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## Protection of Data from Discovery \& Admission into Evidence

Section 148(g)(4) of 23 USC stipulates that data compiled or collected for the preparation of the HSIP Report "...shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in an action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location identified or addressed in such reports..." This information is also protected by 23 USC 409 (discovery and admission as evidence of certain reports and surveys).

## Introduction

This is a report on the Iowa Highway Safety Improvement Program for the state fiscal year 2013. The time period covered by this report is from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) core program created under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). It is established as section 148 of Title 23, United States Code (23 U.S.C. 148) and regulated under 23 CFR 924. These regulations also created the High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP) as a component of the HSIP, and continued a separate Rail Highway Grade Crossing Program (RHGCP). In 2012, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the $21^{\text {st }}$ Century Act (MAP-21) directs states to maintain HSIP, update their SHSP, and discontinue HRRRP.

The federal regulations also require strategic plans and annual reports. Here is a list of the documents that lowa maintains in accordance with the regulations:

- Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) -- Iowa wrote a Comprehensive Highway Safety Plan (CHSP) in 2006 and has completed writing a new SHSP in 2013
- Transparency (5\%) Report - Annually updated until 2012, discontinued in 2013
- HSIP Report - Annually updated
- RHGCP Report - Annually updated
- SHSP Report - Annually updated

Included herein is information regarding the Iowa HSIP, including the final year of HRRRP. In this report, the HSIP is the focus of Parts A, B, and C, and Part D is reserved for the HRRRP.

At the Iowa DOT, two offices were responsible for different components of the HSIP. The Office of Local Systems administered the HRRRP, and the Office of Traffic and Safety administers the remainder of the HSIP. Each office has contributed to this report on the basis of their administrative responsibilities.

## A. HSIP Program Structure

i. Program Administration

## Program Administrators

The Iowa HSIP program is administered by the Iowa DOT Office of Traffic and Safety. It is a centrally-run program.

## Funding Allocation

Available HSIP funding is generally allocated to the Primary Road System (state-owned roadways) in Iowa. Only an occasional local project receives HSIP funding.

Funding for safety initiatives on county- and city-owned roads, the Secondary Road System and Local Road System respectively, has come from two different programs.

The HRRRP was used exclusively for projects on the Secondary Road System.
The other program is a state based safety program known as the Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP). In 1987, the lowa Legislature enacted a state law requiring $1 / 2$ percent of the state gas tax revenues be used to fund traffic safety projects. The TSIP is administered on a competitive application basis, and all road systems are eligible for funding. Historically, cities and counties receive the greatest portion of these funds. Projects completed with this program are not included in this report.

## Project Selection

In Iowa, we aspire to select HSIP projects that emerge from the SHSP and the Safety Improvement Candidate Lists.

In the development of the SHSP, it was revealed that lowa highway safety issues can be segregated into one of two engineering-based categories: intersections or lane departure.

In preparation of the Safety Improvement Candidate Lists, we look further at the data and the highway systems in lowa (Primary, Secondary, and Local Road systems). The goal is to identify locations or corridors with a history of crashes. Mapping is the preferred choice to communicate the areas of concern, and the following maps were developed in 2010:

- Intersections
- Lane Departure
- Run off the road right
- Cross Median
- Cross Centerline
- Curves

These maps show locations with the greatest number of crashes in lowa. Please note the maps are not trying to convey that these roads are hazardous, but that these roads experience a greater number of crashes than other like roads in lowa.

While the maps described above have not been updated recently, lowa is in the process of developing an updated network screening tool to produce new maps. Visual representation will continue to be used in project selection.

The Iowa HSIP Project Identification Process was established in 2003, and remains current today.

Here are some brief highlights of this process:

- Selected projects are aligned with the SHSP categories: intersections or lane departure.
- Locations identified in the Safety Improvement Candidate Lists are based on the number of fatal and major injury crashes over a ten year period.
- Prioritization of potential HSIP projects is first made on a benefit versus cost basis. By this, we are indicating that we try to implement projects and treatments that will provide the greatest reduction in crashes for a minimal cost.

