**Maryland**
**Highway Safety Improvement Program**
**CY 2012 Annual Report**

## Executive Summary

Summary Maryland Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) CY 2012

- HSIP is administered centrally
- Local roads are not allocated HSIP funds
- The Maryland Highway Safety Office (MHSO) along with the Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) and the Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services are important internal partners with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) in the HSIP process. Several regional planning organizations also coordinate with the SHA as external partners.
- Programs administered under the HSIP
    - Median Barrier
    - Horizontal Curve
    - Skid Hazard
    - Roadway Departure
    - Left-turn crash
    - Intersection Crash Data
    - Low Cost Spot Improvements
    - Pedestrian Safety
    - Rural State Highway
    - Right Angle Crash
    - Highway Sections
- The data types used in the HSIP program methodology are vehicle crashes and traffic volume
- The project identification methodology used in the HSIP program are Crash frequency and Relative severity index
- The HSIP projects are advanced for implementation by an SHA selection committee. The criteria considered are Safety, Congestion, Operations and Local Support
- The proportion of HSIP program Funds used in CY 2012 for funding systemic improvements is 34%
- The types of systemic improvements include
    - Cable median barriers
    - Rumble strips
    - Traffic control device rehabilitation
    - Pavement installation and improvement
- Engineering studies are used to identify potential countermeasures
- The HSIP funding for CY 2012
    - Programmed - $4,388,623.49
        - Non-infrastructure portion - $3,071,402
    - Obligated - $12,618,395

  - Non-infrastructure portion - $1,316,221.51
- More site specific information is expected to be available in CY 2013 for individual HSIP related projects
- The General listing of projects includes various traffic control, roadside, intersection geometry and non-infrastructure projects
- The Overview of safety trends indicates that the reported number of fatalities have decreased from 623 in 2008 to 527 in 2012 (rolling average format) and that the number of serious injuries have decreased from 6,077 in 2008 to 3,895 in 2012 (rolling average format)
- The Roadway ownership indicates that in 2012 the top four road systems experienced the following number of fatalities:
    - MD State Highways – 220
    - County Roads – 130
    - Interstate Highways – 63
    - US Highways – 56
- Older Driver (65+) Fatal and Severe Injury per capita rate has decreased from 2005-9 (3.4) as compared with 2007-2011 (3.0)
- The effectiveness of the HSIP program will be indicated by the crash data trends. More site specific data is expected to become available in subsequent HSIP reports
- The significant programmatic change in the HSIP program is the inclusion of more non-infrastructure projects such as the Roadway Safety Audit and the Strategic Highway Safety Program (non-construction portions) along with various MHSO public safety outreach efforts.
- Overall yearly crash trends for the individual SHSP areas along with the HSIP Sub-Program areas are shown in charts in the annual report

**Maryland**
**Highway Safety Improvement Program**
**CY 2012 Annual Report**

## Program Structure

### *Program Administration*

How are Highway Safety Improvement Program funds administered in a State?
☒Central
☐District
☐Other: 0T

If District, how are the HSIP funds allocated?
☐Formula
☐Crash data
☐Other: 0T

Describe how local roads are addressed as part of Highway Safety Improvement Program.
Local Roads are not given HSIP funds from the State

Identify which internal partners are involved with Highway Safety Improvement Program planning. Check all that apply.
☐Design
☐Planning
☐Maintenance
☐Operations
☒Governor's Highway Safety Office (Maryland Highway Safety Office)
☒Other: Office of Traffic and Safety (SHA), Maryland Highway Safety Office (MVA)

Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.
The Traffic Development and Support Division (TDSD) along with the Maryland Highway Safety Office (MHSO) (Note: MHSO moved from SHA in 2012 and is now part of MVA) and other Office of Traffic and Safety (OOTS) divisions provided leadership, support, and coordination for Maryland's highway safety projects in CY 2012. Part of TDSD and MHSO's responsibility is to work with other State agencies to address highway safety issues. This effort results in a multi agency approach which includes the Motor Vehicle Administration, the Maryland Transportation Authority, the Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services and others having roles in highway safety problems. The seven SHA District Offices also provide a network of field personnel willing to coordinate and provide technical assistance to local agencies. There is a continuing relationship between OOTS and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) along with National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Identify which external partners are involved with Highway Safety Improvement Program planning. Check all that apply.
XMetropolitan Planning Organizations
☐Governor's Highway Safety Office
☐Local Government Association
☐Other: Click here to enter text.

