Protection of Data from Discovery & Admission into Evidence

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

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

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) for FY 2015 is moving toward better alignment with the performance targets of the State of Wyoming through the use of the WYDOT Safety Management System (SMS).

The data requirements for the optimal use of the SMS are large and it has been a number of years getting to the point we are at now with the ability to describe the issues and problems facing the highway system, rural road system and local roads in Wyoming. The HSIP is beginning to take a more rounded approach to all of the issues and problems facing the State.

Projects are selected and programmed by the various WYDOT Districts. The Districts are utilizing the information produced by the Highway Safety Office to better align projects with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan which targets the main safety problem areas for the state highway system. County and local road officials work closely with the University of Wyoming Local technical transfer office to identify and address safety concerns on roadways under their direction and control.

Overall the HSIP for the State of Wyoming is moving in the right direction in regard to safety problem identification and projects to address those issues in a cost effective manner. The Highway Safety Office continues to monitor and evaluate the performance of the highway system in Wyoming.

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?

District

If District, how are the HSIP funds allocated?
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
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.
Identify any program administration practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.

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.

The Highway Safety Office has been the lead in developing a Safety Management System (SMS) for WYDOT. The SMS is maturing rapidly and becoming the go to place for counter measures and projects that have higher benefit/cost ratios. The SMS is based upon the principles contained in the Highway Safety Manual and is very dependent upon data. The SMS development has been a long process but it is now on the verge of driving the HSIP project selection process for WYDOT.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Horizontal Curve</th>
<th>Crash Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Low-Cost Spot Improvements</td>
<td>Sign Replacement And Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>Other-Guardrail upgrade/replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Intersection
Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2011

What data types were used in the program methodology?
Crashes Exposure Roadway
All crashes          Traffic
Fatal crashes only    Volume
Fatal and serious injury crashes only

Functional classification
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
Probability of specific crash types

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
Yes
If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
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?
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).
Rank of Priority Consideration

Available funding 1

Program: Horizontal Curve
Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2009

What data types were used in the program methodology?
Crashes Exposure Roadway
All crashes Traffic Horizontal curvature
Fatal crashes only Volume
Fatal and serious injury crashes Functional classification
only Roadside features

**What project identification methodology was used for this program?**
Crash frequency
Relative severity index
Probability of specific crash types

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

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

**Rank of Priority Consideration**

| Ranking based on B/C | 2 |
| Available funding    | 1 |

---

**Program:** Crash Data
**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-Safety Index rating system

- **Exposure**
  - Traffic
  - Volume

- **Roadway**
  - Horizontal curvature
  - Functional classification
  - Roadside features

**What project identification methodology was used for this program?**
Crash frequency
Relative severity index
Crash rate
Critical rate
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
If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
No
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?
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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Priority Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Roadway Departure
Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2006

What data types were used in the program methodology?
Crashes Exposure Roadway
All crashes Traffic Horizontal curvature
Fatal crashes only Volume Functional classification
Fatal and serious injury crashes only Roadside features

What project identification methodology was used for this program?
Crash frequency
Relative severity index
Crash rate
Critical rate
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
If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
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?
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).

Rank of Priority Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available funding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement based - systemic geometric</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements and some crashed based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Low-Cost Spot Improvements
Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2011

What data types were used in the program methodology?

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

What project identification methodology was used for this program?
Crash frequency
Relative severity index
Crash rate
Critical rate
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?
No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
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).

Rank of Priority Consideration

- Ranking based on B/C: 1
- Available funding: 2

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
- Exposure
- Traffic
- Volume
- Roadway
- Functional classification
- Other-Age and condition of signs

What project identification methodology was used for this program?

- Crash frequency
- Relative severity index
- Crash rate
- Critical rate
- 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

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

- 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?

- 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).

Rank of Priority Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available funding</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative age of signage and functional classification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program: Local Safety
Date of Program Methodology: 10/9/2008

What data types were used in the program methodology?
- Crashes
  - All crashes
- Exposure
  - Traffic
  - Volume
- Roadway
  - Other-A simple roadway drive through rating is used to identify roadway features needing improvement

What project identification methodology was used for this program?
- Crash frequency
- 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
- If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
  - 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

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
Available funding 2
Cost Effectiveness 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Other-Guardrail upgrade/replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Program Methodology:</td>
<td>2/2/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What data types were used in the program methodology?
- Crashes
- Exposure
- Roadway
- All crashes
- Volume
- Roadside features

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

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

If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
No

If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.
Work with the LTAP center using the WRRSP

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?
Selection 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).

Rank of Priority Consideration

| Available funding | 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
Rumble Strips
Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation
Pavement/Shoulder Widening
Install/Improve Signing
Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation
Upgrade Guard Rails
Clear Zone Improvements
Install/Improve Lighting
Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

Engineering Study
Other-Use of Crash Information to identify over-represented crash types to be addressed
Other-Safety Management System

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

Highway Safety Manual

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

The Highway Safety Methodology has been included in the Safety Management System. The ratings and comparisons of safety locations is done with expected crash frequencies. This allows for those locations where there has not been a crash in the last five years to be considered in the analysis for where to spend safety funding.

