



Local Road Safety Peer Exchange – Regions 3 & 5

An RSPCB Peer Exchange

Introduction and Background

This report provides a summary of the proceedings of the Local Road Safety Peer Exchange held in Columbus, Ohio on June 12 and 13, 2013. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) sponsored the Peer Exchange in coordination with the Region 3 & 5 Local Technical Assistance Programs. The purpose of the Peer Exchange was to facilitate the exchange of information on local road safety and explore opportunities for greater coordination and communication between FHWA, State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Local Technical Assistance Program Centers (LTAPs) and local and regional officials and practitioners within the States in these two regions. The Peer Exchange covered four key topics:

- Improving local road safety data collection and analysis;
- Increasing local agency participation in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP);
- Encouraging local involvement in the development and implementation of the States' Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSPs); and
- Improving interagency collaboration.

Representatives from the following LTAP Region 3 and 5 States participated in the event: Delaware, Indiana, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and Wisconsin (see Appendix A for a complete list of participants).

Peer Exchange Proceedings

The format of the Peer Exchange consisted of expert and peer presentations on State practices, followed by facilitated discussions (see Appendix B for the full agenda). At the end of the second day, participants met with colleagues in their respective States to develop action plans covering the key topics discussed. The action plans identified:

- Strategies to improve local road safety in their States;
- Resources needed to achieve those objectives; and
- Champions to lead implementation.

A brief description of the peer exchange proceedings is provided below.

Welcoming Remarks

The FHWA Ohio Division Office Assistant Administrator and the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) Division of Planning Deputy Director welcomed participants to the peer exchange. The presenters addressed the importance of data-based decisionmaking and the value of incorporating local representation into statewide safety planning. They introduced the exchange as a valuable opportunity to develop collaborative approaches to improving highway safety on all public roads.

ABOUT THE PEER EXCHANGE

FHWA's RSPCB Peer-to-Peer Program (P2P) supports and sponsors peer exchanges and workshops hosted by agencies.

Date

June 12 and 13, 2013

Host

Ohio Department of Transportation

Participants

Delaware

Illinois

Indiana

Maryland

Michigan

Minnesota

Ohio

Pennsylvania

Virginia

West Virginia

Wisconsin

FHWA Office of Safety

U.S. DOT Volpe Center

FHWA's Office of Safety sponsors P2P events.

[Learn more.](http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov)





The FHWA Office of Safety Local and Rural Road Safety (LRRS) Program Manager provided an overview of the workshop event and asked participants to introduce themselves and share their expectations. Expectations included the following:

- To develop innovative ideas for improving roadway safety
- To meet other practitioners from the field of roadway safety
- To discover noteworthy practices to bring back to the states
- To gather ideas about involving locals in the SHSP
- To learn about transportation safety plans at the county, city, and township level
- To share and to benefit from the local perspective
- To brainstorm creative ways to fund local improvements
- To learn new ways of gathering local safety data
- To promote local participation on safety projects

Highway Safety Improvement Program Overview

The FHWA Office of Safety HSIP Program Manager gave an overview of HSIP to inform the conversation of the event. She also reviewed changes to the program under Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21).

HSIP is a core Federal-aid program with the goal of reducing fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. HSIP is Federally-funded and State-administered. The program underwent many changes as a result of MAP-21. MAP-21 increased HSIP funding, ended the High Risk Rural Roads Program set-aside, eliminated the requirement for States to submit a transparency report, and increased eligibility for non-infrastructure safety projects. MAP-21 also required the Secretary to establish a regular SHSP update cycle.

Federal requirements and support for SHSPs fall under HSIP, as does the Railway-Highway Crossing Program. SHSPs are data-driven, statewide, comprehensive transportation safety plans that identify safety emphasis areas and strategies to facilitate coordination among State safety stakeholders. The SHSP is intended to guide HSIP investment decisions. This approach results in a systematic and repeatable process, defensible decisions, and, ultimately, the prevention of traffic fatalities and serious injury crashes. Increasing local involvement in the HSIP and SHSP processes is a major challenge and a key focus of the peer exchange.

