

### **Table of Contents**

Table of Contents	2
Disclaimer	3
Executive Summary	4
Introduction	5
Program Structure	5
Program Administration	5
Program Methodology	7
Project Implementation	15
Funds Programmed	15
General Listing of Projects	17
Safety Performance	27
General Highway Safety Trends	27
Safety Performance Targets	33
Applicability of Special Rules	35
Evaluation	37
Program Effectiveness	37
Effectiveness of Groupings or Similar Types of Improvements	
Project Effectiveness	42
Compliance Assessment	43

#### 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."

### **Executive Summary**

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a data-driven, performance based, strategic approach targeted to infrastructure improvements administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Illinois has set its target to reduce motor vehicle related fatalities and serious injuries, as well as the fatality and serious injury rates per million vehicle miles traveled. In addition to these rates, the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) has identified and prioritized safety emphasis areas where performance measures are also narrowed down by functional class of roadways to understand the safety problems and implement appropriate countermeasures to curb preventable fatalities and serious injuries with federal support.

The collaborative working efforts between the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP; last updated on 7/28/2017) HSIP, Highway Safety Plan (HSP), Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan, and Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) are envisioned to provide consistency of data collection and management, integrated safety initiatives, and identification of data-driven performance measures with safety performance assessment. The implementation of the updated SHSP was kicked off in early 2018 and has involved over a hundred stakeholders representing multi-disciplinary areas. This coordination of safety programs helps IDOT prioritize the safety in planning and programming stage and use limited funding with safety improvement potential to set effective goals, targets with safety performance matrix, and assessments in the future.

HSIP is administered and monitored by the IDOT Bureau of Safety Programs and Engineering (BSPE). IDOT works with safety partners to direct limited program dollars to areas with the greatest potential for safety improvement on the transportation system. IDOT uses safety performance functions and the systemic approach for identifying areas of improvement. Projects are selected based on their potential to reduce fatal and serious crashes economically using the IDOT benefit-cost evaluation tool.

### 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 Reporting Guidance dated December 29, 2016 and consists of five sections: program structure, progress in implementing highway safety improvement projects, progress in achieving safety outcomes and performance targets, effectiveness of the improvements and compliance assessment.

### **Program Structure**

### Program Administration

#### Describe the general structure of the HSIP in the State.

The Illinois HSIP policy identifies the process for data analysis, project application, project review, and approval. See the IDOT website for details (http://www.idot.illinois.gov/transportation-system/local-transportation-partners/county-engineers-and-local-public-agencies/funding-opportunities/highway-safety-improvement-program).

The policy is being updated and will include analysis tools and resources as well as improved guidance to direct the program to projects that will have the greatest opportunity to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

#### Where is HSIP staff located within the State DOT?

Other-Bureau of Safety Programs and Engineering

#### How are HSIP funds allocated in a State?

Other-Central Office via Statewide Application Process

#### Describe how local and tribal roads are addressed as part of HSIP.

Twenty percent of the HSIP roadway funding (or \$12M to \$15M annually) is allocated to local roadways. Each IDOT District has a traffic safety committee that coordinates with the IDOT Bureau of Local Roads and local agencies to provide technical support. Illinois leads regular meetings with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to discuss safety performance targets and county SHSP development and implementation. The IDOT BSPE is an active participant in the Illinois Association of County Engineers Traffic and Safety Committee to discuss the SHSP, HSIP, data issues, and ways to advance transportation safety in Illinois on local roadways.

# Identify which internal partners (e.g., State departments of transportation (DOTs) Bureaus, Divisions) are involved with HSIP planning.

- Design
- Districts/Regions
- Local Aid Programs Office/Division
- Maintenance

- Operations
- Planning
- Other-Safety Programs and Engineering

#### Describe coordination with internal partners.

The Central Office Traffic Safety Committee is responsible for reviewing, recommending changes and/or approving or declining HSIP applications. The Central Office Traffic Safety Committee includes members from BSPE, Operations, Design, Planning, Local Aid, and the FHWA Division Office.

The Local Aid office works with each of the District Local Aid offices and local agencies to develop, review, and submit HSIP applications to BSPE.

District traffic engineering and safety staff develop state route HSIP applications by using BSPE safety analysis tools to evaluate the roadway network, identify priority locations, assess crash data and contributing factors, determine recommended proven strategies, and prepare the HSIP application including benefit-cost assessment. District traffic engineering and safety staff conduct basic evaluation assessments for HSIP projects and coordinate with district design, operations and maintenance during the planning process.

District staff work with local agencies to develop their safety program and the District Local Aid office submits the applications to Central Local Aid office.

Local agencies conduct analysis and utilize BSPE-provided tools to support HSIP project development and applications. Local HSIP applications are submitted to the District Local Aid office for submittal to the Central Local Aid office. In some cases, the MPO supports local agency data analysis, application development, and evaluation after implementation. BSPE manages the HSIP program and leads the coordination with all partners.

#### Identify which external partners are involved with HSIP planning.

- FHWA
- Local Government Agency
- Regional Planning Organizations (e.g. MPOs, RPOs, COGs)
- Other-Local Agencies
- Other-NHTSA
- Other-NACE

#### Describe coordination with external partners.

The FHWA Illinois Division office partners with Illinois on various safety initiatives, including review of HSIP applications for funding approval.

The Illinois DOT meets with MPOs regularly to support the safety program. The MPOs work with local agencies to provide leadership and technical expertise.

## Describe HSIP program administration practices that have changed since the last reporting period.

IDOT continues to improve processes to make it easier and more effective to allocate funds appropriately to

local agencies to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on all public roadways. In particular, IDOT lead a pilot study to identify corridors that had an overrepresentation of run-off-the-road serious crashes and would have a positive benefit-cost for shoulder widening. Corridors were identified and discussed with several local agencies. Based on local agency discussions, if the local agency wanted to proceed with improvements IDOT helped to develop the project and allocate HSIP funds for implementation. IDOT has also been reviewing serious injury crashes at signalized intersections and signal phasing projects at key locations to encourage signal phasing changes from permissive and permissive / protected to protected only left turn phasing.

## Describe other aspects of HSIP Administration on which the State would like to elaborate.

The Districts submit HSIP applications through the HSIP SharePoint site and the local agencies submit paper copies for review and approval by a Central Office Traffic Safety Committee. Since 2013, the IDOT Districts have taken an active role in supporting the local roadway safety program. If there are large HSIP funding requests or longer term projects, the committee may recommend that a Road Safety Assessment be conducted to identify low cost safety improvements that could be implemented quickly along with verification of the longer term, high cost projects to ensure appropriate use of HSIP funds. The HSIP policy is being updated to improve project submittals and to encourage the use of highway safety tools such as Safety Tiers, the Highway Safety Manual and the Illinois State and Local Strategic Highway Safety Plans. Additional emphasis has been placed on project and program evaluation. The HSIP program database includes project letting, locations, project type and cost along with before and after crash data to be used for evaluation. Additional data is now required to develop project and program level evaluation assessments to maximize the program and achieve the greatest results.

### Program Methodology

# Does the State have an HSIP manual or similar that clearly describes HSIP planning, implementation and evaluation processes?

