Preparing for the Update of New Hampshire's Strategic Highway Safety Plan

An RSPCB Peer Exchange

Introduction

This report provides a summary of a peer exchange sponsored by the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) that focused on updating New Hampshire's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) and establishing a Toward Zero Deaths (TZD) initiative in the State.

NHDOT applied to the Roadway Safety Professional Capacity Building (RSPCB) Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Program in an effort to build consensus around an updated SHSP. Deciding to apply for technical assistance resulted from NHDOT's participation at a P2P event hosted by the Vermont Agency of Transportation. NHDOT's overarching goal for their P2P event was engaging State highway safety stakeholders in an open dialogue to identify opportunities for cooperation.

NHDOT's objectives in requesting the peer exchange were to:

- Build a sustainable SHSP by energizing existing and developing cooperative partnerships among highway safety stakeholders;
- Strengthen the goals, strategies, and performance tracking for SHSP emphasis areas;
- Learn from others' experiences in linking datasets and coordinating the exchange of safety data between agencies; and
- Identify marketing strategies the SHSP and associated efforts, particularly related to TZD and adaptive behavior-marketing initiatives.

The event focused on sharing information and best practices for developing and implementing an effective SHSP. In selecting peers, NHDOT sought States with strong data collection and analysis capabilities, experience with SHSP marketing campaigns, and success sustaining and implementing the SHSP. Selected peers at the event included the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) presented via web conference.

Through discussions and breakout sessions following the peer presentations, New Hampshire's safety stakeholders identified emphasis-area teams and champions and established preliminary goals, strategies, performance metrics, and timelines. Stakeholders also analyzed New Hampshire's current SHSP, highlighting strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.

ABOUT THE PEER EXCHANGE

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

Date

May 18 –19, 2011

Location

Concord, New Hampshire

Host

New Hampshire Department of Transportation

Key Participants

New Hampshire Highway Safety Agency

New Hampshire State Police

New Hampshire Department of Motor Vehicles

New Hampshire Bureau of Turnpikes

New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services

New Hampshire Department of Justice

New Hampshire State Liquor Commission

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation

Utah Department of Transportation

Washington State Department of Transportation

FHWA New Hampshire Division Office

FHWA Office of Safety

FHWA Resource Center

U.S. DOT Volpe Center

FHWA's Office of Safety sponsors P2P events. Learn more.

Preparing for New Hampshire's Peer Event

The success of New Hampshire's peer event was due to the proactive efforts of NHDOT and the FHWA New Hampshire Division Office. NHDOT applied for its peer exchange within days of returning from a similar event in Vermont and assumed an extraordinary level of responsibility for planning the event and managing its logistics. Key staff from NHDOT, FHWA New Hampshire Division Office, and the FHWA Office of Safety spent four months preparing for the peer exchange. The process included the following steps:

- *Engage State safety staff as champions* – Key individuals from NHDOT initiated the peer exchange and served as champions for implementing actions following the event. Engaging the individuals who manage the SHSP process for the peer exchange is important to ensure momentum for the update process; ongoing involvement of NHDOT safety staff before and after the event is vital to ensure implementation of proposed actions.
- *Select and invite peers* – Event organizers identified and invited peer agencies (PennDOT, UDOT, and WSDOT) that have demonstrated success in creating model SHSPs. Selecting peers that effectively addressed the host agency's program needs was critical to successfully meeting New Hampshire's goals for the peer exchange.
- *Recruit participants* – New Hampshire's primary SHSP and highway safety stakeholders were encouraged to attend the event, as were safety specialists from local agencies, such as regional planning commissions, traffic injury prevention organizations, and institutions of higher education. Convening this group provided an opportunity for New Hampshire's safety specialists, who are responsible for the SHSP update, to network and learn from each other. NHDOT noted that this initial stage of participant outreach presented opportunities for open dialogue and fostered collaboration among agencies.
- *Communicate with peers before the event to provide direction on desired feedback* – Prior to the peer exchange, the NHDOT safety staff developed a list of questions for peers to address in their presentations. These questions focused on safety data issues, SHSP planning and formatting, educational and law enforcement strategies, and experience with TZD initiatives. Pre-event preparation allowed both peers and attendees to better understand New Hampshire's goals for the peer exchange.
- *Host the peer event* – FHWA Office of Safety staff and the New Hampshire planning team created an agenda for the peer exchange that addressed New Hampshire's needs. The planning team also designed discussion worksheets for the workshop that provided a simple way to capture feedback on developing next steps for New Hampshire's SHSP update.

Proceedings

The purpose of the workshop was to prepare for updating the SHSP and re-engage New Hampshire's highway safety stakeholders. Since the release of New Hampshire's previous SHSP in 2007, NHDOT noticed innovative practices among agencies in other States, including extensive use of performance tracking measures, engagement with the public through marketing campaigns, and the emergence of initiatives focused on Zero Deaths targets. NHDOT's goals for the peer exchange included learning from other States' experiences and incorporating successful elements into New Hampshire's SHSP update.

