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.”
# Table of Contents

Disclaimer...................................................................................................................................................... ii
Executive Summary....................................................................................................................................... 1
Introduction .................................................................................................................................................. 2
Program Structure ........................................................................................................................................ 2
  Program Administration ........................................................................................................................... 2
  Program Methodology.............................................................................................................................. 4
Progress in Implementing Projects ............................................................................................................. 16
  Funds Programmed............................................................................................................................. 16
  General Listing of Projects .................................................................................................................. 19
Progress in Achieving Safety Performance Targets .................................................................................... 26
  Overview of General Safety Trends ........................................................................................................ 26
  Application of Special Rules .................................................................................................................... 40
Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Improvements (Program Evaluation) .......................................... 43
  SHSP Emphasis Areas .............................................................................................................................. 45
  Groups of similar project types ............................................................................................................... 50
  Systemic Treatments ............................................................................................................................... 55
  Project Evaluation ................................................................................................................................... 61
Glossary....................................................................................................................................................... 63
Executive Summary

The South Dakota Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is administered through the Office of Project Development in the South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) Central Office. The SDDOT uses Road Safety Audits (RSA), Roadway Safety Improvement (RSI) inspections, and a Safety Module software program to identify locations that would benefit from a safety improvement project. RSI inspections are developed by utilizing the South Dakota Department of Public Safety’s (SDDPS) crash reporting database, SDDOT’s roadway and traffic data, and ArcMap software to determine high crash locations. Both the RSA process and RSI inspections are available for use on all public roadways in South Dakota. HSIP projects are selected for implementation by determining which project will result in the greatest safety improvement for the investment. The overall coordination and collaboration efforts for HSIP projects involve Regional SDDOT personnel, City representatives, County representatives, Township representatives, Consulting Firms, Law Enforcement representatives, among other agencies. The SDDOT HSIP process will be explained in further detail in the Program Methodology section of this report.
**Introduction**

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

**Program Structure**

**Program Administration**

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

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

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

The SDDOT administers a County wide signing program which conducts approximately four County wide signing projects each year. Counties are prioritized by crash rate based on injury crashes and vehicle miles traveled.

Routes are also identified for improvements by conducting both RSI and RSAR inspections and by an over representation of crash clusters and higher than average crash rates.

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

The SHSP is used along with crash record analysis and mapping to hold meetings with operation and maintenance personal to identify locations to apply safety improvements.

During the planning and design process of a project, the HSM and IHSDM software is used to compare options to increase safety.

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

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Governors Highway Safety Office

Local Government Association

Other:
Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee

Other: Other-Meetings with operation and maintenance personal to identify crash locations to implement safety strategies.

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

The SDDOT has recently completed their SHSP. Emphasis has been placed on implementing safety strategies within the SHSP.

**Program Methodology**

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Barrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Curve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Hazard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn Crash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Cost Spot Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural State Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Light Running Prevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Replacement And Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle Crash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Intersection
Date of Program Methodology: 3/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

- **Roadway**
  - Median width
  - Horizontal curvature
  - Functional classification
  - Roadside features
  - Other-Intersection 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
- Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment
- Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments
- Probability of specific crash types
- Excess proportions of specific crash types
Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

☐ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

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

When ADT is available and intersects with State road.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☐ selection committee
☒ Other-B/C ratio

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 4
Program: Horizontal Curve

Date of Program Methodology: 3/1/2013

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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  4
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit  2
Cost Effectiveness  2

Program:  Roadway Departure
Date of Program Methodology:  2/2/2014

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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
What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?
- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
- Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)
- EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment
Relative severity index

Crash rate

Critical rate

Level of service of safety (LOSS)

Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs

Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Crash rates and crash clusters

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

selection committee

Other-SDDOT Project Development Personnel
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 4
- Incremental B/C
- Ranking based on net benefit 2
- Cost Effectiveness 2

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

33%

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

- Cable Median Barriers
- Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation
- Install/Improve Signing
- Upgrade Guard Rails
- Safety Edge
- Rumble Strips
- Pavement/Shoulder Widening
- Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation
- Clear Zone Improvements
- 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 county wide signing project prioritization process has changed. The process now calculates a crash rate for each county based on number of injury crashes and vehicle miles traveled.
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>9202000</td>
<td>10462000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>429000</td>
<td>429000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR Special Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>2884000</td>
<td>3810000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 164</td>
<td>9034000</td>
<td>6520500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 %</td>
<td>31 %</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
$6,407,000.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
$5,709,380.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$1,043,000.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$130,500.00

How much funding was transferred in to the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period?
$15,158.00
How much funding was transferred out of the HSIP to other core program areas during the reporting period?

