

Highway Safety Improvement Program Data Driven Decisions

Pennsylvania Highway Safety Improvement Program 2016 Annual Report

Prepared by: PA

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."

Table of Contents

| Disclaimerii |
|--|
| Executive Summary1 |
| Introduction |
| Program Structure |
| Program Administration2 |
| Program Methodology5 |
| Progress in Implementing Projects |
| Funds Programmed15 |
| General Listing of Projects |
| Progress in Achieving Safety Performance Targets |
| Overview of General Safety Trends41 |
| Application of Special Rules |
| Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Improvements (Program Evaluation) |
| SHSP Emphasis Areas |
| Groups of similar project types63 |
| Systemic Treatments |
| Project Evaluation |
| Glossary |

Executive Summary

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation is pleased to present this Annual Report of our progress with the Highway Safety Improvement Program.

In 2015, 1,200 people lost their lives on Pennsylvania's roadways - an increase of five fatalities since last year's record low since record keeping began in the 1920s. But we have miles to go to reach our ultimate goal of zero deaths on our roads, and our journey includes ongoing work on both the behavioral side of crash causations as well as continuing to improve our highway infrastructure.

Since the last Annual Report, we have maintained our progress on several key initiatives. Pennsylvania completed research for Regionalized SPFs in January 2016. These new SPFs have been added to a Pennsylvania specific HSM analytical tool. PennDOT is currently in the process of updating Publication 638, The District Highway Safety Guidance Manual, to include these new SPFs along with the new FAST Act rules for HSIP funding criteria and updates to our crash data reporting tools. We will also be working to update several publications to incorporate the concepts of the Highway Safety Manual into our policies and practices. PennDOT has began holding Pennsylvania specific Highway Safety Manual training courses which cover not only the manual but also different tools to use and when to use them. This class gives practical examples and then allows attendees to use the revised PennDOT tool to perform HSM analysis. As shown later in this report, many of our engineering districts are planning and completing projects associated with the Intersection Safety Implementation and Roadway Departure Safety Implementation Plans. PennDOT is working on a new sharepoint application process to ensure better tracking of HSIP funding applications from the engineering districts and soon the Area Planning partners. This will help ensure applications are complete and reviewed by both PennDOT and its area planning partners. The new HSIP application program is expected to go live by the end of 2016. PennDOT is also in the process of creating a new SHSP for 2016. A Safety Summit meeting was held early in 2016 to kick the SHSP process off. Steering committees, which include a wide variety of safety stakeholders, are ongoing to determine new goals and targets for Pennsylvania. The new 2016 SHSP will be completed by December 2016.

While there remains much work required to reach our goal of reducing highway fatalities by half by 2030, we remain encouraged by the progress that has been made and the opportunities for the future.

Introduction

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. As per 23 U.S.C. 148(h) and 23 CFR 924.15, States are

required to report annually on the progress being made to advance HSIP implementation and evaluation efforts. The format of this report is consistent with the HSIP MAP-21 Reporting Guidance dated February 13, 2013 and consists of four sections: program structure, progress in implementing HSIP projects, progress in achieving safety performance targets, and assessment of the effectiveness of the improvements.

Program Structure

Program Administration

How are Highway Safety Improvement Program funds allocated in a State?

Other-Central and District offices, along with area planning partners

Describe how local roads are addressed as part of Highway Safety Improvement Program.

Local roadways – those not owned and maintained by the Commonwealth – make up two-thirds of the approximately 120,000 miles of highways in Pennsylvania. These roads are owned by the 2,561 municipalities across the state. In recent years, 16.6% of fatalities and 25% of reportable crashes have occurred on the local road network. While local road fatalities have been generally decreasing over the last decade (see chart below), the fatality numbers have recently held steady just above 200/year and addressing safety issues on these roads will be an integral part of meeting our highway safety goals.

PennDOT is currently expanding programs to address safety on local roads. Basic guidance for local road safety is provided in Section 2.11 of Publication 638. This PennDOT document primarily refers stakeholders to the Department's Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP), which offers free support to municipalities. In addition to training and on-call technical assistance, LTAP administers three location-specific safety programs:

- The <u>Local Safe Roads Communities Program (LSRCP)</u> involves the examination of roadway safety issues within a community. This is followed up by a report with suggested options for future detailed studies.
- The <u>Walkable Communities Program</u> followed a similar procedure to the LSRCP but was focused on pedestrian safety within the municipality. This program is no longer being funded and has been closed by LTAP since December 31, 2015. However the completed reports are still available for municipalities to implement safety recommendations.
- The new <u>PennDOT Directed Technical Assistance Program</u> will identify targeted municipalities and analyze crash data to identify locations within the targeted municipality where opportunities for low cost safety improvements exist. This program in many cases will be a follow up to the LSRCP reports. The final report for the technical assists will result in itemized safety countermeasures ready for a

construction contract that can then be bid on by contractors. (This pilot program started January 1, 2016.)

The aforementioned programs are free to municipalities who choose to participate. LTAP has completed 112 Local Safe Road Communities Reports, 40 Walkable Communities Reports, and 2 PennDOT Directed Technical Assist Reports to date. Safety projects on local roads are eligible for HSIP funding and can follow the same selection criteria as state-owned roads. The recommendations from the Local Safe Road Communities & Walkable Communities programs are eligible. The implementation of the safety countermeasures recommended by these reports has been limited in the past due to the contract administration difficulties associated with federal-aid municipal projects, absence of local funds, or limitations on Department staffing resources to support local road project delivery.

Local roads make up a significant portion of the Commonwealth's highway mileage and experience a large fraction of the fatalities, injuries and reportable crashes. In order to reach our highway safety goals of reducing fatalities and serious injuries by half by the year 2030, Pennsylvania will need to incorporate local road safety into our planning and project selection. **OPTIONS:**

Several options were identified for increasing the consideration of local roads in the planning of safety projects. The following two options were determined to be the best options since both can use HSIP funds:

- Create District-wide or regional contracts for local road improvements similar to the Intersection Safety Implementation Plan (ISIP) and Roadway Departure Implementation Plan RDIP packaged projects Districts have already completed on State routes. The Local Safe Road Communities & Walkable Communities Reports will be utilized to determine the project locations. PennDOT Directed Technical Assistance Reports will then be used to determine itemized, specific low cost safety improvements. The detailed quantities from the PennDOT Directed Technical Assist reports will be used to create a biddable contract in ECMS.
- Create site-specific contacts to address significant safety issues at local road locations.

