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**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

It was another successful year for Nebraska’s HSIP program in 2014. Nearly $15 million was obligated, with over $17 million planned. Once again, Nebraska chose to use a portion of its funds for non-infrastructure projects that addressed the three behavioral critical emphasis areas of its Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Although High Risk Rural Roads funding was discontinued, Nebraska used HSIP funds for several projects intended to reduce crashes on county roads. These included a project to provide up-to-date work zone signs to counties, the third phase of our successful horizontal curve signs project, and the purchase of two retro-reflectometers for use by counties to check the retro-reflectivity of their signs. The retro-reflectometers will be housed at the LTAP office. In addition, traffic control device packages were provided to local emergency response agencies as a part of a highly successful Traffic Incident Management Responder Training Program.

Planning for three more roundabouts in Lincoln took place during 2014, as did proposals for adaptive signal systems in both Omaha and Lincoln. Trailer-mounted attenuators were purchased for the NDOR district trucks to help protect our employees when on the road. Dynamic Message Sign replacements were also funded in four districts.

Major infrastructure projects let during 2014 included the reconstruction of the intersection of 90th & Maple Street in Omaha (N-64 & N-133), the reconstruction of a curve on N-66 north of Ashland, and the conversion of a 4-lane stretch of US-77 in Fremont to a 5-lane section.
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 road projects are regularly funded under the HSIP. The NDOR’s various safety committees identify potential locations for projects and send this information to local governments for their consideration as HSIP projects. City governments are encouraged to submit potential projects to the NDOR for consideration. Representatives of the state’s two largest cities, Omaha and Lincoln, regularly attend Safety Committee meetings and officials from the smaller cities are always welcome. Representatives from the Nebraska LTAP Center and the Nebraska Highway Superintendents Association sit on the High Risk Rural Road committee, which continues to function despite the loss of dedicated funding. The number of projects built on local roads varies from year to year. During State FY 2015 seven HSIP
projects let were for local roads. Other local projects, five in FY 2015, are not included in this total because they are located on state highways.

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

- Design
- Planning
- Maintenance
- Operations
- Governors Highway Safety Office
- Other: Other-Traffic Engineering
- Other: Other-Highway Safety
- Other: Other-Local Projects
- Other: Other-Program Management
- Other: Other-Rail & Public Transportation

**Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.**

All of the above named disciplines play a role in the HSIP process. Highway Safety prepares collision diagrams, spot maps, or lists of high accident locations and presents them to committee members at their monthly meetings. They coordinate with the engineering divisions to get estimated project costs, from which they calculate benefit-cost ratios. They also complete evaluations of completed projects and present them to the group for use in making future decisions. The Traffic Engineering Division is the lead office for all HSIP activity. All HSIP projects are approved by either the NDOR Safety Committee or the Strategic Safety Infrastructure Team. The usual procedure is for an approved HSIP project to be assigned to Roadway Design Division, Traffic Engineering Division, or the Local Projects Section of Materials and Research Division as the lead element, depending on the type of project and whether or not it is on a local road. These units work with Program Management to get the project scheduled and to make sure it is progressing adequately through the steps in the Clarity software, which is used for project programming. This includes the important step of working with the Environmental Section to make sure
all environmental concerns are met. The lead units either design the project or oversee the design of a consultant and prepare the project for letting. If railroad property is involved in the project, Rail & Public Transportation Division must also be consulted. The Operations Division has taken the lead on projects involving bridge anti-icing systems, adaptive signal control, and dynamic message signs, which require systems engineering analysis. The Governor’s Highway Safety Office is responsible for non-infrastructure projects addressing driver behavior issues. The NDOR has begun using the Highway Safety Manual procedures in the analysis and evaluation of some HSIP projects.

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

☐ Metropolitan Planning Organizations
☒ Governors Highway Safety Office
☒ Local Government Association
☒ Other: Other-City of Omaha Public Works Department
☒ Other: Other-City of Lincoln Public Works Department
☒ Other: Other-FHWA Division Office
☒ Other: Other-NE Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP)

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-Other-NDOR has developed a Strategic Plan for HSIP and RHCP Expenditures with the help of FHWA
Describe any other aspects of Highway Safety Improvement Program Administration on which you would like to elaborate.

During FY 2015, Nebraska completed an update of its HSIP process document, which was approved by FHWA. NDOR also issued an RFP for the purchase of a web-based automatic collision diagramming system, to be paid for with HSIP funds. We are currently in the process of selecting a vendor.

