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 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a data-driven, performance based, strategic approach targeted to infrastructure improvements administered by Federal Highways Administration (FHWA). Illinois has set its target to reduce the frequency of fatalities and serious injuries, as well as the exposure rates of fatalities and serious injuries per million vehicle miles traveled. In addition to these rates, Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) has identified and prioritized safety emphasis areas where performance measures are also narrowed down by functional class of roadways to understand the safety problems and implement appropriate countermeasures to curb the preventable fatalities and serious injuries with federal support.

The collaborative working efforts between Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) with Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), Highway Safety Plan (HSP), Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan (CVSP), Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) - Long Range plan with metropolitan level is envisioned to provide consistency of data collection and management, integrated safety initiatives, and identification of data-driven performance measures with safety performance assessment. This coordination of safety programs helps IDOT to prioritize safety in planning and programming stage to utilize limited funding with safety improvement potentials to set effective goals, targets with safety performance matrix and assessments in future.

HSIP is administered and monitored by the Illinois Department of Transportation Bureau of Safety Engineering (BSE). IDOT works with safety partners to direct limited program dollars to areas with the greatest potential for safety improvement on the transportation system. IDOT uses safety performance functions and the systemic approach for identifying areas of improvement. Projects are selected based on their potential to reduce fatal and severe crashes economically using the IDOT benefit-cost evaluation tool. The HSIP roadway funding split between state and local routes remains the same as last year, 80/20. IDOT provides significant technical support in addition to the HSIP roadway safety investment. IDOT works with local agencies to increase obligation rates for HSIP projects approved.

Overall the program has seen a plateau in fatalities over the last few years, but 2014 has shown an approximately 15% decrease compared to this time last year. Detailed crash data analysis has shown that fatalities and severe injuries on the state route system continue to steadily decrease year after year. The local system fatalities and severe injuries have increased slightly, sparking the Illinois Safety Program Local Roadways Initiative focusing on county wide data analysis, Local Roads FIVE PERCENT analysis, roadway safety assessment support, development of County Strategic Highway Safety Plans, and technical support. Illinois continues to monitor progress, evaluates programs and modifies the screening, project identification and project approval approach to achieve Zero Fatalities on Illinois
roadways.
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.

Twenty percent of the HSIP roadway funding is allocated to local roadways. Prior to SAFETEA-LU, local agencies received less than $1 million annually; in recent years, that amount has been increased to between $12 - $15 million annually. This is a substantial increase from program allocation prior to SAFETEA-LU.

Each Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) District has a traffic safety committee that coordinates with the IDOT Bureau of Local Roads and local agencies to provide technical support.
Illinois leads regular meetings with the MPOs to discuss safety performance targets and county SHSP development and implementation.

RSAs are provided to local agencies free-of-charge at the request of local agencies. IDOT BSE coordinates team members and facilities, provides technical analysis, presents the kick-off and team findings and prepares the RSA reports.

The IDOT Bureau of Safety Engineering is an active participant of the Illinois Association of County Engineers Traffic and Safety Committee to discuss the SHSP, HSIP, data issues, and ways to advance transportation safety in Illinois on local roadways.

After identifying increased fatalities on the local roadway system, the IDOT increased focus on local roadways by launching the Local Road Safety Initiative. The Local Road Safety Initiative is a multi-pronged approach to provide the tools and data along with program training and facilitation to organize local transportation safety committees. The participation continues to grow and the quality of applications have improved significantly. Each county is provided with County Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSP) Elements that include crash data trees, Emphasis Area tables, heat maps and effective countermeasures and strategies to address the potential safety improvements. The county SHSPs have been completed for 37 counties so far with the remaining 65 plans targeted for completion in 2015-2016. IDOT has identified site specific improvements using the FHWA Systemic Tool for 8 counties to date.

In early 2014, IDOT developed the FIVE PERCENT location list for the local system to address high priority locations and support system-wide initiatives.