However, actual project selection is affected by factors such as leveraging other program funding, maximizing statewide impact, and other programmed improvements. It is preferred to complete more small or moderate cost projects, in lieu of one or two high cost projects.

## iii. Special Rules

## High Risk Rural Roads Special Rule

The High Risk Rural Roads Special Rule does not apply to lowa as of 2013. The rate of traffic fatalities and serious injuries on local roads has not increased.

## Older Driver and Pedestrian Special Rule

The Older Driver and Pedestrian Special Rule does not apply to lowa as of 2013. The 5-year average of the rate of traffic fatalities and serious injuries per capita for drivers and pedestrians over the age of 65 did not increase by a statistically significant amount. The data and calculations for this rate can be found in Appendix B .
B. HSIP Project Implementation Progress
i. HSIP Funding

The following table shows the total HSIP funding obligated in state fiscal year 2013.

| HSIP Project Funding <br> Estimates based on anticipated letting costs |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State Fiscal Year: | 2013 |  |  |
| Period: | 7/1/12 to 6/30/13 |  |  |
| Funding Category |  | Obligated | Notes |
| HSIP | Section 148 | \$29,378,993.35 |  |
| HES | Section 152 |  |  |
| Optional Safety |  |  |  |
| Penalty Transfer | Section 154 \& 164 |  |  |
| Seat Belt Performance | Section 406 |  |  |
| Incentive Grants | Section 157 \& 163 |  |  |
| Other Federal-Aid Funds | STP, ARRA |  |  |
| State and Local Funds |  | \$ 5,821,966.65 | match to HSIP |
| Total |  | \$ 35,200,960.00 |  |

For state fiscal year 2013, these funds were obligated across the following SHSP categories:

| Intersections | \$ | 252,084.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Departure |  |  |
| Run off the road right | \$ | 34,281,957.00 |
| Cross median | \$ | 666,919.00 |
| Cross centerline | \$ |  |
| Total | \$ | 35,200,960.00 |

ii. General Listing of Projects

| Project Number | County | Route | Roadway Description | Improvement Category (Source: 23 CFR 924) | Project Estimate at FHWA Authorization |  | Federal Share (Obligation Amount) |  | Emphasis Area | Strategy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HSIPX-086-1(8)--3L-10 | Dickinson | la 86 | South of MN border | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 2,129,783.00 | \$ | 1,128,651.30 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-086-1(14)--3L-10 | Dickinson | la 86 | South of MN border | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 67,918.00 | \$ | 61,126.20 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-150-3(65)--3J-10 | Buchanan | la 150 | 170th St. 4.5 mi . N of Independence | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 3,293,837.00 | \$ | 2,496,656.70 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-067-1(134)--3L-82 | Scott | US 67 | Between LeClaire and Princeton | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 817,886.00 | \$ | 736,097.40 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-061-4(109)--3L-70 | Muscatine | US 61 | Iowa 38 to Scott Co Line (SBL) | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 1,775,005.00 | \$ | 1,549,925.79 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-330-1(30)--3L-64 | Jasper, Story, Marshall | la 330 | US 65 to US 30 | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 2,615,600.00 | \$ | 2,249,321.40 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-151-3(140)--3L-57 | Linn, Jones | US 151 | Springville to Monticello | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 4,171,989.00 | \$ | 3,754,790.10 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-061-7(80)--3L-49 | Jackson | US 61 | Maquoketa to Dubuque Co Line | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 3,723,730.00 | \$ | 3,351,357.00 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-030-7(161)--3L-57 | Linn | US 30 | Kirkwood Blvd to US 151 | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 1,731,545.00 | \$ | 1,558,390.50 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-061-8(135)--3L-31 | Dubuque | US 61 | Jackson Co Line to US 151 | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 1,768,998.00 | \$ | 1,592,098.20 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-061-6(71)--3L-23 | Jackson | US 61 | Welton to Maquoketa | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 2,007,153.00 | \$ | 1,806,437.70 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-071-7(53)--3L-11 | Buena <br> Vista, Clay | US 71 | Sioux Rapids to Spencer | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 3,005,919.00 | \$ | 2,705,327.10 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-018-1(79)--3L-84 | Sioux | US 18 | US 75 to Sheldon | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 3,230,840.00 | \$ | 2,907,756.00 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-044-5(25)--3L-25 | Dallas | la 44 | Dallas Center to Grimes | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 1,530,680.00 | \$ | 700,000.20 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-415-1(50)--3L-77 | Polk | la 415 | la 141 to S of Polk City | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 1,577,668.00 | \$ | 1,409,269.50 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-010-1(77)--3L-84 | Sioux | la 10 | State Line to Hawarden | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 803,755.00 | \$ | 518,000.00 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HRRR-C010(81)-5R-10 | Buchanan |  | County project to place rumble strips | Installation of Rumble Strips | \$ | 29,651.00 | \$ | 26,685.56 | Lane Departure | Run off road |
| HSIPX-065-3(61)--3L-91 | Warren | US 65 | Scotch Ridge Road, 2.5 miles south of la 5 | Pavement and Shoulder Widening | \$ | 252,084.00 | \$ | 226,875.60 | Intersection |  |
| IHSIPX-035-4(192)97--08-77 | Polk | 1-35 | Rest Areas | Installation of Guardrail | \$ | 666,919.00 | \$ | 600,227.10 | Lane Departure | Cross <br> Median |
|  |  |  |  | Totals | \$ | 35,200,960.00 | \$ | 29,378,993.35 |  |  |