Local Technical Assistance Program Safety Data Program Performance

The Program Manager for the Local/Tribal Transportation Assistance Program (LTAP/TTAP) at FHWA's Technology Partnership Programs presented an overview of the activities and accomplishments of LTAP/TTAP Centers across the country. There is an LTAP Center in every State and Puerto Rico and seven TTAP Centers. Most LTAPs are housed within universities or State DOTs. The LTAP's flexibility allows LTAP Centers to partner with State DOTs to address the needs of local agencies through training, technical assistance, and technology transfer.

The National Local Technical Assistance Program Association (NLTAPA) represents the 58 LTAP and TTAP Centers in the United States. The Federal Highway Administration and NLTAPA have instituted the Joint Safety Program to support the integration of roadway safety in decisionmaking. The Joint Safety Program's 2012 Performance Report identified areas of opportunity for LTAPs to improve roadway safety through training, technical assistance, communications, and other services that they provide. Common training and education activities at LTAPs include offering relevant National Highway Institute (NHI) and Resource Center trainings, identifying gaps in road safety training available, and delivering original courses to address specific needs. The LTAP Centers also provide local agencies access to safety data, assist local agencies in solving local safety problems, and coordinate among local agencies and connect them to State DOTs.

Developing Safety Plans: A Manual for Local and Rural Road Owners

A representative from the FHWA Resource Center explained the benefits of Local Road Safety Plans (LRSPs) as part of the local road safety planning process and discussed the steps in the development of an LRSP.



LRSPs are locally-coordinated safety plans that provide a comprehensive, flexible framework that draws upon the “4Es” of safety: engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency medical services. LRSPs may result in increased funding for safety improvements in locations where such funding has not traditionally been available, as they help local agencies identify potential safety projects and funding sources for those projects. LRSPs also raise the safety awareness of local officials and may help to establish productive partnerships among local, regional, and state officials. The success of an LRSP often depends on the presence of a local champion, the clarity of the plan’s mission, collaboration between partners, and open lines of communication.

Steps in the development of an LRSP include:

1. Identify champions and fill leadership roles
2. Develop a vision, mission, and achievable goals
3. Collect and analyze safety data
4. Select data-driven emphasis areas that target issues of local importance
5. Identify and prioritize strategies
6. Implement strategies
7. Evaluate and update the LRSP

The FHWA Office of Safety document [Developing Safety Plans: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners](#) provides more detailed information on the development of LRSPs.

State Summary Presentations

Representatives from each State offered a brief overview of local safety efforts in their State, emphasizing challenges and best practices associated with safety data, management of the HSIP, and local involvement in the SHSP. The presentations were followed by a roundtable discussion of noteworthy practices mentioned in the presentations. The following examples of noteworthy practices highlighted by participants:

- **Delaware DOT** has established DelDOT Fatal Crash Review Teams, through which DelDOT staff coordinate with law enforcement agencies on fatality and serious injury crashes by investigating causes of the crash. DelDOT has also improved electronic crash reporting in the State through the implementation of the Delaware Justice Information System’s ECRASH system, which facilitates the process of filling in crash reports and populates the latitude and longitude coordinates of the crash into the crash report to improve data accuracy.
- **Illinois DOT** works to ensure that HSIP funds reach local agencies by hosting local HSIP workshops, conducting roadway safety audits (RSAs), and communicating with local agencies through the Illinois LTAP Center and IDOT districts. IDOT also provides free HSIP training and data-related technical assistance to local agencies. As a result, IDOT devotes 20 percent of its HSIP funds—about \$15 million—to local roadway projects annually.
- **Indiana DOT** allocates one-third of HSIP funding to projects on locally owned roadways. The local portion of HSIP funding is distributed according to population distribution and roadway mileage. To support local agencies, INDOT and the Indiana LTAP Center conduct studies on local roads, facilitate RSAs, and provide local agency staff with training and technical assistance.
- The **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)** is seeking to increase local agency participation in the HSIP process by proactively providing data and technical assistance to the State’s various local agencies. For example, Maryland SHA is implementing a pilot project to identify corridors for safety improvements in two suburban counties near Washington, D.C. with high pedestrian fatality rates.
- **Michigan DOT** is working to improve crash reporting and improve law enforcement officials’ understanding of the importance of accurate crash data by providing training to all State Troopers.
- **Minnesota DOT (MnDOT)** allocates HSIP funding based on the proportion of crashes occurring on the State- and locally-owned portions of the roadway network. MnDOT often bundles safety improvements across multiple jurisdictions under a single contract to take advantage of economies of scale.