0 %

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

Typical project obstacles such as estimating project costs to be programmed, projects timeline slipping due to environmental impacts, right-of-way impacts, can all be expected on any type of project.

Ways to overcome these obstacles is to do a better job of estimating projects and when scheduling projects allow for the proper time to accomplish environmental and ROW activities.

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

The proper emphasis to project management needs to be placed to ensure an HSIP project is kept on schedule and with in budget from the beginning to the end of the life of the project.
## 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>AAD T</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Ownership</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Friction Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>0.7 Miles</td>
<td>40500</td>
<td>361106</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Friction Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Roadway Pavement surface - high friction surface</td>
<td>2.1 Miles</td>
<td>54000</td>
<td>452845</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Signing</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>113 Miles</td>
<td>534276</td>
<td>534276</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing and Delineation</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>22721 Numbers</td>
<td>873804</td>
<td>873804</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</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>Signing and Delineation</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>37841 Numbers</td>
<td>156187</td>
<td>156187</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing and Delineation</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>39439 Numbers</td>
<td>117011</td>
<td>117011</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>Number 3</td>
<td>Number 4</td>
<td>Number 5</td>
<td>Number 6</td>
<td>Number 7</td>
<td>Number 8</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>Signing and Delineation</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>36542</td>
<td>152143</td>
<td>152143</td>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Provide proper signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Upgrades</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>71487</td>
<td>71487</td>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Provide proper signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Install Rumble strips        | Roadway Rumble strips - edge or shoulder                                     | 41.5     | 92708    | 92708    | HSIP     | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | Provide edge line rumble stripe/strip
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoulder widening, Milling and AC Surfacing</th>
<th>Shoulder treatments</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>HSIP Code</th>
<th>HD Code</th>
<th>KPH</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Shoulder Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder widening, Milling and AC Surfacing</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>6.3 Miles</td>
<td>3330369</td>
<td>5536462</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder widening, Milling and AC Surfacing</td>
<td>Widen shoulder - paved or other</td>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>1749657</td>
<td>2294966</td>
<td>5430</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold plastics durable pavement marking</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>14 Miles</td>
<td>139787</td>
<td>139787</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable pavement marking</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>28 Miles</td>
<td>462186</td>
<td>462186</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable pavement</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal</td>
<td>2.14 Miles</td>
<td>270917</td>
<td>270917</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marking</td>
<td>pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>148)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprayable Durable Pavement Marking</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>214583</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>214583</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>78834</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection geometry - other</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>78834</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable pavement marking</td>
<td>Roadway delineation</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>243847</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitudinal pavement markings - remarking</td>
<td>243847</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Signing</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>173298</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway signs</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>173298</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>19375</td>
<td>19375</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durable pavement marking</strong></td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>delineation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pavement markings - -new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rumble Stripes and Pavement Markings</strong></td>
<td>Roadway Rumble strips - edge or shoulder</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>499615</td>
<td>499615</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETY A-LU)</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor Signing</strong></td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>signs and traffic control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway signs (including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post) - new or updated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>788524</td>
<td>788524</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Safety audit</strong></td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section)</td>
<td>Statewide, all function</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>e. Road safety audits</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>148)</td>
<td>classes</td>
<td>roadways</td>
<td>emphasis areas</td>
<td>strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government Highway Safety Engineering</strong></td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Transporta on safety planning</td>
<td>1000 Numbers</td>
<td>62500</td>
<td>62500</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Statewide, all local public roadways</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote Highway Safety</strong></td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Educational efforts</td>
<td>100 Numbers</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Statewide, all function classes</td>
<td>500</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>145.8</td>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>904.4</td>
<td>850.8</td>
<td>836.4</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>797.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

![Graph showing the number of fatalities and serious injuries from 2010 to 2014. The graph indicates a decrease in both categories over the years.]
Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years

![Graph showing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries from 2010 to 2014. The graph indicates a decrease in both fatality and serious injury rates over the years.](image)

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

### Year - 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>14.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.84</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>30.6</td>
<td>136.8</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERRIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>7.53</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>1.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>22.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

![Bar chart showing fatalities by roadway functional classification from 2010 to 2014 in South Dakota. The x-axis represents different roadway functional classifications, and the y-axis shows the number of fatalities. The chart includes classifications such as major collector, principal arterial, minor arterial, local road or street, and so on, with bars in different colors for each year.]
# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level (U)</td>
<td>Level (R)</td>
<td>Level (U)</td>
<td>Level (R)</td>
<td>Level (U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector (U)</td>
<td>Minor Collector (U)</td>
<td>Minor Collector (R)</td>
<td>Principal Arterial (U)</td>
<td>Principal Arterial (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fatality Rate (per HMVMT)
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

