



Getting a Fair Share for Safety

from the
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advocacy Case Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction...	3
Summary of Recommendations...	4
Understand the HSIP planning process...	6
Cultivate internal advocates...	6
Cultivate elected officials...	7
<i>Sidebar: “Virginia’s 10 percent set-aside policy”...</i>	8
Influence the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)...	8
<i>Sidebar: “California and Safe Routes to Schools”...</i>	9
<i>Special section: “Strategic Highway Safety Plans”...</i>	11
Learn the project selection criteria...	13
<i>Sidebar: “Florida’s Project Prioritization Process”...</i>	13
Collect crash and fatality data...	14
Announce the funding opportunity...	15
Follow up...	16
Conclusion – knowledge, connections, data, results...	16
<i>Acknowledgements...</i>	17
<i>Contact us: Let’s work together...</i>	17
<i>Appendix: Bicycle and Pedestrian Fatalities as a Share of All Traffic Fatalities...</i>	18
<i>Appendix: State HSIP spending on Bicycle and Pedestrian projects</i>	19

Introduction

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) was created under the 2006 transportation authorization law, SAFETEA-LU, as one of the core Federal-Aid funding sources. HSIP funds safety projects aimed at reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries. Bike and pedestrian safety projects are eligible for HSIP funding. All public roads – including state, county and local roads – are eligible for HSIP funding. Examples of eligible projects include bike lanes, roadway shoulders, crosswalks, other intersection improvements and signage.

See the Advocacy Advance report on the [HSIP](#) for more information on eligibility, past spending, and program requirements.ⁱ For safety programs that fund education see “[Section 402](#) – State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program.”ⁱⁱ

States DOTs were slow to spend their available HSIP funds in the early years of the program, though they have been catching up in recent years. As of 2010, the 50 states spent 72 percent of the available total. Twenty-one states transferred a combined \$516 million to other highway programs.ⁱⁱⁱ To date, bicycle and pedestrian projects have not received a fair share of HSIP funds. Fourteen percent of traffic fatalities nationwide in 2009 were non-motorists.^{iv} Yet, according to the Financial Management Information System (FMIS), only 6 states (CA, FL, NJ, OH, VA, WA) had HSIP funds coded as bicycle and/or pedestrian projects in 2010. Six states (AL, CA, FL, MN, NC, VA) coded HSIP funds on bicycle/pedestrian projects in 2009. (See appendix.)

This report examines some of the states that have successfully dedicated federal safety funds to reduce bicycle and pedestrian fatalities and crashes. In a number of cases, advocates have taken a leading role in ensuring the transportation agency had prioritized road safety projects for non-motorists. Hopefully, these experiences will help advocates and officials in other states access this untapped resource for badly needed bicycle and pedestrian safety projects.

Summary of Recommendations

Although conditions and specific circumstances vary in different states, the advice from successful advocates and officials is remarkably consistent. The most important and frequent tips require advocates to find out the answers to the WHO, WHAT, WHEN, WHY, and HOWs of the HSIP process.

- **Understand the HSIP planning process.** Get acquainted with the program criteria, requirements, schedule and personnel. The following suggestions will help you do it.
- **Cultivate internal advocates.** Get to know your state's HSIP staff. Find out who else influences the relevant policies, processes and project selection. They can include local agency staff, State Highway Safety Engineers, District Safety Engineers and others. These folks understand the system. They are important sources of information and can be your best allies – many of them care deeply about bicyclist and pedestrian safety.
- **Cultivate elected officials.** Elected officials wield influence over programs and priorities; when they show interest, it matters. They can also be more heavy-handed. When agencies need a nudge, state legislation (or the threat of it) can produce results. The first step can be to highlight the need for safety interventions in your community. Find elected officials who care about this issue at the state and local levels. (Hint: they will care if they know their constituents care.)
- **Influence the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).** In order for bicycle and pedestrian safety projects to be eligible for HSIP funds, the state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan must identify them as priorities. Find out if bicyclist, pedestrian, and/or vulnerable road user safety is a plan priority area and get involved with revising the plan for bike/ped improvements and data collection. (See the matrix of SHSP priorities.^v) Plans have to be revised periodically. Find out when and recommend like-minded officials and advocates for the relevant committees.
- **Learn the project selection criteria.** How does the state select and prioritize safety projects? What are the performance outcomes being measured? Figure out how bicycle and pedestrian projects can compete, before the selections are finalized, to influence the project selection and prioritization process.
- **Collect crash and fatality data.** The HSIP project selection process is data driven. For projects to be funded, they need to be shown to address a proven and quantifiable safety need. Gather this data and encourage the state to develop a better statewide reporting system and GIS mapping to make this data more available to local agencies.
- **Announce the funding opportunity.** If your HSIP proposal deadlines are public, share them with state and local advocates, your constituents and the public, and provide tips for what to emphasize in the application to make for a successful project. If not, find out and share other key deadlines, like for the Transportation Improvement Plans (TIP) and Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSP).