- **Ohio DOT** provides local agencies access to crash data through a web-based tool called the GIS Crash Analysis Tool (GCAT). The tool lets counties and municipalities conduct their own data analysis without the need to hire consultants.
- **Pennsylvania DOT (PennDOT)** has held a District Safety Summit in all 11 PennDOT Districts. The purpose of the Safety Summit is to engage local safety stakeholders in generating ideas to improve safety on local roadways.
- **Virginia DOT** promotes local participation in Virginia's SHSP through outreach meetings with localities and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). The agency has also held five regional meetings for the purpose of developing local SHSPs.
- **West Virginia DOT** holds a one-day course to instruct law enforcement officers on the evaluation of a crash scene and how to assist in crash reconstruction efforts.
- **Wisconsin DOT** individually identifies large HSIP-funded projects in its Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs.

Strategic Highway Safety Plans Noteworthy Practices

Participants heard from select peers regarding strategies for including local agencies in the development of their SHSPs. These presentations were followed by a break-out group discussion highlighting the challenges of encouraging local involvement and identifying possible strategies to engage locals in the development and implementation of SHSPs.

Ohio Noteworthy Practices

ODOT has taken several steps to facilitate local participation in the SHSP. ODOT leverages its strong relationship with the County Engineers Association of Ohio (CEAO) and invites CEAO to its quarterly committee meetings to discuss crash trends and possible strategies. ODOT's top emphasis area in the SHSP—improving data access and quality—intentionally applies to all public roads in Ohio rather than just the State-owned roadway system. ODOT shares safety data and data analysis tools with counties, municipalities, and law enforcement agencies statewide. ODOT has developed automated tools that allow users to easily access crash data and identify trends. Because funding follows data, ODOT has also invested \$5 million over the past five years to create an accurate roadway inventory of each county. ODOT keeps the language of its SHSP deliberately broad in order to facilitate local participation.

ODOT also uses its close relationship with the Ohio LTAP Center to provide local agencies with coaching, training, assistance, and access to HSIP funds. The agency makes funding available for the LTAP Center to conduct County Roadway Safety Audits (CRSAs) and often offers to conduct CRSAs on behalf of counties with a high concentration of crashes. This program has been in place for the past five years.

Minnesota Noteworthy Practices

Minnesota recently completed 87 County Road Safety Plans (CRSPs) around the State. Completing these CRSPs required a great deal of education and outreach, including in-person meetings with each county to inform local stakeholders about the value of the State's safety program. The success of this project built on strong relationships between MnDOT, FHWA, the Center for Transportation Studies at the University of Minnesota, and various counties.

The development of each of Minnesota's CRSPs began with an analysis of county-level crash data and the selection of safety emphasis areas. Next the stakeholders developed a comprehensive list of safety strategies and held safety workshops in which they identified a short list of critical strategies. These strategies then led to specific safety projects as part of a county-wide safety plan.

As a result of the CRSPs, the staff time required to submit HSIP proposals in Minnesota has been greatly reduced. The safety plans provide practitioners with a detailed, prioritized, county-wide plan to guide and support safety investments. The CRSPs also provide information to educate county officials and the public.

Virginia Noteworthy Practices

VDOT's recent SHSP revision process was successful in incorporating participation from MPOs, local traffic safety staff, police and fire departments, and non-profit groups. During the update, VDOT solicited local agencies for ideas, many which were incorporated into



regional and statewide plans. This degree of local participation was largely the result of five regional SHSP meetings hosted by VDOT. During the meetings VDOT staff explained the SHSP process, defined the State's targeted emphasis areas, and requested initial input on a range of local safety issues and strategies.

The ideas generated at these meetings informed the development of the SHSP. For example, local agency representatives requested greater access to data in order to better understand local patterns and trends. As a result, data management and data sharing have become more robust in Virginia.