Identify any program administration practices used to implement the HSIP that have changed since the last reporting period.
☐Multi-disciplinary HSIP steering committee
☐Other: 0T

Describe any other aspects of Highway Safety Improvement Program Administration on which you would like to elaborate.
0T

***Program Methodology***

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| XMedian Barrier | XIntersection | ☐Safe Corridor |
| XHorizontal Curve | ☐Bicycle Safety | XRural State Highway |
| XSkid Hazard | XCrash Data | ☐Red Light Running |
| XRoadway Departure | XLow-Cost Spot Improvements | ☐Sign Replacement and Improvement |
| ☐Local Safety | XPedestrian Safety | XRight Angle Crash |
| XLeft-turn Crash | ☐Shoulder Improvement | XSegments |
| ☐Other: | | |

0T

For each program checked above, enter the following information:

Program: Median Barrier (2010), Horizontal Curve(2010), Skid Hazard (2012), Roadway Departure (2010), Left-Turn Crash (2010), Intersection (2010), Crash Data (2010), Low Cost Spot Improvements (2010), Pedestrian Safety (2012), Rural State Highway (2010), Right Angle Crash (2010), Segments (2010)

Date of Program Methodology: See Above

**Maryland**
**Highway Safety Improvement Program**
**CY 2012 Annual Report**

What data types were used in the program methodology? Check all that apply

| ***Crashes*** | ***Exposure*** | ***Roadway*** |
|---|---|---|
| XAll crashes | ☐Traffic | ☐Median width |
| ☐Fatal crashes only | XVolume | ☐Horizontal curvature |
| ☐Fatal and serious injury crashes only | ☐Population | ☐Functional classification |
| ☐Other: 0T | ☐Lane miles | ☐Roadside features |
| | ☐Other: 0T | ☐Other: 0T |

What project identification methodology was used for this program? Check all that apply.

XCrash frequency

☐Expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐Equivalent property damage only (EPDO crash frequency)

XRelative severity index

☐Crash rate

☐Critical rate

☐Level of service of safety (LOSS)

☐Excess expected crash frequency using SPFs

☐Excess expected crash frequency with EB adjustment

☐Excess expected crash frequency using method of moments

☐Probability of specific crash types

☐Excess proportions of specific crash types

☐Other: 0T

Are local roads (non-state owned and operated) included or addressed in this program?
No
If yes, are local road projects identified using the same methodology as state roads?
If no, describe the methodology used to identify local road projects as part of this program.
0T

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

☐Competitive application process

XSelection committee

☐Other: 0T

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).

XRelative Weight in Scoring

**Safety**: 60%

**Congestion / Operations**: 30%

**Support / Opportunity**: 10%

☐Rank of Priority Consideration

| | |
|---|---|
| Ranking based on B/C | 0T |
| Available funding | 0T |
| Incremental B/C | 0T |
| Ranking based on net benefit | 0T |
| Cost effectiveness | 0T |
| Other | 0T |

What proportion of highway safety improvement program funds address systemic improvements?
34% for CY 2012

Highway safety improvement program funds are used to address which of the following systemic improvements? Please check all that apply.

| | |
|---|---|
| XCable median barriers | XUpgrade guard rails |
| XRumble strips | ☐Clear zone improvements |
| XTraffic control device rehabilitation | ☐Safety edge |
| ☐Pavement/shoulder widening | ☐Install/improve lighting |
| ☐Install/Improve Signing | XAdd/upgrade/modify/remove traffic signal |
| XInstall/improve pavement marking/delineation | ☐Other: 0T |