Roadway Functional Classification:
- Major Collector (U)
- Minor Collector (R)
- Principal Arterial (R)
- Minor Arterial - Other (R)
- Principal Arterial - Other (R)
- Minor Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways (R)
- Principal Arterial - Interstate (R)
- Major Collector (U)
- Principal Arterial - Interstate (U)
- Minor Arterial - Other (U)
- Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressways (U)

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

Serious Injury Rate (per HHVMT)
### 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>77.8</td>
<td>397.8</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>14.25</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</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>26.21</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

Roadway Functional Classification

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

# of Fatalities

- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
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
Fatality Rate by Roadway Ownership

Roadway Functional Classification

Fatality Rate (per HMVT)
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Ownership

Roadway Functional Classification

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

The crash rates are shown very high for the "other - local system" category. This is caused by a difference between how crashes are coded and the availability of VMT data. If crashes are not coded as either state, county, or township they are lumped into the "other - local system" while this category represents a very small portion of the vehicle miles traveled.

The overall crash trend seems to be going down, but the amount of distracted driving seems to be rising with more use of hand held devices by drivers. At this time the number of crashes that have an element of distracted driving involved can not be quantified.

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>0.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2005 Fatality rate (per capita) = 12/136 = 0.09

2006 Fatality rate (per capita) = 20/143 = 0.14

2007 Fatality rate (per capita) = 15/143 = 0.10

2008 Fatality rate (per capita) = 15/144 = 0.10

2009 Fatality rate (per capita) = 10/144 = 0.07

2010 Fatality rate (per capita) = 20/144 = 0.14

2011 Fatality rate (per capita) = 16/146 = 0.11
2012 Fatality rate (per capita) = 13/145 = 0.09
2013 Fatality rate (per capita) = 19/147 = 0.13
2005 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 77/136 = 0.57
2006 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 72/143 = 0.50
2007 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 60/143 = 0.42
2008 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 61/144 = 0.42
2009 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 66/144 = 0.46
2010 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 74/144 = 0.51
2011 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 60/146 = 0.41
2012 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 65/145 = 0.45
2013 Serious Injury rate (per capita) = 52/147 = 0.48
2005 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (12+77)/136 = 0.65
2006 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (20+72)/143 = 0.64
2007 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (15+60)/143 = 0.52
2008 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (15+61)/144 = 0.53
2009 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (10+66)/144 = 0.53
2010 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (20+74)/144 = 0.65
2011 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (16+60)/146 = 0.52
2012 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (13+65)/136 = 0.54
2013 Fatal + Serious Injury rate (per capita) = (19+52)/147 = 0.48
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-Reduction in number of fatal and serious injury crashes

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-Exploring more systemic improvements

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

Systemic improvements have been explored such as horizontal curve delineation, signal corridor timing, corridor signing projects, and intersection improvements. The use of high friction surface treatments
(HFST) along with additional projects to use HFST. Exploring the use of ITS projects such as South Dakota's first Rural Intersection Conflict Warning System.
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>Lane Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>318.6</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>229.2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Vehicle/pedestrian</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td>Vehicle/bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>181.8</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Serious Injuries by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHSP Emphasis Area</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</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>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

2010 2012 2012 2013 2014

Rate of Fatalities

Lane Departure  Roadway Departure  Intersections  Pedestrians  Bicycles  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>28.4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>383.8</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>318.6</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>229.2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.53</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

Number of Fatalities

Target Crash Type

- All
- Angle
- Cross-median
- Fixed object
- Sideswipe
- Head-on
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Target Crash Type
Serious Injury Rate by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2010 to Year 2014

[Graph showing serious injury rate by target crash type for groups of similar projects over the years 2010 to 2014.]
## 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>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>366.8</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Target Crash Type
Fatality Rate by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2010 to Year 2014

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

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Rate of Serious Injury

Target Crash Type

2010 2011 2012 2013 2014
Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

The SDDOT has found a reduction of 21% of targeted crashes with the deployment of stand alone shoulder rumble stripe projects. Shoulder rumble strips showed a reduction of 24% of fatal crashes, 20% of injury crashes and 8% of all crash types.
## 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>Aft-Fatal</th>
<th>Aft-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Aft-All Injuries</th>
<th>Aft-PDO</th>
<th>Evaluation Results (Benefit/Cost Ratio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of West Main Avenue and Sheridan Lake Road in Rapid City</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>Modify traffic signal timing - signal coordination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 year rolling average means the average of five individual, consecutive annual points of data (e.g. annual fatality rate).

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

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

HMVMT means hundred million vehicle miles traveled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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