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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

Wyoming adopted a revised Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) in June of 2012 through its Safety Management System committee (SMS). The SMS committee adopted two additional Emphasis Areas and reorganized the sections within the document. The SHSP attempts to bring together the driver behavior and engineering factors to provide a safer transportation system as a whole.

The methodology for prioritizing projects is a combination of engineering judgment, the geometric conditions and crash information for identified hazardous crash types and locations. The roadway safety projects were selected and prioritized in the State Transportation Improvement Program with input from the Highway Safety Office, Traffic Program and the five District Engineering Programs. Crash locations are typically not consistent year to year. Wyoming uses systematic treatments to improve safety on roadway segments and other locations that have similar characteristics that are a safety concern. Wyoming also uses stand-alone safety projects to address safety issues at a specific spot, for example at an intersection or along a roadway segment. A third general project type that Wyoming utilizes to improve the system is combined projects with other work such as pavement projects or bridge projects.

The overall safety goal of WYDOT with respect to safety is to “Reduce the frequency and severity of crashes on the state’s roadways with the resources available.”

That essentially translates to getting the most reduction in crashes possible from the dollars spent in the name of safety.

The WYDOT Safety Management System is a collection of tools, business processes, cross-program work flows, and the policy on Highway Safety designed to facilitate the identification and correction of safety concerns on the roadway network in Wyoming, and to achieve the overall safety goal.

The Safety Management System supports WYDOT business objectives by helping to accomplish the following:

- Optimize safety spending
  - WYDOT will achieve a higher level of safety improvement (reduction in frequency and/or severity of crashes) through the project work funded in the name of safety.
  - WYDOT will be able to get the highest level of benefit of safety spending by being able to identify and focus on the projects that will provide the greatest reduction for the lowest cost.
- Transparency
WYDOT will be able to provide solid, defensible rationale for decisions regarding safety investments, and be able to communicate clearly to the public, the federal partners, and state legislature with regards to safety efforts.

- The prioritization of safety investments is in line with the WYDOT Balanced Score Card measures for safety, as well as with other associated plans (WYDOT Strategic Plan, the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, the Traffic Records Strategic Plan, etc...).

- Focusing on fatal and incapacitating injury crashes (referred together as “critical crashes”), while also considering counts of all crashes.

Facilitate Cross-Program efforts

- Interactions between various parties will be streamlined with smoother flow of information and actions between District management, Traffic Operations, Project Development, Planning, and Highway Patrol in addition to Highway Safety with regards to the development and deployment of safety remedies.
## 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
- [x] District
- [ ] Other

If District, how are the HSIP funds allocated?

- [ ] Formula
- [ ] Crash Data
- [ ] Population
- [x] Other Judgement based upon data and rating system used to ID specific projects for highway safety funding
Describe how local roads are addressed as part of Highway Safety Improvement Program.

The local county roads are included in the HSIP by the Wyoming rural road safety program (WRRSP) administered by the UW LTAP center. The program reviews crash and roadway feature data to develop high risk road locations. The work done by the LTAP then includes assistance in putting projects together with the local jurisdictions to address the identified roadway safety needs.

There are two MPO’s in Wyoming and they are represented on the Safety Management Committee that identifies emphasis areas for the SHSP. Projects are proposed and developed by the MPO’s with regard to their own identified needs and assistance is provided in data and information.

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

- Design
- Planning
- Maintenance
- Operations
- Governors Highway Safety Office

Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.

Internal partners are asked to provide their expertise in the various areas that they represent. The coordination is required at many levels based upon the policies of WYDOT. Information is developed and disseminated by the Highway Safety Office. The information is used to make decisions regarding project programming and design by the other WYDOT programs responsible for that part of the project development and implementation.