CURRENT DIRECTION:

Proceed with district-wide or regional contracts that will implement several low cost safety improvements at many different locations based on recommendations from PennDOT Directed Technical Assist Reports. Hire a consultant to develop contract documents and work with the Engineering Districts to obtain necessary project clearances such as ROW, utilities, and environmental.

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

Design Planning Maintenance Operations Governors Highway Safety Office Other-Engineering Districts, Planning Organizations, Program Center

Briefly describe coordination with internal partners.

PennDOT Engineering Districts utilize a data-driven analysis process to identify eligible projects and collaborate with regional Planning Organizations to develop a program of safety infrastructure projects. This process was designed to improve highway safety using data-driving project development methods and to fulfill the requirements of Section 148 of MAP-21. The Engineering Districts and regional planning partners are required to submit HSIP project applications to PennDOT's central Highway Safety Section for review and approval. Each District, in coordination with area planning partners, is required to utilize the following three step selection process in programming Section 148 (HSIP) projects:

1. Select projects that contain locations listed on the Statewide High Crash Locations (SHCL) priority ranking. Low cost to high cost improvement options can be considered at these locations.

2. Systematic implementation of proven low cost countermeasures.

- OR -

A project location listed in the Intersection Safety Implementation Plan (ISIP) or Roadway Departure Safety Implementation Plan (RDIP)

- OR -

A District may program locations identified on the Planning Organization lists. The Planning Organization Lists are developed from the same methodology as the Statewide High Crash Location Lists but with lower crash thresholds to allow for the identification of 25 locations overall in each Planning Organization.

3. Projects not meeting the above criteria may be programmed, but first must be approved by the Highway Safety Section Chief & The Center for Program Development & Management. Such approval requests must include the following information:

1) Project Information such as scope, costs and estimated completion dates.

2) The projected safety benefit of the proposed project using data driven safety analysis such as the Highway Safety Manual or B/C methods.

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

Metropolitan Planning Organizations Governors Highway Safety Office Other-MAST Team - See Question 8 for description Other-FHWA PA Division Office

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

Other-MAST meets quarterly to track SHSP implementation and discuss highway safety related topics including the HSIP. MAST includes PennDOT, FHWA, State Police, Liquor Control Board, Dept of Health, Dept of Education and Dept of Drug-Alcohol Programs.

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

The HSIP Program fully aligns with the 2012 Pennsylvania Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). Within this Plan, Infrastructure Improvements are identified as the third of seven "Vital Safety Focus Areas". Key components of this effort are to:

- Reduce Head-On and Cross-Median Crashes
- Improve Intersection Safety
- Reduce Run-Off-Road Crashes
- Reduce the Severity and Frequency of Hit Fixed Object Crashes

Note that the Pennsylvania SHSP is currently being revised this calendar year and is expected to be implemented in December 2016. The strategies and targets in the new SHSP will be discussed in next year's HSIP report.

Program Methodology

Select the programs that are administered under the HSIP.

Median Barrier Bicycle Safety Roadway Departure Pedestrian Safety Intersection Rural State Highways Low-Cost Spot Improvements Left Turn Crash Horizontal Curve Skid Hazard Local Safety Shoulder Improvement

| Program: Date of Program Methodology: | Median Barrier 2/1/2009 | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| What data types were used in th | e program methodology? | |
| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
| All crashes | | Median width |
| | | Other-median slopes/cross- |
| | | section |
| | | |

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? No

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

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

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History1

| Program: | Intersection |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Date of Program Methodology: | 9/1/2009 |

What data types were used in the program methodology?

| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| All crashes | | |

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

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

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

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History1

| Program: Date of Program Metho | Horizontal Curve dology: 2/1/2009 | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| What data types were u | sed in the program methodology | ? |
| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
| All crashes | | Roadside features |

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

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

Available funding

Potential for Improvement based 1 on Crash History

| Program: Date of Program Methodology: | Bicycle Safety 2/1/2009 | |
|--|---|--|
| What data types were used in th | e program methodo | blogy? |
| <i>Crashes</i> All crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
| What project identification meth Crash frequency | nodology was used f | or this program? |
| Are local roads (non-state owner Yes | d and operated) incl | uded or addressed in this program? |
| If yes, are local road projects ider Yes | ntified using the sam | e methodology as state roads? |
| How are highway safety improve selection committee | ement projects adva | nced for implementation? |
| Select the processes used to price the relative importance of each rankings. If weights are entered, both processes the same rank are Rank of Priority Consideration | pritize projects for in process in project p the sum must equa nd skip the next high | nplementation. For the methods selected, indicate ioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical I 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving sest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4). |
| Available funding | 2 | |
| Potential for Improvement I on Crash History | based 1 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Program: | Rural State Highwa | avs |

Date of Program Methodology: 10/1/2012

| What data types were used in the program methodology? | | | |
|---|----------|--|--|
| Crashes | Exposure | | |
| All crashes | | | |

Roadway

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

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

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

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History1

| Program: | Skid Hazard | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Date of Program Methodology: | 2/1/2009 | |
| What data types were used in the | e program methodology? | |
| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
| All crashes | | |
| What project identification meth | odology was used for this program? | |
| Crash frequency | | |
| Are local roads (non-state owned | l and operated) included or addresse | ed in this program? |
| Yes | | |
| | | |

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

Select the processes used to prioritize projects for implementation. For the methods selected, indicate the relative importance of each process in project prioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical

rankings. If weights are entered, the sum must equal 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving both processes the same rank and skip the next highest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4). Rank of Priority Consideration

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History1

| Program: | Roadway Departure | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Date of Program Methodology: | 2/1/2009 | |
| What data types were used in th | e program methodolog | y? |
| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
| All crashes | | |
| What project identification meth | odology was used for t | his program? |
| Crash frequency | | |
| Are local roads (non-state owned | l and operated) include | d or addressed in this program? |
| Yes | | |
| If yes, are local road projects iden | tified using the same me | ethodology as state roads? |
| Yes | | |
| How are highway safety improve | ment projects advance | d for implementation? |
| coloction committee | | |

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).