Break-out Group Discussion

Table 1 summarizes the results of facilitated discussions on the challenges and effective strategies associated with SHSP and local involvement.

Table 1. Local Involvement in SHSPs: Challenges and Strategies

Challenges	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many local agencies fail to see the value of a SHSP or are not aware that it exists • It is unclear which local officials should be involved in the SHSP process • Location of meetings requires travel for many stakeholders, which hinders local participation • Plans are written to include local agencies, but the local agencies are not aware of their role • There is a perception that participation in the SHSP is difficult • A particular emphasis area is applicable to certain localities but not others (e.g., pedestrian safety may be more relevant for urban districts) • The connections between the SHSP and HSIP may not be clear to local agencies • Local agencies are apprehensive about liability issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage peer-to-peer marketing of the plan • Reach out to elected officials immediately after turnover occurs • Think broadly about potential stakeholders • Leverage FHWA Division Office connections to identify potential partners • Use regional meetings or videoconferencing technology to lessen travel barriers • Identify local safety champions to foster excitement for and participation in the SHSP process • Use MPO and LTAP contacts as advocates and mentors for local agencies • Tailor involvement in the SHSP to each locality's strengths and challenges • Use a county safety plan as a starting point for involving locals in the SHSP • Provide tangible incentives for local participation in the SHSP • Communicate that liability issues should not prevent an agency from making safety improvements that could save lives and prevent injuries

Safety Data Noteworthy Practices

Due to strong interest in ODOT's crash data analysis capabilities during Day 1 of the peer exchange, ODOT arranged for a special presentation to demonstrate the functionality of its web-based GIS Crash Analysis Tool, which it makes freely available to consultants, local agencies, and other safety practitioners.

Ohio Noteworthy Practices

Ohio DOT's GIS Crash Analysis Tool was developed in-house by ODOT's Systems Planning and Information Technology Departments using Department of Public Safety-owned crash data. The agency actively promotes the tool for local agencies to select locations for safety improvements. The tool's Google Maps-type functionality makes it easy to use without a specific skill set. The tool uses a simple query form to allow users to search for crashes based on geography, date ranges, driver attributes, vehicle attributes, and other crash



characteristics. Crash information can be easily exported into Microsoft Excel using the related Crash Analysis Module (CAM) Tool. The GCAT tool draws from a complete record of crashes statewide, approximately 300,000 crashes per year.

Safety Data Facilitated Roundtable

Following ODOT's presentation on its crash analysis tool, the facilitator led a roundtable discussion on local involvement in safety data efforts and potential sources of useful safety data, including the following:

- The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's Fatality Analysis Reporting System
- Emergency medical services data
- Private traffic reporting data
- Maintenance staff (who are often the most aware of impacts to fences and guardrails resulting from crashes)
- Transit operators, school bus drivers, and local drivers
- Law enforcement officers and drivers directly involved in crashes

Highway Safety Improvement Program Noteworthy Practices

Participants heard from select peers regarding strategies to improve local involvement in the HSIP process.

Illinois Noteworthy Practices

The Illinois SHSP targets a zero fatality goal with a strong emphasis on local roads. In order to pursue the State's local road safety goals, IDOT has instituted local safety workshops for counties experiencing the greatest number of traffic fatalities in the State. These workshops have featured lessons on multi-disciplinary safety partner collaboration, high-level data analysis tools, and identification of safety emphasis areas and strategies. During these workshops, IDOT staff share data and information with each county to provide them with an overall understanding of the crashes occurring in their jurisdictions, including breakdowns of crashes by type and emphasis area. The goal of each safety workshop is to produce a prioritized list of HSIP-eligible projects and a county-level SHSP.

