MP 60.234 TO MP 68.577, CLAY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>8 Miles</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-49 FROM MP 20.524 TO MP 29.743,</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>9 Miles</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALLAPOOSA COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>557399</td>
<td>2933680</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-169 FROM MP 10.272 TO MP 16.017, RUSSELL AND LEE COUNTIES</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5 Miles</td>
<td>255994</td>
<td>1706626</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-46 FROM MP 0 TO MP 4.875, CLEBURNE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>7 Miles</td>
<td>681505</td>
<td>3104634</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-215 FROM MP 32.74 TO MP 40.482, BIBB COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8 Miles</td>
<td>588707</td>
<td>2803368</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route</td>
<td>From/To</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Cost 1</td>
<td>Cost 2</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-96</td>
<td>MP 19.74 TO MP 21.545, LAMAR COUNTY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>167388</td>
<td>1506494</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-171</td>
<td>MP 23.63 TO MP 34.50, FAYETTE COUNTY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>554901</td>
<td>3963581</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-22</td>
<td>MP 51.77 TO MP 58.25, CHILTON COUNTY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>388272</td>
<td>2589815</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-118</td>
<td>MP 9.17 TO MP 17.13, LAMAR COUNTY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>377033</td>
<td>2513550</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost (in $)</td>
<td>Cost Share</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>SR-191 FROM MP 0 TO MP 6, CHILTON COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modification s to roundabout</td>
<td>ROUNDABOUT AT SR-5 AND CR-58, BIBB COUNTY--PE BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td>5280</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modification s to roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>I-59 FROM MP 55.352 TO MP 73.003, TUSCALOOSA AND GREENE COUNTIES--PE BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>50980</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>I-85 FROM MP 49.50 TO MP 79.80, LEE AND CHAMBERS COUNTIES--PE</td>
<td></td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>SR-110 FROM MP 24.684 TO MP 32.259, BULLOCK COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>8 Miles</td>
<td>526355</td>
<td>3096209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-110 FROM MP 4.65 TO MP 14.127, MONTGOMERY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments, Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>9 Miles</td>
<td>224025</td>
<td>4480507</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td>2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-53 FROM MP 101 TO MP 105.307, MONTGOMERY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments, Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>4 Miles</td>
<td>662635</td>
<td>3897851</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>57540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-3 FROM MP 187.055 TO MP 192.735, AUTAUGA COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments, Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>486927</td>
<td>4869268</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td>14468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Source Funds</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-9</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>726720</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-106</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>750955</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-8</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>412798</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-15</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120285</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-54</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>557339</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Minor</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/Location</td>
<td>Shoulder Treatment</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Funds Available</td>
<td>Arterial Agency</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVA COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110889</td>
<td>Rural Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>5040425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-85 FROM MP 0 TO MP 12.299,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVA/DALE COUNTRIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-105 FROM MP 0 TO MP 9.5,</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>749101</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALE COUNTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>2996404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-95 FROM MP 32.878 TO MP</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>112637</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.17, HENRY COUNTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>4897300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-105 MP 0 TO MP 18.905,</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALE/BARBOUR COUNTRIES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-10</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles</td>
<td>traffic control - other</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-12 FROM MP 187.36 TO MP 192.854, BARBOUR COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-12 FROM MP 215.076 TO MP 215.462, HOUSTON COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-55 FROM MP 10.182 TO MP 23.54, COVINGTON COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-87 FROM MP 24.1 TO MP 31.78, COFFEE COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-167 FROM MP 12.3 TO MP 15.208, DALE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>333447</td>
<td>1587842</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-47 FROM MP 30.316 TO MP 32.592, MONROE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>147307</td>
<td>545581</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-83 FROM MP 21.627 TO MP 24.274, MONROE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>161107</td>
<td>537023</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-56 FROM MP 0 TO MP 12.948, WASHINGTON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>13 Miles</td>
<td>854118</td>
<td>2372549</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-21 FROM MP 78.985 TO MP 84.078, WILCOX COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>5 Miles</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-358 FROM THREE NOTCH RD TO DAWES LANE, MOBILE COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-163 FROM MP 0 TO 2.525, MOBILE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>8003</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-16 FROM MP 68.28 TO MP 68.49, BALDWIN COUNTY</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>4320</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUARDRAIL AND GUARDRAIL END ANCHORS ON CR-67 IN</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **SR-21**-
  - From MP 78.985 to MP 84.078, Wilcox County
  - Shoulder treatments
  - Length: 5 miles
  - Funding: Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)
  - Roadway Departure: 668
  - Agency: State Highway Agency

