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Pre-Poll Question #1

What percentage of the national fatalities are on the locally owned system?

A. 12%
B. 23%
C. 36%
D. 54%
E. 71%
Pre-Poll Question #2

What percentage of the rural road fatalities are on the locally owned system?

A. 10%
B. 20%
C. 30%
D. 50%
E. 70%
Pre-Poll Question #3

What percentage of Federal Safety Funds (HSIP) are obligated to locally owned roads?

A. 8%
B. 17%
C. 31%
D. 48%
E. 71%
Grant Objectives

• Raise awareness of the importance of local road safety
• Improved collaboration between state and local agencies
• Encourage adoption of "new" proven practices that other states have used successfully
• Changed behaviors on allocation of resources to localities
Grant Activities

- Data Analysis
- Strategically Identify 5 States
  - CA
  - TX
  - OH
  - GA
  - NY
- Stakeholder Meetings
  - NACE and its Affiliate
  - NLTAPA
  - DOT
  - FHWA
Data Sources

- 2017 HSIP Reports (and earlier)
  (Highway Safety Improvement Program)
- 2015 FARS (Fatality Analysis Reporting System)
- 2016 FARS
- State Sources
Data Challenges

- Inconsistent Data Reporting
- Not all States Report “Local”, County
- FARS Recently Began Reporting Ownership
- Data from Multiple Sources
- Single year data mixed with multi year averaged data
HSIP Funding

• FY 2014 – 2016 Three Year Average

• Includes:
  – HRRR Special Rule 23 U.S.C. 148 (g)(1)
  – Penalty Funds 23 U.S.C. 154
  – Penalty Funds 23 U.S.C. 164
  – RHCP 23 U.S.C. 130(e)(2)
  – Other Federal Funds (i.e. STBG, NHPP)
  – State and Local Funds
Local and Rural Transportation

Local = Describes the jurisdiction that owns/manages the roads (e.g., not Federal or state)

Rural = Describes the location and context of the road and community
Grant Findings

• Overall, Local Fatalities make up 36%
• 29% Rural Fatalities on the Local System

• 2014-15 HSIP Funding
  – 18% Total HSIP Programmed Local
  – 17% Total HSIP Obligated Local
  – $483,927,848 Transferred from HSIP

(FARS 2016, 14% unreported)
Local Fatalities by State

[Bar chart showing local fatalities by state for the year 1988, with data points for each state represented by bars of varying heights. The chart includes states such as AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY.]
Percent Local Fatalities vs. Percent Total Local HSIP Program Obligated

- Percent Local Fatalities
- Percent Total Local HSIP Program Obligated

States: AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY

- Percent Local Fatalities
  - AL: 7%
  - AK: 5%
  - AZ: 28%
  - AR: 16%
  - CA: 6%
  - CO: 0%
  - CT: 0%
  - DE: 12%
  - FL: 11%
  - GA: 1%
  - HI: 1%
  - ID: 22%
  - IL: 19%
  - IN: 2%
  - IA: 32%
  - KS: 1%
  - KY: 50%
  - LA: 46%
  - ME: 58%
  - MD: 41%
  - MA: 43%
  - MI: 27%
  - MN: 30%
  - MS: 22%
  - MO: 19%
  - MT: 12%
  - NE: 12%
  - NV: 24%
  - NH: 36%
  - NJ: 10%
  - NM: 20%
  - NY: 26%
  - NC: 18%
  - ND: 2%
  - OH: 17%
  - OK: 11%
  - OR: 3%
  - PA: 16%
  - RI: 0%
  - SC: 26%
  - SD: 33%
  - TN: 19%
  - TX: 9%
  - UT: 7%
  - VA: 5%
  - WA: 81%
  - WV: 11%
  - WI: 16%
  - WY: 1%