Identify which external partners are involved with Highway Safety Improvement Program planning.
Metropolitan Planning Organizations
Governors Highway Safety Office
Local Government Association
Other:

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- No program administration practices have changed since the last report

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

None

Program Methodology
Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

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

**Program:**
Median Barrier

**Date of Program Methodology:** 10/9/2006

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash frequency</th>
<th>Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)</td>
<td>□ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
☐ 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-District and Traffic Operations input

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

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

Available funding 1

Incremental B/C

Ranking based on net benefit

Other

Program: Intersection

Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2011

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

**Roadway**
- Median width
- Horizontal curvature
- Functional classification
- Roadside features
- Other-Rural Intersections and the type of traffic control present for example signalized or not

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment
Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?

☒ Yes
☐ No

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

☐ Yes
☒ No

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

Rural off system intersections are studied independently from on system intersections. Urban intersections are also studied within the community that they exist. A statewide program does not currently exist.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☒ Available funding 1
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☐ Other

Program: Horizontal Curve

Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2009

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

☐ Other       ☐ Lane miles       ☒ Roadside features

☐ Other       ☐ Other

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

☒ Crash frequency

☐ Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐ Equivalent property damage only (EPDO Crash frequency)

☐ EPDO crash frequency with EB adjustment

☒ Relative severity index

☐ Crash rate

☐ Critical rate

☐ Level of service of safety (LOSS)

☐ Excess expected crash frequency using SPF

☐ Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

☐ Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

☒ Probability of specific crash types

☐ Excess proportions of specific crash types

☐ Other

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
Competitive application process

selection committee

Other-District and Traffic operations input

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

Program: Crash Data

Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2008

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>
</tbody>
</table>
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

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

- ✔ Yes
- □ No

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.

Crash Data is tailored for the specific study that is being conducted for the other roadways whether they be rural counties or urban communities. The Wyoming rural road safety program is utilized for HRRR projects.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process
☐ Selection committee
☒ Other-Data improvement projects are developed and implemented by the WY traffic records coordinating committee

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring
☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C
☒ Available funding 1
☐ Incremental B/C
☐ Ranking based on net benefit
☒ Cost Effectiveness 2
What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

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

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

☐ Other

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

The local roads utilize specific studies to determine project needs.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐ Competitive application process

☐ Selection committee

☒ Other-District and Traffic operations input

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

☐ Relative Weight in Scoring

☒ Rank of Priority Consideration

☐ Ranking based on B/C

☒ Available funding

1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Low-Cost Spot Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Program Methodology:</td>
<td>10/9/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
- Other

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

Relative severity index

Crash rate

Critical rate

Level of service of safety (LOSS)

Excess expected crash frequency using SPF

Excess expected crash frequency with the EB adjustment

Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

Probability of specific crash types

Excess proportions of specific crash types

Other

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

Yes

No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process

selection committee

Other-District and Traffic operations input

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

Relative Weight in Scoring
Rank of Priority Consideration

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

Program: Sign Replacement And Improvement
Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2008

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

**Roadway**
- Median width
- Horizontal curvature
- Functional classification
- Roadside features
- Other-Age and condition of signs

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-Age of signs in combination with functional classification of the roadway is the main factor

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.

Sign replacement and improvement projects are done through the WRRSP methodology for Counties. For Urban communities these type of projects are done on a corridor basis.

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

Rank of Priority Consideration

- [ ] Ranking based on B/C
- [x] Available funding 2
- [ ] Incremental B/C
- [ ] Ranking based on net benefit
- [ ] Other
- [x] Relative age of signage and functional classification 1

Program: Local Safety

Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2008

What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes Exposure Roadway
What project identification methodology was used for this program?

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

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
Yes
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 Wyoming Rural Road Safety Program (WRRSP) utilizes crash data and drive through surveys to rank and prioritize local road safety needs and assists in identifying projects to address needs.

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

Competitive application process
selection committee
Other

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

Relative Weight in Scoring
Rank of Priority Consideration

Ranking based on B/C
Available funding 2
Incremental B/C
Ranking based on net benefit
Cost Effectiveness 1
What proportion of highway safety improvement program funds address systemic improvements?

70

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
- Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal
- Rumble Strips
- Pavement/Shoulder Widening
- Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation
- Clear Zone Improvements
- Install/Improve Lighting
- Other

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- Engineering Study
- Road Safety Assessment
- Other: Other-Use of Crash Information to identify over-represented crash types to be addressed
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.