Yes FileName: Final\_HSIP\_Departmental\_Policy\_Nov\_27\_2006-Final2.doc.pdf

http://www.idot.illinois.gov/Assets/uploads/files/Transportation-System/Manuals-Guides-&-Handbooks/Safety/SAFETY%201.06%20-%20Safety%20Engineering%20Policy%20Memorandum.pdf

#### Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

- Horizontal Curve
- HRRR
- Local Safety
- Pedestrian Safety
- Other-Run off Road (Pilot)

#### **Program: Horizontal Curve**

#### Date of Program Methodology:3/1/2018

#### What is the justification for this program?

• Addresses SHSP priority or emphasis area

• FHWA focused approach to safety

#### What is the funding approach for this program?

Competes with all projects

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

Crashes	Exposure	Roadway	
		Median	width
All crashe	s Traffic	Horizontal	curvature
Fatal and serious injury crashes only	Volume	Functional Roadside features	classification

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

- Crash frequency
- Crash rate
- Other-Weighted crash rate

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

Yes

Are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads? Yes

#### How are projects under this program 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 Cost Effectiveness:2

Program: HRRR

Date of Program Methodology:3/1/2018

#### What is the justification for this program?

• Other-HRRR

# 2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program **What is the funding approach for this program?**

Funding set-aside

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

Crashes	Exposure	Roadway
Fatal and serious injury crashes only	Traffic	Functional classification

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

- Crash rate
- Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs

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

Yes

#### Are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads? Yes

#### How are projects under this program 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:1 Cost Effectiveness:2

Program: Local Safety

Date of Program Methodology:1/1/2018

#### What is the justification for this program?

- Addresses SHSP priority or emphasis area
- FHWA focused approach to safety
- Other-HRRR Penalty
- Other-FHWA EDC5

#### What is the funding approach for this program?

Other-HSIP allocation for locally owned roadways

### 2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program **What data types were used in the program methodology?**

Crashes
---------

Exposure

Roadway

Fatal and serious injury crashes only Traffic

Functional Other-Ownership classification

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

- Crash frequency
- Crash rate
- Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs
- Excess proportions of specific crash types
- Probability of specific crash types

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

Yes

#### Are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads? Yes

#### How are projects under this program 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

#### Program: Pedestrian Safety

#### Date of Program Methodology:9/28/2017

#### What is the justification for this program?

- Addresses SHSP priority or emphasis area
- FHWA focused approach to safety

#### What is the funding approach for this program?

Competes with all projects

#### 2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program What data types were used in the program methodology?

Crashes

Exposure

Roadway

Other-Pedestrian fatal and serious crashes only

Other-All routes eligible

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

Crash frequency

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

Yes

Are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads? Yes

#### How are projects under this program 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).

#### **Rank of Priority Consideration**

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

#### Program: Other-Run off Road (Pilot)

#### Date of Program Methodology: 3/4/2019

#### What is the justification for this program?

- Addresses SHSP priority or emphasis area
- FHWA focused approach to safety

#### What is the funding approach for this program?

Other-Encourages county participation in HSIP

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

Crashes		Exposure	Roadway	
Other-Run-off-the-road crashes	all	injury	Functional of Other-Roadway features t	classification hat may be

#### 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

Are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads? Yes

#### How are projects under this program 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:1 Cost Effectiveness:2

What is the justification for this program?

Run off the road cashes are the leading severity crashes on the Local System. The State of Illinois was also in non-compliance for High Risk Rural Roads. Many downstate counties have not been submitting HSIP Projects when funds are available. The pilot of was to help counties identify corridors that have significant number of run off the road crashes and cost effective solutions to address those crashes.

Methodology?

Pilot Counties were given a county wide map identifying ROR Corridors. A table was with the map showing crash data, miles, recommended countermeasures and estimated B/C.

#### What percentage of HSIP funds address systemic improvements?

30

#### HSIP funds are used to address which of the following systemic improvements?

• Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal

- Cable Median Barriers
- High friction surface treatment
- Horizontal curve signs
- Install/Improve Signing
- Pavement/Shoulder Widening
- Rumble Strips

#### What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

- Crash data analysis
- Data-driven safety analysis tools (HSM, CMF Clearinghouse, SafetyAnalyst, usRAP)
- Engineering Study
- Road Safety Assessment
- SHSP/Local road safety plan
- Stakeholder input

#### **Does the State HSIP consider connected vehicles and ITS technologies?** No

Although HSIP funds aren't used for these items, IDOT has been implementing changeable message signs, Smart Work Zones and improved communication to reduce secondary incidents at high priority locations.

#### Does the State use the Highway Safety Manual to support HSIP efforts?

Yes

#### Please describe how the State uses the HSM to support HSIP efforts.

HSM safety performance functions are used to develop safety tiers for planning and programming of projects. Districts utilize the HSM to diagnose and analyze crash data to identify potential countermeasures. Countermeasure effectiveness is determined using the CMF Clearinghouse and projects are assessed using the benefit-cost approaches outlined in the HSM. Statewide projects that have utilized HSIP funding and were completed between 2007 and 2015 were evaluated using simple before and after analysis, similar to those outlined in the HSM.

## Describe program methodology practices that have changed since the last reporting period.

IDOT and FHWA-IL conducted a joint process review on the HSIP application process for local agencies, to identify areas for growth. As part of the process, IDOT has improved and streamlined processes to support HSIP on local roadways. One example new program is the run-off-the-road pilot study which will be expanded statewide to assist local agencies in identifying candidate locations and countermeasures to reduce serious ROR crashes.

# Describe other aspects of the HSIP methodology on which the State would like to elaborate.

The HSIP Policy Memorandum references a safety analysis process for HSIP candidate projects that should be similar to the Road Safety Assessment (RSA) process. An RSA is a data-driven systematic process that applies crash data and identified contributing factors in tying the target severe crashes to each countermeasure. The RSA safety analysis process has become a more prominent aspect for many HSIP

2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program submittals when larger dollar amounts would be involved. IDOT has a draft RSA Policy Memorandum in place that supports HSIP.

### **Project Implementation**

### Funds Programmed

#### **Reporting period for HSIP funding.**

State Fiscal Year

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

FUNDING CATEGORY	PROGRAMMED	OBLIGATED	% OBLIGATED/PROGRAMMED
HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	\$109,919,000	\$56,656,397	51.54%
HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	\$292,000	\$5,435,700	1861.54%
Penalty Funds (23 U.S.C. 154)	\$10,805,000	\$0	0%
Penalty Funds (23 U.S.C. 164)	\$4,183,000	\$0	0%
RHCP(forHSIPpurposes)(23U.S.C.130(e)(2))(23)(23)	\$6,034,000	\$0	0%
Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STBG, NHPP)	\$0	\$0	0%
State and Local Funds	\$0	\$0	0%
Totals	\$131,233,000	\$62,092,097	47.31%

# How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and operated) or tribal safety projects?

\$13,277,000

# How much funding is obligated to local or tribal safety projects? \$6,869,750

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?

0%

# How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?

# How much funding was transferred in to the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period under 23 U.S.C. 126?

#### 2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program How much funding was transferred out of the HSIP to other core program areas during the reporting period under 23 U.S.C. 126?