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History

What data types were used in the program methodology?

| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| All crashes | | |

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

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

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

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History

| Program: Date of Program Methodology: | Local Safety 2/1/2009 | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| What data types were used in th | ne program methodology? | |
| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
| All crashes | | Functional classification |

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

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation?

selection committee

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

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History1

| Program: | Pedestrian Safety |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Date of Program Methodology: | 2/1/2009 |

What data types were used in the program methodology?

| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| All crashes | | |

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

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

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

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History1

| Program: Date of Program Methodology: | Left Turn Crash 2/1/2009 | |
|--|---|--|
| What data types were used in the | e program methodo | blogy? |
| Crashes All crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
| What project identification meth Crash frequency | odology was used f | or this program? |
| Are local roads (non-state owned Yes | and operated) incl | uded or addressed in this program? |
| If yes, are local road projects iden Yes | tified using the sam | e methodology as state roads? |
| How are highway safety improve selection committee | ment projects adva | nced for implementation? |
| Select the processes used to prio the relative importance of each p rankings. If weights are entered, both processes the same rank an Rank of Priority Consideration | ritize projects for in rocess in project pr the sum must equa d skip the next high | nplementation. For the methods selected, indicate ioritization. Enter either the weights or numerical I 100. If ranks are entered, indicate ties by giving lest rank (as an example: 1, 2, 2, 4). |
| Available funding | 2 | |
| Potential for Improvement b on Crash History | ased 1 | |
| | | |

| Program: | Shoulder Improvement |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Date of Program Methodology: | 2/1/2009 |
| | |

What data types were used in the program methodology?

| Crashes | Exposure | Roadway |
|-------------|----------|---------|
| All crashes | | |

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

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

How are highway safety improvement projects advanced for implementation? selection committee

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

Available funding2Potential for Improvement based1on Crash History

What proportion of highway safety improvement program funds address systemic improvements?

25%

Highway safety improvement program funds are used to address which of the following systemic improvements?

Cable Median Barriers Rumble Strips Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation Pavement/Shoulder Widening Install/Improve Signing Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation Upgrade Guard Rails Clear Zone Improvements Safety Edge Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal

What process is used to identify potential countermeasures?

Engineering Study Road Safety Assessment Other-RDIP, ISIP, and other specific countermeasure crash lists that include high tension cable median barriers and wrong way crash lists

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

Highway Safety Manual

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

Research is complete for the Regionalized Safety Performance Functions. PennDOT is currently in the process of updating our *Highway Safety Guidance Manual*, (Publication 638) to reflect the new SPFs. These new SPFs cover 15 different types of intersections and segments. we are also finishing work for Interstate SPFs. PennDOT is working with Penn State University and the PA Turnpike to develop the interstate SPFs. The regionalized SPFs will therefore provide more accurate results.

The Pennsylvania-specific HSM workbook has been developed and has been introduced through the HSM training sessions and STIC innovation days. While not yet a formal requirement for projects, staff in the engineering districts and the regional planning partners (MPOs) have been using the worksheet and providing feedback.

While the HSM initiatives have not yet reached the level of implementation that will allow us to realize direct results, we are optimistic that in the coming years we will begin to see an improvement in safety numbers and the types and quality of safety projects coming through the programs.

Progress in Implementing Projects

Funds Programmed

Reporting period for Highway Safety Improvement Program funding.

State Fiscal Year

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

| Funding Category | Programmed* | | Obligated | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------|------------------|------|
| HSIP (Section 148) | \$92,485,000.00 | 90 % | \$90,149,800.31 | 90 % |
| HRRRP (SAFETEA-LU) | \$0.00 | 0 % | \$0.00 | 0 % |
| HRRR Special Rule | \$0.00 | 0 % | \$0.00 | 0 % |
| Penalty Transfer - Section 154 | \$0.00 | 0 % | \$0.00 | 0 % |
| Penalty Transfer – Section 164 | \$0.00 | 0 % | \$0.00 | 0 % |
| Incentive Grants - Section 163 | \$0.00 | 0 % | \$0.00 | 0 % |
| Incentive Grants (Section 406) | \$0.00 | 0 % | \$0.00 | 0 % |
| State and Local Funds | \$10,000,000.00 | 10 % | \$10,000,000.00 | 10 % |
| Totals | \$102,485,000.00 | 100% | \$100,149,800.31 | 100% |

How much funding is programmed to local (non-state owned and operated) safety projects? \$500,000.00 How much funding is obligated to local safety projects? \$0.00

How much funding is programmed to non-infrastructure safety projects? 0 % How much funding is obligated to non-infrastructure safety projects? 0 % How much funding was transferred in to the HSIP from other core program areas during the reporting period?

0%

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

0 %

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

There are a few Engineering Districts that have struggled in the project development of HSIP funded safety project. This results in several projects missing let dates and HSIP funds not being used for those projects in the planned years. We then rush to find other projects that other Engineering Districts can develop quickly and let for construction. To overcome these project delivery issues, the Highway Safety Section is working with PennDOT's Bureau of Project Delivery to track the milestones of HSIP projects to ensure design project mangers stay on schedule to deliver good safety improvement projects on time. A District's past project delivery track record may also become part of a weighted criteria for HSIP set aside project selection.

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

Research is complete for Pennsylvania's Regionalized Safety Performance Functions. PennDOT is currently in the process of updating our *Highway Safety Guidance Manual*, (Publication 638) to reflect the new regional SPFs. These new SPFs cover 15 different types of intersections and segments. We are also finishing work for Interstate SPFs. PennDOT is working with Penn State University and the PA Turnpike to develop the interstate SPFs. Penn State's research shows the regionalized SPFs will provide more accurate analysis results than the AASHTO HSM in Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania-specific HSM workbook has been developed and has been introduced through the Pennsylvania Specific HSM training sessions and STIC innovation days. While not yet a formal requirement for projects, staff in the engineering districts and the regional planning partners (MPOs) have been using the workbook and providing feedback. PennDOT also encourages the Districts and Planning Partners to use other HSM tools available at the National HSM website like IHSDM and ISATe. As a member state of the HSM-PFS, Pennsylvania also looks forward to using the new HSM Safety Performance for Intersection Control Evaluation (SPICE) tool that is in development and should be completed in late 2017 or early 2018. This SPICE tool will focus specifically on intersection operations and how they affect safety. The tool will be similar to CAP-X which is used for high level capacity analysis. The SPICE tool will allow PennDOT to do a high level evaluations of intersections for safety along with capacity evaluations and choose the best options to pursue early in the planning & programing process.