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

XEngineering Study

☐Road Safety Assessment

☐Other: 0T

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

☐Highway Safety Manual

☐Road Safety Audits

☐Systemic Approach

☐Other: 0T

Describe any other aspects of the Highway Safety Improvement Program methodology on which you would like to elaborate.
0T

## Progress in Implementing Projects

***Funds Programmed***

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

Calendar Year

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

| **HSIP Project Funding** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Reporting Period 01/01/2012 to 12/31/2012** | | |
| **Funding Category** | **Programmed*** | **Obligated** |
| **HSIP (Section 148)** | **57,696.51** | **325,000.00** |
| **HSIP (SAFETEA-LU)** | **3,408,246.75** | **9,944,377.00** |
| **HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU)** | **91,872.23** | **400,000.00** |
| **HRRR Special Rule** | | |
| **Penalty Transfer - Section 154** | | |
| **Penalty Transfer – Section 164** | **0** | **656,000** |
| **Incentive Grants - Section 163** | | |
| **Incentive Grants (Section 406)** | **179,253** | **393,058** |
| **Other Federal-aid Funds (i.e. STP, NHPP)** | **651,555** | **900,000** |
| **State and Local Funds** | | |
| **Total** | **4,388,623.49** | **12,618,395** |

How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and maintained) safety projects?
**None**
How much funding is obligated to local safety projects?
None

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$3,071,402 – CY 2012
How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects?
$1,316,221.51 – CY 2012

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

None

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

None

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

None at this time

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

More site specific information is expected to be available in CY 2013 for individual HSIP related projects

**Maryland**
**Highway Safety Improvement Program**
**CY 2012 Annual Report**

## *General Listing of Projects*

List each highway safety improvement project obligated during the reporting period.

| Project | Improvement Category *(see Attachment 4)* | Output *(i.e. #, miles)* | HSIP Cost* | Total Cost | Funding Category^ | Functional Classification**^ | AADT** | Speed** | Roadway Ownership^ | Relationship to SHSP | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | Emphasis Area^ | Strategy |
| Intersection Traffic Control (preliminary engineering) | Modify control – two way stop to roundabout | n/a | 91,872.23 | 400,000 | HSIP – High Risk Rural Road Program | Rural minor arterial | 7,152 (2012 mainline) | 50 MPH (mainline) | MD State Highway Cecil Co | Highway Infrastructure | Safety improvement at High Crash Location |
| Non _ infrastructure | Road safety audits | n/a | 57,696.51 | 325,000 | HSIP | n/a | n/a | n/a | MD State Highway | Pedestrian Crashes | Develop model processes to identify and prioritize high incident locations and system wide pedestrian safety issues |
| Pedestrians and bicyclists | Modify existing crosswalk (ADA) | n/a | 124,206.50 | 188,329 | HSIP (SAFETEA-LU) | n/a | n/a | n/a | MD State Highway District 3 | Pedestrian Crashes | Develop and evaluate model approaches to engineering built environments that accommodate safe pedestrian travel |
| Roadside | Barrier - other | n/a | 5081 | 50,336 | HSIP (SAFETEA-LU) | n/a | n/a | n/a | MD State Highway District 7 | Highway Infrastructure | Analyze data to identify system wide improvements to reduce the number and severity of infrastructure crashes |
| Non _ infrastructure | Transportation safety planning | n/a | 427,717 | 797,334 | HSIP (SAFETEA-LU | n/a | n/a | n/a | MD State Highway | Highway Infrastructure | Develop model processes to identify and prioritize high incident locations and system wide pedestrian safety issues |
| Roadside | Barrier - other | n/a | 621,319.37 | 1,206,920 | HSIP (SAFETEA-LU) | n/a | n/a | n/a | MD State Highway District 1 | Highway Infrastructure | Analyze data to identify system wide improvements to reduce the number and severity of infrastructure crashes |
| Roadway | Roadway – other (pavement markings) | n/a | 570,773.24 | 5,089,271 | HSIP (SAFETEA-LU) | n/a | n/a | n/a | MD State Highway District 6 | Highway Infrastructure | Analyze data to identify system wide improvements to reduce the number and severity of infrastructure crashes |
| Roadside | Barrier - other | n/a | 181,162.25 | 853,481 | HSIP (SAFETEA-LU) | n/a | n/a | n/a | MD State Highway District 5 | Highway Infrastructure | Analyze data to identify system wide improvements to reduce the number and severity of infrastructure crashes |
| Intersection Geometry | Auxiliary Lanes miscellaneous | n/a | 1,477,987.39 | 1,758,666 | HSIP (SAFETEA-LU | Urban minor arterial | 20,410 (2012 mainline) | 40 MPH (mainline) | MD State Highway Baltimore Co | Highway Infrastructure | Safety improvement at High Crash Location |