- **Follow up.** Meet with the department and elected officials after safety projects have been selected. Thank them for funded bicycle and pedestrian safety projects, and remind them of the continued need. Follow-up with local communities that were funded for bicycle and pedestrian projects to ensure that they do a good job with the funding and that they evaluate the results. That way you can publicize how they got the funding and made the improvements to inspire other agencies to apply for HSIP funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the next round.

Understand the HSIP planning process

A big part of tapping into any federal funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects is learning the lay of the land and knowing what questions to ask. Advocates who know *who* to talk to, *what* to propose, *how* projects are selected and prioritized, *why* departments fund some projects and not others, and *how* the process works will be better positioned to get their favored projects funded than those who haven't done their research. As with the other funding sources, the answers to these questions can vary by state so advocates need to start by asking questions to learn the specifics for their state.

Here are a few examples of differences among states. In Washington, Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs) are invited to submit projects for funding.^{vi} In California, half of the funds are awarded by the state and half by localities.^{vii} The vast majority of HSIP funds are used for safety infrastructure improvements, but there are exceptions: advocates in New Jersey will find that NJDOT funds education programs through HSIP. This is because the source usually used for safety programs ([Section 402 funds](#)^{viii}) are not managed through NJDOT. In Florida, the DOT tries to address safety issues in their resurfacing projects. If the safety issue is too large or expensive to fix, it often becomes an HSIP priority. In Hawaii, the HDOT Highway Safety Office has influence over the HSIP as well as the members of the Governor's Highway Safety Committee. The Hawaii GHSC votes on funding for HSIP funds, ranking all proposals as high, medium or low priority. Knowing the particulars of your state will help you find the right partners, advocate for the right projects, and ensure that your project stays on track.

Much of the following advice focuses on helping advocates usher targeted bicycle and pedestrian projects through the HSIP process. However, much can be done to improve the safety of vulnerable road users in other safety projects as well. Stephen Read, VDOT's Highway Safety Improvement Programs Manager has trained engineers to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian safety into all projects. In fact, the best case scenario is one in which the DOT incorporates bicycle and pedestrian safety in all of their projects (Complete Streets policies) and in all of their HSIP projects. California has endorsed their Strategic Highway Safety Plan priorities for all of their surface transportation projects (more on Strategic Highway Safety Plans later).

Cultivate internal advocates

Stephen Read was twice hit by a car; once as a child and once as an adult. So, as the HSIP Program Manager for the state of Virginia, Read is motivated by both personal and professional experience to address bicycle and pedestrian crashes.

The state and local officials who manage the HSIP and highway safety are important sources of information and can be your best allies. Many of them, like Stephen Read, care deeply about bicycle and pedestrian safety. Find out who influences the relevant policies processes, and project selection. They can include local agency staff, State Highway Safety Engineers, District Safety Engineers, and others. These folks understand the system, have the information you need, and know how to get things done.

In South Carolina, the Palmetto Cycling Coalition has been working closely with Rob Lee, the Captain of the SC Highway Patrol and the Chair of the Vulnerable Roadway User emphasis area of the SC Strategic Highway Safety Plan. It can take some time to find your ally, so advocates build on their existing local and regional agency and elected leader relationships. “By way of a lot of phone calls and emails to various people at DOT and DPS [the Department of Public Safety], I found my way to Rob Lee,” says Rachael Kefalos, executive director of the Palmetto Cycling Coalition.

As the Captain of the Highway Patrol “he is in a position of a lot of influence but he is also quite busy and hard to get a hold of. We've been pretty lucky that most of DPS has been quite receptive to our efforts, and that I'm not limited to just Captain Lee as our connection to the Department,” Kefalos says. “Given how busy he is, I don't think we would be where we are now if it hadn't been for the openness of the Department as a whole.” As a tip to advocates looking for their own Captain Lee, Kefalos recommends being cooperative, patient and gracious: “No need to approach these people with big egos, lofty agendas and lots of Lycra. It pays off to show that you know your stuff but are willing to play nice in the sandbox.”

Because Florida has the most bicyclist fatalities in the country, their DOT Safety Office staff members take bike and pedestrian crashes quite personally and have become internal advocates to ensure safety funding remains high. Florida advocates have also been active in pushing for higher safety funding levels.

The best internal advocates are both well positioned and sympathetic to bicycle and pedestrian safety. They can be State or District Safety Engineers, HSIP Program Managers, or in other related positions. Advocates might be surprised who could turn out to be sympathetic within the agency.