PennDOT is also looking at creating a new way to develop priority location lists using HSM methodologies from Chapter 4 for the AASHTO HSM. This involves evaluating new crash data systems from various vendors. This process is under way.

While the HSM initiatives have not yet reached the level of implementation that will allow us to realize direct results, we are optimistic that in the coming years we will begin to see an improvement in safety numbers and the types and quality of safety projects coming through the programs.

General Listing of Projects

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

| Project | Improveme nt Category | Outpu t | HSIP Cost | Total Cost | Funding Categor | Functional Classificati | AAD T | Spee d | Roadway Ownershi | Relationship | to SHSP |
|---|--|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| | | | | | y | on | | | р | Emphasis Area | Strateg y |
| US 6 Center Turn Lane | Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add two-way left-turn lane | 0.67 Miles | 1209000 | 2980860 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 1066 2 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| Philipsburg Add Center Ln | Intersection geometry Auxiliary lanes - add two-way left-turn lane | 1.47 Miles | 724436 | 1087718 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 9305 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 26/45 Shingletown Intersection | Interchange design Interchange design - other | 1.45 Miles | 50000 | 500000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 6466 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 118 & Idetown Rd. | Interchange design Interchange design - other | 0.08 Miles | 20000 | 1630819 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 6448 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |

| US22 Frankstown Intrsctns Hamot Rd/Oliver Rd Intersection | Interchange design Interchange design - other Interchange design Interchange design - other | 1.42 Miles 0.23 Miles | 3719263 300000 | 7692040 300000 | HSIP (Section 148) HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other Urban Minor Collector | 5982 5528 | 35 40 | State Highway Agency State Highway Agency | Intersection s Intersection s | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--------------|----------|--|--|--|
| SR 64/550 Intersection Improvement | Interchange design Interchange design - other | 0.38 Miles | 300000 | 300000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 6588 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| Big "I" Roundabout | Interchange design Interchange design - other | 1.22 Miles | 500000 | 500000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 5902 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| PA 68/Dolby Street Intersection | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.75 Miles | 360000 | 975000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 5240 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| Nyes/Dvnshre Hts Safety | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.18 Miles | 300000 | 400000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Collector | 1169 9 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 183/4016 (Schaeffers) | Intersection geometry Intersection | 0.88 Miles | 433192 | 2308343 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 1268 1 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |

| | geometry - other | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------|----------|---------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Blaktwn Rd/Irshtwn Rd/208 | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 1.02 Miles | 28355.14 | 1617852 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 9191 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 222 - 863 Early Action | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 1.15 Miles | 282594 | 762594 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 1143 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| PA 116 and Oxford Ave | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.2 Miles | 620780 | 1138280 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Collector | 6565 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| US11 & PA997 Intersection | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 2.08 Miles | 1100000 | 1595226 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 1005 1 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| US119/PA 310 Intersection | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.69 Miles | 1908 | 1696177 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 4748 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| Hbg. Pike/ Dillerville Rd | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 3.73 Miles | 3145933 | 3900933 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 1585 1 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| US222/322 | Intersection | 1.19 | 500000 | 575000 | HSIP | Urban | 1485 | 35 | State | Intersection | |

| Interchange Imp | geometry Intersection geometry - other | Miles | | | (Section 148) | Principal Arterial - Other | 8 | | Highway Agency | S | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| SR 73/662 Corridor Safety | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 1.34 Miles | 202500 | 2163501 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 8084 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| PA 145 and SR 329 | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.6 Miles | 1722250 | 2371475 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 9836 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| US220/SR4018 Intersection | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.25 Miles | 1153600 | 1153600 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1228 8 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| US220 & PA199 Int | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.22 Miles | 900000 | 2390000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 2638 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| 873 & Best Station Road | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.21 Miles | 114165 | 307318 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 7443 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| ISIP Open End Project | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - | 0 Miles | 1575000 | 4782337 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |

| | other | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| DW ISIP Signal Impr-2015 | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0 Miles | 1681785 | 1382633 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 11/SR 3023& Birch, SR 11& Hickory, SR 3023& Elm | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.26 Miles | 617174 | 804029 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 8698 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 89 & SR 430 Intersection | Intersection geometry Intersection geometry - other | 0.44 Miles | 90000 | 90000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 2299 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| Dunmore Signal Network | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 1.22 Miles | 324338 | 1074927 5 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1817 1 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR61/209 Intersection | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 3.65 Miles | 185000 | 462155 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 9654 | 50 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| PA268/SR1038 Intersection | Intersection traffic control | 0.37 Miles | 839 | 3594690 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - | 1296 4 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |

| | Intersection traffic control - other | | | | | Other | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 248/946 Intersctn Impr Berlinsville | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.14 Miles | 145300 | 2060033 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1021 6 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| Mount Zion Rd Improvement | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 2.76 Miles | 841600 | 1129600 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1489 6 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 248 and Walnut Drive | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.12 Miles | 782180 | 1416905 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1026 7 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| 422 & Ramona Rd Intersect | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 1.07 Miles | 430000 | 2693109 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1473 9 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 19: 5 Leg Intersection | Intersection traffic | 0.69 Miles | 16000 | 1687232 | HSIP (Section | Rural Minor Arterial | 6348 | 35 | State Highway | Intersection s | |

| Mount Hope Intrscn Improv | control Intersection traffic control - other Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - | 0.39 Miles | 500000 | 500000 | 148) HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 1843 | 35 | Agency State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
|------------------------------|--|---------------|--------|--------|----------------------------------|---|-----------|----|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| PA462 Signal Improvements | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 7.59 Miles | 125000 | 125000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1489 6 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR2016 at RiverAve Signal | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.03 Miles | 443210 | 595000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 8930 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| Carson Valley ITS Improve | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 2.17 Miles | 300500 | 300500 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 5496 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |

2016 Pennsylvania Highway Safety Improvement Program

| ISIP Signals Project | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.13 Miles | 2139156 | 2139156 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 7272 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
|--|---|---------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| District Signal Upgrades | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.59 Miles | 675800 | 725800 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1365 4 | 30 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 18/Rutledge Rd Intersection | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 3.12 Miles | 100000 | 100000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 5122 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| US 62/State St Intersection | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 2.16 Miles | 650000 | 650000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressway s | 2875 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| PA 98/Sterrettania Rd Intersection | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic | 1.9 Miles | 180000 | 180000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 1952 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |

| | control - other | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--------|--------------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|--------------------|--|
| 2018 ISIP Signalized Intersections | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.54 Miles | 30000 | 30000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 3560 | 20 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 18/Edgewood Dr Intersection | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.68 Miles | 90000 | 90000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 4558 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| SR 18 & SR 518 Intersection | Intersection traffic control Intersection traffic control - other | 0.19 Miles | 70000 | 70000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 9141 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Intersection s | |
| PA 88/51 Brdge/Safety Imp | Miscellaneo us | 1.25 Miles | 195000 | 1128989 9 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1312 1 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Infrastructu re | |
| B&C TO STOCKPILE | Miscellaneo us | 0.52 Miles | 160 | 4343994 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 7691 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Infrastructu re | |
| Slipery Rock Rd/Swamp Run | Miscellaneo us | 0.13 Miles | 2000 | 1717673 | HSIP (Section | Rural Minor Arterial | 3308 | 40 | State Highway | Infrastructu re | |

| | | | | | 148) | | | | Agency | | |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------|--------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|--------------------|--|
| SR 61 ov Susquehanna Rvr | Miscellaneo us | 1.24 Miles | 59700 | 1659200 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 3720 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Infrastructu re | |
| Dist 12-15-RSA | Miscellaneo us | 19.26 Miles | 497262 | 497262 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 2622 | 50 | State Highway Agency | Infrastructu re | |
| New Falls Rd HSIP | Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneo us pedestrians and bicyclists | 2.72 Miles | 630000 | 630000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 1284 3 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Pedestrians | |
| Robbins Ave ISIP | Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneo us pedestrians and bicyclists | 7.93 Miles | 175000 | 1318582 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 6849 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Pedestrians | |
| Cottman Ave ISIP | Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneo us pedestrians and bicyclists | 6.7 Miles | 280000 | 1255000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 9779 | 30 | State Highway Agency | Pedestrians | |

2016 Pennsylvania Highway Safety Improvement Program

| Levick Street ISIP | Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneo us pedestrians and bicyclists | 2.01 Miles | 344050 | 1077486 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1475 1 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Pedestrians | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Ridge Avenue ISIP | Pedestrians and bicyclists Miscellaneo us pedestrians and bicyclists | 1.63 Miles | 420000 | 420000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Collector | 7586 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Pedestrians | |
| Broad St. RR Grade Xing | Railroad grade crossings Railroad grade crossings - other | 0 Miles | 399000 | 959000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Vehicle- Train Safety | |
| Martins RdtoChristians Rd | Roadside Roadside - other | 1.77 Miles | 125000 | 1266100 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1184 0 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Post & Cable Guide Rail | Roadside Roadside - other | 6.92 Miles | 1111741 | 1236741 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 4886 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Post & Cable Guide Rail | Roadside Roadside - other | 1.7 Miles | 94734 | 231734 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 5497 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

| Cable Median Barrier | Roadside Roadside - other | 13.63 Miles | 18560 | 800000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressway s | 1055 8 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| PA 115 Edge Line Rumble Strips | Roadside Roadside - other | 4.22 Miles | 10000 | 10000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 4917 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Mercer Tree Removal | Roadside Roadside - other | 9.38 Miles | 370036 | 370036 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1162 2 | 70 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Erie Tree Removal | Roadside Roadside - other | 14.87 Miles | 383525 | 383525 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 9295 | 70 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Northwest Tree Removal | Roadside Roadside - other | 18 Miles | 436689 | 436689 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 1679 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| I-90 Cable Median | Roadside Roadside - other | 28.63 Miles | 30000 | 1230000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1461 2 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 0652 Shoulders / ELRS | Roadside Roadside - other | 2.34 Miles | 10000 | 412804 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 7051 | 50 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Dist. GuideRail Upgrade | Roadside Roadside - other | 14 Miles | 1000000 | 1000000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 763 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Cable Guide Rail | Roadside | 9.52 | 570000 | 570000 | HSIP | Rural Major | 916 | 35 | State | Roadway | |

| Updates | Roadside - other | Miles | | | (Section 148) | Collector | | | Highway Agency | Departure | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| D9 2015 HSIP CMB | Roadside Roadside - other | 53.73 Miles | 3843392 | 3843392 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 1089 3 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| District Cable Median Bar | Roadside Roadside - other | 49.22 Miles | 2950460 | 2830460 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressway s | 1104 7 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 2015/2016 Cable GR Update | Roadside Roadside - other | 20.08 Miles | 525400 | 525400 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Collector | 750 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Cable Guide Rail Removal | Roadside Roadside - other | 15.79 Miles | 700000 | 700000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 1831 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 220 Cable Guide Rail | Roadside Roadside - other | 0.6 Miles | 78000 | 78000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressway s | 8840 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 322 Cable Guide Rail | Roadside Roadside - other | 0.61 Miles | 75000 | 75000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 7589 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 322 Cable | Roadside | 1.05 | 130000 | 130000 | HSIP | Urban | 7589 | 55 | State | Roadway | |

2016 Pennsylvania Highway Safety Improvement Program

| GuideRail II | Roadside - other | Miles | 1127000 | 1127000 | (Section 148) | Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressway s | 2427 | | Highway Agency | Departure | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 15/16(F) | Roadside - other | Miles | 1127000 | 1127000 | (Section 148) | Principal Arterial - Other | 3427 | 55 | Highway Agency | Departure | |
| I-80 MCGR | Roadside Roadside - other | 2.99 Miles | 290310 | 390310 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1885 5 | 70 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| RDIP-2015 GuideRail Upg | Roadside Roadside - other | 0 Miles | 542476 | 1542476 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Tioga US15 MCGR | Roadside Roadside - other | 21.28 Miles | 1323061 | 1333061 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 6326 | 70 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| D3 CGR Replacement | Roadside Roadside - other | 0 Miles | 468638 | 508638 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Lyco US15 MCGR | Roadside Roadside - other | 28.33 Miles | 650000 | 680000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 6443 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| I-81 Median Barrier | Roadside Roadside - other | 18.27 Miles | 702983 | 702983 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1588 1 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