Michigan Noteworthy Practices

MDOT has instituted a strong local safety initiative. One of its many goals is to improve the number and quality of HSIP applications. MDOT provides participating local agencies site-specific analysis, including ranking reports for local curves, intersections, and segments. Michigan DOT staff visit counties to conduct one- to two-day field reviews with county staff to discuss locations of interest. During these visits, MDOT and county staff review countermeasures and discuss realistic sources of funding. In addition to direct technical assistance, MDOT promotes the use of its RoadSoft safety tool, which includes collision diagrams, crash reports, aerial imagery, and curve identification features. MDOT also hosts an annual traffic safety summit and encourages local participation through a scholarship program. Finally, Michigan offers a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for HSIP funding that minimizes the difficulty of complying with Federal requirements. The State's programmatic agreement with FHWA includes a design exception that reduces the burden of complying with Federal regulations.

Michigan's safety initiative brings safety to the forefront and results in a higher level of trust between local and State agencies. The State's safety efforts have improved the quality of HSIP applications and saved limited local agency staff time. As a result of the initiative, Michigan has seen an increase in the number of HSIP applications and improved maintenance practices across the State.

Indiana Noteworthy Practices

Indiana's Hazard Elimination Program for Existing Roads and Streets (HELPERS) is a local assistance program that helps local agencies submit HSIP applications. The primary audience for HELPERS is local agencies that fall outside of metropolitan planning area jurisdiction. The Indiana LTAP Center reviews local HSIP applications before they are submitted and provides general assistance tailored to the needs of each specific agency, ranging from simple presentations for county commissioners to drafting HSIP applications.



The HELPERS program currently provides assistance for two types of safety projects: sign inventories and sign replacement projects. The application process for sign inventory projects is streamlined and requires very little project-specific information. Sign replacement projects are somewhat more expensive and complicated to implement. Applications for sign replacement projects must include needs assessments, crash data analysis, cost-to-benefit ratios, and photographic proof of sign inventory, much of which HELPERS is able to do for the counties.

The benefits of the sign projects include increased safety on local roads, more standardized roadway signage, and a more complete inventory of signs. One study found a 7 to 16 percent reduction in overall crashes after the completion of a county sign replacement project, which corresponds well to the crash reduction factors used to estimate the impact of these projects.

Table 3 summarizes the result of facilitated discussions on challenges and effective strategies associated with HSIP project selection and implementation on local roads.

Table 3. HSIP Project Selection and Implementation: Challenges and Noteworthy Practices

Challenges	Noteworthy Practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The administrative cost of using Federal funds is prohibitively high for local agencies • Lack of leadership support at the DOT and local levels creates obstacles for funding and participation • The perception of inequitable funding allocation discourages smaller counties from applying for funding • Perception that Federal programs fail to meet local needs due to disconnect and miscommunication • Local agencies face limited resources to administer projects or conduct data analysis to identify safety needs • Local agency staff often have limited safety expertise or are overburdened with other responsibilities • The term "highway" in HSIP communicates that HSIP is not applicable for local agencies • Local agencies are discouraged from applying for HSIP funds because of the perceived difficulty of complying with the National Environmental Protection Act 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional Federal-aid training for local agencies • Implement highway safety training for elected and appointed officials • Set aside funding for specific counties or groups of counties • Offer local agencies a guarantee of funding to incentivize participation • Take advantage of FHWA's safety training, which can be adjusted to suit local needs • Provide data directly to local agencies or conduct data analysis on their behalf • Recommend cost-effective projects that are simple to implement and easy to justify to local management • Adopt a Toward Zero Deaths goal in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan to galvanize safety efforts • Include a consistent safety message in all communication with local agencies • Change the name of the program (e.g., "Roadway Safety Improvement Plan") • Identify local safety champions

Opportunities for LTAP Centers and Local Agency Involvement in the State Safety Program

After each group reported back from their respective breakout sessions, a roundtable discussion on the role and opportunities for the LTAP Centers' involvement in local road safety was led by the facilitator. Participants were encouraged to note ideas about how to involve LTAP Center personnel in the State safety process. They identified the following noteworthy practices:

- Provide direct assistance to local agencies, including assistance in complying with State and Federal regulations
- Visit counties with a high level of crashes, potentially alongside State DOT or FHWA Division staff
- Offer workshops on topics such as roadway departures and sign inventory programs
- Coordinate opportunities for State DOTs to connect with local agencies
- Disseminate data and provide data analysis training to local agencies
- Convey messages to local agencies through municipal leagues or other associations



- Align LTAP and State DOT safety initiatives to avoid duplication of effort
- Demonstrate new technologies such as Chip Seal and Safety Edge
- Conduct surveys to determine local safety needs
- Participate in updates to the SHSP
- Serve as a clearinghouse for safety-related resources

Action Plan Highlights

Each State group was tasked with developing an overall Action Plan that outlines strategies to improve their local road safety program, resources to be employed in the implementation of identified strategies, and a champion to assist in moving each strategy forward. Representatives from each State reported out to the group the results of their action planning sessions.