Workshop participants included 49 professionals representing 30 organizations and the four "E's" (engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency services) (see Appendix A for a complete list of participants). The peer exchange began with welcoming remarks from leadership of NHDOT, the New Hampshire Department of Safety (NHDOS), and the New Hampshire Highway Safety Agency (NHHSA) (see Appendix B for the agenda). Staff from the FHWA New Hampshire Division Office, NHDOS, and NHDOT then presented an overview of the workshop and background information about highway safety in New Hampshire. Next, peer agencies discussed their experience and perspective on creating a successful SHSP. Following the peer presentations on day one, breakout groups assessed the strengths and weaknesses of New Hampshire's current SHSP and opportunities for improvement. The following day, breakout groups reconvened to determine membership in a SHSP Core Group and confirm emphasis areas for the updated plan.

Welcome

The NHDOT Commissioner welcomed participants to the peer exchange and emphasized NHDOT's commitment to safety. He shared his strong desire for agencies to work together to ensure that they use all available resources to make highways as safe as possible for the traveling public. He also thanked all of the participating agencies for coming together to learn, share best practices, and develop a plan for strategically moving forward.

The NHDOS Assistant Commissioner discussed the impact of traffic collisions in New Hampshire and nationwide. He detailed the many challenges facing highway safety today, including distracted driving, driving under the influence of legal and illegal drugs, drivers with mental health problems, and elderly drivers. All of these challenges must be addressed despite looming budget cuts. He also emphasized the need for improved collection and management of collision data to more effectively implement countermeasures.

Finally, the NHHSA Coordinator detailed New Hampshire's unique perspective on roadway safety. He cited New Hampshire's official motto – "Live free or die" – as a unique challenge in addressing highway safety. The fact that New Hampshire has the largest legislative body in the country can be an obstacle for passing safety-related legislation. He presented an overview of New Hampshire's recent successes in highway safety including:

- All-time lows in the number of roadway fatalities, especially among motorcyclists, despite the fact that helmets are not mandatory.
- Steady increases in seatbelt usage rates since the State began tracking the statistic - a high of 72.2 percent in 2010 - although seatbelts are only required for drivers and passengers under the age of 18.
- Progress in addressing impaired driving. The NHHSA recently partnered with law enforcement and the New Hampshire State Liquor Commission to purchase a sobriety checkpoint van available to any municipality.

Background

Highway Safety Improvement Program

The FHWA New Hampshire Division Office's Safety and Operations Engineer presented an overview of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The purpose of the HSIP is to make infrastructure improvements to reduce the number of fatal and severe injury crashes on all public roads. To receive HSIP funding, each State is required to create a SHSP, which involves analysis of crash data to identify emphasis areas and crash problems related to the emphasis areas, selection of appropriate countermeasures, and prioritization of projects in an HSIP. The HSIP must also align with the State Transportation Improvement Program. If a State demonstrates in its SHSP that its infrastructure safety needs are met, up to 10 percent of its HSIP funding may be applied to non-infrastructure safety strategies.

Safety Data

The NHDOS Business Systems Analyst described New Hampshire's data program and management systems. NHDOS understands the importance of crash data collection and analysis to target the most cost-effective solutions to safety problems. NHDOS collects data that are categorized by crash characteristics, as well as information about the vehicle, driver, and other involved persons. New Hampshire's fatal crash data has historically been easier to request and query than non-fatal crash data, although NHDOS is currently funding a project to reduce wait times for non-fatal data from a few months to a few hours. New Hampshire's crash data are available in an annual report published by NHDOS, which summarizes annual crash data and contextualizes the year's crash data against historic trends.

Motorcycle Safety

The Chief Project Manager for NHDOT presented observations based on his participation in a motorcycle scanning tour hosted by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. The objective of the tour was to identify cost-effective options to address motorcycle safety and learn about opportunities to integrate them into infrastructure design, barrier design, maintenance practices, intersection operations, and pavement treatments. The scanning tour found areas of opportunity for motorcycle safety in rider education and training as well as infrastructure designs capable of accommodating motorcycles.

Peer Presentations

Prior to the event, the SHSP Core Group compiled a list of questions related to gaps in New Hampshire's program that the group had identified. The three participating peer agencies tailored their discussions to respond to these questions. An overview of their presentations follows.