Progress in Implementing Projects

Funds Programmed

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.
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>$11,000,000.00</td>
<td>49 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)</td>
<td>$540,000.00</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>$5,300,000.00</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>$5,475,000.00</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$22,315,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and operated) safety projects? $540,000.00

How much funding is obligated to local safety projects? $630,023.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects? $1,110,044.00

How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects? $1,110,044.00
How much funding was transferred in to the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period?  
$0.00

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

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

There are no impediments to obligating the HSIP funding.

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

Wyoming is moving forward with the use of its Safety Management System. The transition from many projects being based upon engineering judgment to the utilization of the SMS will benefit the State in getting the best projects done first in the years to come.
### 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>AA DT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Roadway Owner</th>
<th>Relationship to SHSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0300047 - Gillette/WYO 50 &amp; 4J RD</td>
<td>Intersection geometry&lt;br&gt;Intersection geometrics - miscellaneous/other/unspecified</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>7239</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Local Coordination/Intersections</td>
<td>Local Coordination/Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507037 - Chief Joseph Highway</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>54294</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B099075 - UW Tech Transfer</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure transportation safety planning</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>27270</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Statewide Transportation planning locals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Local Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B142029 - District 2 Guardrail</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - metal</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>34279</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Guardrail Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Improvement Type</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B151035</td>
<td>Dist 1</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - metal</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Guardrail Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B151104</td>
<td>Dist 1</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B151109</td>
<td>Dist 1</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B152105</td>
<td>Dist 2</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B153106</td>
<td>Dist 3</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B154020</td>
<td>Dist 4</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - metal</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Guardrail Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B154107</td>
<td>Dist 4</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Improve</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>Urban Principal</td>
<td>State Highw</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B155108 - Districtwide Thermoplastic Markings</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Markings</td>
<td>retroreflectivity</td>
<td>305295</td>
<td>Arterial - Other</td>
<td>B155108 - Districtwide Thermoplastic Markings</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Improve retroreflectivity</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>HSIP (Section 148)</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane 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>B159034 - Statewide Epoxy Striping</td>
<td>Statewide Epoxy Striping</td>
<td>Roadway delineation Longitudinal pavement markings - new</td>
<td>183947 7</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B159044 - HRRR/Statewide Signs</td>
<td>HRRR/Statewide Signs</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or updated</td>
<td>258731.2</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Local Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B159045 - Statewide Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Statewide Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Roadway Rumble strips - edge or shoulder</td>
<td>672320</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install Rumble strips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B169021 - Statewide Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Statewide Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Roadway Rumble strips - center</td>
<td>1932483</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Install Rumble Strips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN04111 - Various Cnty Rds - Sweetwat</td>
<td>Various Cnty Rds - Sweetwat</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post)</td>
<td>99541.71</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>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>CN22035 -</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Roadway signs (including post) - new or</td>
<td>77008</td>
<td>County Highway agency</td>
<td>Roadway departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR/Tet on Cnty</td>
<td>updated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I803149 - District One Sign and Post Upgrade</td>
<td>Roadway signs and traffic control Sign sheeting - upgrade or replacement</td>
<td>20079</td>
<td>State Highway agency</td>
<td>Roadway departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N212116 -</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>1282135</td>
<td>State Highway agency</td>
<td>Roadway departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper South /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYO 220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N212117 -</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>632045</td>
<td>State Highway agency</td>
<td>Roadway departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper / Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N341110 -</td>
<td>Roadside Barrier - metal</td>
<td>824943</td>
<td>State Highway agency</td>
<td>Roadway departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper / US20/26 / Guardrail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Guardrail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N341111 -</td>
<td>Roadway Roadway - other</td>
<td>288650</td>
<td>State Highway agency</td>
<td>Roadway departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper - Shoshoni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P212096 -</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>287246</td>
<td>State Highway agency</td>
<td>Lane departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>Arterial - Other</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Numbers</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>CN02103 - HRRR / various Cnty Rds - Laramie Cnty</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFE TEA-LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN15021 - HRRR / Hot Springs Cnty</td>
<td>Rural Local Road or Street</td>
<td>County Highway Agency</td>
<td>HRRRP (SAFE TEA-LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRR015 - University of Wyoming FY 2015 T2 Center</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure</td>
<td>NON-INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>'0254147 - Casper Marginal North Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'0254147 - Casper Marginal North Section</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N212094 - Casp/West Belt Loop/Sec 2</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMDT015</td>
<td>Penalties</td>
<td>Penalties</td>
<td>Penalties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Patrol mobile Data Terminals</td>
<td>Data/traffic records</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</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>U258012 - Casp/Wyo Blvd/Turn Ln/05</td>
<td>Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>326193.01</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer - Section 154</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N104087 - Hoback - Jackson</td>
<td>Roadside Roadside grading</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>391814.5.86</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Rural Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N212094 - Casper Streets</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>206183.9.01</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Lane Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P541014 - Rawlins Streets / Intersection</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>5559556</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U258012 - Casp/Wyo Blvd/Turn Ln/05</td>
<td>Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>391789.95</td>
<td>Penalty Transfer – Section 164</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>State Highway Agency</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n 164</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>
</tbody>
</table>