Key actions included:

- Generating more local involvement in the SHSP update process
- Streamlining contracting regulations to simplify the process of applying for HSIP funds for localities
- Creating new safety training programs for local elected officials and law enforcement agencies
- Increasing the number of HSIP-funded projects that address locally owned roads
- Using peer-to-peer marketing to promote SHSPs to local agencies
- Promoting the use of low-cost safety improvements to local agencies
- Analyzing post-improvement crash data to evaluate the effectiveness of safety improvements
- Providing training for local agencies on data analysis techniques and the use of data tools
- Improving access to data for local agencies
- Providing technical assistance through LTAP Centers
- Using Road Safety Audits to identify projects on local roads that can use HSIP funds
- Encouraging the development of County SHSPs and Local Road Safety Plans
- Reaching out to local agencies through LTAPs and State DOT Districts

Feedback and Suggestions

In their evaluations, participants appreciated the opportunity to learn from peer presentations, discuss issues in small groups, network with their peers, and develop action plans to coordinate actions on outstanding issues. Participants were able to learn about innovative strategies for engaging locals, get to know their colleagues better, and plan concrete follow-up actions to take home to their respective States. Traveling to the peer exchange for two full days was a challenge for some, but those who were able to participate left highly motivated to improve coordination on transportation safety issues with local stakeholders in their respective States. Many expressed their appreciation of Ohio DOT's excellent facilities and generous hospitality.



Appendix A: Event Registrants

FHWA/Volpe	
Craig Allred Transportation Specialist FHWA Resource Center Business Phone Number: 720-963-3236 Business Email: craig.allred@dot.gov	Scott Middleton Analyst Volpe Center
Rosemarie Anderson Transportation Specialist FHWA Office of Safety Business Phone Number: 202-366-5007 Business Email: rosemarie.anderson@dot.gov	Karen Scurry Transportation Specialist FHWA Office of Safety Business Phone Number: 609-637-4207 Business Email: karen.scurry@dot.gov
Cameron Ishaq Management Consultant Fasterhorse LLC Business Phone Number: 301-661-9110 Business Email: cameron.ishaq@fasterhorse.com	Jeffrey Zaharewicz LTAP/TTAP Program Manager FHWA Office of Technical Services Business Phone Number: 703-235-0991 Business Email: jeffrey.zaharewicz@dot.gov
Aaron Jette Community Planner Volpe/US DOT Business Phone Number: 617-494-2335 Business Email: aaron.jette@dot.gov	
Delaware	
Rusty Lee Center Director Delaware LTAP / T2 Center Newark, DE Business Phone Number: 302-831-6241 Business Email: elee@udel.edu	Adam Weiser Safety Programs Manager Delaware Department of Transportation Smyrna, DE Business Phone Number: 302-659-4073 Business Email: adam.weiser@state.de.us
Illinois	
Alan Ho Mobility & Safety Team Leader/Safety Engineer FHWA IL Division Office Springfield, IL Business Phone Number: 217-492-4622 Business Email: alan.ho@dot.gov	Tim Sheehan Safety Design Unit Chief IL DOT/Bureau of Safety Engineering Springfield, IL Business Phone Number: 217-782-3568 Business Email: tim.sheehan@illinois.gov
Gwen Montgomery Technology Transfer Program Manager Illinois Department of Transportation Springfield, IL Business Phone Number: 217-785-2350 Business Email: gwen.montgomery@illinois.gov	
Indiana	
Rick Drumm Safety Engineer FHWA - Indiana Division Office Indianapolis, IN Business Phone Number: 317-226-7487 Business Email: rick.drumm@dot.gov	Laura Slusher Traffic Safety Engineer Indiana LTAP West Lafayette, IN Business Phone Number: 765-494-7038 Business Email: lslusher@purdue.edu
Mike Holowaty Manager, Office of Traffic Safety Indiana Department of Transportation Indianapolis, IN Business Phone Number: 317-232-5337 Business Email: mholowaty@indot.in.gov	