0%

# Discuss impediments to obligating HSIP funds and plans to overcome this challenge in the future.

IDOT Districts and local agencies have a variety of challenges that delay obligating federal funds, such as scoping and design and the overall federal aid process. When federal funds are involved, the engineering agreement and joint funding agreement processes hamper the timeline for federal HSIP projects. Depending on the complexity of the project, the federal National Environmental Policy Act process for environmental review can impact the project timeline and obtaining right-of way can also be time consuming and impact the project delivery schedule. Depending on the complexity of the project, obtaining required permits can impact the project timeline. Obtaining community approval and acceptance of some treatments has been a focus. Education of flashing yellow arrows, roundabouts and rumble strips in advance of construction have been helpful for increasing public understanding and acceptance of safety countermeasures.

Effective, July 24, 2015, Illinois Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA) was signed into law to require the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive set of standards that mandate accountability and transparency throughout the entire life cycle of a grant. Illinois is the first and only state to provide such legislation in the nation. GATA requires local agencies to provide project information in advance of HSIP approvals and continue to provide project financial reporting from planning to construction. Some local agencies have indicated that the GATA process and meeting the ten percent HSIP match have been challenging. For additional information on GATA see https://www2.illinois.gov/sites/GATA/Pages/default.aspx

List the projects obligated using HSIP funds for the reporting period.

PROJECT NAME	IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY	OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TYPE	HSIP PROJECT COST(\$)	TOTAL PROJECT COST(\$)	FUNDING CATEGORY	LAND USE/AREA TYPE	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	AADT	SPEED	OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
201203009	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane	2	Intersections	\$2475000	\$2750000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	10,875	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201212011	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane	1	Intersections	\$3433500	\$3815000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Minor Arterial	10,300	45	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201212024	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane	1	Intersections	\$1800000	\$2000000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	12,650	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201302007	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	13.65	Miles	\$4100000	\$7620000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	8,000	55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201305004	Access management	Change in access - close or restrict existing access	1.69	Miles	\$8919000	\$9910000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Principal Arterial- Other	21,300	45	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersection Pedestrian	Enhance intersection safety performance
201311002	Intersection traffic control	Modify control - two-way stop to roundabout	1	Intersections	\$5940000	\$6600000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	13,250	45	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201312005	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane	1	Intersections	\$3735000	\$4150000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Principal Arterial- Other	62,300	45	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201312006	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane	1	Intersections	\$3001500	\$3335000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Principal Arterial- Other	48,000	45	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201410265	Intersection traffic control	Modify control - all-way stop to roundabout	1	Intersections	\$5130000	\$5700000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	11,900	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201506012	Intersection traffic control	Modify control - two-way stop to roundabout	1	Intersections	\$2919600	\$3244000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	16,250	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance

#### HSIP TOTAL LAND PROJECT **IMPROVEMENT** OUTPUT FUNDING FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORY OUTPUTS PROJECT PROJECT **USE/AREA** AADT SPEED NAME CATEGORY TYPE CATEGORY **CLASSIFICATION** COST(\$) COST(\$) TYPE 201605013 Auxiliary lanes - modify left-turn 6 \$3285000 \$3650000 HSIP (23 Urban Principal Arterial-73,200 40 Intersection Intersections lane offset U.S.C. 148) Other geometry 201608001 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 42 \$321000 \$690000 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies 0 0 Locations U.S.C. 148) cushions, terminals) HSIP (23 Urban Principal Arterial-40 201610001 Intersection \$1350000 \$1500000 27,300 Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn 1 Intersections U.S.C. 148) Other geometry lane (23 Urban 45 201610003 Roadway Rumble strips - center Miles \$135000 \$150000 HSIP Minor Arterial 32,450 U.S.C. 148) (23 Rural 201610004 Shoulder Miles \$1980000 \$2200000 HSIP Minor Arterial 9,350 55 Widen shoulder - paved or other 14.6 U.S.C. 148) treatments Intersection \$704000 HSIP (23 Urban 201611005 Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn \$633300 Minor Arterial 8,600 55 1 Intersections U.S.C. 148) geometry lane 0 0 201702005 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 56 Locations \$720000 \$800000 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies cushions, terminals) U.S.C. 148) HSIP (23 Rural 70 201702007 Pavement surface - high friction 9 \$1296000 \$1440000 Principal Arterial-24,000 Roadway Locations U.S.C. 148) surface Interstate Urban \$1890000 \$2600000 HSIP (23 55 201702009 Intersection Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn Intersections Principal Arterial-15,400 1 Other U.S.C. 148) geometry lane (23 Rural 55 201703002 Miles \$1620000 \$1800000 HSIP Minor Arterial 8,450 Shoulder Widen shoulder - paved or other 9.93 treatments U.S.C. 148) Rural 0 201709004 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 201 Locations \$900000 \$1000000 HSIP (23 Minor Arterial 0 cushions, terminals) U.S.C. 148)

OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes

#### HSIP TOTAL LAND PROJECT **IMPROVEMENT** OUTPUT FUNDING FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORY OUTPUTS PROJECT PROJECT **USE/AREA** AADT SPEED NAME CATEGORY TYPE CATEGORY **CLASSIFICATION** COST(\$) COST(\$) TYPE 201710001 traffic signal 1 \$855000 \$950000 HSIP (23 Urban Principal Arterial-65,200 40 Intersection Modifv Intersections traffic control modernization/replacement U.S.C. 148) Other 201710002 Modify traffic signal \$405000 \$450000 HSIP (23 Urban Minor Arterial 16,700 40 Intersection 1 Intersections U.S.C. 148) traffic control modernization/replacement \$300000 HSIP (23 Rural 950 55 Roadside Removal of roadside objects 65 \$270000 Minor Arterial 201711001 trees (trees, poles, etc.) U.S.C. 148) HSIP (23 Urban Principal Arterial-55 201711002 Roadway Delineators post-mounted or on 8.1 Miles \$967500 \$1075000 65,000 delineation barrier U.S.C. 148) Interstate (23 Urban 201711003 traffic \$540000 \$600000 HSIP Principal Arterial-24,100 45 Intersection Modify signal 1 Intersections Other traffic control U.S.C. 148) modernization/replacement HRRR Miles Rural 750 55 201712026 Shoulder \$1710000 \$1900000 Major Collector Widen shoulder - paved or other 8.93 Special Rule treatments (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1)) Minor Arterial 201712040 Shoulder Widen shoulder - paved or other 7.36 Miles \$1337400 \$1486000 HSIP (23 Rural 4,250 55 U.S.C. 148) treatments Miles HSIP (23 Urban 201801001 Miscellaneous pedestrians and \$7740000 \$8600000 Principal Arterial-71,700 35 Pedestrians and 1.55 U.S.C. 148) bicyclists bicyclists Other HSIP 201801002 Roadway Pavement surface - high friction 0.7 Miles \$900000 \$1000000 (23 Urban Principal Arterial-285,600 55 surface U.S.C. 148) Interstate \$529000 Rural 50 HSIP (23 0 201801003 Roadway Rumble strips - center 1 corridor \$476100 Principal Arterial-U.S.C. 148) Other 201801006 Intersection Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn 2 \$2250000 \$2500000 HSIP (23 Urban Principal Arterial-16,900 50 Intersections Other geometry U.S.C. 148) lane

OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Minimize the likelihood of crashing into an object
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Pedestrians	Improve visibility between motor vehicles and pedestrians
State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance

PROJECT NAME	IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY	OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TYPE	HSIP PROJECT COST(\$)	TOTAL PROJECT COST(\$)	FUNDING CATEGORY	LAND USE/AREA TYPE	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	AADT	SPEED	OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
201801007	Intersection traffic control	Modify traffic signal - add backplates with retroreflective borders	1	corridor	\$279000	\$310000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	0	0	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201801008	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	17	Locations	\$556200	\$618000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	14,700	55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201802002	Lighting	Intersection lighting	7	Locations	\$688500	\$765000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	15,000	65	State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201803001	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - modify left-turn lane offset	1	Intersections	\$675000	\$750000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Principal Arterial- Other	18,300	45	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201803002	Roadside	Barrier - cable	6.54	Miles	\$900000	\$1000000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Principal Arterial- Interstate	18,700	70	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201803003	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	2	Miles	\$360000	\$400000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	8,550	55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201803004	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	6.34	Miles	\$1170000	\$1300000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	5,050	55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201805001	Intersection traffic control	Intersection flashers - add stop sign-mounted	1	Intersections	\$67500	\$75000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	5,075	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201805002	Intersection traffic control	Intersection flashers - add stop sign-mounted	1	Intersections	\$67500	\$75000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	4,000	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201805004	Non- infrastructure	Data/traffic records	1	crash reconstruction statewide	\$1125000	\$1250000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	0	0	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Data	Data
201805005	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	4.7	Miles	\$900000	\$1000000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	2,350	55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes

#### PROJECT **IMPROVEMENT** OUTPUT FUNDING FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORY OUTPUTS PROJECT PROJECT **USE/AREA** AADT NAME CATEGORY TYPE CATEGORY **CLASSIFICATION** COST(\$) COST(\$) TYPE 0 201805006 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 76 \$1350000 \$1500000 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies Locations U.S.C. 148) cushions, terminals) 201806002 Intersection traffic control - other Intersection J \$1620000 \$1800000 HSIP (23 Rural Principal Arterial-42,000 Intersection 1 U.S.C. 148) Other traffic control Turn \$554200 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies 0 201807001 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 23 \$498780 Locations cushions, terminals) U.S.C. 148) (23 Rural Principal Arterial-201807002 Shoulder Widen shoulder - paved or other 2.8 Miles \$540000 \$600000 HSIP 1,550 treatments U.S.C. 148) Other (23 Rural 201807004 5 Miles \$675000 \$750000 HSIP Principal Arterial-23,600 Roadside Barrier - cable Interstate U.S.C. 148) 4.1 Miles HSIP (23 Rural 201807005 Roadside \$562500 \$625000 Principal Arterial-24,600 Barrier - cable U.S.C. 148) Interstate 2 201807006 Pedestrians and Pedestrian signal Approaches \$1260000 \$1400000 HSIP (23 Urban Principal Arterial-29,275 U.S.C. 148) Other bicyclists HSIP (23 Rural 201807007 Barrier end treatments (crash \$900000 \$1000000 Principal Arterial-0 Roadside 39 Locations U.S.C. 148) cushions, terminals) Other Shoulder HRRR \$1399500 \$1555000 Rural 700 201808001 Widen shoulder - paved or other 5.8 Miles Major Collector Special Rule treatments (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1)) 201808002 Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn 2 \$900000 \$1000000 HSIP (23 Urban Minor Arterial Intersection Locations 18,250 geometry lane U.S.C. 148) 201808003 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 102 \$900000 \$1000000 HRRR Rural Principal Arterial-10,000 Locations Special Rule Other cushions, terminals) (23 U.S.C.

HSIP

TOTAL

LAND

#### 2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program

148(g)(1))

SPEED	OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY		
55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		
55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance		
55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		
55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		
70	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		
70	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		
45	State Highway Agency	Spot	Pedestrians	Reduce Pedestrian exposure to vehicular traffic		
55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		
55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		
35	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance		
55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes		

PROJECT NAME	IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY	OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TYPE	HSIP PROJECT COST(\$)	TOTAL PROJECT COST(\$)	FUNDING CATEGORY	LAND USE/AREA TYPE	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	AADT	SPEED	OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
201808004	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	157	Locations	\$630000	\$700000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	0	0	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201808005	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	28	Locations	\$929700	\$1033000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	0	55	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809002	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn lane	0.36	Miles	\$405900	\$451000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	16,500	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Minimize the Consequences of poor sight distance
201809003	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	1	Locations	\$1350000	\$1500000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	0	0	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809004	Roadway	Rumble strips - edge or shoulder	25.2	Miles	\$180900	\$201000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Interstate	0	65	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809005	Intersection geometry	Auxiliary lanes - modify auxiliary through lane	0.32	Miles	\$1086551	\$1207279	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Principal Arterial- Other	13,500	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Minimize the Consequences of poor sight distance
201809007	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	8.41	Miles	\$1980000	\$2200000	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	1,800	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809008	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	5.29	Miles	\$1260000	\$1400000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Minor Arterial	3,600	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809009	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	72	Locations	\$720000	\$800000	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	700	0	State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809010	Roadway signs and traffic control	Roadway signs and traffic control - other	18	Locations	\$3564000	\$3960000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Principal Arterial- Other	18,300	35	State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201809011	Roadway	Rumble strips - edge or shoulder	6	Locations	\$243000	\$270000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	5,567	55	State Highway Agency	Spot	Lane Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes

#### HSIP TOTAL LAND PROJECT **IMPROVEMENT** OUTPUT FUNDING FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORY OUTPUTS PROJECT PROJECT **USE/AREA** AADT SPEED NAME CATEGORY TYPE CATEGORY **CLASSIFICATION** COST(\$) COST(\$) TYPE Roadside Removal of roadside objects 19 \$1419139 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies 5,650 55 201810001 Locations \$1540000 (trees, poles, etc.) U.S.C. 148) 201810005 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 73 \$270000 \$300000 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies 0 0 Locations U.S.C. 148) cushions, terminals) \$1135440 HRRR Rural 55 201810006 Shoulder Miles \$1021860 Minor Arterial 3,800 Widen shoulder - paved or other 0.97 treatments Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1)) Rural 5,500 55 201810007 Shoulder Widen shoulder - paved or other 6.95 Miles \$2525000 \$8750000 HSIP (23 Minor Arterial treatments U.S.C. 148) (23 Multiple/Varies 201810008 Barrier end treatments (crash 31 \$279000 \$310000 HSIP Multiple/Varies 0 0 Roadside Locations cushions, terminals) U.S.C. 148) Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies \$380000 HSIP (23 0 201810009 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 38 \$342000 0 Locations U.S.C. 148) cushions, terminals) 201810010 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 54 0 0 Locations \$486000 \$540000 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies cushions, terminals) U.S.C. 148) (23 Urban 30 traffic signal 1 \$720000 \$800000 HSIP Principal Arterial-36,700 201811004 Intersection Modify Intersections U.S.C. 148) traffic control modernization/replacement Other \$540000 \$600000 HSIP (23 Urban 54,250 40 201811005 Intersection Auxiliary lanes - modify left-turn 4 Principal Arterial-Approaches U.S.C. 148) geometry lane offset Other Rural 201811006 Miles \$1828800 \$2032000 HSIP (23 1,750 55 Shoulder Widen shoulder - paved or other 9.9 Major Collector treatments U.S.C. 148) 201812001 Lighting Intersection lighting 1 \$26000 \$4550000 HSIP (23 Rural Minor Arterial 6,539 55 Intersections U.S.C. 148)

OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Minimize the likelihood of crashing into an object
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Minimize the Consequences of poor sight distance
State Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Minimize the Consequences of leaving the road
State Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance

#### HSIP TOTAL LAND PROJECT IMPROVEMENT OUTPUT FUNDING FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORY OUTPUTS PROJECT PROJECT **USE/AREA** AADT SPEED NAME CATEGORY TYPE CATEGORY **CLASSIFICATION** COST(\$) COST(\$) TYPE Auxiliary lanes - add left-turn 4 \$3179070 \$3532300 HSIP (23 Urban Principal Arterial-50,600 45 201809117 Intersection Intersections U.S.C. 148) Other geometry lane 201809118 Pedestrians and \$90000 \$100000 HSIP (23 Urban Minor Arterial 9,545 30 Pedestrian warning signs -4 Locations U.S.C. 148) bicyclists overhead 201809119 Intersection Modify traffic signal add 1 \$824040 \$915600 HSIP (23 Urban Minor Arterial 35,900 45 Intersections additional signal heads U.S.C. 148) traffic control Modify traffic signal - add \$640440 \$711600 HSIP (23 Urban 45 201809120 Intersection 1 Intersections Minor Arterial 25,600 additional signal heads traffic control U.S.C. 148) (23 Modify traffic signal - add 7 \$740160 \$822400 HSIP Urban Minor Arterial 40 201809121 Intersection Intersections 14,900 traffic control flashing yellow arrow U.S.C. 148) 201809135 15 \$4257000 \$4730000 HSIP (23 Urban 31,500 35 Intersection Modify traffic signal Intersections Minor Arterial miscellaneous/other/unspecified traffic control U.S.C. 148) 0 0 201809126 Roadside Barrier end treatments (crash 92 Locations \$1000000 \$1136094 HSIP (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies cushions, terminals) U.S.C. 148) Rural \$189000 \$210000 HRRR Major Collector 55 201809127 Roadway Roadway widening - travel lanes 1 Intersections 8,700 Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1)) 201809128 Roadway \$558000 \$620000 HRRR Rural Major Collector 3,400 55 Superelevation / cross slope Curves Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1)) \$1111111 0 0 210 (23 Multiple/Varies Multiple/Varies 201809110 Roadside Barrier-metal Locations \$1000000 HSIP U.S.C. 148) 201809111 Intersection Modify traffic signal - modify 8 \$1804551 \$2005057 HSIP (23 Urban Minor Arterial 9,500 30 Intersections traffic control signal mounting (spanwire to U.S.C. 148) mast arm)

OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
County Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
City or Municipal Highway Agency	Spot	Pedestrians	Improve visibility between motor vehicles and pedestrians
County Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
County Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
County Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
City or Municipal Highway Agency	Systemic	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
County Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
County Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
County Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Enhance intersection safety performance
County Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
City or Municipal Highway Agency	Systemic	Intersections	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes

PROJECT NAME	IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY	OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TYPE	HSIP PROJECT COST(\$)	TOTAL PROJECT COST(\$)	FUNDING CATEGORY	LAND USE/AREA TYPE	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	AADT	SPEED	OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
201809112	Roadside	Barrier- metal	25	Locations	\$617591	\$686212	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Major Collector	500	0	County Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809113	Roadway	Roadway narrowing (road diet, roadway reconfiguration)	1	Miles	\$2353423	\$2614914	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Minor Arterial	9,100	30	City or Municipal Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809104	Roadway	Roadway - other	2	Miles	\$2583360	\$2870400	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	550	55	County Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809115	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	8.9	Miles	\$1283478	\$1426087	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	1,650	55	County Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809101	Access management	Raised island - install new	1	Intersections	\$216900	\$241000	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Major Collector	7,200	30	City or Municipal Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201809102	Roadway	Roadway - other	1	Miles	\$1318500	\$1465000	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	1,350	55	County Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809103	Roadway	Roadway widening - travel lanes	1.05	Miles	\$1000000	\$1111111	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	1,750	55	County Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809114	Lighting	Intersection lighting	1	Intersections	\$49500	\$55000	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	900	55	County Highway Agency	Spot	Intersections	Enhance intersection safety performance
201809130	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	75	Locations	\$1000000	\$1111111	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	0	0	County Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809131	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	146	Locations	\$1000000	\$1111111	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	0	0	County Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes
201809133	Roadside	Barrier end treatments (crash cushions, terminals)	304	Locations	\$1000000	\$1111111	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Multiple/Varies	Multiple/Varies	0	0	County Highway Agency	Systemic	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes

PROJECT NAME	IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORY	OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TYPE	HSIP PROJECT COST(\$)	TOTAL PROJECT COST(\$)	FUNDING CATEGORY	LAND USE/AREA TYPE	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	AADT	SPEED	OWNERSHIP	METHOD FOR SITE SELECTION	SHSP EMPHASIS AREA	SHSP STRATEGY
201809106	Pedestrians and bicyclists	Install sidewalk	3900	Feet	\$704921	\$783246	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Urban	Major Collector	11,200	35	City or Municipal Highway Agency	Spot	Pedestrians	Reduce Pedestrian exposure to vehicular traffic
201809116	Roadside	Removal of roadside objects (trees, poles, etc.)	9000	Feet	\$597618	\$664020	HSIP (23 U.S.C. 148)	Rural	Major Collector	1,600	55	County Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Reduce the severity of the crash
201809100	Shoulder treatments	Widen shoulder - paved or other	8	Miles	\$540000	\$600000	HRRR Special Rule (23 U.S.C. 148(g)(1))	Rural	Major Collector	1,260	55	County Highway Agency	Spot	Roadway Departure	Keep vehicles in their respective lanes

### Safety Performance

### General Highway Safety Trends

# Present data showing the general highway safety trends in the State for the past five years.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Fatalities	911	927	918	956	991	924	998	1,078	1,031
Serious Injuries	13,006	12,631	11,939	12,398	12,300	11,748	12,844	11,622	11,354
Fatality rate (per HMVMT)	0.861	0.876	0.889	0.914	0.941	0.881	0.948	1.005	0.950
Serious injury rate (per HMVMT)	12.288	11.940	11.565	11.855	11.681	11.199	12.206	10.830	10.510
Number non- motorized fatalities	131	139	166	170	156	155	178	173	189
Number of non- motorized serious injuries	1,444	1,378	1,307	1,334	1,283	1,292	1,574	1,207	1,403



#### Serious Injuries → 5 Year Rolling Avg.

### **Annual Serious Injuries**



### Fatality rate (per HMVMT)

#### Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) 12.5 12 11.5 11 10.5 10 9.5 2013 2010 2011 2012 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) → 5 Year Rolling Avg.