In 2013, IDOT also embarked on a pilot program for 9 counties in the use of usRAP for county routes.

The DOT coordinates safety 4E workshops that encourage coordination and training locals on HSIP best practices. Based on the technical support provided, local agencies apply for HSIP funds for implementation. The HSIP applications are reviewed by the IDOT Central Office traffic safety committee to approve projects, recommend changes or refinements and consult with local agencies to ensure safety investments address program goals.

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

- Design
- Planning
- Maintenance
Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.

IDOT BSE provides statewide data analysis to develop the Safer Roads Index (SRI) for all state routes, the local FIVE PERCENT locations and systemic safety initiatives; such as wrong way driving, pedestrian, curves. This information is provided to the Districts and local agencies through avenues such as the Safety Portal.

Each District has a safety committee comprised of representative in design, planning and operations. This committee reviews the Safety Tier locations, systemic analysis results, performs safety data analysis and field reviews, and identifies potential HSIP projects based on priority and safety needs. The Districts review local HSIP applications and provide input and recommendations prior to submitting applications to IDOT Central Office.

IDOT BSE utilized the HSIP SharePoint site to coordinate internally with Districts, Office of Planning and Programming and Office of Budget and Fiscal Management and other IDOT Offices, including FHWA Illinois Division Office.

IDOT Bureau of Safety Engineering leads a Transportation Safety Committee in Central Office that review and approve, deny or make recommend changes to all statewide HSIP projects. The committee includes members of IDOT BSE, IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment, IDOT Bureau of Local Roads and FHWA.

Identify which external partners are involved with Highway Safety Improvement Program planning.
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-IDOT continues to use a safety committee to help administer the program

☒ Other: Other-Established the Safer Roads Index with Safety Tiers to better utilize HSIP funding and maximize other funding sources. Developed the local FIVE PERCENT locations for local agency project identification.

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

The Districts and local agencies submit HSIP applications through the HSIP SharePoint site for review and approval by a Central Transportation Safety Committee. Since 2013, the IDOT Districts have taken a more active role in supporting the local roadway safety program. If there are large HSIP funding requests or longer term projects, the committee may recommend that a Road Safety Assessment be conducted to identify low cost safety improvements that could be implemented quickly along with verification of the longer term, high cost projects to ensure the best and most appropriate use of HSIP funds to maximize results.
Program Methodology

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

- Median Barrier
- Horizontal Curve
- Skid Hazard
- Roadway Departure
- Local Safety
- Left Turn Crash
- Other: Other-Wrong Way Driving

- Intersection
- Crash Data
- Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- Pedestrian Safety
- Shoulder Improvement
- Segments

Program: Median Barrier

Date of Program Methodology: 6/1/2009

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>
</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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Intersection

Date of Program Methodology: 6/30/2011

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>Lane miles</td>
<td>Roadside features</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- [ ] Crash frequency
- [ ] Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- [ ] Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- [ ] EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- [ ] Relative severity index
- [ ] Crash rate
- [ ] Critical rate
- [ ] Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- [ ] Excess expected crash frequency using 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 - Safer Roads Index, Potential for Safety Improvement Tiers

**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?
If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.

Network screening based on weighted critical rate and systemic risk based approaches and site specific crash history based approaches.

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

- **Yes**
- **No**

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

- **Relative Weight in Scoring**
- **Rank of Priority Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Rank of Priority Consideration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on B/C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental B/C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on net benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program: Horizontal Curve
Date of Program Methodology: 8/16/2013

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 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></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 SPFrs
- ☒ 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-Weighted crash rate

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

Other

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C

Available funding 2

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit
Program: Skid Hazard
Date of Program Methodology: 7/6/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- □ Crash frequency
- □ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- □ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- □ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
- □ Relative severity index
- □ Crash rate
- □ Critical rate
- □ Level of service of safety (LOSS)
Excess expected crash frequency using 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-selection based on priority list