Maryland	
Ed Stellfox Director UMD T2 Center College Park, MD Business Phone Number: 301-405-6369 Business Email: stellfox@umd.edu	Cedric Ward Director, Office of Traffic and Safety Maryland State Highway Administration Hanover, MD Business Phone Number: 410-787-5815 Business Email: cward@sha.state.md.us
Michigan	
Lawrence Hummel Engineer-Manager Van Buren County Road Commission Lawrence, MI Business Phone Number: 269-569-6218 Business Email: vbcrchummel@comcast.net	Tracie Leix Safety Programs Unit Supervisor Michigan Department of Transportation Lansing, MI Business Phone Number: 517-373-8950 Business Email: leixt@michigan.gov
Minnesota	
Derek Leuer Assistant State Traffic Safety Engineer Minnesota Department of Transportation Roseville, MN Business Phone Number: 651-234-7372 Business Email: derek.leuer@state.mn.us	Richard West Public Works Director/County Engineer Otter Tail County Fergus Falls, MN Business Phone Number: 218-998-8473 Business Email: rwest@co.ottertail.mn.us
Stephanie Malinoff Director of Outreach Services Center for Transportation Studies Minneapolis, MN Business Phone Number: 612-624-8398 Business Email: malinoff@umn.edu	
Ohio	
Michael B. Armstrong (retired) Safety Engineer FHWA, Ohio Division Office Columbus, OH Business Phone Number: 614-280-6855 Business Email: michael.armstrong@dot.gov	Michelle May Safety Program Manager Ohio Department of Transportation Columbus, OH Business Phone Number: 614-644-8309 Business Email: michelle.may@dot.state.oh.us
Victoria Beale LTAP Center Director Ohio LTAP Center/Ohio DOT Columbus, OH Business Phone Number: 614-466-3129 Business Email: victoria.beale@dot.state.oh.us	Michael McNeill Transportation Engineer Ohio Department of Transportation Columbus, OH Business Phone Number: 614-387-1265 Business Email: michael.mcneill@dot.state.oh.us
David Brand County Engineer, Madison County London, OH Business Phone Number: 740-852-9404 Business Email: dbrand@co.madison.oh.us	Michele Risko CSTP/LBR Program Manager County Engineers Association of Ohio Columbus, OH Business Phone Number: 614-221-0707 Business Email: mrisko@ceao.org
Jim DeSanto Transportation Engineer FHWA Ohio Division Office Columbus, OH Business Phone Number: 614-280-6830 Business Email: james.desanto@dot.gov	Derek Troyer Transportation Engineer Ohio Department of Transportation Columbus, OH Business Phone Number: 614-387-5164 Business Email: derek.troyer@dot.state.oh.us
Jeff Linkous County Engineer Clinton County Wilmington, OH Business Phone Number: 937-382-2078 Business Email: jlinkous@clintoncountyengineer.org	



Pennsylvania	
Louis Ferretti LTAP Program Director Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Harrisburg, PA Business Phone Number: 717-787-2598 Business Email: lferretti@pa.gov	Kathryn Power District Safety Engineer Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Bridgeville, PA Business Phone Number: 412-429-4966 Business Email: kpower@pa.gov
Virginia	
Emily Parkany Director Transportation Training Academy (VA LTAP) Charlottesville, VA Business Phone Number: 434-982-2695 Business Email: emilyparkany@virginia.edu	Tracy Turpin HSIP Program Manager Virginia Department of Transportation Richmond, VA Business Phone Number: 804-786-6610 Business Email: tracy.turpin@vdot.virginia.gov
West Virginia	
Ryan Brumfield Safety Engineer FHWA WV Division Office Charleston, WV Business Phone Number: 304-347-5473 Business Email: ryan.brumfield@dot.gov	Saleem Salameh Technical Study Director KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission Huntington, WV Business Phone Number: 304-523-7434 Business Email: ssalameh@ntelos.net
Ronald Eck Senior Advisor West Virginia LTAP Morgantown, WV Business Phone Number: 304-293-9931 Business Email: ronald.eck@mail.wvu.edu	
Wisconsin	
Scott Janowiak Safety Program Manager Wisconsin Department of Transportation Madison, WI Business Phone Number: 608-266-9911 Business Email: scott.janowiak@dot.wi.gov	Steve Pudloski Director Wisconsin LTAP Madison, WI Business Phone Number: 608-262-8707 Business Email: pudloski@engr.wisc.edu