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

WSDOT's Director of Enterprise Risk Management discussed Washington's SHSP process. Washington developed its first highway safety plan in 2000, which coincided with establishing its Zero Fatalities vision. While the Director acknowledged that the State's traditional 4E approach has contributed to significant reductions in fatalities, he also suggested that solutions involving significant data analysis can provide additional reductions in fatalities. He described several key elements that have contributed to the agency's success:

- Create a diverse and engaged stakeholders group to build and sustain support for the SHSP. Washington's safety program has benefited by involving numerous partners in the SHSP process. When Washington's first highway safety plan was created in 2000, WSDOT and the Washington State Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) were the only contributors. Since then, the State has experienced a culture shift in the way safety is addressed. There are now 90 participants working on the SHSP, including government (Federal, Tribal, State, county and local), private sector companies, nonprofits, advocacy groups, and regional planning organizations.
- Use a data-driven approach to establish emphasis areas that will have the greatest impact on safety. By using a data-driven approach, Washington has identified the major contributing factors to fatal and serious crashes. Initially, WSDOT met with stakeholders to identify emphasis areas, which resulted in 22 priority areas. The Secretary of Transportation was not satisfied with the high number of first priorities and requested that the State focus on areas with the greatest safety impact. WSDOT has since moved to a formal, data-driven process to identify priority emphasis areas. To aid this process, WSDOT maintains 490 layers in a geographic information system (GIS) that are available to the Washington State Patrol and other safety stakeholders.
- Prioritize the highest-impact collision types to support funding decisions. Washington identifies the highest-impact collision categories based on the percentage of all fatal crashes and the potential for investments to provide crash reduction benefits. The State categorizes its SHSP emphasis areas into four priority areas based on their percentage of total fatalities; projects related to the highest-priority area are most likely to receive funding.
- Build consistent, robust databases for accurate data analysis. The Director highlighted the need for linkages between injury definitions between police and hospital registries for better and more consistent characterization of fatal, serious-injury, and minor-injury collisions.
- Measure and report performance to the public to provide public and political accountability for the SHSP. WSDOT regards performance management as an opportunity to better manage the agency and State-owned transportation systems. WSDOT publishes its performance management data in a quarterly publication called the *Gray Notebook.* The *Gray Notebook* is provided to legislators and is available to the public. In addition to performance management data, it discusses funding and revenue challenges, internal agency initiatives, investment decision-making needs and trade-offs, and sustainable transportation processes. It covers a number of safety-related topics and provides details on how safety programs are being implemented and developed to help reduce fatal and serious injury crashes in Washington to achieve Target Zero goals. The *Gray Notebook* is as an effective tool in educating the public and politicians and in providing support for funding safety projects and programs in the State.

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)

PennDOT's Safety Management Division Chief and the Transportation Planning Specialist responsible for coordinating Pennsylvania's SHSP process discussed their experience and successful practices via web conference. Based on data, Pennsylvania focuses on seven emphasis areas from its SHSP, which its Multi-Agency Safety Team (MAST) oversees. MAST is composed of leaders from SHSP stakeholder agencies and controls the direction of the plan. The group meets quarterly to assess the status of implementation activities. About 40 organizations are involved in Pennsylvania's SHSP: each organization is represented by a steering committee member who is briefed on the status of the SHSP on an annual basis. Highlights from the discussion on Pennsylvania's SHSP success factors are outlined below.

- Use guiding principles to structure an effective SHSP. In developing and implementing its SHSP, Pennsylvania adheres to the following principles:
    - Share ownership for each emphasis area and strategy;
    - Maximize SHSP stakeholder involvement;

  - Identify opportunities to learn from other States; and
  - Keep the 4Es in mind.

  These guidelines have been important keeping safety stakeholders engaged and giving them a role in the SHSP process.
- Select emphasis areas and prioritize investments. Pennsylvania identified seven emphasis areas in its current SHSP based on a five-year average number of fatalities. Each of the emphasis areas is assigned a Safety Multi-Agency Roads Team (SMART), which is composed of relevant safety stakeholders and is responsible for implementing selected strategies and reporting progress. In addition to these primary emphasis areas, Pennsylvania maintains nine lower-priority emphasis areas that do not have specific implementation teams. PennDOT requires each of its districts to coordinate with stakeholders to develop regional emphasis areas and priorities for local roads. These regional priorities must be related to the statewide SHSP. PennDOT also works with its Local Technical Assistance Program to implement the SHSP locally.
- Create goals and performance measures to ensure accountability for implementation. Pennsylvania sets an overall fatality goal for its SHSP, which provides a foundation to set emphasis area and district fatality goals. Pennsylvania also establishes intermediate goals that lead to fatality reductions. Stakeholder agencies within each SMART team are responsible for tracking the goals with green, yellow, or red status. Stakeholder must report to the MAST committee if the status is not green.
- Communicate goals and results to the public. Each year, PennDOT produces a statewide highway safety summary report, as well as a corresponding report for each district. These reports discuss progress in each emphasis area, as well as current data and emerging trends.
- Educate the public on how driver behaviors affect roadway safety. PennDOT developed the DriveSafePA.org website, which provides comprehensive information on the role driver behaviors play in highway safety. The website covers the following topics: aggressive driving, bicycle/pedestrian, child passenger safety, heavy trucks, engineering infrastructure, impaired driving, mature drivers, motorcycle safety, school bus safety, seat belts, work zones, and young drivers. An interactive quiz is provided that allows users to test their highway safety knowledge. The site includes educational resources, including videos, radio public service announcements, and traffic safety brochures. Information is also provided on recently enacted traffic safety laws such as the "Steer Clear" law. Finally, another one of the features is a display showing annual traffic fatalities in PA over the last 10 years as well as the current weekly fatality number and comparison with previous years.
- Improve data collection and data management. Pennsylvania's data-driven highway safety program focuses on improving the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of its crash data. The State's law enforcement liaison program was established in 2009 with the goals of: (1) enabling all fatal crash reports to be submitted within 24 hours of the crash; and (2) transitioning to electronic crash report submission by 2012.
- Compile data in electronic formats. Pennsylvania maintains its crash data from as early as 1997 in the Crash Data Analysis Retrieval Tool (CDART). CDART currently has 350 registered users from PennDOT, the Pennsylvania State Police, and 23 planning organizations. PennDOT also maintains a GIS Interactive Query Tool, which includes a feature to map all eligible locations for High Risk Rural Road funding.
- Evaluate countermeasures over time to monitor effectiveness. Pennsylvania tracks the deployment of countermeasures against the number of fatalities from crash types associated with those countermeasures. The Safety Management Division Chief demonstrated several trends illustrating positive relationships between countermeasure deployments and fatalities and crashes, including:
  - Miles of centerline rumble strips installed and head-on crash fatalities;
  - Miles of edge-line rumble strips installed and run-off-the-road fatalities; and
  - Number of tree removal/trimming locations and annual tree collision fatalities.

Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)

UDOT's Traffic and Safety Division Safety Programs Engineer provided a history of Utah's SHSP development. While preparing to host the 2002 Winter Olympics, Utah's annual fatalities spiked to almost 400. To address this increase, Utah's transportation planning projects focused primarily on infrastructure improvements. As a result, Utah's SHSP initially looked like an engineering document and was not consumable by other safety partners. With the introduction of SAFETEA-LU in 2006, Utah used 10 percent flex funding to establish its Zero Fatalities marketing initiative and the SHSP was updated for a wider safety stakeholder audience. The Zero Fatalities

campaign has been the key to integrating safety into Utah's culture and highlighting its importance to all stakeholder groups by helping Utah to:

- Create a statewide theme/goal. Utah found that the Zero Fatalities campaign has helped Utah establish a purpose for its SHSP by establishing champions to implement SHSP emphasis areas, creating ambassadors and partners to promote highway safety, and using educational outreach efforts to interact with local communities,
- Collaborate, coordinate, and communicate to keep stakeholders engaged. UDOT and the Utah Department of Public Safety are the lead agencies for the SHSP. Representatives from these agencies serve on an executive committee, composed of many agencies, to oversee day-to-day SHSP activities. To support Utah's focus on collaboration, cooperation, and coordination, Utah maintains a Zero Fatalities website (http://ut.zerofatalities.com/) where Utah's partner agencies can report on activities. Monthly and annual statistics are published on the website for use by the public and the media, as well as testimonials from friends and relatives of victims of crashes. Although "Zero Fatalities" represents Utah's ultimate goal, the website also tracks progress towards short-term goals.
- Deploy creative marketing and outreach strategies to reach a broad audience. Zero Fatalities successfully developed a presence on social media through Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter. Although initially met with skepticism regarding the feasibility of the initiative's goal, the media now have a more positive perspective on Zero Fatalities in part due to UDOT leadership's comfort in speaking with them. Furthermore, based on a marketing survey of 18-to 55-year old Utah residents, 75 percent of the population is aware of the campaign. While Zero Fatalities is funded primarily by UDOT, citizens do not view it as a UDOT or government campaign, but as a grassroots community campaign.

  Zero Fatalities has been successful in its public outreach efforts targeting teens. The organization has a full-time coordinator who works with high school students and has created a teen safe driving program called "Don't Drive Stupid" that identifies a core group of leaders in each high school to be Zero Fatalities ambassadors. Utah publishes an annual memorial book of every teen that dies in a traffic crash, which includes biographies written by family members, which has been an effective way to reach drivers during their influential teen years. Zero Fatalities also initiated a seatbelt campaign in elementary schools, not just as a way to increase the use of seatbelts and booster seats, but also to relay a message about seatbelts to parents and grandparents. Through its multi-faceted efforts to create and implement an effective SHSP, Utah reduced fatalities by 37 percent in 2010, from a peak of 373 in 2000.

Breakout Group Discussions

Following the peer presentations, participants divided into breakout groups designed to allow diverse stakeholders to work together and build relationships in a collaborative setting. Participants represented their individual organizations as champions but also learned from other members of the group. Each breakout group discussed the strengths and weaknesses of New Hampshire's current SHSP as well as opportunities for improvement. On the second day, groups discussed the composition of New Hampshire's SHSP Core Group, emphasis areas to include in New Hampshire's updated SHSP, and strategies and timelines for each emphasis area. Planning worksheets were supplied for groups to document their work and a facilitator moderated each of the sessions. Findings and recommendations from the breakout groups are summarized below by topic.