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

Relative Weight in Scoring
Rank of Priority Consideration
Ranking based on B/C
Available funding 2
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit
Cost Effectiveness 1

Program: Crash Data
Date of Program Methodology: 8/1/2010

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

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-Identification of crash locations for local safety program data analysis and project prioritization

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-Data collection 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

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Other

data collection

Program: Roadway Departure

Date of Program Methodology: 6/30/2011

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes

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

Exposure

- Traffic
- Volume
- Population
- Lane miles
- Other

Roadway

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?
Crash frequency

Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

Relative severity index

Crash rate

Critical rate

Level of service of safety (LOSS)

Excess expected crash frequency using SPF

Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other-benefit to cost analysis

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

If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.

Systemic risk based approaches and site specific crash history based approaches

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

- Relative Weight in Scoring
- Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement
Date of Program Methodology: 6/30/2011

What data types were used in the program methodology?

- Crashes
  - All crashes
  - Fatal crashes only

- Exposure
  - Traffic
  - Volume

- Roadway
  - Median width
  - Horizontal curvature
2015 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program

- Fatal and serious injury crashes only
- Population
- Functional classification
- Other
- Lane miles
- Roadside features
- Other
- Other

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

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

If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.

State routes are not eligible for this Rural Road Sign Upgrade 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  2

☐ Incremental B/C

☐ Ranking based on net benefit

☒ Cost Effectiveness  1

Program: Local Safety
Date of Program Methodology: 6/30/2011

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

**Roadway**
- [x] Median width
- [x] Horizontal curvature
- [x] Functional classification
- [x] 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
- [x] Critical rate
- [ ] Level of service of safety (LOSS)
- [ ] Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
- [ ] Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- [ ] Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- [ ] Probability of specific crash types
- [ ] Excess proportions of specific crash types
Other-Systemic Risk based approach, local knowledge

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

If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.

Local road safety projects are identified through the local FIVE PERCENT report, heat maps, data trees, systemic safety analysis, road safety assessments and local knowledge.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☑ Competitive application process
☒ Selection committee
☐ Other

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Cost Effectiveness 1

Program: Pedestrian Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 2/3/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs

Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

Other

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration
Program: Left Turn Crash

Date of Program Methodology: 1/2/2011

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

**Exposure**
- [X] Traffic

**Roadway**
- [ ] Median width
- [ ] Horizontal curvature
- [X] Functional classification
- [ ] Population
- [ ] Lane miles
- [ ] Other

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

Relative severity index

Crash rate

Critical rate

Level of service of safety (LOSS)

Excess expected crash frequency using 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 1
- Available funding
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Program Methodology:</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

**Exposure**
- [x] Traffic
- [ ] Volume
- [ ] Population

**Roadway**
- [ ] Median width
- [ ] Horizontal curvature
- [x] Functional classification
- [ ] Roadside features
- [x] Other-Number of lanes, urban versus rural, median type

What project identification methodology was used for this program?
- [ ] Crash frequency
Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

Relative severity index

Crash rate

Critical rate

Level of service of safety (LOSS)

Excess expected crash frequency using SPF’s

Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.

Systemic risk based approaches and site specific crash history based approaches

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Other-Wrong Way Driving
Date of Program Methodology: 8/3/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

- Other-Wrong way driving incidents
- Lane miles
- Roadside features
- Other
- Other Contributing factors related to interchange type and features

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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

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

40

Highway safety improvement program funds are used to address which of the following systemic improvements?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Median Barriers</td>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Pavement/Shoulder Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Signing</td>
<td>Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Guard Rails</td>
<td>Clear Zone Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Edge</td>
<td>Install/Improve Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- Engineering Study
- Road Safety Assessment
- Other:

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

- Highway Safety Manual
- Road Safety audits
- Systemic Approach
- Other: Other-Methods shown are currently being used for program identification. Advances have
taken place in both the use of the HSM, greater use of RSAs and systemic applications such as curves, rumble strips and flashing yellow arrow intersection improvements.