- Percent Total Local HSIP Program Obligated
  - AL: 48%
  - AK: 45%
  - AZ: 40%
  - AR: 38%
  - CA: 23%
  - CO: 7%
  - CT: 17%
  - DE: 12%
  - FL: 38%
  - GA: 11%
  - HI: 46%
  - ID: 11%
  - IL: 9%
  - IN: 12%
  - IA: 22%
  - KS: 3%
  - KY: 6%
  - LA: 12%
  - ME: 36%
  - MD: 21%
  - MA: 18%
  - MI: 27%
  - MN: 19%
  - MS: 12%
  - MO: 27%
  - MT: 22%
  - NE: 12%
  - NV: 36%
  - NH: 24%
  - NJ: 31%
  - NM: 26%
  - NY: 18%
  - NC: 19%
  - ND: 53%
  - OH: 31%
  - OK: 22%
  - OR: 38%
  - PA: 11%
  - RI: 27%
  - SC: 18%
  - SD: 42%
  - TN: 33%
  - TX: 26%
  - UT: 12%
  - VA: 20%
  - WA: 30%
  - WV: 13%
  - WI: 18%
  - WY: 54%
## Top Ten States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Fatalities</th>
<th>State Fatalities</th>
<th>County Fatalities</th>
<th>Municipal Fatalities</th>
<th>Total Local Fatalities</th>
<th>% Local</th>
<th>% Total HSIP Funds on Locals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA 2016 FARS</td>
<td>3622</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 2016 FARS</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX TxDOT 2014-2016</td>
<td>3627</td>
<td>2816</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH HSIP 2017</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI HSIP 2017</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>551</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY* HSIP 2017</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA HSIP 2017</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL FARS 2016</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ FARS 2016</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL 2016 FARS</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top ten States with the highest local fatalities account for 60% of all local fatalities, yet receive only 7% of the total HSIP funds.
Stakeholder Meeting Discussion Items

• Inclusion of Locals in the State Safety Process
• Funding Local Safety Programs
• Program Delivery
• Access to Data and Data Analysis
• Local Road Safety Plans
• Systemic Approach
Inclusion of Locals in the State Safety Process

• It can be a challenge organizing Locals
• Are Locals included in the State Safety Planning Process?
• Are they really given the opportunity to provide input?
• Do they really provide input?
• Who are the Locals?
• Are they signatories on the SHSP?
Inclusion of Locals in the State Safety Planning Process

• “The statewide Highway Safety Improvement Program will include all roads by increasing the level of engagement of local highway agencies in the HSIP…” NDDOT

• Numerous States include locals in the process.
### ND Vision Zero Plan, 2018

#### Fatal + Severe Injury Crashes & Rates

**State vs. Local**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crash Frequency</strong></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>K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K+A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crash Rate (per MVMT)</strong></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>K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K+A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MVMT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>5,083</td>
<td>5,409</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>6,669</td>
<td>6,566</td>
<td>6,742</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>6,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crash Frequency</strong></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>K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K+A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crash Rate (per MVMT)</strong></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>K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K+A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MVMT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,837</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>3,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ND Vision Zero Plan, 2018

**Infrastructure Strategies:**
Local Road Safety Program – Priority Safety Strategies

**Program Focus:** Deployment of proven, effective & low cost strategies

**Rural**
- Enhanced Edgelines
- Intersection Street Lighting
- Chevrons

**Urban**
- Traffic Signal Confirmation Lights
- Curb Extensions
Recommendations

• Provide a strategy in the SHSP for increasing engagement at the local level in statewide safety planning like North Dakota has done.

• State Departments of Transportation should also organize a Local HSIP Advisory Committee.

• Committees to help oversee the implementation of the HSIP program similar to Caltrans.
Funding Local Safety Programs

• In Minnesota, the DOT distributes HSIP funding to each district based on the proportion of fatal and serious injury crashes occurring in the district.

• Typically, this funding allocation has ranged from 28 percent State highway/72 percent local roadway in the metropolitan area to a 50-percent/50-percent split in another district.
Washington State

• HSIP funds are split between state and local agency programs based on the priority one infrastructure areas within Washington state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (Target Zero).

• The numbers of serious and fatal crashes are used to develop a program split, which equals 30% to WSDOT programs and 70% to local agencies, primarily cities and counties.
Consistent messages heard from the Partnering meetings:

• A desire to work with local partners and to increase the efforts on local road safety to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

• Consideration for expenditure of resources should be more in line with the portion of fatalities.
Project Bundling

• MN Bundled by District
• Each MnDOT district created one single project, which included numerous safety improvements in local roads
• Reduction in unit costs, administrative costs
• More counties involved in a wider deployment of safety countermeasures.
**Greater Minnesota Application for Federal Funds**
Due November 22, 2017

**Contact Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>ATP or District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>County(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>MPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Joint project (i.e. multiple agencies, MnDOT-Local agency, …)

**Project Name or Brief Description:**


**Project Location(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Outputs</th>
<th>Roadway Jurisdiction(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 miles</td>
<td>□ Trunk Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 intersections</td>
<td>□ County State Aid Highway (CSAH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 curves</td>
<td>□ County Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Municipal State Aid Highway (MSAH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ City Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Selection:**

- Project identified in safety plan
- Systemic or risk analysis performed
- Reactive project, benefit-cost ratio =

Describe any prioritization used in site selection:


**Requested Funding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested State Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Estimated Costs by Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>□ Federal $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>□ State Aid $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>□ Local $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>□ Total $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting Documents:**