2016 Pennsylvania

| I-80 Median Barrier | Roadside Roadside - other | 102.7 4 Miles | 1757860 | 2850441 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1166 3 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| I-380 Median Barrier | Roadside Roadside - other | 26.51 Miles | 108570 | 227000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1492 6 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Interstate 81 CMB | Roadside Roadside - other | 9.68 Miles | 619114 | 619114 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1953 9 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 6 Cable Median Barrier | Roadside Roadside - other | 7.04 Miles | 970000 | 970000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 7157 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Rumble Strips 2016 | Roadside Roadside - other | 13.62 Miles | 484640 | 484640 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 5375 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| NEPA Cable Guiderail #3 | Roadside Roadside - other | 27.14 Miles | 877506 | 877506 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Local Road or Street | 318 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Tioga US15 MCGR 2 | Roadside Roadside - other | 9.13 Miles | 550000 | 550000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 5923 | 70 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 12 Median Barrier | Roadside Roadside - other | 3.02 Miles | 44150 | 44150 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressway | 1080 0 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| | | | | | | S | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Scotrun - Swiftwater | Roadway Roadway - other | 4.57 Miles | 6288.57 | 1553135 5 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 2511 8 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 248 Barrier Install | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.44 Miles | 263628 | 263628 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 8502 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Kennedy Drive/County Road | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.05 Miles | 20000 | 4070837 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 8044 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Exit 7 Improvements | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.61 Miles | 806218 | 2979184 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 4893 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 234 & 3001 Improvements | Roadway Roadway - other | 2.44 Miles | 252000 | 585000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 5260 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| PA 27/North St. Connector | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.48 Miles | 405000 | 9227600 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 1346 1 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 222 & Shantz & 863 Improv | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.24 Miles | 1413112 | 7109518 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 2191 3 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Beaver Run Curve | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.47 Miles | 1618000 | 2124500 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 1648 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Roosevelt Blvd. Phase2(C) | Roadway Roadway - other | 21.08 Miles | 731691.7 2 | 4910522 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 2128 7 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

| Olney:Broad- Rising Sun(C) | Roadway Roadway - other | 1.61 Miles | 1509708 | 6582868 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1093 6 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| AlleghnyAv:Ridge- Aramingo | Roadway Roadway - other | 7.33 Miles | 1155000 | 2345000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 4212 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Erie Av: Broad St. - K St(C) | Roadway Roadway - other | 2.47 Miles | 4500000 | 6194510 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 9733 | 30 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| PA31 W Somrst Corridr Imp | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.8 Miles | 4413264 | 8272509 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 7408 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Carlisle Pk/US 22 Signals | Roadway Roadway - other | 25.02 Miles | 417300 | 4956450 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1192 5 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| United High School Curve | Roadway Roadway - other | 1.36 Miles | 4847090 | 1003230 0 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 4758 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Bull Road Improvement | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.38 Miles | 770000 | 1521000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 8966 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| PA 287 to West Fourth Street | Roadway Roadway - other | 12.89 Miles | 1419106 | 2512756 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1362 2 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 209 Mt Nebo to Municipal | Roadway Roadway - other | 2.47 Miles | 191718 | 1325718 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 1602 0 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

| 51 Safety/Midwood- Edgebro | Roadway Roadway - other | 1.84 Miles | 110100 | 1470100 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 2244 4 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Colebrook Road Improvemt | Roadway Roadway - other | 3.55 Miles | 250000 | 330000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 7670 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| HATS Low Cost Safety | Roadway Roadway - other | 2.21 Miles | 825462 | 825462 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 3299 | 50 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| PA 34 Low Cost Safety | Roadway Roadway - other | 27.56 Miles | 1255958 | 1255958 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 296 | 30 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Cameron St Low Cost Safe | Roadway Roadway - other | 6.1 Miles | 372002 | 822002 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1308 8 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 5: Grngarden- Chestnut | Roadway Roadway - other | 3.58 Miles | 99000 | 1539495 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1090 9 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| RDIP Signs- Markings | Roadway Roadway - other | 29.17 Miles | 33302 | 781770 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Collector | 624 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Erie ISIP/RDIP Systematic | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 339072 | 439072 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Mercer ISIP/RDIP System | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 252368 | 352368 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| NW ISIP/RDIP Systematic | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 302005 | 402005 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

2016 Pennsylvania Highway Safety Improvement Program

| SR 115-Effort- Corridr Imp 2005 Corridor Improvement | Roadway Roadway - other Roadway Roadway - other | 1.17 Miles 2.06 Miles | 185620 626000 | 185620 2822832 | HSIP (Section 148) HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1021 4 1106 7 | 40 25 | State Highway Agency State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure Roadway Departure | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--|--|------------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| SHRP2 TIM TtT | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 160000 | 200000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 6 and SR 191 HFSurface | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.98 Miles | 484545 | 484545 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 7849 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| High Friction Surfaces(F) | Roadway Roadway - other | 6.77 Miles | 119682 | 2354682 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Collector | 4291 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Curves b/t Tivoli & Glen Mawr | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.74 Miles | 10000 | 10000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 3851 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| RDIP Open End Project | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 1575000 | 4759687 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| High Friction Surfaces 2016(C) | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 1943789 | 2793278 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Wrong Way Entry Signs | Roadway Roadway - other | 14.87 Miles | 741362 | 741362 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Interstate | 2807 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| RDIP (CableGuiderailRe pl) | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 1143056 | 1143056 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

| Wrong Way Rmp Upgrades | Roadway Roadway - other | 60.51 Miles | 140700 | 140700 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 7286 | 70 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|--|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| D10-2015 Systematic RDIP | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 216159 | 716159 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| I-80 High Frict Surf Trt | Roadway Roadway - other | 1.95 Miles | 260000 | 260000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1202 3 | 70 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| I-80 High Frict Surf Trt | Roadway Roadway - other | 2.01 Miles | 465000 | 465000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Interstate | 1203 0 | 65 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Kelly Drive Novachip(C) | Roadway Roadway - other | 5.08 Miles | 2082301 | 2082301 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1361 5 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Cobbs Creek HFS(C) | Roadway Roadway - other | 3.41 Miles | 720000 | 1218922 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1758 1 | 25 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Wrong Way Ramp Updates | Roadway Roadway - other | 3.53 Miles | 416750 | 426750 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 407 | 00 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Int/Run-off-Road Saf Imp | Roadway Roadway - other | 14.71 Miles | 525550 | 525550 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and | 1652 4 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