Strengths of New Hampshire's SHSP

New Hampshire's SHSP has affected the way that NHDOT conducts its business, particularly with regard to motorcycles. Other strengths of New Hampshire's SHSP and related efforts include:

- *Clear Purpose:* The SHSP has a mission statement, vision, and goals.
- *Flexibility:* The SHSP focuses on both proactive and reactive strategies.
- *Responsibility:* Emphasis area groups within the SHSP are responsible for developing and implementing strategies to address overall goals.
- *Committed Champion:* New Hampshire has an effective champion for its SHSP – the State Highway Safety Engineer.
- *High-Quality Fatal Crash Data:* New Hampshire has high-quality fatal crash data, which law enforcement agencies use to effectively target their resources.

- *Support and Commitment from Law Enforcement:* Enforcement is able to focus on distracted and impaired driving and there has also been a dedicated aggressive driving program developed through the SHSP.

Weaknesses of SHSP

The groups identified a few weaknesses of New Hampshire's current SHSP including:

- *Communication*: The SHSP has not been widely circulated. Additional communication and follow-up activities are needed.
- *Branding and Marketing*: The public is not aware of the SHSP; it is not in a format that the public can easily access or understand.
- *Narrow Focus:* The SHSP's focus is on fatalities and should be expanded to include prevention of injury crashes.
- *Implementation:* New Hampshire did not develop an implementation plan to supplement its SHSP; the plan describes what New Hampshire wants to accomplish but not who, when, and how.
- *Evaluation Measures:* The SHSP lacks performance measures and a mechanism for evaluation.

Opportunities for Improvement

Based on peer discussions and lessons learned from peer presentations, the groups outlined several opportunities for improving the SHSP in its next iteration:

- Create a charter for stakeholder agencies to formalize and document agency involvement and commitment and foster an environment of greater accountability among emphasis area teams.
- Focus on enforcement strategies to address behavioral issues such as speeding and distracted and impaired driving.
- Engage the public by holding public meetings to explain what the SHSP is and how the public can get involved.
- Create a safety branding initiative in New Hampshire with the SHSP as its foundation.

Next Steps

Based on breakout group discussions during the second day of the event, the membership of the SHSP Core Group was established, which will include representatives from the following organizations:

- New Hampshire DOT
  - Highway Safety
  - Operations
  - Design
  - Maintenance
  - Safe Routes to School
- Department of Motor Vehicles
  - Motorcycle Rider Program
  - Fatal Crash Data
- Division of Public Health Services, Department of Health and Human Services
- Bureau of Drug and Alcohol Services
- Highway Safety Agency
- Commissioner's Office, Department of Safety
- Attorney General's Office
- Legislature (transportation representative from House or Senate)
- Public Works Departments
- American Traffic Safety Services Association
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- Regional Planning Commissions
- FHWA New Hampshire Division Office

- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
- Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
- State Motor Carrier Enforcement
- Industry/Vendor Partners
- Injury Prevention Center

Next, the participants developed lists of emphasis area team champions and members. The groups also established draft goals, with strategies and performance measures for each. New Hampshire's emphasis areas include roadway departure, intersections, motorcycles and other vulnerable users, driver and passenger protection, teen drivers, elderly drivers, impaired drivers, speeding, distracted driving, and comprehensive data improvement. (See Appendix C for a table summarizing the work of an example emphasis area group – roadway departure – including goals, strategies, and performance measures.) Strategies focused on the following common themes:

- Deploy a variety of low-cost engineering countermeasures;
- Adopt education and public awareness campaigns;
- Improve data-sharing and analysis capabilities within and between agencies;
- Use data to strategically deploy law enforcement campaigns;
- Support legislative initiatives that target behavioral safety issues; and
- Leverage relationships with unconventional partner organizations.

Participants also developed the following list of requirements for New Hampshire's updated SHSP:

- A clear and concise statement of the document's mission/vision that includes a broad, Zero Fatalities goal;
- A charter for the Executive Committee;
- Emphasis areas including the following:
    - Problem statement;
    - Data analysis;
    - Strategies;
    - Goals/targets;
    - Implementation actions;
    - Time frames;
    - Performance measures;
    - Expected outcomes; and
    - Available resources.
- Demonstrated links to partner agency plans.

All emphasis area groups agreed to hold an initial meeting within four months of the peer exchange and committed to holding subsequent meetings on a regular basis (e.g., monthly or quarterly).