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

The HSIP process continues to improve each year. One area that continues to evolve is multi-year programing that allows Districts to establish program priorities and needs over multiple years. This helps to administer the program and ensure smooth and efficient use of funds on effective safety improvements.
**Progress in Implementing Projects**

**Funds Programmed**

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Programmed*</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>104652000</td>
<td>43573151.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>2619000</td>
<td>256380.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HRRR Special Rule**

- Penalty Transfer - Section 154
- Penalty Transfer - Section 164

**Incentive Grants**

- Incentive Grants - Section 163
- Incentive Grants (Section 406)

**Other Federal-aid Funds**

- Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)

**State and Local Funds**
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
$24,773,000.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
$2,500,000.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$2,500,000.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$2,500,000.00

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

$0.00

$2.5M is obligated to support training, data improvements and safety analysis in support of the infrastructure safety program

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

Local agencies have a variety of challenges that delay obligating federal funds, such as scoping and design and the overall federal aid process.

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</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownershop</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201203015</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - add additional signal heads</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>666000</td>
<td>740000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement treatments, pavement marking</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201204001</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway widening - travel lanes</td>
<td>4.14 Miles</td>
<td>48735</td>
<td>62415</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement treatments, pavement marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201204003</td>
<td>Intersection geometry modify intersection corner radius</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>31640</td>
<td>75650</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sight distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201208001</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>3.4 Miles</td>
<td>80000</td>
<td>80000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane addition, rumble strips, pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Total Length</td>
<td>Modified HSIP Miles</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201212024</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>1.19 Miles</td>
<td>1350000 00 1500000 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>13100 055</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Exclusive left turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201301001</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>567000 00 567000 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>66000 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Left turn lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201303003</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal timing - left-turn phasing (permissive to protected/permissive)</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>315000 00 350000 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>14100 35</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Protected left-turn lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201303005</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Systemic improvements - signal-controlled</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>4961317 4961317</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>84250 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Protected left-turn lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201303011</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8.5 Miles</td>
<td>1952000 1952000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>20500 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure Widen Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201304008</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5.74 Miles</td>
<td>0 991300 00991300 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>32500 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure Widen Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201305002</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5.41 Miles</td>
<td>941700 941700</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>24000 55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Other Paved shoulder, Rumble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201305003</td>
<td>Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>0.3 Miles</td>
<td>$3006000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Large trucks</td>
<td>Provide TWLTL; Resurfacing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201305005</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>1.98 Miles</td>
<td>$3422000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201307001</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal timing - left-turn phasing</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>$1250000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>303000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201308002</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>4.64 Miles</td>
<td>$1356000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201309001</td>
<td>Roadway development - other</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>$1582000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201310003</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>3.1 Miles</td>
<td>$8220000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201310001</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$211500</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal timing - left-turn phasing (permissive to protected-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Protected left-turn lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only)</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Section 148)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13950</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>7450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>left-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control modification - left-turn phasing (permissive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pedestrian Signing; Pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to protected-only)</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Section 148)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>marking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54900</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>7090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>left-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Systemic improvements - signal-controlled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Traffic signal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Section 148)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60750</td>
<td>6750</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>left-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal timing - left-turn phasing (permissive to protected-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Protected left-turn lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only)</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Section 148)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>left-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>lane phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>HSIP Section</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Left-turn and right-turn lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roadway Rumble strips - center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4950</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4559</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roadside Removal of roadside objects (trees, poles, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **201310013**: Intersection geometry - other
- **201310014**: Roadway Rumble strips - center
- **201310017**: Intersection traffic control
- **201310018**: Roadside Barrier - other
- **201310021**: Roadside Removal of roadside objects (trees, poles, etc.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>HSIP (Section)</th>
<th>Agency Type</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Left Turn Offset, Signal Head per Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013100 23</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - add additional signal heads</td>
<td>1 Numbers 45000 0 50000 0</td>
<td>4330 0</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013100 27</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>1 Numbers 31600 0 31600 0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Exclusive left-turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013100 29</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - add additional signal heads</td>
<td>12.88 Miles 20700 00 23000 00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Speed signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013100 31</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers 14000 00 19000 00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013100 34</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal timing - left-turn phasing (permissive to protected-only)</td>
<td>1 Numbers 91800 0 10200 0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Protected left-turn lane phasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013100 36</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - concrete</td>
<td>1 Numbers 33000 0 33000 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Median barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013100 37</td>
<td>Access management</td>
<td>1 Numbers 90000 0 10000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>City of Municipal</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Pedestrian Signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013110 03</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>Illinois Highway Agency</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Arterial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          |                                                  |       | 0      | n 148)                          | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 3950 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection
|          |                                                  |       |        |                                 |         | Exclusive left turn lanes         |
| 2013110 04 | Roadway Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment | 4.3   | 96800  | Illinois Highway Agency         | HSIP    | Rural Major Collector             | 2900 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure
|          |                                                  |       | 0      |                                 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways | 1630 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure
|          |                                                  |       |        |                                 |         | Guardrail                        |
| 2013110 05 | Roadside Barrier - other                        | 6.9   | 77500  | Illinois Highway Agency         | HSIP    | Rural Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways | 1200 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection
|          |                                                  |       | 0      |                                 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | Pavement markings |
| 2013110 07 | Intersection traffic control Pavement markings - add advance stop ahead | 0.01  | 22500  | Illinois Highway Agency         | HSIP    | Rural Major Collector             | 44100 | 44100 | State Highway Agency | Intersection
|          |                                                  |       | 0      |                                 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | Pavement markings |
| 2013110 08 | Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal timing - left-turn phasing (permissive to protected-only) | 1     | 44100  | Illinois Highway Agency         | HSIP    | Urban Minor Arterial              | 0    | 40 | State Highway Agency | Left turn phase
<p>|          |                                                  |       | 0      |                                 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | Pavement markings |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Budget Year 1</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Budget Year 2</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Year 3</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>State Highway Agency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201312001</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.25 Miles</td>
<td>62600</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>189600</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Realignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201312002</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>946060</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guardrail, Paved Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201312003</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>255150</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Paved Shoulder, Rumble strips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201312004</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>162000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Exclusive left turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201312005</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal - add additional signal heads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>279000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Intersection phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201312006</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add right-turn lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>261000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Intersection phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201312007</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>Pedestrian signal</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>121500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148) Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Signal head per lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Highway Improvement Program Number</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Rumble strips</td>
<td>Details</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20131208</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>1 Numb</td>
<td>54000 00 60000 00</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20131209</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>1 Numb</td>
<td>16200 00 18000 00</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140201</td>
<td>Roadway Rumble strips - edge or shoulder</td>
<td>1 Numb</td>
<td>39200 0 39200 0</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>1300 0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rumble strips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140203</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>1 Numb</td>
<td>10000 00 10000 00</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane add</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140301</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>26.02 Miles</td>
<td>19910 00 19910 00</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1250 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140302</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - concrete</td>
<td>1 Numb</td>
<td>0 52500 0</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Highway Agency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201403003</td>
<td>Alignment Horizontal curve realignment</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Frontage</td>
<td>Horizonal alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201404001</td>
<td>Roadway Superelevation / cross slope</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>Superelevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201404002</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>Resurfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201404003</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments - other</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201404004</td>
<td>Roadway Superelevation / cross slope</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Superelevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201404005</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Pavement treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201405001</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Minor</td>
<td>Protected left-turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>MILE</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>MILE</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201405002</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HSIP(Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201405003</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>1 Miles</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>HSIP(Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201405004</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>87500</td>
<td>87500</td>
<td>HSIP(Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>5950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201405005</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16200</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>HSIP(Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201405006</td>
<td>Alignment Horizontal curve realignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71200</td>
<td>71200</td>
<td>HSIP(Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201406001</td>
<td>Alignment Horizontal</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>11700</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>HSIP(Sectio n 148)</td>
<td>5040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Timing - left-turn phasing (permissive to protected-only):**
- **Arterial:**
- **Agency:**
- **ons:**
- **Roadway Departure:**
- **Resurfacing:**
- **Improvement roadway:**
- **Protected left-turn lane phasing:**
- **Delineators:**
- **Guardrails:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20140602</td>
<td>Roadway Rumble strips - transverse</td>
<td>17.22 Miles</td>
<td>25650 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>1003 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140603</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>10.72 Miles</td>
<td>32572 80</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4250 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140604</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway widening - add lane(s) along segment</td>
<td>2.7 Miles</td>
<td>87480 0</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2180 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140605</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify traffic signal - add additional signal heads</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>13500 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140606</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>31500 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140607</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5.66 Miles</td>
<td>10000 00</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>3050 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140700</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>21000 00</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5160 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No.</td>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Lane (Section 148)</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201407002</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneous pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52000</td>
<td>52000 (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201407003</td>
<td>Speed management Speed management - other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>16000 (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201407004</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>44.61</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>20000 (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201407018</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15330</td>
<td>15330 (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201409001</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Advanced technology and ITS - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27500</td>
<td>27500 (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Cost (In $1000)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201409005</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>2.5 Miles</td>
<td>66000</td>
<td>66000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201409006</td>
<td>Shoulder treatments Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>1.3 Miles</td>
<td>76000</td>
<td>76000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201409007</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>2.16 Miles</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201409008</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>0.85 Miles</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201410060</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Systemic improvements - signal-controlled</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201410371</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>13820</td>
<td>13820</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201411001</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Advanced technology and ITS - other</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>10730</td>
<td>26481</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201411000</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Intersecti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>05</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>(Section 148)</th>
<th>Minor Arterial</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Highway Agency</th>
<th>ons</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>1076.6</td>
<td>1009.4</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>940.6</td>
<td>758.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>14530.6</td>
<td>13368.2</td>
<td>12675</td>
<td>12454.8</td>
<td>9853.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>9.41</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