**Program Methodology**

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

- [ ] Median Barrier
- [ ] Horizontal Curve
- [ ] Skid Hazard
- [x] Roadway Departure
- [ ] Local Safety
- [ ] Left Turn Crash
- [ ] Other:

- [x] Intersection
- [ ] Bicycle Safety
- [ ] Crash Data
- [ ] Low-Cost Spot Improvements
- [x] Safe Corridor
- [ ] Rural State Highways
- [ ] Red Light Running Prevention
- [ ] Sign Replacement And Improvement
- [ ] Pedestrian Safety
- [ ] Shoulder Improvement
- [ ] Right Angle Crash
- [ ] Segments

---

**Program:** Intersection

**Date of Program Methodology:** 9/27/1990

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

- [x] All crashes
- [ ] Traffic
- [ ] Median width
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

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

The number and type of crashes to address systemic improvements and on occasion the same methodology as used on state roads.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

Selection committee

Other

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

Relative Weight in Scoring

Rank of Priority Consideration

- Ranking based on B/C 3
- Available funding 2
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit
- Other
- Design and Project 1
Development Time

Program: Roadway Departure

Date of Program Methodology: 9/27/1990

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-Land Use
- ☒ Other-Median Type
- ☒ Other-Number 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

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.

The number and type of roadway departure crashes on a particular roadway to address systemic improvements.

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  3
☒ Available funding  2
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Other
☒ Design and Project Development Time  1

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

10

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

☐ Cable Median Barriers
☒ 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  Other

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- Engineering Study
- Road Safety Assessment
- Other:

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

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

Describe any other aspects of the Highway Safety Improvement Program methodology on which you would like to elaborate.
The NDOR has continued to increase its emphasis on systemic projects in the HSIP program. This is evident in the newly developed Strategic Plan for HSIP and RHCP Expenditures. Systemic projects are increasing in HSIP planning, and should increase in obligations in future years.

Likewise, the NDOR is increasing its use of the Highway Safety Manual in project evaluations. This use should continue to grow in the future.
Progress in Implementing Projects

Funds Programmed

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

- Calendar Year
- State Fiscal Year
- Federal Fiscal Year

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Programmed*</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>17116800</td>
<td>14651381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR Special Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Grants - Section 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Grants (Section 406)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)</td>
<td>2802758</td>
<td>2171421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Funds</td>
<td>2802758</td>
<td>2171421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
$6,317,891.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
$1,281,061.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$2,532,080.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$2,346,001.00

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

$0.00

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

Some local agencies are reluctant to apply for HSIP funds because of the perceived difficulty of following federal rules. For example, some counties chose not to take part in the statewide bridge object marker project due to the time needed to complete project requirements. The NDOR and LTAP will continue to encourage counties to take part in future projects of this type.

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

A major step in the HSIP implementation process was taken this year when NDOR and FHWA collaborated on a Strategic Plan for HSIP and RHCP Expenditures. This plan will allow NDOR to sustain consistent obligations of HSIP funds. It provides a list of countermeasures that is intended as an implementation document for the Nebraska Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). The document also lays out a 6-year plan for HSIP expenditures which incorporates the countermeasures listed in the plan.

NDOR will continue to use a crash data-driven analysis approach to justify expenditure of HSIP funds, but will also rely more on a systemic approach, as it is recognized that certain types of crashes occur randomly throughout the highway system. National research identifying best practices and FHWA endorsements of specific practices will also be followed.
### General Listing of Projects