- **CR-358**-
  - From Three Notch Rd to Dawes Lane, Mobile County
  - Intersection geometry
  - Numbers: 700709, 700709
  - HSIP (Section 148)
  - Roadway Departure: 45
  - Agency: County Highway Agency

- **SR-163**-
  - From MP 0 to 2.525, Mobile County
  - Shoulder treatments
  - Length: 3 miles
  - Funding: Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)
  - Roadway Departure: 8003
  - Agency: State Highway Agency

- **SR-16**-
  - From MP 68.28 to MP 68.49, Baldwin County
  - Intersection geometry
  - Numbers: 175000, 175000
  - HSIP (Section 148)
  - Roadway Departure: 4320
  - Agency: State Highway Agency

- **GUARDRAIL AND GUARDRAIL END ANCHORS ON CR-67**
  - Roadside Barrier - cable
  - Numbers: 0, 163898
  - HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)
  - Roadway Departure: 45
  - Agency: County Highway Agency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JACKSON COUNTY</th>
<th>SR-41 FROM MP 74.057 TO MP 80.611, WILCOX AND MONROE COUNTIES</th>
<th>Shoulder treatments</th>
<th>7 Miles</th>
<th>391868</th>
<th>1399529</th>
<th>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</th>
<th>Rural Minor Arterial</th>
<th>577</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>State Highway Agency</th>
<th>Roadway Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-68 FROM MP 22.95 TO MP 30.33, CHEROKEE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>8 Miles</td>
<td>324640</td>
<td>2318860</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>10460</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-65 FROM MP 0 TO MP 3.47, JACKSON COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>4 Miles</td>
<td>182429</td>
<td>729717</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-65 FROM MP 198.021 TO MP 209.405, CHILTON COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>11 Miles</td>
<td>268218</td>
<td>812782</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>34410</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Roadside Feature</td>
<td>Length (Miles)</td>
<td>Federal Aid Funds</td>
<td>Type of Roadway</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-65 FROM MP 209.405 TO MP 255.948, CHILTON COUNTY</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>400153, 1212584</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>38091, 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-59 FROM MP 0 TO MP 27, SUMTER COUNTY (PE BUDGET)</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - cable</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>114650, 343950</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>19670, 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-170 FROM MP 0 TO MP 11.68, ELMORE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>809734, 4763142</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CLASSES</td>
<td>4818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-6 FROM MP 171.45 TO MP 179.35, MONTGOMERY COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>582019, 3233440</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1280, 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-153 FROM MP 0 TO MP 9, GENEVA</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>949462, 3956089</td>
<td>Rural Minor</td>
<td>1693, 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Federal-aid</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-125 FROM MP 19.4 TO MP 25.65, PIKE COUNTY</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6 Miles 476917 2167805</td>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP) Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1287 55 State Highway Agency Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERCHANGE MODIFICATION ON SR-17 AT SR-158 RAMPS, MOBILE COUNTY (PE BUDGET)</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - modification to roundabout</td>
<td>1 Numbers 312000 312000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways</td>
<td>State Highway Agency Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY OUTREACH CAMPAIGNS AND OTHER SAFETY ACTIVITIES FY 2014</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Outreach 1 Numbers 500000 500000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency SAFETY OUTREACH EFFORTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDOT AND ALABAMA</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure 1 Numbe 1250000 1250000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>Enforceme nt Efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY OVERTIME ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS FY 2014</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>rs</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCHASE OF HORIZONTAL CURVE ASSESSMENT DEVICES FOR COUNTY AND ALDOT PERSONNEL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>125 Numbers</td>
<td>640000</td>
<td>640000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT OF SAFETY PERFORMANCE FUNCTION (SPF) AND PART C CRASH MODIFICATION FACTORS ON RURAL LOCAL ROADS IN ALABAMA</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>308626</td>
<td>308626</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE I OF THE</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>350305</td>
<td>350305</td>
<td>HSIP (Section</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>Development of SHSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN (SHSP)</td>
<td>e Transportati on safety planning</td>
<td>rs</td>
<td>148)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDOT STATEWIDE WRONG-WAY INTERCHANGE ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Transportati on safety planning</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>381405</td>
<td>381405</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Progress in Achieving Safety Performance Targets

## Overview of General Safety Trends

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures*</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>18757</td>
<td>15705</td>
<td>12949</td>
<td>10609</td>
<td>9174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>14.1</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 over the last five years.]
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To the maximum extent possible, present performance measure* data by functional classification and ownership.