Cultivate elected officials and build public support

Mary Margot Whipple used her position as a state Senator to nudge the Virginia DOT to take action. Whipple had long been pushing for a dedicated funding stream for bike/ped projects. When her legislation started to gain traction, VDOT officials realized they had the authority to implement the policy themselves, on their terms. Rather than let the state assembly tell them how to direct funds, they decided to do it themselves. The VDOT created an internal policy to set aside 10 percent of state federal safety money for bike/ped safety. (See sidebar.)

The will to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian safety, as evidenced by Virginia, doesn't always develop organically. When agencies need a nudge, state legislation — or the threat of it — can produce results. Advocates play a key role in fostering that political support to make bike/ped safety a priority.

The best way to get officials on your side is to highlight the needs of your community and show that the issue has the support of the public. Elected officials will care about improving safety of biking and walking, if they know their constituents care about it. Darla Letourneau did just that in Florida.

After the Alliance for Biking & Walking's [2010 Benchmarking Report](#), Transportation 4 America's "[Dangerous by Design](#)," and [National Highway Traffic Safety Administration](#) data showed that Florida is the most dangerous state in the country for pedestrians and cyclists, Darla Letourneau, of the advocacy group BikeWalkLee, released [a report](#) calling on Florida to "allocate a 'fair share' of its federal safety funds to pedestrian/bicycle safety projects, reflecting their share of all traffic fatalities (21%)."ix The report drew from the Advocacy Advance reports on [HSIP](#) and [Section 402](#). Letourneau's report critiqued the state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan for not setting workable performance measures and for not driving FDOT's spending on safety. In addition to calling for a fair share for safety, it requested legislation to ensure that FDOT allocates "all the federal safety funds (both the annual federal allocation and any balance forward from previous years) for safety improvement projects." Efforts like this bring bicyclist and pedestrian safety to the attention of lawmakers and demonstrate the need for proper safety investments.

Influence the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)

In order for bicycle and pedestrian safety projects to be eligible for HSIP funds, the state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan must identify them as priorities. Advocates should find out if bicyclist, pedestrian, and/or vulnerable road user safety is an emphasis area in the state's plan. Plans are revised periodically. Advocates should find out how and when this happens. (See the matrix of SHSP priorities^x and see the call out box for more on SHSPs.)

Advocates in Hawaii worked hard to shape the state's SHSP. Their experience shows the opportunities and challenges offered by the Strategic Highway Safety Plan process and accessing HSIP funds. Laura Dierenfield, executive director of PATH: Peoples Advocacy for Trails Hawaii, served on the Bicycle Committee for Hawaii's Strategic Highway Safety Plan. She was tapped to take over from the resigning chair because of her involvement in bicycle advocacy. She says that bicycle

Virginia's 10 percent set-aside policy

After elected officials in the Virginia State Assembly began pushing for a dedicated funding stream for bicycle and pedestrian safety, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) decided to create an internal policy that would set aside 10 percent of the state federal safety money for bike/ped safety. The 10 percent figure was arrived at because bicycle and pedestrian fatalities make up about 10 percent of the traffic deaths in Virginia.

Initially, projects were taken from Transportation Enhancements lists and funded by HSIP funds. Then official looked at how non-motorized safety was approached in other states, like California, and eventually created their own guidelines for selecting projects: "[Framework for Selection and Evaluation of Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Projects in Virginia](#)". They shifted from looking at intersections to focusing on entire corridors.

Information on Virginia's Bike and Pedestrian Safety Program can be found here:

http://www.virginiadot.org/business/ted_app_pro.asp#download

and pedestrian safety was chosen as an issue area because of advocates' dedicated work and commitment to raise awareness for the issue.

"Bike and Pedestrian advocates have been at the table for nearly all major transportation planning initiatives over the last quarter century in Hawaii," she says, "so I think that including bike/ped was not considered a stretch within the Hawaii SHSP. Another reason bike/ped was included is that Hawaii does have major issues with ped/bike safety. We are consistently in the top 10 most dangerous places to be a bicyclist or pedestrian. Drivers here are very aggressive due to major congestion, poor connectivity and terrible land use planning that has resulted in people living far from their workplaces and suffering horrendously long daily commutes."

In terms of advice for advocates, Dierenfield reiterates the importance of making the right connections. "I think that the most important thing is to establish relationships with leaders at the State Transportation Agency, whether that begins with the Bicycle Coordinator, letters right to the Director, or another method."