## Progress in Achieving Safety Performance Targets

### *Overview of General Safety Trends*

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

| Performance Measures* | [2008] | [2009] | [2010] | [2011] | [2012] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of fatalities | 623 | 604 | 581 | 548 | 527 |
| Number of serious injuries | 6077 | 5407 | 4780 | 4304 | 3895 |
| Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | 1.11 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 0.97 | 0.94 |
| Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) | 10.82 | 9.6 | 8.5 | 7.68 | 6.96 |

*States should use a 5-year rolling average to present the performance measures

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

| Function Classification | [Year] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of fatalities | Number of serious injuries | Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

**Maryland**
**Highway Safety Improvement Program**
**CY 2012 Annual Report**

| Roadway Ownership | [2010-2012] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of fatalities | Number of injuries | Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | injury rate (per HMVMT) |
| **County Rd** | | | | |
| 2010 | 113 | 9510 | 0.20 | 16.92 |
| 2011 | 109 | 9767 | 0.19 | 17.43 |
| 2012 | 130 | 9327 | 0.23 | 16.54 |
| **Government Rd** | | | | |
| 2010 | 1 | 35 | 0.002 | 0.06 |
| 2011 | 1 | 55 | 0.002 | 0.10 |
| 2012 | 2 | 38 | 0.004 | 0.07 |
| **Interstate Hwy** | | | | |
| 2010 | 47 | 3312 | 0.08 | 5.89 |
| 2011 | 60 | 3510 | 0.11 | 6.26 |
| 2012 | 63 | 3174 | 0.11 | 5.63 |
| **MD State Hwy** | | | | |
| 2010 | 205 | 14350 | 0.36 | 25.53 |
| 2011 | 227 | 14007 | 0.40 | 24.99 |
| 2012 | 220 | 14625 | 0.39 | 25.94 |
| **Municipal Rd** | | | | |
| 2010 | 41 | 7387 | 0.07 | 13.14 |
| 2011 | 9 | 7422 | 0.02 | 13.24 |
| 2012 | 4 | 7936 | 0.01 | 14.07 |
| **Other Public Rd** | | | | |
| 2010 | 1 | 128 | 0.002 | 0.23 |
| 2011 | 1 | 94 | 0.002 | 0.17 |
| 2012 | 1 | 160 | 0.002 | 0.28 |
| **Ramp** | | | | |
| 2010 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0.07 |
| 2011 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0.04 |
| 2012 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0.04 |
| **Service Rd** | | | | |
| 2010 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0.07 |
| 2011 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0.03 |
| 2012 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0.03 |
| **US Hwy** | | | | |
| 2010 | 78 | 4050 | 0.14 | 7.21 |
| 2011 | 54 | 3858 | 0.10 | 6.88 |
| 2012 | 56 | 3750 | 0.10 | 6.65 |
| **Unknown Rd** | | | | |
| 2010 | 10 | 1582 | 0.02 | 2.81 |
| 2011 | 27 | 2002 | 0.05 | 3.57 |
| 2012 | 35 | 1670 | 0.06 | 2.96 |

Describe any other aspects of the general highway safety trends on which you would like to elaborate.
0T

***Application of Special Rules***

Present the rate of traffic fatalities and serious injuries per capita for drivers and pedestrians over the age of 65.

| Older Driver Performance Measures | [Year] | [Year] | [Year] | [Year] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fatality rate (per capita) | See calculations | | | |
| Serious injury rate (per capita) | See calculations | | | |
| Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita) | See Calculations | | | |

Show your calculations.