## C. Program Effectiveness

i. General Highway Safety Trends

The following charts show the recent fatality and major injury trends in Iowa.



The charts show year by year fluctuation in fatalities and major injuries, but the general trend has been downward.

Another indicator is rate. This is figured as the number of occurrences per hundred million vehicle miles traveled (HMVMT).


In Iowa, we have slow steady decline in the fatality rate over a long period of time. We are also seeing a more significant decline in the major injury rate.
ii. Overall HSIP Effectiveness

At the onset of the HSIP program in lowa, funding was generally targeted towards urban intersections. Over the years, HSIP funding expenditures has been focused on the emphasis areas defined in the SHSP, in particular lane departure.

As the HSIP program began to focus on lane departure projects, a parallel initiative to change design policies was initiated. This policy change was to address lane departure crashes, and the following table provides a brief summary of the changes.

## Paved Shoulder Policy

Originally issued in January 2004, and revised in June 2008. The policy was created to address run off the road crashes.

## Original policy highlights

All interstates are to get full width paved shoulders.
All NHS routes and non-NHS routes with 3000 or more ADT are to get four foot paved shoulders. The remaining shoulder width is granular.
Non-NHS routes with less than 3000 ADT can have four foot paved shoulders if conditional warrants are met.

## Policy revision

Added six foot paved shoulder conditions and additional conditions that merit a full width paved shoulder.

## Milled Rumble Policy

Originally issued in January 2004 as a compliment to the Paved Shoulder Policy, and revised in June 2010. The policy was created to address run off the road crashes.

## Original policy highlights

Milled rumble strips become the standard with asphalt shoulders. Concrete pavement and shoulders still rely on stamped rumbles.

## Policy revision

Added centerline rumbles to the policy. Centerline rumbles are now standard on undivided, rural highways.

Shoulder rumbles are standard for asphalt and concrete. Shoulder rumbles are expected on all paved shoulders with exceptions for residential and urban areas.

## Safety Edge Policy

Issued in April 2010 and is supplemental to the Paved Shoulder Policy. This policy address run off the road crashes.

## Original policy highlights

Safety edge becomes the standard pavement edge treatment when paved shoulders are not included or less than 4 feet wide. This policy completes a series of treatments to address run off the road crashes.

The effect of these policies is far reaching, and difficult to measure. These policies imbed safety features within projects outside the HSIP, and broaden the reach of HSIP safety initiatives. They represent a systemic implementation of safety features, albeit a slow delivery process. Now, even regular capacity and infrastructure projects are incorporating safety features that help reduce crashes.

Included in Appendix A is a simple before/after evaluation of previously completed HSIP projects. For projects old enough, either a 3,4, or 5 year before/after is provided.