### Non Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

#### Describe fatality data source.

FARS

# To the maximum extent possible, present this data by functional classification and ownership.

Year 2017												
Functional Classification	Number of Fatalities (5-yr avg)	Number of Serious Injuries (5-yr avg)	Fatality Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)	Serious Injury Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)								
Rural Principal Arterial (RPA) - Interstate	141.6	1,171.6	0.94	7.4								
Rural Principal Arterial (RPA) - Other Freeways and Expressways			0	0								
Rural Principal Arterial (RPA) - Other			0	0								
Rural Minor Arterial	112.6	792.8	2.53	17.79								
Rural Minor Collector	11.8	90.6	2.61	19.59								
Rural Major Collector	106.8	775	2.47	17.83								
Rural Local Road or Street	79.2	620.2	2.34	18.34								

Functional Classification	Number of Fatalities (5-yr avg)	Number of Serious Injuries (5-yr avg)	Fatality Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)	Serious Injury Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)
Urban Principal Arterial (UPA) - Interstate	274.6	3,454.4	1.12	14.14
Urban Principal Arterial (UPA) - Other Freeways and Expressways	5.6	52.2	0.47	4.42
Urban Principal Arterial (UPA) - Other			0	0
Urban Minor Arterial	145	2,351.2	0.94	15.23
Urban Minor Collector			0	0
Urban Major Collector			0	0
Urban Local Road or Street	56.4	1,382.2	0.49	11.97

Roadways	Number of Fatalities (5-yr avg)	Number of Serious Injuries (5-yr avg)	Fatality Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)	Serious Injury Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)
State Highway Agency				
County Highway Agency				
Town or Township Highway Agency				
City or Municipal Highway Agency				
State Park, Forest, or Reservation Agency				
Local Park, Forest or Reservation Agency				
Other State Agency	0.4	9.2	0.4	9.49
Other Local Agency				
Private (Other than Railroad)				
Railroad				
State Toll Authority				
Local Toll Authority				
Other Public Instrumentality (e.g. Airport, School, University)				
Indian Tribe Nation				
Other State Agency	0.4	9.2	0.4	9.49
County	151.4	1,538.4	1.31	13.29
Municipality	209	4,214	1.19	23.95
Federal Agency	0.6	1.8	1.37	4.2
Adjacent County	0.4	2.2	1.66	8.91
Private (Including Toll Authorities)	22.6	181	0.24	1.92
Adjacent Township or Road District	6.4	49.8	1.21	9.37

Year 2017

2019	Illinois	Highway	/ Safety	Improveme	ent Program
------	----------	---------	----------	-----------	-------------

Roadways	Number of Fatalities (5-yr avg)	Number of Serious Injuries (5-yr avg)	Fatality Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)	Serious Injury Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)	
Township or Road District	94.4	786	1.23	10.26	
Illinois Division of Highways	525.6	5,201.4	0.89	8.78	

#### Provide additional discussion related to general highway safety trends.

From 2013 to 2017, there was a 10% increase in fatalities (991 in 2013 to 1090 in 2017). In contrast, there was a 2.3% decrease in serious injuries (12,300 in 2013 to 12,023 in 2017) from 2013 to 2017.

#### Safety Performance Targets

#### Safety Performance Targets

Calendar Year 2020 Targets \*

#### Number of Fatalities:985.0

#### Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

Total traffic fatalities in Illinois are a main concern and reduction of total fatalities remains the primary goal of the Department as stated in the SHSP. Data from 2010-2018 were utilized to create a fiveyear rolling average for each year. For example, the rolling average for 2013 was computed by averaging 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. A rolling average is commonly used to smooth out short-term fluctuations and highlight longer-term trends or cycles. To project performance targets for Illinois, a two-percent reduction was utilized. The goal for 2019 was computed by reducing 2018 by two-percent and 2020 was computed by reducing 2019 by two-percent. A two-percent reduction was used due to the fact the five-year rolling averages from 2014 to 2018 have an upward linear trend as seen through the linear regression line. The goal for Illinois is to reach zero fatalities per year and using a two-percent reduction will enable the state to reach its goal. The mission of the SHSP is to develop, implement and manage a data-driven, integrated, multi-stakeholder process to reduce traffic-related deaths and life-altering injuries on all public roads in Illinois. Each of the emphasis areas are prioritized and based on the greatest opportunity to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

#### Number of Serious Injuries:11668.7

#### Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

For Total Serious Injuries in Traffic Crashes, five-year rolling averages were created for each year from 2013-2017 since 2018 was not yet available. 2018 was then estimated through the use of a trendline and the total average of 2014 through 2018. Although this resulted in a downward trend, the reduction of fatalities by 2020 was not sufficient to be greater than two-percent; therefore, a two-percent reduction was used which sets a target of 11,668.7 total serious injuries in 2020. Reducing serious injuries is a goal set in the SHSP along with the reduction of fatalities. The mission of the SHSP is to develop, implement and manage a data-driven, integrated, multi-stakeholder process to

reduce traffic-related deaths and life-altering injuries on all public roads in Illinois. Each of the emphasis areas are prioritized and based on the greatest opportunity to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

#### Fatality Rate:0.910

#### Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

Similar to previous target selection methods, five-year rolling averages were used from 2014-2018 for the Total Traffic Fatality Rate. Since the 2018 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) data from FHWA were not available, the 2018 state VMT data published by IDOT were used to calculate the fatality rate. Like the Total Traffic Fatalities, the data show an upward trend. To move toward the goal of zero fatalities, a two-percent reduction is applied annually resulting in the projected rate of 0.91 per 100 million VMT in 2020. Reducing the fatalities and the fatality rate in Illinois are a main concern and a primary goal of the Department as stated in the SHSP. The mission of the SHSP is to develop, implement and manage a data-driven, integrated, multi-stakeholder process to reduce traffic-related deaths and life-altering injuries on all public roads in Illinois. Each of the emphasis areas are prioritized and based on the greatest opportunity to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

#### Serious Injury Rate:10.800

#### Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

For Total Serious Injury Rate per 100M VMT, five-year rolling averages for Total Serious Injuries (as previously shown) were divided by five-year rolling averages for VMT for 2014 through 2018. Since Federal VMT was available for all years except 2018, state VMT was used for 2018. Linear regression for the projected values of 2019 and 2020 only show a slight downward trend in the reduction of Total Serious Injury Rate by 2020 of 11.07 per 100 M VMT. Instead, a two-percent reduction was used, bringing the target to 10.80 per 100 M VMT in 2020. Reducing the serious injuries and the serious injury rate in Illinois are a main concern and a primary goal of the Department as stated in the SHSP. The mission of the SHSP is to develop, implement and manage a data-driven, integrated, multi-stakeholder process to reduce traffic-related deaths and life-altering injuries on all public roads in Illinois. Each of the emphasis areas are prioritized and based on the greatest opportunity to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

#### **Total Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries:1456.2**

#### Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.

For the Number of Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries, five-year rolling averages were created for each year from 2013-2017 since 2018 was not yet available. Next, a trendline was created based on the data from 2013-2017. Using the trendline, the value for 2018 was calculated. 2018 was further estimated by taking this trend value for 2018 and averaging it with the total average of 2014 through 2018. This resulted in an upward trend, moving Illinois away from the goal of reaching zero fatalities so a two-percent reduction was used. This sets the target to 1,456.2 Nonmotorized fatalities and serious injuries in 2020. The mission of the SHSP is to develop, implement and manage a data-driven, integrated, multi-stakeholder process to reduce traffic-related deaths and life-altering injuries on all public roads in Illinois. Each of the emphasis areas are prioritized and based on the greatest opportunity to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

#### 2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program Describe efforts to coordinate with other stakeholders (e.g. MPOs, SHSO) to establish safety performance targets.