Key Findings and Lessons Learned

New Hampshire's peer exchange successfully engaged the State's primary highway safety stakeholders to launch an update to the SHSP. Event participants contributed to a critical analysis of New Hampshire's existing SHSP, outlined ten preliminary emphasis areas for an update of the Plan, and determined membership recommendations and a timeline for the SHSP Core Group and emphasis area teams. Stakeholders learned about successful practices in other States and how to incorporate them into planning for New Hampshire's SHSP update. Participants made particular note of the value of Washington's prioritization of emphasis areas, Pennsylvania's focus on tracking performance, and Utah's success in marketing its SHSP activities to the public.

Noteworthy practices learned from the event included the following:

- *Develop a clear mission and vision statement for the SHSP.* A clear and concise statement about the goals, mission, and/or vision of the SHSP communicates the importance of the Plan and associated activities to stakeholders and partners.
- *Engage diverse partners to establish momentum for SHSP development and implementation.* All three peer agencies discussed their success in engaging partners in SHSP development and implementation processes. Washington's SHSP efforts began with two agencies but now include more than 100, while Pennsylvania and Utah's SHSPs are developed, managed, and implemented by multi-agency teams formed through a formal charter process. These charters help document member agencies' commitment to the SHSP. Furthermore, Utah's Zero Fatalities charter unites the perspectives of many traffic safety programs into a single, consistent message.
- *Determine a target audience for the SHSP; if appropriate, publicize and market the SHSP.* New Hampshire should decide whether the SHSP should be limited to public agencies with an interest in highway safety or if it should be marketed to the general public. If the target audience includes the public, the importance of marketing and outreach should be considered to engage as broad an audience as possible. A statewide theme or goal can unite the efforts of multiple highway safety stakeholders and improve recognition of the SHSP among members of the public. Effective communication through traditional and social media outlets can enhance the image of the SHSP among different demographic groups.
- *Track progress with performance measures.* All three peer States presented examples of how they track performance, ranging from progress towards Zero Fatality goals to activities to implement strategies within each emphasis area. All of these performance-tracking efforts enable organizations to illustrate to leadership, legislators, and the public how their actions are influencing crash and fatality trends and where increased focus in particular areas will lead to desired outcomes.

Feedback and Suggestions

Participants and key staff involved in planning the event appreciated the opportunity to learn from peer States and facilitators. They indicated that the peer presentations provided excellent support and guidance to begin the update process for New Hampshire's SHSP. In particular, participants commented that peer presentations were helpful to better understand how to apply performance measures to track SHSP-related activities and the SHSP's potential role to establish a safety brand to raise public awareness. Multiple participants indicated that the event was an ideal opportunity to understand the needs of various partners involved in roadway safety and build consensus around those needs. Participants also appreciated facilitators' subject matter expertise and event coordination experience.

Appendix A: Event Presenters, Planners, and Registrants

Peer Presenters	
Scott Jones Safety Programs Engineer Utah Department of Transportation Traffic and Safety Office Phone: (801) 965-4285 Email: wsjones@utah.gov	Gary Modi Chief, Safety Management Division Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Office Phone: (717) 783-1190 Email: gmodi@state.pa.us
John Milton Director, Enterprise Risk Management Washington State Department of Transportation Office Phone: (360) 704-6363 Email: miltonj@wsdot.wa.gov	Jeff Roecker Transportation Planning Specialist Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Office Phone: (717) 525-5766 Email: jroecker@state.pa.us
FHWA/Volpe	
Tamiko Burnell Transportation Specialist FHWA Office of Safety Office Phone: (202) 366-1200 Email: tamiko.burnell@dot.gov	Susan Smichenko Community Planner Volpe National Transportation Systems Center Office Phone: (617) 494-3438 Email: Susan.Smichenko@dot.gov
Ryan Brumfeld Transportation Specialist FHWA Office of Safety Office Phone: (304) 347-5473 Email: ryan.brumfeld@dot.gov	Timothy Taylor Highway Safety Engineer FHWA Resource Center Office Phone: (404) 562-3560 Email: Timothy.Taylor@dot.gov
David Perlman Operations Research Analyst Volpe National Transportation Systems Center Office Phone: (617) 494-3178 Email: David.Perlman@dot.gov	
New Hampshire Event Planners	
Martin Calawa Safety and Traffic Operations Engineer FHWA New Hampshire Division Office Office Phone: (603) 228-3057 x108 Email: martin.calawa@dot.gov	Stuart Thompson Highway Safety Engineer New Hampshire Department of Transportation Office Phone: (603) 271-1407 Email: gthompson@dot.state.nh.us
Craig Green Assist. Dir. of Project Development New Hampshire Department of Transportation Office Phone: (603) 271-7419 Email: cgreen@dot.state.nh.us	
Attendees	
Michael Allen 3M Traffic Safety Specialist 3M Company – Traffic Safety Systems Office Phone: (401) 368-0438 Email: mdallen@mmm.com	Kimberley Griswold Vice President, Client Planning and Strategy wedu Office Phone: (603) 647-9338 Email: kim@wedu.com
Darren Benoit Transportation Manager McFarland Johnson Office Phone: (603) 225-2978 Email: DBenoit@MJINC.com	Gary Guzouskas Coordinator Keene State College-Driver Education Instructor Preparation Program Office Phone: (603) 313-1864 Email: gguzouskas@keene.edu