Dierenfield also emphasized the point that, unfortunately, the work is not finished once the plan is agreed upon. There are major implementation challenges. They include: competing with other emphasis areas for priority actions, limited financial and partner resources to carry out strategies, and getting the attention of key leadership within the Attorney General's Office, police, the state DOT, county transportation and planning agencies to implement strategies." Nonetheless, Dierenfield says HSIP has funded \$125,000 in bicycle and pedestrian projects, focused primarily on Bicycle and pedestrian education and motorist awareness. Hawaii's advocates have also successfully worked together to bring a number of workshops to the state and they've convinced the state to program \$92 million over the next six years to bicycle and pedestrian projects statewide.

Dierenfield shares a story that highlights the need for advocates to stay engaged in the process, even after the SHSP is written. She says, "NHTSA did an audit of the Safe Communities program back in March of 2010

California and Safe Routes to Schools

There are many local funding opportunities for safety programs in California, but the potential for tapping into federal HSIP funds was too great for Safe Routes to School advocates to ignore. When the 2005 federal transportation re-authorization law (SAFETEA-LU) required Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSP), three dozen California bicycle and pedestrian advocates met in Sacramento to discuss how they'd approach safety issues. They endorsed the 16 AASHTO recommended safety priorities – including one for pedestrians and one for bicyclists. Caltrans created work groups for each "challenge areas." Deb Hubsmith and the SRTS network made sure that bicycle and pedestrian advocates were in all of the major working groups including intersections, drunk driving, and off-road collisions, not just the pedestrians and bicyclists groups, to make sure that their interests were represented. For bike and pedestrian committees, advocates were selected as co-chairs alongside officials.

The committees produce detailed reports on safety, crashes, and fatalities. Advocates wrote a white paper making the case for a 20 percent set-aside for bicyclist and pedestrian safety. Though it was not successful, Hubsmith says that "overall the process elevated the importance of bike/ped safety." Caltrans now uses the framework developed during the SHSP process for all of its transportation spending.

(Deb Hubsmith and Jessica Meaney, Jan 20, 2011)

and that resulted in some changes in the way they allocate funds. Unfortunately for bicycle projects, this gave HDOT an excuse not to fund bicycle safety as it's not officially one of NHTSA's 14 priority areas. I feel this is a major setback to funding bicycle safety initiatives." ^{xi}

Deb Hubsmith, director of the [Safe Routes to School National Partnership](#), offers several good pieces of advice to help advocates shape or improve their state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan:

- Get involved early and make sure that there are bicycle and pedestrian committees. Ideally there are separate bicycle and pedestrian committees because the needs can be unique.
- Make sure to get advocates on all committees that affect bicycle and pedestrian safety and do outreach to get people to the big statewide public meetings.
- Point out the percentage of bicycle and pedestrian fatalities in the state and the need for equity – in Florida it is 21 percent, in California it is 20 percent, and in Virginia it is 10 percent.
- Work with DOT staff to get internal champions. (As Palmetto Cycling Coalition's Rachael Kefalos says: "So much of our success as bicycle advocates is about having an internal champion." ^{xii}).
- Once the plans are adopted – make sure that there is some relationship to programming HSIP and other funding. In California, Caltrans says that they are now using the SHSP as a framework for all funding allocations, not just the HSIP. "This has helped Safe Routes to School (SRTS), as we're continuing to get \$24.25 million a year in state funding for SRTS, partly because SRTS was the no. 1 walking strategy," Hubsmith says.
- Get the DOT to calculate what percentage of projects they fund through HSIP to serve bicyclists and pedestrians, or get a dollar amount. It is possible to use the Financial Management Information System (FMIS), though it only counts money spent on standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects, not the bicycle or pedestrian share of other projects. "Last year 27 percent of the HSIP funding including bike/ped in some way in their projects," ^{xiii} according to Hubsmith.

Strategic Highway Safety Plans

By Chris Gladora and Darren Flusche

Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSPs) are statewide comprehensive plans that identify and prioritize highway safety concerns and provide action plans for addressing them. Including bicycle and pedestrian safety in a SHSP establishes a strategy for reducing bicyclist and pedestrian fatalities and injuries and allows States to access funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires each state to complete a SHSP. SAFETEA-LU established the [Highway Safety Improvement Program](#) (HSIP), designed to reduce highway fatalities by doubling funds for infrastructure safety. States must create a SHSP in order to be eligible for these funds.

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the SHSP and its requirements and offer suggestions for how bicycle and pedestrian advocates can influence their state's SHSP. The appendix shows the SHSP emphasis areas for every state in the nation and Washington, D.C. so that advocates can easily identify where bicycle and pedestrian safety falls, if at all, in their state's plan. Since the allocation of federal funding from the HSIP is dictated by the SHSP's emphasis areas, it is essential that bicycle and pedestrian safety are priorities in a state's plan in order to direct funding to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety programs.