## D. High Risk Rural Roads Program

The High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP) has been discontinued in MAP-21. The following pages detail the final year of the HRRRP.

While MAP-21 ended HRRRP, it also added performance measures for roads previously eligible for HRRRP funding. If fatal and major injury crashes on high risk rural roads increase for two consecutive years, then the state is required to invest a portion of HSIP funds (two times the 2009 HRRRP level) on those roads.

In the 2013 Iowa Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), high risk rural roads are defined as the paved rural major and minor collectors, and the paved local roads.

The lowa DOT is committed to improving safety on all public roads. To do so, the lowa DOT is taking advantage of its set-aside option and is allocating $\$ 2$ million of its HSIP funds to provide a systemic safety program for the county road system under a new program: HSIP-Secondary Roads.

Because it focuses on low-cost safety improvements, the HSIP-Secondary Roads program will fund more projects than the former HRRRP did. It will emphasize reducing crashes related to rural road lane departures, through projects in the $\$ 10,000$ per mile cost range. (The discontinued HRRR program focused on $\$ 500,000$ maximum, spot improvement grants.)

In addition, HSIP-Secondary Roads promotes systemic implementation of safety countermeasures. The systemic approach installs appropriate low cost countermeasures along an entire corridor, instead of treating only a single problem location.

FFY 2013 High Risk Rural Roads Annual Report

## Protection of Data from Discovery \& Admission into Evidence

Section $148(\mathrm{~g})(4)$ of 23 USC stipulates that date compiled or collected for the preparation of the HSIP Report "...shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in an action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location identified or addressed in such reports..." This information is also protected by 23 USC 409 (discovery and admission as evidence of certain reports and surveys).

## A. Methodology Used to Identify HRRR Projects

The lowa DOT has traffic data and crash data on all state and local routes. Paved routes classified as rural major collectors, rural minor collectors, and rural local routes with crash rates above the statewide average for fatal and major injury accidents define the eligible routes. Counties are provided maps showing all the eligible high risk rural roads in their respective counties. We utilize both a crash rate per 100M VMT and crashes per mile (crash density) to locate road segments that are in the top $15 \%$ of each category. Maps are also provided to counties showing them their top $15 \%$ locations. We use this information, along with a Benefit/Cost Ratio to rate county applications for HRRR funding. The lowa DOT also provides detailed crash information free to counties to assist them in analyzing their crash histories.
B. Program Effectiveness

It is too early in the program to analyze "after" accident data to measure program effectiveness. A 5-year accident history prior to the improvements will be compared to a 5 -year accident history following the improvements.

## C. Project Evaluation

The evaluation of individual projects will be accomplished when the 5 -year accident history following the improvements is available.

General Listing of Obligated Projects In FFY 2013

| Project | Improvement <br> Category | Output | Cost | Relationship to SHSP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Emphasis Area | Strategy |
| HRRR-CO91(88)--5R-91 | 2 | 2.83 miles | \$293,384.60 | Roadway Departure | Paved Shoulders |
| HRRR-C010(81)--5R-10 | 2 | 6.71 miles | \$2,230,018.08 | Roadway Departure | Paved Shoulders |
| HRRR-C006(76)--5R-06 | 1 | Intersection | \$410,412.00 | Intersection crash severity | vertical <br> realignment to <br> alleviate sight <br> distance issues |
| HRRR-CO77(165)--5R77 | 1 | Intersection | \$25,375.00 | Intersection crash severity | oversize stop signs with flashing beacon |


| HRRRP Project Funding |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Reporting Period: 10/01/2012 to 09/30/2013 |  |  |
| Funding Category | Programmed | Obligated |
| HRRRP | $\$ 1,510,865.00$ | $\$ 1,136,829.00$ |
| Other Federal-Aid Funds | $\$ 2,023,000.00$ | $\$ 1,050,723.00$ |
| State and Local Funds | $\$ 1,412,000.00$ | $\$ 771,637.00$ |
|  |  |  |

Below is a listing of projects obligated each of the previous Federal Fiscal Years:

General Listing of Obligated Projects In FFY 2012

| Project | Improvement <br> Category | Output | Cost | Relationship to SHSP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  |  |  | Emphasis Area | Strategy |  |
| HRRR-C010(69)--5R-10 | 1 | Intersection | $\$ 631,470.00$ | Intersection crash <br> severity | Roundabout |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HRRR-C091(83)--5R-91 | 2 | 5.91 miles | $\$ 591,682.00$ | Roadway Departure | Paved Shoulders |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HRRR-C022(67)--5R-22 | 17 | 0.65 miles | $\$ 150,127.00$ | Roadway Departure | Guardrail in Curves |

General Listing of Obligated Projects In FFY 2011

| Project | Improvement <br> Category | Output | Cost | Relationship to SHSP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Emphasis Area | Strategy |  |
| HRRR-C077(159)--7W-77 | 1 | Intersection | $\$ 777,042.00$ | Roadway Departure | Grade improvements, <br> new bridge |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HRRR-C050(90)--5R-50 | 2 | 0.2 miles | $\$ 385,999.00$ | Roadway Departure | Paved Shldrs, curves |


| Project | Improvement <br> Category | Output | Cost | Relationship to SHSP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  |  |  | Emphasis Area | Strategy |  |
| HRRR-C063(88)--5R-63 | 2 | 1.65 miles | $\$ 2,191,000.00$ | Roadway Departure |  <br> Realign Curves |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HRRR-C010(61)--5R-10 | 2 | 7 miles | $\$ 1,086,000.00$ | Roadway Departure | Paved Shoulders |
| HRRR-C010(69)--5R-10 | 1 | intersection | $\$ 91,764.00$ | Crash Severity | Roundabout |

General Listing of Obligated Projects In FFY 2009

| Project | Improvement <br> Category | Output | Cost | Relationship to SHSP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Emphasis Area | Strategy |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HRRR-C091(77)--5R- } \\ & 91 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3.8 Miles | \$268,217.69 | Roadway Departure | Paved Shoulders |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HRRR-C057(87)--5R- } \\ & 57 \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 0.5 Miles | \$298,213.34 | Intersections | Improve sight distance |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HRRR-C025(73)--5R- } \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 Miles | \$293,508.91 | Roadway Departure | Widen Shoulders and Flatten Foreslopes |

## APPENDIX A - Before and After Crash Analysis for Past Projects




Appendix B -Older Driver \& Pedestrian Special Rule Calculation

Appendix B
Older Driver and Pedestrian Special Rule Calculation

## 2001-2013 Older Drivers and Pedestrians* <br> Injury Status <br> Statewide, Iowa

| Injury Status | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fatal | 57 | 61 | 63 | 57 | 68 | 82 | 61 | 61 | 54 | 58 | 72 | 54 |
| Incapacitating | 193 | 197 | 196 | 176 | 148 | 164 | 152 | 137 | 109 | 153 | 121 | 131 |
| Non-incapacitating | 659 | 570 | 522 | 555 | 504 | 506 | 506 | 480 | 444 | 460 | 407 | 457 |
| Possible | 952 | 874 | 932 | 923 | 885 | 898 | 830 | 839 | 832 | 831 | 798 | 856 |
| Unknown | 92 | 122 | 326 | 266 | 1310 | 1597 | 513 | 65 | 52 | 89 | 61 | 49 |
| F + SI | 250 | 258 | 259 | 233 | 216 | 246 | 213 | 198 | 163 | 211 | 193 | 185 |
|  | 65+ Persons (per 1,000 population) <br> Annual rate |  |  |  | 140 | 146 | 147 | 148 | 148 | 148 | 150 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |
| 5-year average rate |  |  |  |  | 2001-2005 | 2002-2006 | 2003-2007 | 2004-2008 | 2005-2009 | 2006-2010 | 2007-2011 | 2008-2012 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1216 | 1212 | 1167 | 1106 | 1036 | 1031 | 978 | 950 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.18 | vs. | 0.18 |  |

* Older Drivers and Pedestrians include persons 65 or older who were identified as having been in the driver seating position or identified specifically as a pedestrian. ** 2003 data is preliminary, downloaded 10/15/2013