### Year - 2014

<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>47</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>536</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>29</td>
<td>199</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>39</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREeways AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</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>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

### # of Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR COLLECTOR (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR COLLECTOR (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL ROAD OR STREET (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR COLLECTOR (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR COLLECTOR (U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing the number of serious injuries by roadway functional classification for the years 2010 to 2014.](chart.png)
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Roadway Functional Classification:
- PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL (R)
- MINOR ARTERIAL - OTHER (R)
- LOCAL ROAD OR STREET (R)
- PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE (U)
- MINOR ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS (R)
- MAJOR COLLECTOR (U)
- MINOR COLLECTOR (U)
- PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS (U)

Serious Injury Rate (per HMVT):
- 0.6
- 0.4
- 0.2
- 0
- -0.2
- -0.4
- -0.6

Years:
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
## Year - 2014

<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>480</td>
<td>7971</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2449</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>113</td>
<td>1997</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>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by Roadway Ownership
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Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

Alabama has had a steady decline in both the number of fatalities and the number of serious injuries. This year's report shows a continuing decline also.

Alabama is still incorporating highway functional class into the crash data system administered through the CARE system. The rolling average for 2014 was calculated for this report. However the rate of fatalities and serious injuries for highway functional classification and/or roadway classification is still not available.

**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>0.744</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>8.918</td>
<td>8.196</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>5.946</td>
<td>5.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>9.658</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.766</td>
<td>6.734</td>
<td>5.842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The number of fatalities for drivers and pedestrians 65 years of age and older from the FARS annual Report File and the number of serious injuries from Alabama’s CARE system are added together. That amount is then divided by the number of people in Alabama who are 65 years of age and older compared to the total State population to determine the rate for that particular year, i.e. 2005.

Example: For 2005: \( \frac{(\text{No. of Fatalities} + \text{No. of Serious Injuries})}{\text{Total of Older Drivers and Pedestrians for 2005}} \) = RATE FOR 2005


Example:

\[
\frac{(2005 \text{ RATE}) + (2006 \text{ RATE}) + (2007 \text{ RATE}) + (2008 \text{ RATE}) + (2009 \text{ RATE})}{5} = \text{ ROLLING AVERAGE FOR 2009}
\]

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:

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

☐ Shift Focus to Fatalities and Serious Injuries
☐ Include Local Roads in Highway Safety Improvement Program
☐ Organizational Changes
☒ None
☐ Other:

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

No significant program changes since the last report.
**SHSP Emphasis Areas**
For each SHSP emphasis area that relates to the HSIP, present trends in emphasis area performance measures.

**Year - 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP-related SHSP Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>2763</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>9202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

SHSP Emphasis Area
Number of Serious Injuries by SHSP Emphasis Area
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- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014

SHSF Emphasis Area
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Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

SHSP Emphasis Area

Roadway Departure  Intersections  Older Drivers  Work Zones  Data
Groups of similar project types
Present the overall effectiveness of groups of similar types of projects.

Year - 2014

<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>Median Barrier</td>
<td>Interstate Median Barrier</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>9202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>STATE ROUTE_ROR</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>601</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 2010 to Year 2014

Target Crash Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed object</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intersection</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear-end</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed-related</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2010 to Year 2014

![Bar chart showing the number of serious injuries by target crash type for each year from 2010 to 2014.](chart.png)
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**Systemic Treatments**
Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

**Year - 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic improvement</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Median Barriers</td>
<td>Interstate Median Barrier</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement/Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>State Routes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Target Crash Type
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements
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Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

ALDOT has been integrating the Highway Safety Manual (HSM), GIS and roadway inventory into the various safety programs to improve safety data collection and analysis. There is also a study on "Integrating Safety and Operations into Planning, Design, Construction, and Post Construction Operations." This study includes research methodology and data collection, creates an environment for integrating operations and safety into multimodal planning efforts, reviews statewide, regional, corridor and sub-areas opportunities, then will conclude with a final workshop and study documentations.
### Project Evaluation

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-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Bef-All Injuries</th>
<th>Bef-PDO</th>
<th>Aft-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Aft-All Injuries</th>
<th>Aft-PDO</th>
<th>Aft-Total</th>
<th>Evaluation Results (Benefit/Cost Ratio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</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.