Overview of the SHSP

The ultimate goal of the SHSP is to reduce highway fatalities and injuries on *all public roads*. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the plans help states reach this goal by requiring them to “identify and analyze highway safety problems and opportunities, include projects or strategies to address them, and evaluate the accuracy of data and the priority of proposed improvements.” The plan must be based on “accurate and timely safety data, consultation with safety stakeholders, and performance-based goals that address infrastructure and behavioral safety problems on all public roads.” In addition, the HSIP requires states to develop an evaluation process to assess results and set priorities for highway safety improvements.

In essence, the SHSP document is a data-driven, four to five year plan that integrates statewide goals and safety programs in order to provide a comprehensive approach to highway safety. The document is the culmination of a collaborative process that includes requirements outlined by SAFETEA-LU but can be tailored to each state's needs. The responsibility of facilitating this process, drafting the plan, and implementing it falls to the state.

FHWA guidance on SHSP's (A Champion's Guide to Saving Lives) suggests states consider the following activities when developing their SHSPs:

- Gaining leadership support and initiative
- Identifying a defender
- Initiating the development process
- Gathering data
- Analyzing data
- Establishing a working group
- Bringing safety partners together
- Adopting a strategic goal
- Identifying key emphasis areas
- Forming task groups
- Identifying key emphasis area performance based goals
- Identifying strategies and countermeasures
- Determining priorities for implementation
- Writing the SHSP

An important part of the SHSP process is to prioritize highway safety problems so that federal funding is used effectively. States are required to use data to quantify problems in their state to establish key emphasis areas and to create a benchmark for safety improvements. Once the key emphasis areas are identified, state DOTs must also create an action plan for each area. The action plans must include implementation details – the who, what, when, where, how, and performance measures.

States must report annually on their progress. “To ensure that the program is being implemented as intended and that it is achieving its purpose, an annual report on the HSIP implementation and effectiveness is required by 23 U.S.C. §148(g) and 23 CFR 924,” says the FHWA HSIP reporting guidance. “Furthermore, State Departments of Transportation (SDOT) that can clearly demonstrate the success of the safety program, through regular reporting, can use the report to communicate to others within their State about the importance of continuing to focus on improving highway safety.”

Snapshot of the nation: summary of SHSPs by State

The appendix features a list of each state's SHSP emphasis areas with bicycle and pedestrian safety highlighted. Of all 50 states and Washington D.C., 28 percent of the plans specifically include bicycle safety in their emphasis areas, 36 percent include pedestrian safety, and 30 percent include both bicyclists and pedestrians as “vulnerable” or “special” road users. However, 17 states (34 percent) do not include bicycle or pedestrian safety at all in their emphasis areas. Most of these states are located in the North or Southeastern U.S.

Of the states that included bicycle or pedestrian safety in their emphasis areas, none ranked bicycle safety as their number one priority. Only one state, Nevada, ranked pedestrian safety as its number one priority. The majority of States ranked impaired driving, seat belt usage and aggressive driving as their top priorities. States that included bicycle and pedestrian safety in their plans within a vulnerable or special users' category also included other users, such as motorcyclists, truck drivers and elderly drivers in the category. For more information, a link to every state's full SHSP is included in the appendix.

Learn the project selection criteria

In order to get bicycle and pedestrian safety projects funded, advocates need to know how to propose a project that fits the criteria. They need to find out: How the state selects and prioritizes safety projects? What are the performance outcomes being measured? How can bicycle and pedestrian projects compete?

Below are examples from a handful of states' guidance and application documents.

In [Virginia](#) project eligibility and requirements vary by project type. Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Program projects require a risk analysis and they must encompass the following:

- (1) Projects need to be relevant to the program purpose of reducing crashes or risks for bicyclists and pedestrians within a transportation network.
- (2) Proposed improvements must match existing hazardous situations.
- (3) The proposed project cost must be less than \$500,000.
- (4) Applicants must demonstrate that projects will meet all the necessary guidelines and standards for design and construction to ensure that approved projects will be completed in a reasonable time period. For example, proposal for the installation of a traffic signal should provide a traffic signal warrant analysis.
- (5) All projects must upgrade non-standard safety features to existing standards, when those features are within the scope and work area of the project. Requests for exceptions to this requirement will follow the appropriate procedures. Further, all projects must meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).^{xiv}

Florida's Project Prioritization Process

Projects in Florida are prioritized through the Community Traffic Safety Team, made up of first responders, city planners and active citizens. It sets priorities for their community, county or region before reaching the FDOT District Safety Engineer.

The engineers still need to do traffic studies and cost-benefit analyses – even where there is strong public or political support. Therefore, officials recommend that advocates have good data and have a sound solution that fits within the framework of what can be done within HSIP guidance.