- # Serious Injuries
- # Fatalities

- 2010: 1076.6 # Fatalities, 14500 # Serious Injuries
- 2011: 1008.4 # Fatalities, 13750 # Serious Injuries
- 2012: 951 # Fatalities, 12500 # Serious Injuries
- 2013: 940.6 # Fatalities, 11500 # Serious Injuries
- 2014: 750.4 # Fatalities, 9500 # Serious Injuries
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

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

### Year - 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>101.4</td>
<td>1004.8</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>524.6</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>16.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>716.2</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>522.8</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2976.8</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Length (ft)</td>
<td>Segment Length (% Of Illinois Roads)</td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREeways AND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1998.8</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>612.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>289.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>770.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>234.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSTATE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

![Chart showing fatalities by roadway functional classification for years 2010 to 2014.](chart.png)
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar Chart](image)

- **Roadway Functional Classification**
  - Major Collector (U)
  - Minor Collector (R)
  - Local Road on Street (R)
  - Principal Arterial - Other (R)
  - Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways (R)
  - Principal Arterial - Interstate (R)

- **Years**
  - 2010
  - 2011
  - 2012
  - 2013
  - 2014

**Axes**
- Y-axis: Number of Serious Injuries
- X-axis: Roadway Functional Classification
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014

Roadway Functional Classification

- Major Collector (U)
- Minor Collector (U)
- Local Road or Street (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways (R)
- Principal Arterial - Interstate (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other (R)
- Minor Arterial - Other (R)
- Minor Arterial - Collector (R)
- Principal Arterial - Collector (R)
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014