- Benefit-Cost Ratio Calculation
- Crash Data Sheet(s)
- Letter(s) of Support
- Project Map
- Project Summary
- Safety Plan Project Page(s)
- Traffic Volume Data Sheet(s)
- Other:
HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION
North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming
项目名称：13th Ave NE from Intersection with 98th St NE to Intersection with ND 43
Agency Name: Bottineau County
Contact Name: Hiltrude Gimbrel
Telephone Number: 701-228-3681
Email Address: hitrudegimbrelcco.bottineauco.nd.us

ND State Project Sheets

13th Ave NE from Intersection with 98th St NE to Intersection with ND 43
Agency Name: Bottineau County

ND DOT District: 4
Telephone Number: 701-228-3681
Email Address: hitrudegimbrelcco.bottineauco.nd.us

Please attach a location map. You may use additional text to further describe your project.

Location Description

Street: Intersection with 38th St NE

Street: Intersection with ND 43

Facility Type: Rural

Roadway Type: Rural

Average Daily Traffic: 22

Average Daily Traffic: 18


ND DOT Project Sheets

Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Expected Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADT Range</th>
<th>Expected Value</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ND Density</th>
<th>Expected Value</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Density</th>
<th>Expected Value</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curve Critical Radius Density</th>
<th>Expected Value</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe Proposed Safety Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost per Mile</th>
<th>Million</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th Edge Line</td>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Edge Line</td>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge马克-line</td>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground in View Reflective Markings</td>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Line Marker Strip</td>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost per Mile</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$23,546</td>
<td>$23,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match (5% of total project cost)</td>
<td>$4,083</td>
<td>$4,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$27,628</td>
<td>$27,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND DOT Project Sheets

ND DOT Central Office Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost per Mile</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost per Mile</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 3/10/2016

Image Source: NDOT, 2017
HSIP ANALYZER

Cost Estimate, Crash Data and Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) Calculation for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Application

Important: Review and follow the step-by-step instructions in "Manual for HSIP Analyzer". Completing the HSIP Analyzer without referencing to the manual may result in an application with fatal flaws that will be disqualified from the ranking and selection process.

All yellow highlighted fields must be filled in. The gray fields are calculated and read-only. This is a dynamic form (later steps vary depending on the data entered in earlier steps). If any error messages in red appear, fix the errors prior to proceeding to the next steps.

1. Application ID, Project Location and Project Description (copy from the HSIP Application Form):

   Application ID: 

   Save this file using the Application ID plus 'Calc' as the file name (e.g., '07.Long_Angela-MCalc.pdf').

   Project Location:
   (limited to 250 characters)

   Project Description:
   (limited to 250 characters)

2. Application Category (Check one):

   Application Categories that require a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR):

   - [ ] Common BCR Application
   - [ ] Set-aside for High Friction Surface Treatment

   Application Categories that do NOT require a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR):

   - [ ] Set-aside for Guardrail Upgrades
   - [ ] Set-aside for Horizontal Curve Signing
   - [ ] Set-aside for Pedestrian Crossing Enhancements
   - [ ] Set-aside for Tribes

   Dual consideration?
   If an Application Category that does not require a BCR is selected above, check this box to indicate your desire that this application will be considered as a Common BCR Application as well in case it does not get selected for funding under the set-aside category. If this box is checked, a benefit cost analysis is required so the project will have a BCR.
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Access to Data and Data Analysis

• Do Locals have adequate access to safety data?
• What are the Data Sources used?
• Do Locals have the necessary skills to analyze the data?
• What resources are available for analysis?
• What are the barriers?
## Sample Crash Data Summary

### Washington DOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2015 County X Data</th>
<th>Fatal/Serious Injury Crashes Only</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Public Roads</td>
<td>All Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Collisions</td>
<td>11,001</td>
<td>2,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Fatal Collisions</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Serious Injury Collisions</td>
<td>8,813</td>
<td>2,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Alcohol-Related Collisions</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Fatalities</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Injuries</td>
<td>15,491</td>
<td>3,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Collision Type