Typically, it is city and county commissioners and managers, as well as MPO staff, who expect FDOT to be responsive to these issues. For them it is a huge mechanism for pushing quality of life and safety that is desired by constituents. Work with them to advance your project.

In accordance with the HSIP requirement, FDOT maps the [five percent](#) high crash corridors and intersections. They then overlay bike/ped crashes over the rest of the crash data. They found that the same high crash corridors that were bad for bicyclists and pedestrians were bad for cars.

They are now working on creating a separate 5 percent report for the vulnerable user category.

[Minnesota](#)'s guidance states, "Funding is for roadway construction and reconstruction projects designed to decrease the frequency and/or severity of vehicular crashes. These crashes can involve pedestrians, bicycles and other non-motorized vehicles," while noting that the improvement must address areas with a crash history, must be permanent and cannot be used to fund right of way costs.^{xv}

[North Carolina](#)'s divides eligible locations into three categories: intersections, sections and bicycle/pedestrian intersections. The document identifies 2014 potentially hazardous intersections and 556 potentially hazardous "sections" and 77 potentially hazardous bicycle/pedestrian intersection.^{xvi} Advocates could push for projects on these 77 intersections.

The first line of [California](#)'s eligibility says: "HSIP funds are eligible for work on any publicly-owned roadway or bicycle/pedestrian pathway or trail that corrects or improves the safety for its users." It also has this well-thought-out policy on rumble strips: "Installation of rumble strips or other warning devices, if the rumble strips or other devices do not adversely affect the safety or mobility of bicyclists, pedestrians and persons with disabilities."^{xvii} California may be changing their application and measurement tool. Advocates are monitoring the situation to ensure that the new methodology will be sensitive to bicycle and pedestrian crashes.

The lesson of the above guidance is that advocates should understand the problem and have a proposed solution that fits the program requirements. You don't have to come up with detailed engineering drawings, but having ideas on how to fix the problem will steer District Safety Engineers and other officials in the direction you want.

Collect crash and fatality data

It is impossible to read anything about HSIP, or to talk with anyone knowledgeable about it, without hearing that the program is "data-driven." The program was written with the expressed purpose of addressing quantifiable safety concerns. Cynics point to this fact-based approach to explain why HSIP was under-used for several years: DOTs can't just fund the projects they already intended to complete and claim it was for safety purposes.

Successful proposals need to show that improvements will directly reduce crashes and fatalities. Traditional project identification methods of the HSIP were location-based, which made it harder for projects designed for bicyclists and pedestrians whose crashes tend to be dispersed. That has changed.

"Since SAFETEA-LU, the HSIP very much supports the use of systemic treatments and the SHSP very much lends itself to systemic treatments," says Erin Kenley, the Safety Program Implementation Team Leader in the FHWA Office of Safety.^{xviii} A systemic highway safety improvement is a particular countermeasure, or set of countermeasures, implemented on all roadways or roadway sections where a particular crash type is linked with a particular roadway or element.

Here are some recommendations for making the case with data:

- You need comprehensive data to be taken seriously in the SHSP process.

- High Crash Corridors for motorists are often dangerous for cyclists as well. Using your state's [5 percent High Crash Corridor report](#),^{xix} look for redundancy in locations where bike/ped crashes are highest. Where there is overlap, make the case for inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian provisions in current plans.
- Use [heat maps](#) to identify high bike and pedestrian crash corridors. Virginia's Stephen Read says, "You need to be able to visualize the problem. If you react to one fatality at a time, you get spotty and address things here and there. You need a systematized approach."
- If bike/ped crash history are present but represents low numbers, use a longer time frame, e.g., 5-6 years worth of data instead of 2-3 years.
- Look at crash corridors instead of just intersections.
- Advocates should work on quantifying the problem before skipping ahead of the solution. Know the process in which projects are developed. Understand whether the nature is infrastructure, education/behavior or enforcement problem.
- See the appendix for bicycle and pedestrian fatalities as a share of all traffic fatalities in 2009 by state.

The data requirements present both a challenge and an opportunity to advocates. For example, the California application requires collision data. This is labor intensive for cities to produce and many jurisdictions do not collect it. In fact, this is not unusual. "A [2008 report](#) from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) concluded that many states "lacked components of the prescribed crash data analysis systems, such as a system for locating crashes and roadway data for local roads. FHWA is developing such a system for the states but many states lack necessary data for local roads because they do not maintain or operate them."^{xx} To address this problem, Caltrans funded researchers at UC Berkeley to map fatalities with no knowledge of [GIS](#) necessary. It is currently accessible to people with a [".gov"](#) email address. Hopefully it will soon be available to everyone. Crash data are increasingly available online and technology is developing to help planners and advocates use them to make their case.