The IDOT Bureau of Safety Programs and Engineering lead safety performance target setting coordination and concurrence efforts. BSPE initiated the process by developing statistical relationships for each performance measure using linear regression, linear regression with 5 year averages, ordinary least squared and exponential smoothing models to assess their fit with safety performance historic trends and account for future indicators and influences. Outside indicators considered include trends related to population, population by age, licensing by age and geography, mode shift, oil futures, pending legislation, funding and budgets for enforcement, education and engineering. In addition to historic trends and outside influences, Illinois considered long term goals and the vision of achieving zero fatalities on all public roadways. In addition to statewide metrics, BSPE developed initial safety performance calculations for each of the MPOs statewide for their use in target setting.

BSPE convenes meetings with the Highway Safety Office and HSP program managers, Districts and MPOs to discuss the initial findings and safety target recommendations. After obtaining input, BSPE met with the SHSP Executive Committee to share findings and recommendations. The SHSP Executive Committee provided feedback and concurrence on the safety targets. After state targets were set, IDOT Districts worked with MPOs to set local safety performance targets. A majority of the MPOs supported the state targets but some MPOs opted for tailored performance measures related to non-motorized or specific crash types.

#### Does the State want to report additional optional targets?

No

#### Describe progress toward meeting the State's 2018 Safety Performance Targets (based on data available at the time of reporting). For each target, include a discussion of any reasons for differences in the actual outcomes and targets.

Fatalities: IDOT set targets to decrease fatalities by two percent annually, despite indicators and an increasing trend for years 2015, 2016 and 2017. While targets may not be met for 2018, the state is making progress as seen in fatality reductions between 2018 and 2019. The longer term trajectory appears to be decreasing. Efforts have been made to specifically focus on implemented projects and adjustments to the program to address system needs.

Serious Injuries: IDOT set targets to decrease serious injuries by two percent annually, despite indicators and an increasing trend for years 2015 and 2017. There were decreases in 2014 and 2016. 2018 data will be needed to assess impacts relative to targets.

Fatality rate: IDOT set targets to decrease fatality rate by two percent annually, despite indicators and an increase in years 2015 and 2017. There were decreases in 2016 and 2018.

Serious injury rate: IDOT set targets to decrease serious injury rate by two percent annually, despite indicators and an increase in years 2015 and 2017. There were decreases in 2016 and will need to monitor 2018 to determine the impact on targets.

Non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries: IDOT set targets to decrease non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries by two percent annually, despite indicators and an increase in years 2015 and 2017. There were decreases in 2016 and will need to monitor 2018 to determine the impact on targets.

### Applicability of Special Rules

# Does the HRRR special rule apply to the State for this reporting period? No

As directed by the FHWA, "...States triggers the HRRR Special Rule if the fatality rate on the rural roads in the

State increases over the most recent 2-year period for which data is available." The two most recent, complete, and available years of FARS data for Illinois are 2016 and 2017. Also, the guidelines provided by FHWA indicates that "...HRRRs are limited to the functional classifications of rural major and minor collectors and rural local roads...". The source for both of these statements can found in the following link: https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/hrrr/

After considering this guidance, the High-Risk Rural Road (HRRR) calculations for the State of Illinois are listed below (note: this is for the 2019 reporting period).

Since the 2017 HRRR fatality rate is lower than the 2016 HRRR fatality rate, Illinois does not fall into the penalty category for the 2019 reporting period.

For 2016:

Fatalities on Rural, Minor Collector: 8 Fatalities on Rural, Major Collector: 117 Fatalities on Rural, Local Road or Street: 87 Sum of fatalities on these three Functional Classes: 212

HMVMT on Rural, Minor Collector: 5.52 HMVMT on Rural, Major Collector: 40.66 HMVMT on Rural, Local Road or Street: 32.73 Sum of HMVMT on these three Functional Classes: 78.91

2016 HRRR fatality rate: 212 / 78.91 = 2.68

For 2017: Fatalities on Rural, Minor Collector: 8 Fatalities on Rural, Major Collector: 109 Fatalities on Rural, Local Road or Street: 62 Sum of fatalities on these three Functional Classes: 179

HMVMT on Rural, Minor Collector: 5.38 HMVMT on Rural, Major Collector: 39.96 HMVMT on Rural, Local Road or Street: 32.57 Sum of HMVMT on these three Functional Classes: 77.91

2017 HRRR fatality rate: 179 / 77.91 = 2.29

### Provide the number of older driver and pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries 65 years of age and older for the past seven years.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Number of Older Driver and Pedestrian Fatalities	109	126	125	139	146	158	176
Number of Older Driver and Pedestrian Serious Injuries	905	854	892	932	905	1,016	893

Based on guidance of this question from FHWA it was instructed that the year prior to the most current complete crash year should be used. Illinois' most current complete crash year is 2017, for this reason our analysis ends on 2016.

### Evaluation

### **Program Effectiveness**

#### How does the State measure effectiveness of the HSIP?

- Benefit/Cost Ratio
- Other-naive before-after studies for specific projects
- Other-Statewide fatal and serious injuries, local route fatal and serious injuries and performance measures by emphasis area
- Other-Empirical Bayes (EB) methods for projects and the program

The State measures the effectiveness of the HSIP program using two primary methods:

- Executive Level using Benefic Cost Ratios (BCR): The BCR is calculated as total benefit divided by total project cost in today's dollars. The total benefit is defined as the difference between the average crash cost between before and after periods over the service life of the project. A statewide HSIP program evaluation study was performed for projects awarded in 2007 and after and completed by 2015. These projects were evaluated using crash data from 2005-2016 and at least two years of before and two years of after data for each project. For the study crash costs are considered as ~\$6M for fatal, ~\$300K for A injury, and ~\$120K for B injury crashes and results were presented at the aggregate program level.
- 2. Treatment Level using Actual Crash Reduction: While the BCR provides an executive overview of the HSIP performance, the actual crash reductions provide a more detailed assessment of the performance for each treatment by crash types and/or IL SHSP Emphasis Area. The actual crash reductions are defined as the ratio of the average crash frequency in the after period by before period. The actual crash reductions are naïve CMFs and depending on the sample size, provide an estimate of the safety performance of the treatments.

# Based on the measures of effectiveness selected previously, describe the results of the State's program level evaluations.

HSIP projects awarded after January 1, 2007 and completed before January 1, 2015 include more than 370 contracts, over 2100 miles of roadway, over 500 intersections, and more than 260M HSIP dollars. The estimated safety benefit of these investments is estimated between \$3.5B and over \$7B depending on the crash cost source. \$3.5B is based on the 2010 HSM comprehensive crash costs grown to the 2016 annual equivalent costs of \$6.2M for fatal crashes, \$336k for serious injury crashes (A type injury severity) and \$123k for evident injury crashes (B type injury severity). Over \$7B is based on 2019 National Safety Council Comprehensive Costs of \$10.5M for fatal crashes, \$1.1M for serious injury crashes (A type injury severity) and \$318k for evident injury crashes (B type injury severity).