- **Hit Fixed Object**: 3,159 (28.7%), 1,165 (43.2%), 837 (42.9%), 14 (53.8%), 98,165 (18.8%), 26,992 (40.2%), 18,862 (57.4%), 256 (62.1%)
- **Overtur**: 965 (8.8%), 311 (11.5%), 162 (8.3%), 3 (11.5%), 12,052 (2.3%), 3,816 (5.7%), 1,761 (3.5%), 22 (5.3%)
- **Head On**: 582 (5.3%), 162 (6.0%), 122 (5.3%), 2 (7.7%), 2,708 (0.5%), 745 (1.1%), 564 (1.1%), 5 (1.2%)
- **Wildlife**: 96 (0.9%), 47 (1.7%), 25 (1.3%), 1 (3.8%), 10,337 (2.0%), 1,899 (2.8%), 1,017 (2.0%), 36 (8.7%)
- **Angle (T)**: 1,269 (11.5%), 276 (10.2%), 201 (10.3%), 1 (3.8%), 85,518 (16.3%), 9,845 (14.7%), 8,043 (15.9%), 31 (7.5%)
- **Rearend**: 819 (7.4%), 104 (3.9%), 83 (4.3%), 1 (3.8%), 158,078 (30.2%), 10,539 (17.5%), 9,353 (18.5%), 20 (4.9%)
- **Hit Pedestrian**: 1,680 (15.3%), 196 (7.3%), 165 (8.5%), 1 (3.8%), 9,152 (1.7%), 699 (1.0%), 609 (1.2%), 4 (1.0%)
- **Hit Cyclist**: 635 (5.8%), 91 (3.4%), 80 (4.1%), 1 (3.8%), 7,024 (1.3%), 574 (0.9%), 517 (1.0%), 3 (0.7%)
- **Sideswipe (Opposite Direction)**: 154 (1.4%), 36 (1.3%), 27 (1.4%), 1 (3.8%), 3,431 (0.7%), 972 (1.4%), 718 (1.4%), 3 (0.7%)
- **Other**: 477 (4.3%), 100 (3.7%), 78 (4.0%), 1 (3.8%), 21,778 (4.2%), 2,378 (3.5%), 1,806 (3.6%), 10 (2.4%)
- **Sideswipe (Same Direction)**: 334 (3.0%), 64 (2.4%), 51 (2.6%), 0 (0.0%), 52,884 (10.1%), 3,287 (4.9%), 2,603 (5.2%), 11 (2.7%)
- **Hit Parked Car**: 157 (1.4%), 29 (1.1%), 24 (1.2%), 0 (0.0%), 31,358 (6.0%), 2,143 (3.2%), 1,728 (3.4%), 6 (1.5%)
- **Angle (Left Turn)**: 665 (6.0%), 116 (4.3%), 96 (4.9%), 0 (0.0%), 30,582 (5.8%), 3,133 (4.8%), 2,887 (5.7%), 5 (1.2%)

### By Roadway Surface

- **Dry**: 8,124 (73.8%), 2,005 (74.3%), 1,375 (70.5%), 17 (65.4%), 348,551 (66.6%), 42,097 (62.7%), 30,873 (61.2%), 246 (59.7%)
- **Wet**: 2,331 (21.2%), 526 (19.5%), 481 (24.7%), 3 (11.5%), 139,440 (26.7%), 17,583 (26.2%), 16,233 (32.2%), 108 (26.2%)
- **Snow / Slush**: 144 (1.3%), 26 (1.0%), 12 (0.6%), 2 (7.7%), 10,902 (2.1%), 1,710 (2.5%), 650 (1.3%), 10 (2.4%)
- **Ice**: 238 (2.2%), 90 (3.3%), 51 (2.6%), 1 (3.8%), 13,809 (2.6%), 4,508 (6.7%), 1,949 (3.9%), 29 (7.0%)
- **Other**: 164 (1.5%), 52 (1.9%), 32 (1.6%), 3 (11.5%), 10,484 (2.0%), 1,239 (1.8%), 769 (1.5%), 19 (4.6%)
A basic tool for accessing fatal or injury collisions from the California Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS).
LOCAL SAFETY ASSISTANCE

ODOT’s Highway Safety Program is providing consultant assistance to local agencies and regional planning organizations to complete safety plans and studies, and assist with funding applications and project development on locally maintained roads.

ODOT is offering four types of assistance that can lead to qualifying for Highway Safety Improvement Program funds:

REGIONAL & COUNTY SAFETY PLANS:
Regional & County Safety Plans provide a framework for identifying, analyzing, and prioritizing roadway safety improvements on all public roads. The process results in a prioritized list of issues, factors, actions, and improvements that can be used to reduce fatalities and serious injuries across a region’s roadway network. Our team can help navigate any or all of the safety plan development process.

ROAD SAFETY AUDITS (RSA):
RSAs are a formal, independent safety evaluation of an existing roadway by an experienced and multidisciplinary team of specialists. Our team can help facilitate this evaluation and identify possible countermeasures to address safety issues.