Fatalities are the visible tip of a very large iceberg. A lack of crashes is no proof of safety. It may be a sign that most people consider their roads too dangerous to attempt. In this sense the deck is stacked against bicycle safety projects. A better safety metric may well be an increase in bicycling. Nonetheless, advocates should do their best to gather the data that will make their case.

Announce the funding opportunity

One of the strengths of a good advocacy organization is the ability to communicate and share information with its members, the public, and decision-makers. Advocacy organizations stay alert for deadlines in the HSIP project selection process and share them with their networks.

A good example of this is the Safe Routes to School network in California. HSIP is on their statewide network monthly call agenda. They make it a priority because it's a larger pot of money than most. When they first announced the funding opportunity, they even got press coverage. They use their

Listserv to alert communities across the state about project selection deadlines and to solicit proposals. They also share where CalTrans have HSIP trainings.

SRTS had hoped to work with CalTrans to create a webinar on how to make bicycle and pedestrian project applications competitive with information on the guidelines, how to apply and what kinds of projects get funded. This didn't come to be but would be an excellent idea for an advocacy organization to take on.

Follow up

Finally, follow up with your transportation agency, your contacts there and the relevant elected officials after the funding cycle. Review HSIP spending, thank them for funded bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and remind them of the continued needs for investments in the safety of vulnerable road users.

As was noted several times above, things can change in the process or requirements that can impact the ability of bicycle and pedestrian projects to compete for safety funding. Keep an eye on the system and stay alert for these changes.

Conclusion – knowledge, connections, data, results

HSIP details, like deadlines, staff contacts and selection criteria, are different in each state but the tactics used by successful advocates are remarkably similar. The keys are participation in the process, forming relationships with the key players, mastering program requirements and selection criteria, being armed with the appropriate data and building a supportive political environment for bicycle and pedestrian safety. Using federal safety funds can be cumbersome for states and project sites require sufficient crash history to be selected. Therefore, states and localities with high crash figure for pedestrians and bicyclists are the best candidates for HSIP campaigns. There is certainly no shortage of useful potential bicycle and pedestrian safety projects out there – and there is plenty of unspent HSIP money in many states.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Deb Hubsmith of the Safe Routes to School National Partnership for her comprehensive and thoughtful advocacy recommendations and to Jessica Meaney, also of SRTS, for sharing her strategies from California. Thank you to Laura Dierenfield, executive director of PATH: Peoples Advocacy for Trails Hawaii, for sharing her state's story. We thank these state officials who provided their insight: Sheree Davis of New Jersey DOT, Maryanne Koos of Florida DOT and the FDOT Safety Office, and Stephen Read of Virginia DOT. Erin Kenley, Tamara Redmon, Dick Schaffer and Karen Yunk from the FHWA Office of Safety provided an invaluable review of the report. They are not responsible for any errors therein.

Much appreciation to Chris Gladora for drafting the section on Strategic Highway Safety Plans and compiling the list of SHSP priorities. Jeff Peel, the League's state and local advocacy coordinator and Advocacy Advance partner, contributed substantial time and expertise to this project. Thank you also to Randy Neufeld for his recommendations and on-going support of the Advocacy Advance effort to help state and local advocates access federal funds.

Contact us: Let's work together

Contact the Advocacy Advance Team, a partnership between the League of American Bicyclists and the Alliance for Biking & Walking, for more information on HSIP

Contact:

Darren Flusche
Policy Analyst
League of American Bicyclists
darren@bikeleague.org
202-822-1333 X235

Brigid O'Keane
Advocacy Advance Program Manager
Alliance for Biking & Walking
202-449-9692 x 4
Brigid@PeoplePoweredMovement.org

Jeff Peel
State and Local Coordinator
League of American Bicyclists
202-822-1333 X220

For more information on accessing federal funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian projects, visit: www.AdvocacyAdvance.org