2016  Wyoming  Highway Safety Improvement Program
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></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance measure data is presented using a five-year rolling average.
Number of Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years
5-yr Average Measure Data

Rate of Fatalities for the Last Five Years
5-yr Average Measure Data
Rate of Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years
5-yr Average Measure Data
To the maximum extent possible, present performance measure* data by functional classification and ownership.

### Year - 2015

<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>24</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>56.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR STREET</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>61.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>45.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification
5-yr Average Measure Data

Roadway Functional Classification
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# Serious Injuries by Roadway Functional Classification
5-yr Average Measure Data

![Graph showing the number of serious injuries by roadway functional classification from 2011 to 2015.](image)

- **Y-axis:** Number of Serious Injuries
- **X-axis:** Roadway Functional Classification

Legend:
- Orange: 2011
- Blue: 2012
- Red: 2013
- Pink: 2014
- Green: 2015

The graph illustrates the distribution of serious injuries across different roadway classifications over the years.
Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification
5-yr Average Measure Data

Roadway Functional Classification

Fatality Rate (per HWY-MI)
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Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification
5-yr Average Measure Data

Roadway Functional Classification

Serious Injury Rate (per HHV)
<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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership
5-yr Average Measure Data

Roadway Functional Classification
Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.

Fatalities are lower over the past year. Serious injuries are also lower than the previous year. This overall trend is good. We have seen in Wyoming the numbers of fatalities and serious injuries go up and down over the last five years, but are trending downward overall.

This is a good indication that the projects and activities utilizing HSIP funding are making a positive impact. The goal now is to optimize the impact that can be made with the available funding for Highway Safety projects.

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>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older Drivers and Pedestrians Special Rule</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># People 65 &amp; older Per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Driv &amp; Ped with F+SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#F+SI/Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2012 and 2014 decreased from 0.7 to 0.6. 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>Fatality Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports

5 Year Average 0.7 0.7

5 Year Average 0.7 0.6

August 31, 2016 2008 - 2012 2010 - 2014
5 Year Average 0.7 0.6
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?

Other-Better project selection based upon benefits and costs

Other-Movement towards target setting and performance measures to access the HSIP.

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

Other-Adoption of the SMS to drive project selection decisions

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

The Safety Management System is moving toward utilizing the Highway Safety Manual methodology of expected crashes. This allows for the comparison of roadway segments that may have experienced low crashes in the past five years but still have deficiencies that need to be addressed.

The benefits and costs of applying a treatment to these segments can be better analyzed for consideration.
SHSP Emphasis Areas

For each SHSP emphasis area that relates to the HSIP, present trends in emphasis area performance measures.

<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>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclists</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Fatalities by SHSP Emphasis Area
5-yr Average Measure Data

Year 2011 to Year 2015
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Fatality Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area
5-yr Average Measure Data

Year 2011 to Year 2015

SHSP Emphasis Area
Serious Injury Rate by SHSP Emphasis Area
5-yr Average Measure Data

Year 2011 to Year 2015

Groups of similar project types
Present the overall effectiveness of groups of similar types of projects.

### Year - 2015

<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>Local Safety</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Departure</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Curve</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Guardrail upgrade/replacement</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Replacement And Improvement</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects
5-yr Average Measure Data

Year 2011 to Year 2015
#Serious Injuries by Target Crash Type for Groups of Similar Projects
5-yr Average Measure Data
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Systemic Treatments
Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

### Year - 2015

<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>Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Signing</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement/Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Zone Improvements</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Guard Rails</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Run-off-road</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fatalities by Target Crash Type for Systemic Safety Improvements

Year 2011 to Year 2015

![Bar chart showing number of fatalities by target crash type from 2011 to 2015. The chart includes various crash types such as All, Angle, Cross median, Sideswipe, Head on, Left-turn, Night-time, Intersections, Rear-end, Right-turn, Run-off-road, Speed-related, Truck-related, Vehicle/animal, Vehicle/bicycle, Pedestrian, Interstate, and Wet road.]
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Describe any other aspects of the overall Highway Safety Improvement Program effectiveness on which you would like to elaborate.

None
## 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>None</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>

Projects are not evaluated by specific project. Data required is too large at this time. Database improvements are being done so that evaluations can be done in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Attachments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>Files Attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary

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

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

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

HMVMT means hundred million vehicle miles traveled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Systematic refers to an approach where an agency deploys countermeasures at all locations across a system.

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.