Attendees (continued)	
Roberta Bourque Business Systems Analyst DOS/DMV Office Phone: (603) 227-4041 Email: roberta.bourque@dos.nh.gov	Howard Hedegard Highway Safety Specialist Injury Prevention Center at Dartmouth Office Phone: (603) 848-0078 Email: nhtrafficsafety@yahoo.com
Robin Bousa Director of Transportation Systems VHB Office Phone: (603) 644-0888 Email: rbousa@vhb.com	John LeLacheur Captain NH State Police Office Phone: (603) 223-8514 Email: john.lelacheur@dos.nh.gov
Angie Byrne Regional Program Manager NHTSA Region 1 Office Phone: (617) 494-2682 Email: angie.byrne@dot.gov	Robert Letourneau Motorcycle Education Specialist DOS-DMV-MRT Office Phone: (603) 227-4111 Email: robert.letourneau@dos.nh.gov
Kevin Carter Division Administrator USDOT – FHMCSA Office Phone: (603) 228-3112 x103 Email: Kevin.Carter@dot.gov	Mark Liebl Lieutenant NH State Police Office Phone: (603) 223-8520 Email: Mark.Liebl@dos.nh.gov
Chip Cooper EMS Research and Quality Management Coordinator NH Bureau of EMS Office Phone: (603) 223-4226 Email: richard.cooper@dos.nh.gov	Nathan Miller Senior Planner UVLSRPC Office Phone: (603) 448-1680 Email: nmiller@uvlsrpc.org
Keith Cota Chief Project Manager NHDOT Office Phone: (603) 271-1615 Email: kcota@dot.state.nh.us	Pat Moody Director Public Affairs/Traffic Safety AAA Northern New England Office Phone: (207) 780-6916 Email: pmoody@nne.aaa.com
Jo-Ellen Courtney Child Passenger Safety Specialist Injury Prevention Center/Dartmouth Office Phone: (603) 653-8355 Email: jo-ellen.courtney@dartmouth.edu	Sam Newsom Civil Engineer NHDOT Office Phone: (603 485-3806 Email: SNewsom@dot.state.nh.us
Richard Crate Chief of Police Enfield Police Department/NH Chief of Police Office Phone: 603-632-7501 Email: rcrate@enfield.nh.us	Patricia Rainboth Executive Director Victims Inc. Office Phone: (603) 335-7777 Email: pat.rainboth@victimsinc.org
Kathleen Daley MRT Coordinator DOS-DMV-MRT Office Phone: (603) 227-4051 Email: kathleen.daley@dos.nh.gov	Debra Samaha Program Director Injury Prevention Center at Dartmouth Office Phone: (603) 653-8357 Email: debra.samaha@dartmouth.edu
Marco Damiata Regional Program Manager NHTSA Office Phone: (617) 494-3657 Email: Marco.Damata@dot.gov	Kevin Sheppard Public Works Director City of Manchester Office Phone: (603) 624-6444 Email: ksheppard@manchesternh.gov
Glenn Davison GIS Project Manager NH DOT Office Phone: (603) 271-7145 Email: gdavison@dot.state.nh.us	Rhonda Siegal Injury Prevention Program Manager New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services Office Phone: (603)271-4700 Email: rsiegel@dhhs.state.nh.us

Attendees (continued)	
Michael Desrochers Senior Project Manager Jacobs Office Phone: (603) 666-7181 Email: Mike.Desrochers@jacobs.com	David Smith Assistant Administrator Bureau of Turnpikes-NHDOT Office Phone: (603) 485.3806 Email: dssmith@dot.state.nh.us
Kathy DesRoches Director WFD Manchester Community College Office Phone: (603) 206-8161 Email: Kdesroches@ccsnh.edu	Christopher Storm State Trooper New Hampshire State Police-Troop-A Office Phone: (603) 223-8490 Email: Christopher.Storm@dos.nh.gov
Kimberly Eccles Principal VHB Office Phone: (919) 834-3972 Email: Keccles@VHB.com	Peter M. Thompson Coordinator NH Highway Safety Agency Office Phone: (603) 271-2131 Email: pthomson@nhhsa.state.nh.us
Jim Esdon Program Manager Injury Prevention Center at Dartmouth Office Phone: (603) 653-8360 Email: jim.edson@dartmouth.edu	Friedrich von Recklinghausen Trauma Program Manager DHMC/DMS Office Phone: (603) 650-6064 Email:Friedrich.M.Von.Recklinghausen@hitchcock.org
Diana Fenton Assist. Attorney General NH Department of Justice Office Phone: (603) 271-6771 Email: diana.fenton@doj.nh.gov	Steven Wade Executive Director Brain Injury Association of NH Office Phone: (603) 225-8400 Email: steve@bianh.org
Debra Garvin Program Manager NH Highway Safety Agency Office Phone: (603) 271-2131 Email: dgarvin@nhhsa.state.nh.us	Brad Weilbrenner Research Program Specialist NH DOS - Bureau of Emergency Medical Services Office Phone: (603) 223-4200 Email: Brad.Weilbrenner@dot.nh.gov
Steve Gratton CEO Lovering Family Foundation Office Phone:(603) 848-2131 Email: sgratton@tds.net	Glen Wilder FARS Analyst / Fatal Crash Unit State of NH DOS / DMV Office Phone: (603) 227-4185 Email: Glen.Wilder@dos.nh.gov