SAFETY STUDIES:
Safety Studies analyze roadway and traffic data to determine why crashes are occurring at a certain location and identify short and long term countermeasures to reduce them. These are typically required when seeking Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding. Our team can help local partners complete a safety study and apply for HSIP funds.

SYSTEMIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS:
Rather than attempting to reduce crashes at spot locations, a systemic approach takes a broader view and seeks to reduce crashes across an entire roadway system using low-cost safety improvements. Our team can help local partners develop a systemic safety project and secure resources for implementation.

HOW TO APPLY:
Local Public Agencies and regional planning organizations can apply for assistance through the link below:

https://ODOT.transportation.com/forms/local_safety_assistance_request

Applications are reviewed on an as-received basis.

ELIGIBILITY & COST:
These are free services offered to local public agencies and regional planning organizations.

Awards are offered on the basis of the potential impact of the project to reduce severe crashes (fatalities and serious injuries) and agency need.

Safety Studies and Road Safety Audits are intended to occur at locally maintained locations with documented crash patterns. Priority will be given to locations appearing on regional or state priority safety location lists.

For more information, please contact Jordan Whisler (614.644.8181)
GEARS Richmond County

Report by Month:
- January: 421
- February: 321
- March: 377
- April: 369
- May: 2495
- June: 278
- July: 209
- August: 503
- September: 603
- October: 803
- November: 1003
- December: 1203

Age of Driver:
- 20-24: 625
- 25-34: 3181
- 35-44: 3775
- 45-54: 369
- 55-64: 2495
- 65-74: 294
- 75+: 835

Days of Week:
- Sunday: 603
- Monday: 278
- Tuesday: 1003
- Wednesday: 803
- Thursday: 1203
- Friday: 603
- Saturday: 1203

Time of Day:
- Fewest crashes: 12:00 AM - 3:00 AM
- Most crashes: 5:00 PM - 8:00 PM

Local Road Safety Plans
Local Road Safety Plans

• Deployment Options
  – State Driven
  – State Assisted
  – County Driven
“Systemic safety planning is the process of evaluating an entire system using a defined set of criteria to identify candidate locations for safety investments to reduce the occurrence of and the potential for severe crashes.”
Findings

• All States visited expressed a desire to implement Local Road Safety Plans.

• All States agreed that providing the proper data to locals was essential.

• While all States recognized the need for a systemic approach, there are various levels of adoption and implementation. It is recommended that all States increase the training available on this topic, particularly with local audiences.
Findings

All States visited expressed a desire to work with local partners and to increase the efforts on local road safety to reduce fatalities and serious injuries. Some States indicated that expenditure of resources should be more in line with the portion of fatalities.
Recommendations

• Data submitted for the 2017 HSIP Reports shows great improvement over previous years however improvement in needed for consistency between States, particularly with HSIP funding and fatalities and serious injuries by ownership.

• States should include Local Road Safety as an emphasis area in their SHSPs and annual HSIP Reports. As a minimum they should quantify local fatalities and serious injuries and identify measures to reduce them.
Recommendations (cont.)

• Inclusion of local representatives in critical to implementing local road safety programs. It is recommended that locals serve and participate in oversight committees such as SHSP and HSIP Committees. Efforts of outreach to locals should be included in their SHSPs.

• Locals have various levels of access to safety data and limited skills to analyze the data. States should work with locals to provide access to data and useable information to enable proper decision making.
Recommendations (cont.)

- States should develop a clear vision and implementation of Local Road Safety Plans throughout the State. This could be done through a variety of ways as documented in this report, including county wide, through MPOs or regionally.

- Finally, efforts like this should continue to other states with high local fatalities and serious injuries.
Project Team

• Brian Keierleber, County Engineer (Buchanan County, Iowa) and Past NACE President
• Scott Davis, Thurston County and NACE Safety Committee Chair
• Hillary Isebrands, Federal Highway Administration
• Jerry Roche, Federal Highway Administration
• Marie Walsh, Director, Louisiana Local Technical Assistance Program
Stakeholders

- California Department of Transportation
- California Local Technical Assistance Program
- Texas Department of Transportation
- Texas Local Technical Assistance Program
- Ohio Department of Transportation
- Ohio Local Technical Assistance Program
- County Engineers Association of Ohio
- New York Local Technical Assistance Program
- Georgia Department of Transportation
- Georgia Local Technical Assistance Program
- Federal Highway Administration
Please evaluate this presentation using the Lifesavers Conference Mobile App

SELECT SESSIONS ICON

SELECT APPLICABLE TRACK

SELECT APPLICABLE WORKSHOP

CLICK RATE SESSION BUTTON (OR) CLIPBOARD ICON