**2005 to 2009 Driver and Pedestrian Fatal and Severe Injury 65 and older**

| Year | Accidents | Pop Figure | Rate | Years | Total Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2005 | 477 | 112 | 4.26 | 1 | |
| 2006 | 417 | 115 | 3.63 | 1 | |
| 2007 | 382 | 118 | 3.24 | 1 | |
| 2008 | 366 | 121 | 3.02 | 1 | |
| 2009 | 365 | 121 | 3.02 | 1 | |
| | | | 17.16 | 5 | **3.4** |

**2007 to 2011 Driver and Pedestrian Fatal and Severe Injury 65 and older**

| Year | Accidents | Pop Figure | Rate | Years | Total Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2007 | 382 | 118 | 3.24 | 1 | |
| 2008 | 366 | 121 | 3.02 | 1 | |
| 2009 | 365 | 121 | 3.02 | 1 | |
| 2010 | 330 | 123 | 2.68 | 1 | |
| 2011 | 360 | 126 | 2.86 | 1 | |
| | | | 14.82 | 5 | **3.0** |

Does the older driver special rule apply to your state?
No

If yes, describe the approach to include respective strategies to address the increase in those rates in the State SHSP.
0T

## Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Improvements (Program Evaluation)

What indicators of success can you use to demonstrate effectiveness and success in the Highway Safety Improvement Program? Select all that apply.

☐B/C ratio

☐Policy change

☒Other: The effectiveness of the HSIP program will be indicated by the crash data trends. More site specific data is expected to become available in subsequent HSIP reports

What significant programmatic changes have occurred since the last reporting period? Select all that apply.

☐Shift focus to fatalities and serious injuries

☐Organizational changes

☐More systemic programs included in HSIP

☒Other: More non-infrastructure projects included in HSIP

Briefly describe significant program changes that have occurred since the last reporting period.
The significant programmatic change in the HSIP program is the inclusion of more non-infrastructure projects such as the Roadway safety Audit and the Strategic Highway Safety Program (non-construction portions) along with various MHSO public safety outreach efforts.

***SHSP Emphasis Areas***

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

| HSIP-related SHSP Emphasis Areas | Number of fatalities | Number of injuries | Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | injury rate (per HMVMT) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Distracted Driving** | | | | |
| 2008 | 290 | 31778 | 0.52 | 56.60 |
| 2009 | 252 | 30152 | 0.45 | 54.20 |
| 2010 | 249 | 28875 | 0.44 | 51.37 |
| 2011 | 231 | 29112 | 0.41 | 51.94 |
| 2012 | 246 | 28518 | 0.44 | 50.57 |
| **Impaired Driving** | | | | |
| 2008 | 145 | 4291 | 0.26 | 7.64 |
| 2009 | 162 | 4525 | 0.29 | 8.13 |
| 2010 | 177 | 4087 | 0.31 | 7.27 |
| 2011 | 181 | 4031 | 0.32 | 7.19 |
| 2012 | 173 | 4022 | 0.31 | 7.13 |
| **Aggressive Driving** | | | | |
| 2008 | 63 | 4203 | 0.11 | 7.49 |
| 2009 | 54 | 4050 | 0.10 | 7.28 |
| 2010 | 47 | 3792 | 0.08 | 6.75 |
| 2011 | 44 | 3900 | 0.08 | 6.96 |
| 2012 | 55 | 3612 | 0.10 | 6.41 |
| **Occupant Protection** | | | | |
| 2008 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 2009 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 2010 | 47 | 3792 | 0.08 | 6.75 |
| 2011 | 44 | 3900 | 0.08 | 6.96 |
| 2012 | 55 | 3612 | 0.10 | 6.41 |
| **Highway Infrastructure** | | | | |
| 2008 | 424 | 30130 | 0.76 | 53.66 |
| 2009 | 367 | 26154 | 0.66 | 47.01 |
| 2010 | 345 | 27044 | 0.61 | 48.12 |
| 2011 | 313 | 27410 | 0.56 | 48.90 |
| 2012 | 321 | 26803 | 0.57 | 47.53 |
| **Pedestrian Crashes** | | | | |
| 2008 | 115 | 2469 | 0.20 | 4.40 |
| 2009 | 111 | 2340 | 0.20 | 4.21 |
| 2010 | 101 | 2339 | 0.18 | 4.16 |
| 2011 | 105 | 2173 | 0.19 | 3.88 |
| 2012 | 96 | 2425 | 0.17 | 4.30 |