The overall safety benefit is based on the observed reduction in crash frequency for the treated sites over the service life of the projects which is equivalent to a BCR of greater than 9. In addition to BCR which provides a measure of effectiveness on an executive level, IDOT also uses the actual crash reductions to track the overall impact of HSIP funds on treated sites. Based on the evaluation results, in average, treated sites have observed 20% reduction in their K crashes, 18% reduction in A injury crashes and more than 5% reduction in B injury crashes or a 10% overall reduction on KAB injury crashes.

# What other indicators of success does the State use to demonstrate effectiveness and success of the Highway Safety Improvement Program?

• Other-Improving and coordinating infrastructure and behavior strategies to maximize benefits

In addition to measures of effectiveness described in Q40 and Q41, IDOT tracks the total KAB crashes and fatalities statewide, by land use, jurisdiction, emphasis area, crash type, crash cause, crash time, vehicle type, and more to identify trends. The identified trends will be further studied, and proper actions will be made to mitigate them.

### Effectiveness of Groupings or Similar Types of Improvements

#### Present and describe trends in SHSP emphasis area performance measures.

SHSP Emphasis Area	Targeted Crash Type	Number of Fatalities (5-yr avg)	Number of Serious Injuries (5-yr avg)	Fatality Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)	Serious Injury Rate (per HMVMT) (5-yr avg)						
Lane Departure		0	0	0	0						
Roadway Departure		524.4	3,628.6	0.49	3.42						
Intersections		255.4	5,127.2	0.24	4.83						
Pedestrians		141.2	997.6	0.13	0.94						
Bicyclists	26		417.6	0.03	0.39						
Older Drivers		205	2,031.8	0.2	1.91						
Motorcyclists		149.2	961.4	0.14	0.91						
Work Zones		33.8	196.2	0.03	0.18						
Younger Drivers		143.6	2,282	0.14	2.15						
Speeding and Aggressive		245.2	2,566	0.23	2.42						
Unrestrained Occupants		333	1,422	0.31	1.34						

Year 2017





# Has the State completed any countermeasure effectiveness evaluations during the reporting period?

No

IDOT prepared an HSIP evaluation tool and considered the naïve before and after for all HSIP investments

2019 Illinois Highway Safety Improvement Program between 2007 and 2015. More detailed evaluation of specific treatments is anticipated in the upcoming months for treatments with significant implementation such as rumble strips and cable median barrier.

### Project Effectiveness

Provide the following information for previously implemented projects that the State evaluated this reporting period.

LOCATION	FUNCTIONAL CLASS	IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY	IMPROVEMENT TYPE	PDO BEFORE	PDO AFTER	FATALITY BEFORE	FATALITY AFTER	SERIOUS INJURY BEFORE	SERIOUS INJURY AFTER	ALL OTHER INJURY BEFORE	ALL OTHER INJURY AFTER	TOTAL BEFORE	TOTAL AFTER	EVALUATION RESULTS (BENEFIT/COST RATIO)
NA														

Not applicable

### **Compliance Assessment**

### What date was the State's current SHSP approved by the Governor or designated State representative?

07/28/2017

#### What are the years being covered by the current SHSP?

From: 2017 To: 2022

#### When does the State anticipate completing it's next SHSP update?

2022

#### Provide the current status (percent complete) of MIRE fundamental data elements collection efforts using the table below.

ROAD TYPE	MIRE NAME (MIRE NO.)	NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - SEGMENT		NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - INTERSECTION		NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - RAMPS		LOCAL PAVED ROADS		UNPAVED ROADS	
		NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	
ROADWAY SEGMENT	Segment Identifier (12)	100	100					100	100	100	100
	Route Number (8)	100	100								
	Route/Street Name (9)	100	100								
	Federal Aid/Route Type (21)	100	100								
	Rural/Urban Designation (20)	100	100					100	100		
	Surface Type (23)	100	100					100	100		
	Begin Point Segment Descriptor (10)	100	100					100	100	100	100
	End Point Segment Descriptor (11)	100	100					100	100	100	100
	Segment Length (13)	100	100								
	Direction of Inventory (18)	100	100								
	Functional Class (19)	100	100					100	100	100	100
	Median Type (54)	100	100								
	Access Control (22)	100	100								

ROAD TYPE	MIRE NAME (MIRE NO.)	NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - SEGMENT		NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - INTERSECTION		NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - RAMPS		LOCAL PAVED ROADS		UNPAVED ROADS	
		NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	
	One/Two Way Operations (91)	100	100								
	Number of Through Lanes (31)	100	100					100	100		
	Average Annual Daily Traffic (79)	100	100					100	100		
	AADT Year (80)	100	100								
	Type of Governmental Ownership (4)	100	100					100	100	100	100
INTERSECTION	Unique Junction Identifier (120)			100	100						
	Location Identifier for Road 1 Crossing Point (122)			100	100						
	Location Identifier for Road 2 Crossing Point (123)			100	100						
	Intersection/Junction Geometry (126)			100	100						
	Intersection/Junction Traffic Control (131)			100	100						
	AADT for Each Intersecting Road (79)			100	100						
	AADT Year (80)			100	100						
	Unique Approach Identifier (139)			100	100						
INTERCHANGE/RAMP	Unique Interchange Identifier (178)					100	100				
	Location Identifier for Roadway at Beginning of Ramp Terminal (197)					100	100				
	Location Identifier for Roadway at Ending Ramp Terminal (201)					100	100				
	Ramp Length (187)					100	100				

ROAD TYPE	MIRE NAME (MIRE NO.)	NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - SEGMENT		NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - INTERSECTION		NON LOCAL PAVED ROADS - RAMPS		LOCAL PAVED ROADS		UNPAVED ROADS	
		NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	STATE	NON-STATE	
	Roadway Type at Beginning of Ramp Terminal (195)					100	100				
	Roadway Type at End Ramp Terminal (199)					100	100				
	Interchange Type (182)					100	100				
	Ramp AADT (191)					100	100				
Year of Ramp AAD (192)						100	100				
	Functional Class (19)					100	100				
	Type of Governmental Ownership (4)					100	100				
Totals (Average Percent Complete):		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

\*Based on Functional Classification

### Describe actions the State will take moving forward to meet the requirement to have complete access to the MIRE fundamental data elements on all public roads by September 30, 2026.

Illinois has all the required MIRE fundamental data elements. Based on the results of the Illinois roadway Data improvement program (RDIP) assessment that was completed in early 2018, Illinois is one of the few states where the MIRE fundamental data elements are collected.

#### Did the State conduct an HSIP program assessment during the reporting period?

No

IDOT is continuously assessing the HSIP program and making adjustments to improve effectiveness and streamlining processes. These efforts will continue through 2019 and policy changes are anticipated in 2020. When does the State plan to complete its next HSIP program assessment.

2020

### **Optional Attachments**

Program Structure:

Final\_HSIP\_Departmental\_Policy\_Nov\_27\_2006-Final2.doc.pdf Project Implementation:

Safety Performance:

Evaluation:

Compliance Assessment:

#### Glossary

**5 year rolling average:** means the average of five individuals, 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.