Roadway Functional Classification
## Year - 2010

<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>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PARK, FOREST, OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PARK, FOREST OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATE AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE (OTHER THAN RAILROAD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAILROAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PUBLIC INSTRUMENTALITY (E.G. AIRPORT, SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN TRIBE NATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership

- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014

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

2010  2011  2012  2013  2014
Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

From 2009 to 2013, there is a 13% reduction of fatalities on state routes (552 in 2009 to 483 in 2013) but 42% increase on local routes (359 in 2009 to 508 in 2013). Similarly, there is a 25% reduction of serious injuries on state routes (7151 in 2009 to 5382 in 2013) but 18% increase on local routes (5855 in 2009 to 6918 in 2013) from 2009 to 2013.

**Application of Special Rules**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older Driver 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>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Fatality and serious injury rate for 2013:

\[
\frac{(2009 \text{ older driver fatalities} + 2009 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities} + 2009 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities})}{2009 \text{ older person population} + (2010 \text{ older driver fatalities} + 2010 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities} + 2010 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities})}{2010 \text{ older person population} + (2011 \text{ older driver fatalities} + 2011 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities} + 2011 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities})}{2011 \text{ older person population} + (2012 \text{ older driver fatalities} + 2012 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities} + 2012 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities})}{2012 \text{ older person population} + (2013 \text{ older driver fatalities} + 2013 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities} + 2013 \text{ older pedestrian fatalities})}{2013 \text{ older person population}}/5 \text{ years}
\]

\[
\frac{((119 + 907)/124) + ((109 + 905)/126) + ((125 + 854)/128) + ((126 + 892)/132) + ((140 + 932)/135)}{5} = 7.93
\]
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

Does the older driver special rule apply to your state?

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

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

☐ None

☐ Benefit/cost

☐ Policy change

☒ Other: Other-Statewide fatal and serious injuries, local route fatal and serious injuries and performance measures by emphasis area and District

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.
Illinois has been developing and maintaining databases that will be used for project and program evaluation. This will supplement the statewide performance metrics that are being used to manage and track program successes and make changes as needed.
**SHSP Emphasis Areas**
For each SHSP emphasis area that relates to the HSIP, present trends in emphasis area performance measures.

**Year - 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP-related SHSP Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td>494.6</td>
<td>3994.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.2</td>
<td>5437.6</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>976.4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>418.4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>163.8</td>
<td>1910.8</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1127.4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>206.8</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.2</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

# of Fatalities

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

Year 2010 to Year 2014

SHSP Emphasis Area

# of Serious Injuries

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

2010  2011  2012  2013  2014
Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

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

SHSP Emphasis Area
**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>Horizontal Curve</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>145.2</td>
<td>1106.4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>763.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Overturned, Fixed Object, Sideswipe-opposite direction, Head on</td>
<td>399.8</td>
<td>3137.8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>Segments, Intersections</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>5221.4</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>190.8</td>
<td>4306.8</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4.11</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

[Bar chart showing the number of fatalities by target crash type for each year from 2010 to 2014.]
#Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2010 to Year 2014
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Target Crash Type

- All
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- Fixed object
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- Right-turn
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- Truck-related
- Vehicle/animal
- Vehicle/bicycle
- Wet road
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Target Crash Type
Systemic Treatments
Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

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

Year 2010 to Year 2014
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# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

**Year 2010 to Year 2014**
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**X-axis:** Target Crash Type
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements
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Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Rate of Serious Injuries

Target Crash Type
Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

The statewide safety program is evaluated, monitored and tracked at the statewide, local routes.
**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-Fatal</th>
<th>Bef-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Bef-All Injuries</th>
<th>Bef-PDO</th>
<th>Bef-Total</th>
<th>Aft-Fatal</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Optional Attachments

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

**5 year rolling average** means the average of five individual, consecutive annual points of data (e.g. annual fatality rate).

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

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

**HMVMT** means hundred million vehicle miles traveled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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