Appendix B: Agenda

NEW HAMPSHIRE STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN UPDATE
PEER EXCHANGE/WORKSHOP AGENDA
May 18 - 19, 2011

Wednesday, May 18, 2011 – Peer Exchange

8:00 am	Welcoming Remarks - George N. Campbell, Jr. – Commissioner, NH Department of Transportation - Earl Sweeny – Assistant Commissioner, NH Department of Safety - Peter Thomson – Coordinator, NH Highway Safety Agency
8:20 am	Workshop Overview/Expected Outcomes – Stuart Thompson, Highway Safety Engineer, NH DOT
8:30 am	Overview of FHWA's Safety Program – Martin Calawa, FHWA NH Division Office
8:45 am	Overview of New Hampshire's Data Program, Roberta Bourque
9:00 am	Presentation on International Motorcycle Scanning Tour – Keith Cota, Chief Project Manager, NH DOT Highway Design
9:15 am	Peer Presentation – John Milton – WSDOT Director, Enterprise Risk Management
9:50 am	*Break*
10:00 am	Peer Presentation – Gary Modi – Chief, Safety Management Division / Jeffery Roecker – Transportation Planning Specialist, Pennsylvania DOT
10:35 am	Peer Presentation – Scott Jones – Safety Programs Engineer, Utah DOT Traffic and Safety
11:10 am	Q&A for Peers
11:30 am	Lunch
12:30 pm	SHSP Update - Breakout Groups • Current SHSP Strengths • Current SHSP Weaknesses • SHSP Opportunities for Improvements
1:30 pm	Report Out
2:00 pm	*Break*
2:10 pm	Large Group Discussion • SHSP Structure • Mission • Vision
3:00 pm	Breakout Groups - Emphasis Area Action Plans for Implementation • Purpose and Benefits • Select Emphasis Areas • Critical Elements: o Goals o Strategies o Performance Measures o Targets • Tracking Performance
3:45 pm	Wrap-Up
4:00 pm	Adjourn

PEER EXCHANGE/WORKSHOP AGENDA
(continued)

Thursday, May 19, 2011

8:00 am	Welcome and Logistics
8:15 am	Emphasis Area Groups Breakout – Action Plans for Implementation • Goals • Strategies
9:30 am	Report Out
10:00 am	*Break*
10:15 am	Emphasis Area Groups Breakout – Action Plans for Implementation (continued) • Performance Measures • Targets and Tracking
11:15 am	Report Out
12:00 pm	Lunch
1:00 pm	Emphasis Area Groups Breakout – Action Plans for Implementation (continued) • Performance Measures • Targets and Tracking
2:00 pm	Report Out
2:30 pm	*Break*
2:45 pm	Future Expectations and Next Steps
3:30 pm	Adjourn

Appendix C: Example Emphasis Area – Roadway Departure

EMPHASIS AREA	GOALS	EXAMPLE STRATEGIES
Lane Departure	Keep vehicles in their lane.	For horizontal curves: • Shoulder and centerline rumble strips • Curve delineation • Advanced warning signs • All weather/enhanced pavement markings • High-friction surface treatment • Improve sight distance • Verify adequate super-elevation • Rumble strips with RPMs Other countermeasures: • Flatten curves • Improve super-elevation • Active warning devices • Concrete median barriers • Roadway lighting • Widen shoulders • Grooved pavement
	Minimize the likelihood of a crash or vehicle overturning.	• Safety edge • Shoulder leveling • Guardrail and concrete median barrier • Add all-weather shoulder • Lane widening program • Remove, relocate, and redesign obstacles (trees, utility poles) • Flatten slopes
	Reduce the severity of lane departure crashes.	• Use less rigid barriers • Use guardrail that is safer for motorcyclists • Maintain roadside clear zone • Flatten slopes • Remove, relocate, and redesign obstacles (trees, utility poles)
Tracking Performance	• Periodically review data for high crash locations and assign accountability. • Use the Highway Safety Manual to evaluate/assess predicted crashes along segments of roadway. • Use data to set thresholds at a certain number of crashes per segment. • Evaluate and develop a set of countermeasures and policies.	
Performance Measures	• Projects per year. • Miles of countermeasures installed per year.