| | | | | | | Expressway s | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| US15 Wrong Way Ramps | Roadway Roadway - other | 7.62 Miles | 187800 | 217800 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other Freeways and Expressway s | 952 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| D3 RDIP | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 191756 | 271756 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Dist12-15RDIP-2 | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.24 Miles | 780937 | 780937 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 5356 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Dist 12-15 RDIP-3 | Roadway Roadway - other | 1.55 Miles | 1032460 | 1032460 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 4886 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| DW Systematic Impr 2015 | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 2505056 | 3035441 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 222 & 100 Ramp Pre-emptn | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.36 Miles | 2000 | 2000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Principal Arterial - Other | 1095 3 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 209 -Schafer School House | Roadway Roadway - other | 4.3 Miles | 350000 | 950000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 1031 9 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Advance Signal for SR 422 and 2077 Intersection | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.16 Miles | 8040 | 8040 | HSIP (Section 148) | Urban Minor Arterial | 4581 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

2016 Pennsylvania

| Gordon Mountain Road Truck Signing | Roadway Roadway - other | 2.26 Miles | 87352 | 136321 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Collector | 2054 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
|---|---|---------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------|---|-----------|----|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Bellefonte Interchange Safety Study | Roadway Roadway - other | 6.16 Miles | 151000 | 151000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Principal Arterial - Other | 1143 5 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| 2018 RDIP/ISIP Signing and Ped | Roadway Roadway - other | 0.64 Miles | 10000 | 10000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Minor Arterial | 2160 | 55 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| Municipal Safety LTAP | Roadway Roadway - other | 0 Miles | 500000 | 500000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Various | 0 | 0 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 0739 Shld Widen / ELRS | Shoulder treatments Shoulder treatments - other | 2.36 Miles | 915500 | 7061000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 3720 | 40 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 739 Should / Widening | Shoulder treatments Shoulder treatments - other | 1.86 Miles | 126000 | 645000 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 1114 | 35 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |
| SR 11 Shoulder / ELRS. | Shoulder treatments Shoulder treatments - other | 3.11 Miles | 212945.6 5 | 751140 | HSIP (Section 148) | Rural Major Collector | 1865 | 45 | State Highway Agency | Roadway Departure | |

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* | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Number of fatalities | 1365 | 1329 | 1277 | 1265 | 1240 |
| Number of serious injuries | 3693 | 3556 | 3432 | 3340 | 3235 |
| Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | 1.31 | 1.3 | 1.27 | 1.27 | 1.24 |
| Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) | 3.55 | 3.48 | 3.41 | 3.34 | 3.24 |

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







Number of Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years 5-yr Average Measure Data







Rate of Serious Injuries for the Last Five Years 5-yr Average Measure Data

To the maximum extent possible, present performance measure* data by functional classification and ownership.

| Function Classification | Number of fatalities | Number of serious injuries | Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| RURAL PRINCIPAL | 55 | 108 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| | | | | |
| | 100 | 185 | 0.1 | 0.19 |
| ARTERIAL - OTHER | | | | |
| | 156 | 313 | 0.16 | 0.31 |
| ARTERIAL | | | | |
| | 52 | 126 | 0.05 | 0.13 |
| COLLECTOR | | | | |
| RURAL MAJOR | 121 | 273 | 0.12 | 0.27 |
| COLLECTOR | | | | |
| RURAL LOCAL ROAD OR | 27 | 71 | 0.03 | 0.07 |
| STREET | | | | |
| URBAN PRINCIPAL | 69 | 151 | 0.07 | 0.15 |
| ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE | | | | |
| URBAN PRINCIPAL | 33 | 80 | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| ARTERIAL - OTHER | | | | |
| EXPRESSWAYS | | | | |
| | | | | |

| URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER | 209 | 590 | 0.21 | 0.59 |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|------|
| URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL | 135 | 378 | 0.14 | 0.38 |
| URBAN MINOR COLLECTOR | 62 | 186 | 0.06 | 0.19 |
| URBAN LOCAL ROAD OR STREET | 7 | 32 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| OTHER | 213 | 754 | 0.21 | 0.76 |

Fatalities by Roadway Functional Classification 5-yr Average Measure Data



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



47

Fatality Rate by Roadway Functional Classification 5-yr Average Measure Data



Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Functional Classification 5-yr Average Measure Data



| Roadway Ownership | Number of fatalities | Number of serious injuries | Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| STATE HIGHWAY AGENCY | 1017 | 2479 | 1.02 | 2.48 |
| COUNTY HIGHWAY AGENCY | 7 | 19 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| CITY OF MUNICIPAL HIGHWAY AGENCY | 198 | 694 | 0.2 | 0.69 |
| PRIVATE (OTHER THAN RAILROAD) | 1 | 6 | | 0.01 |
| STATE TOLL AUTHORITY | 17 | 46 | 0.02 | 0.05 |

Number of Fatalities by Roadway Ownership 5-yr Average Measure Data



Number of Serious Injuries by Roadway Ownership 5-yr Average Measure Data



Fatality Rate by Roadway Ownership 5-yr Average Measure Data



Serious Injury Rate by Roadway Ownership 5-yr Average Measure Data



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

2015 Vehicle Miles Traveled was available and used for this Report.

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 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Performance Measures | | | | | |
| Fatality rate (per capita) | 0.062 | 0.082 | 0.102 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Serious injury rate (per capita) | 0.074 | 0.098 | 0.124 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita) | 0.134 | 0.176 | 0.222 | 0.222 | 0.224 |

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

Older Persons Per 1000 Population before 2008 was not provided by FHWA. Therefore the annual performance measure data was not populated for 2006 and 2007. This directly affects the 5-yr data for years 2010 and 2011 as skewed because full 5-yr historical data is not available before 2012.

Here is the calculation used for deriving the Fatality and serious injury rate (per capita):

((Older Driver Fatalities + Older Pedestrian Fatalities)/Older Persons Per 1000 Population)

+

((Older Driver Serious Injuries + Older Pedestrian Serious Injuries)/Older Persons Per 1000 Population)

Rate of Fatalities and Serious injuries for the Last Five Years 5-yr Average Measure Data



Does the older driver special rule apply to your state?