Appendix B: Agenda

REGIONS 3 & 5 - LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PEER EXCHANGE

Columbus, OH – June 12 and 13, 2013

DAY 1

8:00 – 8:30AM

Welcoming Remarks

- Laurie Leffler, *Division Administrator, FHWA*
- Jennifer Townley, *Deputy Director, Division of Planning, ODOT*

Workshop Overview

8:30 – 9:00

Participant Introductions

9:00 – 10:00

Presentations

- Highway Safety Improvement Program Overview (MAP 21) – **Karen Scurry**, *FHWA Office of Safety*
- LTAP Safety Data Program Performance – **Jeffrey Zaharewicz** – *FHWA, Technology Partnership Program*
- Local Road Safety Plans – **Craig Allred**, *FHWA, Resource Center*

10:00 – 10:15

BREAK

10:15 – 12:30PM

State Presentations – Brief presentation by each State on local safety efforts in data collection and analysis, SHSP, and HSIP – **DE, IL, IN, MD, MI, MN, OH, PA, VA, WV, WI**

12:30 – 1:15

LUNCH

1:15 – 1:45

Facilitated Roundtable Discussion

Noteworthy practices from the State presentations

1:45 – 2:45

Presentations – Strategic Highway Safety Plans – LTAP and Local Agency involvement in the State SHSP process – Development, Implementation & Marketing

- **Michelle May**, *Ohio Department of Transportation*
- **Richard West**, *County Engineer, Otter Tail County, MN*
- **Tracy Turpin**, *HSIP Program Manager, Virginia Department of Transportation*

2:45 – 3:00

BREAK

3:00 – 4:00

Breakout Groups – SHSP and Local Involvement Challenges

- Challenges getting local involvement
- Is the SHSP tailored for local involvement?
- Strategies to get locals involved and maintain their interest

4:00 – 4:30

Report Back

4:30 – 5:00 PM

Wrap Up



DAY 2

8:00 – 8:30AM Recap of DAY 1

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 8:30 – 9:15 | Facilitated Roundtable Discussion – Safety Data <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Challenges• Best Practices• What or Who is Missing from the Efforts and How Can They be Engaged? |
| 9:15 – 10:15 | Presentations -- Highway Safety Improvement Program (including data analysis) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tim Sheehan, Safety Design Unit Chief, Illinois Department of Transportation• Tracie Leix, Safety Programs Unit Supervisor, Michigan Department of Transportation & Larry Hummel, Engineer-Manager, Van Buren County Road Commission• Laura Slusher, Traffic Safety Engineer, Indiana LTAP |
| 10:15 – 10:30 | BREAK |
| 10:30 – 11:30 | Breakout Groups – Highway Safety Improvement Program Project Selection and Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Challenges to Allocating Funds to Locals• Strategies Addressing Identified Challenges• Managing Local Projects• Identify Each Agencies' Role |
| 11:30 – 12:00PM | Report Back |
| 12:00 – 12:45 | LUNCH |
| 12:45 – 1:30 | Breakout Discussion
Opportunities for LTAP/TTAP Centers and Local Agency Involvement in State Safety Program |
| 1:30 – 2:45 | Action Planning – Breakout Groups by State
Each State will develop an Action Plan based on Lessons Learned during the Workshop – Actions, Implementation, Timeline and Responsible Agency |
| 2:45 – 3:45 | Report Back |
| 3:45 – 4:00PM | Wrap Up (Next Steps), Adjourn |