List each highway safety improvement project obligated during the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Improvement Category</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>HSIP Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>00787 Horizontal Curve Signs, Phase 3</strong></td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Curve-related warning signs and flashers</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>54646</td>
<td>54646</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>Various - Major Collector, Local</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>00928B NDOR Safety Education Commercials</strong></td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Educational efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>55573</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12944 Lincoln - N. 14th &amp; Cornhusker Highway</strong></td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Modify control - two-way</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>279824</td>
<td>1081040</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>13400</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersectio ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Traffic Control Action</td>
<td>HSIP Number</td>
<td>Road Type</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Traffic Agency</td>
<td>Recommended 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>13147</td>
<td>Lincoln - S. Coddington &amp; W. Van Dorn Street</td>
<td>Modify control - two-way stop to roundabout</td>
<td>125755</td>
<td>Urban Major Collector</td>
<td>8745</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Choose appropriate intersection traffic control to minimize crash frequency and severity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13227</td>
<td>Lincoln - N. 66th Street &amp; Fremont Street</td>
<td>Modify control - two-way stop to roundabout</td>
<td>1204459</td>
<td>Urban Principal</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13244</td>
<td>Lincoln - N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13500</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>29000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Improve safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Local Agency</td>
<td>Description</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th Street Adaptive Signals</td>
<td>control Modify traffic signal timing - signal coordination</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>I Highway Agency</td>
<td>through data analysis and coordination with local agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00894 Retro-Reflectometers</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Non-infrastructure - other</td>
<td>2 Numbers</td>
<td>64225</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Keep vehicles from encroaching on the roadside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00907 Trailer Mounted Attenuators</td>
<td>Work Zone</td>
<td>51 Numbers</td>
<td>777775</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Protecting highway workers from errant vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00928C &quot;Click It or Ticket&quot; Overtime Enforcement</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Enforcement</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>111114</td>
<td>Unbelted Vehicle Occupants</td>
<td>Maximize use of occupant restraints by all vehicle occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00928D &quot;Click It or Ticket&quot; Overtime Enforcement</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>55555</td>
<td>Unbelted Vehicle</td>
<td>Maximize use of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket PI&amp;E Messaging</td>
<td>00928E &quot;You Drink, You Drive, You Lose&quot; Overtime Enforcement</td>
<td>00928F &quot;You Drink, You Drive, You Lose&quot; PI&amp;E Campaign</td>
<td>00928G NDOR Safety Education Commercials</td>
<td>00928H &quot;Click It or Ticket&quot; Enforcement - May</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re Educational efforts</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Educational efforts 250000 277781 HSIP (Section 148) Not Applicable</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Educational efforts 100000 111114 HSIP (Section 148) Not Applicable</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Educational efforts 200000 293930 HSIP (Section 148) Not Applicable</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Educational Enforcement 275000 275003 HSIP (Section 148) Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable</td>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>Impaired Driving</td>
<td>Impaired Driving</td>
<td>Unbelted Vehicle Occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant restraints by all vehicle occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforce DUI laws</td>
<td>Enforce DUI laws</td>
<td>Maximize use of occupant restraints by all vehicle occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>HSIP Code</td>
<td>Non-Infrastructural Code</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>Goal</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>00928J</td>
<td>&quot;Click It or Ticket&quot; PI&amp;E Messaging - May</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Unbelted Vehicle Occupants</td>
<td>Maximize use of occupant restraints by all vehicle occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00936</td>
<td>Statewide Work Zone Signs</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Various - Major Collector and Local</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td>Warn drivers of potential work zone hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00942</td>
<td>&quot;You Drink, You Drive, You Lose&quot; Overtime Enforcement</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Impaired Driving</td>
<td>Enforce DUI laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00942A</td>
<td>&quot;You Drink, You Drive, You Lose&quot; PI&amp;E Campaign</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Impaired Driving</td>
<td>Reduce excessive drinking and underage drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ithaca - Ashland</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Horizontal curve realignment</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>2350730</td>
<td>10679797</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>60</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></td>
<td>District 1 - DMS Replacement</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Dynamic message signs</td>
<td>3 Numbers</td>
<td>303419</td>
<td>338232</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>29855</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omaha - 90th &amp; Maple Street</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>4 Numbers</td>
<td>1909722</td>
<td>2124341</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>53170</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fremont - US-77, 5th St. to 10th St.</td>
<td>Roadway widening</td>
<td>add lane(s)</td>
<td>0.29 Miles</td>
<td>1028251</td>
<td>14590851</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>12630</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Along Segment</td>
<td>Intersection Traffic Control</td>
<td>Modify Traffic Signal Timing - Signal Coordination</td>
<td>Project Numbers</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Improved Safety Features</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>22482</td>
<td>Omaha - Dodge Street Adaptive Signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Numbers</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Improve safety through data analysis and coordination with local agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22490</td>
<td>District 2 - DMS Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Numbers</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22596</td>
<td>Omaha - Southbound I-680 to Eastbound I-80 Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42 Miles</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42739</td>
<td>District 4 - DMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Along Segment</th>
<th>Intersection Traffic Control</th>
<th>Modify Traffic Signal Timing - Signal Coordination</th>
<th>Project Numbers</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Roadway Departure</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Improved Safety Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22482</td>
<td>Omaha - Dodge Street Adaptive Signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Numbers</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Improve safety through data analysis and coordination with local agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22490</td>
<td>District 2 - DMS Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Numbers</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22596</td>
<td>Omaha - Southbound I-680 to Eastbound I-80 Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42 Miles</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42739</td>
<td>District 4 - DMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>message signs</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51480 Melbeta - Jct. of N-92 &amp; L79E</strong></td>
<td>Intersection geometry Splitter island - remove from one or more approaches</td>
<td>0.8 Miles</td>
<td>750407</td>
<td>1134118</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61547 District 6 - DMS Replacement</strong></td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS Dynamic message signs</td>
<td>6 Numbers</td>
<td>618030</td>
<td>691800</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>14615</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</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>229</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>8.61</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