Use of the Highway Safety Manual techniques for predicting crashes and use of the Empirical Bayes (EB) methodology to adjust/weight predicted crashes into expected crashes for Wyoming roadways has taken place over the last year. The new methodology is being adopted into the process for identifying benefits for potential projects. These benefits are used to assisting in setting performance goals for Safety.
**Progress in Implementing Projects**

**Funds Programmed**

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Programmed*</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>13326065.6</td>
<td>13326065.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>643784.57</td>
<td>643784.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR Special Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>5471186</td>
<td>5471186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>5471186</td>
<td>5471186</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?
$540,000.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
$540,000.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$200,000.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$210,449.00

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

0 %

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

There are no significant impediments to obligating HSIP funds. Wyoming obligates all of its HSIP funding each FY.

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

None
## 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>HSI P 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>HSIP-SEP 100.49 0202052-00 LOVL-EMBL/STR CJJ &amp; CJN</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13573</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure Guardrail and joint improvemen ts at a structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLETTE / WYO 50 &amp; 4J ROAD</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205032.9</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP-SEP 0.00 1507037-00 CHIEF JOSEPH/WYO 296/GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>921891</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MESSAGE</td>
<td>Advanced technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190762</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Minor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNS</td>
<td>and ITS</td>
<td>IMP PROG</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Departure</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>DIST 4 / VAR LOC / GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 5 / VAR LOC / CURVE CHEVRON</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE / VAR LOC / RUMBLE STRIPS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 1 DMS/HAR INSTALLATIONS</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 1 GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 2 GRADING AND GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE EPOXY STRIPING</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1028268</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</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>DIST 1 GUARDRAIL UPGRADE</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46383</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE EPOXY STRIPING</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143507</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE RUMBLE STRIPS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46395</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 1 GUARDRAIL UPGRADE</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46383</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 5 GUARDRAIL UPGRADE</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91961</td>
<td>HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATEWIDE EPOXY STRIPING</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60679 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATEWIDE RUMBLE STRIPS</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55661 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIST 1 / I-80 SIGN INSTALLATION</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7421 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LARAMIE - CHEYENNE</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11131 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANIEL JUNCTION - HOBACK JUNCTION</strong></td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40490 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVERTON - SHOSHONI</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3022 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Departure</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>RIVERTON - SHOSHONI</td>
<td>Miscellaneus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>Highway Safety Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYO 220 / ROBERTSON ROAD</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4525</td>
<td>Highway Safety Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SmUbn&amp;Ubnzd Othr Prin Arterial</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER SOUTH / WYO 220</td>
<td>Miscellaneus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>119726</td>
<td>Highway Safety Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER / INDIAN SPRINGS ROAD</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14691</td>
<td>Highway Safety Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SmUbn&amp;Ubnzd Othr Prin Arterial</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUDDY GAP - CASPER</td>
<td>Miscellaneus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>87063</td>
<td>Highway Safety Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETEETSEE - CODY</td>
<td>Miscellaneus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>76057</td>
<td>Highway Safety Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial -</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Departure</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>CASPER / US 20/26 / GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>Miscellaneou s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 46769 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>0 0 State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER - SHOSHONI</td>
<td>Miscellaneou s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 9794 HIGHWAY SAFETY IMP PROG</td>
<td>0 0 State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEN SLEEP - BUFFALO</td>
<td>Intersection geometry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 827235 HIGHWAY IMP PROG</td>
<td>0 0 State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLETTE STREETS / UNION CHAPEL</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 407292 HIGHWAY IMP PROG</td>
<td>0 0 State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEYENNE - HAWK SPRINGS</td>
<td>Miscellaneou s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 125679 HIGHWAY IMP PROG</td>
<td>0 0 State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUSK - MULE CREEK ROAD</td>
<td>Miscellaneou s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 197356 HIGHWAY IMP PROG</td>
<td>0 0 State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>approving_organisation</td>
<td>roadways_type</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><strong>FARSON - LANDER</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneou us</td>
<td>77454</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASPER STREETS</strong></td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>4298848</td>
<td>SmUbn&amp;Ubn zd Othr Prin Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersectio ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LARAMIE - COLORADO STATE LINE</strong></td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>18098</td>
<td>Rural Minor Arterial</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRR / SHERIDAN COUNTY ROAD 74</strong></td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRR / WIND RIVER / SIGNS</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneou us</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>Indian Tribe Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRRR / WIND RIVER /</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneou us</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>Indian Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKINGS</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>RISK RURAL ROAD</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>Departure</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>HRRR / WIND RIVER / GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous us</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>13406</td>
<td>HSIP-HIGH RISK RURAL ROAD</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Indian Tribe Nation</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR / VARIOUS PARK COUNTY ROADS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous us</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>52374</td>
<td>HSIP-HIGH RISK RURAL ROAD</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR / ROAD 204 AND 125 GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>Miscellaneous us</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>73420</td>
<td>HSIP-HIGH RISK RURAL ROAD</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR / VARIOUS LINCOLN COUNTY ROADS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous us</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>99428</td>
<td>HSIP-HIGH RISK RURAL ROAD</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR / VARIOUS LINCOLN</td>
<td>Miscellaneous us</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>12482</td>
<td>HSIP-HIGH RISK</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY ROADS</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR / VARIOUS LINCOLN COUNTY ROADS</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR / VARIOUS CONVERSE COUNTY ROADS</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR / VARIOUS CONVERSE COUNTY ROADS</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS / CASPER EVENTS CENTER</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 1 PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td>Project Type</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>DIST 2</td>
<td>PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>SEC 154 PENALTIES - FOR HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 3</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127103</td>
<td>SEC 154 PENALTIES - FOR HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 3</td>
<td>PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>SEC 154 PENALTIES - FOR HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA/DELL RANGE BLVD</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Road safety audits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>SEC 154 PENALTIES - FOR HSIP</td>
<td>SmUbn&amp;Ubn zd Othr Prin Arterial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>City of Municipal Highway Agency</td>
<td>Local Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARAMIE - COLORADO STATE LINE</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5614607.02</td>
<td>SEC 154 PENALTIES - FOR HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOSHONI - THERMOPOLIS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>SEC 154 PENALTIES - FOR HSIP</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Penalties</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Safety Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</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>UCROSS - GILLETTE</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>SEC 164</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST 3 ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>SEC 164</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARAMIE - COLORADO STATE LINE</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>SEC 164</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER / US20/26 / ITS</td>
<td>Advanced technology and ITS</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>SEC 164</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAWLINS STREETS / INTERSECTION</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>SEC 164</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress in Achieving Safety Performance Targets