No

Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Improvements (Program Evaluation)

What indicators of success can you use to demonstrate effectiveness and success in the Highway Safety Improvement Program?

Other-Application of proven safety Countermeasures like HFST and rumble strips.

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

Include Local Roads in Highway Safety Improvement Program

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

The changes for local roads are described in detail in section 1.4, "Local Roads".

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 | Target Crash Type | Number of fatalities | Number of serious injuries | Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) | Other- 1 | Other- 2 | Other- 3 | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Roadway Departure | Run-off-road | 742 | 1433 | 0.74 | 1.44 | | | | |
| Intersections | Intersections | 266 | 977 | 0.27 | 0.98 | | | | |
| Pedestrians | Vehicle/pedestrian | 157 | 279 | 0.16 | 0.28 | | | | |
| Bicyclists | Vehicle/bicycle | 15 | 58 | 0.02 | 0.06 | | | | |
| Older Drivers | Older Driver | 275 | 478 | 0.28 | 0.48 | | | | |
| Motorcyclists | Motorcycle | 191 | 520 | 0.19 | 0.52 | | | | |
| Work Zones | Work Zone | 21 | 41 | 0.02 | 0.04 | | | | |

















Groups of similar project types

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

| HSIP Sub-program | Target Crash Type | Number of | Number of | Fatality rate | Serious injury rate | Other- | Other- | Other- | |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--|
| Types | | fatalities | serious injuries | (per HMVMT) | (per HMVMT) | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Shoulder | Run-off-road | 742 | 1433 | 0.74 | 0.28 | | | | |
| Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| Roadway | Run-off-road | 742 | 1433 | 0.74 | 1.44 | | | | |
| Departure | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Safety | Local Road (Only) | 206 | 717 | 0.21 | 0.72 | | | | |
| Pedestrian Safety | Vehicle/pedestrian | 157 | 279 | 0.16 | 0.28 | | | | |
| Median Barrier | Cross median | 14 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.01 | | | | |
| Intersection | Intersections | 266 | 977 | 0.27 | 0.98 | | | | |
| Horizontal Curve | | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle Safety | Vehicle/bicycle | 15 | 58 | 0.02 | 0.06 | | | | |









Systemic Treatments

Present the overall effectiveness of systemic treatments.

| Systemic improvement | Target Crash Type | Number of fatalities | Number of serious injuries | Fatality rate (per HMVMT) | Serious injury rate (per HMVMT) | Other- 1 | Other- 2 | Other- 3 |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| Install/Improve Pavement Marking and/or Delineation | All | 1240 | 3235 | 1.24 | 3.24 | | | |
| Pavement/Shoulder Widening | Run-off-road | 742 | 1433 | 0.74 | 1.44 | | | |
| Rumble Strips | All | 1240 | 3235 | 1.24 | 3.24 | | | |
| Cable Median Barriers | Cross median | 44 | 67 | 0.04 | 0.07 | | | |
| Traffic Control Device Rehabilitation | Intersections | 266 | 977 | 0.27 | 0.98 | | | |
| Upgrade Guard Rails | Hit Guiderail | 127.8 | 244 | 0.18 | 0.24 | | | |
| Install/Improve Signing | All | 1240 | 3235 | 1.24 | 3.24 | | | |
| Add/Upgrade/Modify/Remove Traffic Signal | Intersections | 266 | 977 | 0.27 | 0.98 | | | |








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

Before the recent ruling for MAP-21 and the FAST Act, HSIP funds could be used for driver behavioral safety issues. While using funds for behavioral issues was permitted, PennDOT only used HSIP funds for infrastructure related safety improvements. All behavioral safety aspects for Pennsylvania have been funded by NHTSA or State safety funds. The HSIP funds have resulted in a variety of infrastructure related projects which installed basic warning signs at curves and intersections at various locations across the state to large scale reconstruction projects that rebuilt intersections into safer geometric and operational configurations.

In 2015 fatalities across the nation went up significantly. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania did have a slight increase in total highway fatalities at 0.4% (5 more fatalities than 2014). This increase was well below the national 8% increase. PennDOT will continue to monitor the crash trends for each year and determine what options are working and what methods need changed to reduce the fatal and serious injury crashes. At the end of 2016 Pennsylvania will adopt a new SHSP. The new SHSP has been in development since January 2016. PennDOT has hosted several steering committee meetings in 2016 to gather input from all safety stakeholders across the state. The new visions, goals, and targets established by the 2016 SHSP will target areas that should reduce fatalities and serious injuries. The new objectives will be established with data to so measurable results can be tracked. The SHSP will not only be adopted by PennDOT, but all other safety stakeholders across the state. The goals of the SHSP will be carried out by MAST (Multi Agency Safety Team).

PennDOT is also in the process of developing a Speed Management Action Plan (SMAP) which is being directed by FHWA. Findings and recommendations from this SMAP will be incorporated into HSIP project selection in the future years.

Project Evaluation

Provide project evaluation data for completed projects (optional).

| Location | Functional Class | Improvement Category | Improvement Type | Bef- Fatal | Bef- Serious Injury | Bef-All Injuries | Bef- PDO | Bef- Total | Aft- Fatal | Aft- Serious Injury | Aft-All Injuries | Aft- PDO | Aft- Total | Evaluation Results (Benefit/ Cost Ratio) |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------|---|
| Statewide CLRS | Systemic | Roadway | Rumble strips - center | | | | | | | | | | | 251 miles in 2015 bringing our total up to 5453 miles statewide |
| Statewide ELR/SRS | systemic | Roadway | Rumble strips - edge or shoulder | | | | | | | | | | | 72 miles were added this year for a total of 4470 miles Statewide |

2016 Pennsylvania Highway Safety Improvement Program

| Statewide High Tension Cable Median Barrier | Systemic | Roadway | Roadway - other | | | | | | We installed 66 miles in 2015 bringing the total miles up to 206 miles statewide. |
|---|----------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Statewide High Friction Surface Treatments | Systemic | Roadway | Pavement surface - high friction surface | | | | | | We added 21 miles of HFST in 2015 (91 new locations) bringing the total up to 28.41 miles or 154 locations across the state. |

Optional Attachments

Sections

Files Attached

Glossary

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

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

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

HMVMT means hundred million vehicle miles traveled.

Non-infrastructure projects are projects that do not result in construction. Examples of noninfrastructure 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.