![Chart showing the number of fatalities and serious injuries over the last five years.](chart_image)
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

![Graph showing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries for the last five years.](image-url)
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>22.4</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>212.2</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>27.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>17.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>257.4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>11.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>192.2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing fatalities by roadway functional classification across different years (2010-2014). The x-axis represents different classifications of roadways, and the y-axis shows the number of fatalities. Each year has a different color, allowing for comparison over time.](chart.png)
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification

[Bar chart showing the number of serious injuries by roadway functional classification for the years 2010 to 2014. The chart includes categories such as Major Collector (U), Principal Arterial (U), Minor Collector (R), etc.]
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification
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Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification
### 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>134</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>15.69</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>30</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>11.49</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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Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership

![Bar chart showing the number of serious injuries by roadway ownership from 2010 to 2014. The chart displays data for various categories such as State, County, Town, City, Local Park, Other State, Private, Railroad, State Toll, Local Toll, and Other.]
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Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

After two good years in 2010 and 2011, fatalities have begun to trend back upward in 2012-2014. The 5-year rolling averages for fatalities and fatality rate have held nearly constant over the last three years. Serious injuries, on the other hand, have been steadily decreasing. The 5-year rolling average for Serious Injury Rate has dropped from 9.89 in 2010 to 8.61 in 2014.

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>0.3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

From Nebraska state crash database:

Drivers and Pedestrians age 65 and over:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Driver + Peds)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries (Drvr + Peds)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities + Serious Injuries</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Factor (FHWA)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fatality + Serious Injury Rate (5-Yr. Rolling average 2007 - 2011): \( \frac{(236 + 251 + 242 + 244 + 235)}{(133 + 134 + 134 + 135 + 136)} = 1.80 \)

Fatality + Serious Injury Rate (5-Yr. Rolling average 2009-2013): \( \frac{(242 + 244 + 235 + 233 + 208)}{(134 + 135 + 136 + 138 + 142)} = 1.71 \)
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:

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

☐ Shift Focus to Fatalities and Serious Injuries
☐ Include Local Roads in Highway Safety Improvement Program
☐ Organizational Changes
☐ None
☒ Other: Other-Development of an NDOR Strategic Plan for HSIP and RCHP Expenditures

Briefly describe significant program changes that have occurred since the last reporting period.
During the past year, NDOR developed a Strategic Plan for HSIP and RHCP Expenditures. This is a multi-year plan that lays out certain types of projects that will be funded into the future. The Plan will allow NDOR to make better use of its available HSIP funds.
**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>122.4</td>
<td>693.2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Intersection crashes</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>4.28</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

# of Fatalities

SHSP Emphasis Area
Number of Serious Injuries by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

# of Serious Injuries
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Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

SHSP Emphasis Area
Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

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>Intersection</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>369.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerline Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>170.6</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.38</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
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# 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>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/animal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle/pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Target Crash Type

Rate of Fatalities

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

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Target Crash Type

Rate of Serious Injuries
**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>Shoulder Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Target Crash Type

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

# of Fatalities
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# 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

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Rate of Fatalities

Target Crash Type

2010 2012 2012 2013 2014
Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Rate of Serious Injuries

Target Crash Type

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

The Nebraska HSIP program continues to be effective in reducing crashes. Most of our project evaluations had positive outcomes. The six evaluations completed in 2014 showed an overall decrease in crashes of 35%.
## 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>Omaha - Intersection of 19th/20th Streets with Cass Street</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Intersection geometrics - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha - Intersection of Northbound US-75 (Kennedy Freeway) Ramps/25th Street and &quot;Q&quot; Street</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Supplemental Feature</td>
<td>Quantity</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>
<tr>
<td>Grand Island - US-30 &amp; Engleman Road</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>0 2 5 4 11 0 0 0 3 3 4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Pleasant Dale - Jct. of US-6 &amp; N-103</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify control - two-way stop to roundabout</td>
<td>0 0 4 4 8 0 0 2 2 4 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast of Bancroft - Jct. of N-16 &amp; N-51</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Roadside</td>
<td>Removal of roadside objects (trees, poles, etc.)</td>
<td>0 0 3 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Kearney - I-80 - Remove viaduct, replace with culvert</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>Roadside</td>
<td>Roadside grading</td>
<td>0 1 1 12 14 0 0 2 2 0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Optional Attachments

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