Overview of General Safety Trends
Present data showing the general highway safety trends in the state for the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures*</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.54</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th># Serious Injuries</th>
<th># Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate of Fatalities and Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years

![Graph showing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries over the last five years. The graph includes data points for each year from 2010 to 2014. The y-axis represents the rate per HMVMT, while the x-axis shows the years. The graph indicates a decrease in serious injuries and a small increase in fatalities between 2010 and 2014.](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>29</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.45</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>46</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>17.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>13.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>61.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification

![Graph showing the number of fatalities by roadway functional classification for years 2010 to 2014. The x-axis represents the different types of roadways, and the y-axis represents the number of fatalities. Each year's data is represented by a different colored bar.](image)
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

The graph shows the fatality rate per HMMVT (Hundred Million Motor Vehicle Traveler Miles) for different roadway functional classifications over the years 2010 to 2014. The classifications include:

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

The fatality rates vary significantly across these classifications and years, with some showing a higher increase compared to others.
Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification

- Serious Injury Rate (per HHVMT)
- Roadway Functional Classification

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

<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>73</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OR TOWNSHIP HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PARK, FOREST, OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PARK, FOREST OR RESERVATION AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATE AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL AGENCY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE (OTHER THAN RAILROAD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAILROAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TOLL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PUBLIC INSTRUMENTALITY (E.G. AIRPORT, SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by Roadway Ownership

- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014

# of Fatalities

Roadway Functional Classification

- STATE
- COUNTY
- TOWN
- CITY
- STATE PARK
- OTHER STATE
- PRIVATE
- RAILROAD
- STATE TOLL
- LOCAL TOLL
- OTHER
Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership

Roadway Functional Classification

# of Serious Injuries

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

Fatal and Serious Injury crashes in Wyoming have increased over the last year, but the trend is downward when looking at a five year period. The efforts of WYDOT on focusing HSIP projects on Safety Emphasis areas of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan are indicating progress on driving down fatal and serious injury crashes.

**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</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance measure data is presented using a five-year rolling average.
The State of Wyoming's 5-year fatality and serious injuries per capita for drivers and pedestrians who were 65 years of age or older for the periods ending in 2011 and 2013 decreased from 0.42 to 0.35. Therefore the Special Rule would not apply to the State of Wyoming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports

5 Year Average | 0.53 | 0.42

5 Year Average | 0.47 | 0.39

5 Year Average | 0.42 | 0.35
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-The trend is downward in fatalities and serious injuries. This is due to an added emphasis on doing projects that are focused on the right areas of concern.

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

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

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

None
### 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>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.36</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

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

2010  2011  2012  2013  2014
Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHSP Emphasis Area</th>
<th>2010</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area

Year 2010 to Year 2014

Rate of Serious Injury

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>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Replacement And Improvement</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Curve</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects
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#Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects

Year 2010 to Year 2014

![Graph showing serious injuries by target crash type for different years (2010 to 2014). The x-axis represents target crash types including all types, angle, cross median, fixed object, sideswipe, head on, left-turn, right-time, intersections, non-intersection, rear-end, right-turn, run-off-road, speed-related, truck-related, vehicle, animal, vehicle/bicycle, vehicle/pedestrian, wet road. The y-axis represents the number of serious injuries ranging from 0 to 1000. The graph indicates the variation in serious injuries across different years and crash types.]
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**Systemic Treatments**

Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

### Year - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic improvement</th>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>Number of fatalities</th>
<th>Number of serious injuries</th>
<th>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</th>
<th>Other-1</th>
<th>Other-2</th>
<th>Other-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Zone Improvements</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Signing</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Median Barriers</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement/Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</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>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Guard Rails</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.9</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Crash Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></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</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>

# of Fatalities
# Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

**Year 2010 to Year 2014**

![Graph showing number of serious injuries by target crash type for system safety improvements from 2010 to 2014. The graph uses a color-coded legend for each year: 2010 (blue), 2011 (red), 2012 (green), 2013 (purple), and 2014 (orange). The x-axis represents different types of crashes (e.g., All, Angle, Cross-median, Sideswipe, Head on, Left-turn, Right-time, Intersections, Non-intersection, Rear-end, Right-turn, Run-off-road, Speed-related, Truck-related, Vehicle/animal, Vehicle/bicycle, Wet road). The y-axis represents the number of serious injuries. Different crash types show varying levels of injuries across the years.]
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Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

WYDOT is completing projects targeted at the predominate crash type of run off the road. The systemic improvement projects are difficult to analyze as a direct contributing factor to the downward trend in fatal and serious injury crashes in the State.

These type of projects are helping drive down the fatal and serious injury crashes because many times we do not know where drivers will be impaired, distracted or fatigued while travelling on the system.
### Project Evaluation

Provide project evaluation data for completed projects (optional).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Improvement Category</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Bef-Fatal</th>
<th>Bef-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Bef-All Injuries</th>
<th>Bef-PDO</th>
<th>Bef-Total</th>
<th>Aft-Fatal</th>
<th>Aft-Serious Injury</th>
<th>Aft-All Injuries</th>
<th>Aft-PDO</th>
<th>Aft-Total</th>
<th>Evaluation Results (Benefit/Cost Ratio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Optional Attachments

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