***Groups of similar project types***

Present the overall effectiveness of HSIP subprograms.

| HSIP Sub-program Types | Number of fatal accidents | Number of serious injury accidents | Fatal acc rate (per HMVMT) | Serious injury acc rate (per HMVMT) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Skid Hazard** | | | | |
| 2010 – wet surface | 55 | 486 | 0.10 | 0.86 |
| 2011 – wet surface | 63 | 566 | 0.11 | 1.01 |
| 2012 – wet surface | 67 | 410 | 0.12 | 0.73 |
| **Left Turn Crash** | | | | |
| 2010 – left turn | 22 | 268 | 0.04 | 0.48 |
| 2011 – left turn | 19 | 241 | 0.03 | 0.43 |
| 2012 – left turn | 26 | 209 | 0.05 | 0.37 |
| **Intersection Crash** | | | | |
| 2010 – int related | 109 | 1189 | 0.19 | 2.12 |
| 2011 – int related | 105 | 1106 | 0.19 | 1.97 |
| 2012 – int related | 87 | 945 | 0.15 | 1.68 |
| **Pedestrian Safety** | | | | |
| 2010 - pedestrian | 85 | 333 | 0.15 | 0.59 |
| 2011 - pedestrian | 97 | 324 | 0.17 | 0.58 |
| 2012 - pedestrian | 88 | 305 | 0.16 | 0.54 |
| **Right Angle Crash** | | | | |
| 2010 - angle | 64 | 510 | 0.11 | 0.91 |
| 2011 - angle | 52 | 475 | 0.09 | 0.85 |
| 2012 - angle | 51 | 376 | 0.09 | 0.67 |

***Systemic Treatments***

Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

| HSIP Sub-program Types | Number of fatal accidents* | Number of serious injury accidents* | Fatality acc rate (per HMVMT)* | Serious injury acc rate (per HMVMT)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Median Barrier** | | | | |
| 2010 - opp direction | 37 | 182 | 0.07 | 0.32 |
| 2011 – opp direction | 50 | 164 | 0.09 | 0.29 |
| 2012 – opp direction | 55 | 135 | 0.10 | 0.24 |
| **Horizontal Curve** | | | | |
| 2010 – run off road | 24 | 135 | 0.04 | 0.24 |
| 2011 – run off road | 34 | 147 | 0.06 | 0.26 |
| 2012 – run off road | 44 | 113 | 0.08 | 0.20 |
| **Roadway Departure** | | | | |
| 2010 – run off road | 24 | 135 | 0.04 | 0.24 |
| 2011 – run off road | 34 | 147 | 0.06 | 0.26 |
| 2012 – run off road | 44 | 113 | 0.08 | 0.20 |

*For the target crash type.

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

**Note 1:** "Functional classification and ownership" information was not available at report time
**Note 2**: All injuries were used instead of severe injuries for the "Roadway Ownership" tables used in lieu of unavailable (at report time) severe injury totals.
**Note 3**: Fatal accident and severe injury accident totals were used in lieu of unavailable (at report time) fatality and severe injury totals for "HSIP Sub Program" and "Systemic Treatment" worksheets
**Note 4**: All injuries were used instead of severe injuries for the "SHSP Emphasis Areas" tables in order to maintain consistency with the MD SHSP injuries goals.

Provide project evaluation data for completed projects (optional).
[Insert project evaluation table]