Appendix: Bicycle and Pedestrian Fatalities as a Share of All Traffic Fatalities

2009 Traffic Fatalities and Mode Share									
State	Total traffic fatalities (FARS)	Bicycle + pedestrian share of total traffic fatalities	Pedestrian fatalities (2009)		Cyclist fatalities (2009)		Combined bike/ped commuter share (ACS 2009)	Walk commuters (ACS 2009)	Bike commuters (ACS 2009)
			#	%	#	%			
USA	33,808	14%	4092	12.1	630	2	3.5%	2.9%	0.6%
Alabama	848	8%	64	7.5	6	1	1.4%	1.3%	0.1%
Alaska	64	17%	9	14.1	2	3	8.8%	8.0%	0.8%
Arizona	807	18%	120	14.9	25	3	3.3%	2.4%	0.9%
Arkansas	585	7%	36	6.2	5	1	2.0%	1.9%	0.1%
California	3,081	21%	563	18.3	99	3	3.8%	2.8%	1.0%
Colorado	465	12%	47	10.1	10	2	4.4%	3.0%	1.4%
Connecticut	223	12%	26	11.7	1	0	3.2%	2.9%	0.3%
Delaware	116	18%	15	12.9	6	5	2.7%	2.4%	0.3%
District of Columbia	29	48%	14	48.3	0	0	13.3%	11.1%	2.2%
Florida	2,558	22%	466	18.2	107	4	2.2%	1.5%	0.7%
Georgia	1,284	13%	150	11.7	21	2	1.9%	1.7%	0.2%
Hawaii	109	17%	16	14.7	3	3	5.8%	4.5%	1.3%
Idaho	226	8%	10	4.4	7	3	3.8%	2.6%	1.2%
Illinois	911	14%	111	12.2	20	2	3.8%	3.2%	0.6%
Indiana	693	8%	50	7.2	7	1	2.6%	2.2%	0.4%
Iowa	372	6%	21	5.6	2	1	4.4%	4.0%	0.4%
Kansas	386	7%	22	5.7	5	1	3.2%	2.8%	0.4%
Kentucky	791	6%	41	5.2	5	1	2.6%	2.4%	0.2%
Louisiana	821	15%	107	13	13	2	2.4%	2.0%	0.4%
Maine	159	7%	11	6.9	0	0	4.7%	4.2%	0.5%
Maryland	547	23%	113	20.7	11	2	3.0%	2.6%	0.4%
Massachusetts	334	16%	48	14.4	6	2	5.5%	4.7%	0.8%
Michigan	871	16%	118	13.5	19	2	2.9%	2.4%	0.5%
Minnesota	421	12%	42	10	10	2	3.6%	2.9%	0.7%
Mississippi	700	10%	58	8.3	10	1	1.7%	1.7%	0.1%
Missouri	878	8%	68	7.7	2	0	2.2%	2.0%	0.3%
Montana	221	7%	15	6.8	1	1	7.1%	5.4%	1.7%
Nebraska	223	5%	9	4	3	1	3.8%	3.3%	0.4%
Nevada	243	17%	35	14.4	6	3	2.5%	2.1%	0.4%
New Hampshire	110	8%	8	7.3	1	1	3.2%	2.8%	0.4%
New Jersey	583	29%	157	26.9	13	2	3.7%	3.4%	0.3%
New Mexico	361	12%	39	10.8	3	1	3.1%	2.4%	0.7%
New York	1,156	29%	306	26.5	29	3	6.9%	6.4%	0.4%
North Carolina	1,314	12%	146	11.1	16	1	2.3%	2.0%	0.3%
North Dakota	140	4%	4	2.9	1	1	4.0%	3.6%	0.4%
Ohio	1,021	10%	85	8.3	19	2	2.5%	2.3%	0.3%
Oklahoma	738	6%	31	4.2	11	2	2.1%	1.9%	0.2%
Oregon	377	11%	35	9.3	8	2	6.2%	3.9%	2.3%
Pennsylvania	1,256	12%	134	10.7	15	1	4.5%	4.0%	0.5%
Rhode Island	83	19%	16	19.3	0	0	3.5%	3.2%	0.4%
South Carolina	894	11%	89	10	11	1	2.2%	1.9%	0.3%
South Dakota	131	3%	4	3.1	0	0	4.9%	4.3%	0.6%
Tennessee	989	8%	70	7.1	9	1	1.5%	1.4%	0.1%
Texas	3,071	13%	344	11.2	48	2	2.0%	1.7%	0.2%
Utah	244	10%	19	7.8	5	2	3.8%	2.9%	0.8%
Vermont	74	7%	5	6.8	0	0	6.2%	5.4%	0.8%
Virginia	757	11%	73	9.6	11	2	2.6%	2.2%	0.3%
Washington	492	14%	61	12.4	9	2	4.3%	3.4%	0.9%
West Virginia	356	6%	21	5.9	0	0	2.9%	2.8%	0.2%
Wisconsin	561	8%	38	6.8	7	1	4.1%	3.4%	0.7%
Wyoming	134	3%	2	1.5	2	2	4.2%	3.4%	0.8%

Fatality Source: www.fars.nhtsa.dot.gov/States/StatesCrashesAndAllVictims.aspx; Commuter mode share source: American Community Survey, US Census Bureau

This report is a product of Advocacy Advance — a partnership of the League of American Bicyclists and the Alliance for Biking & Walking.



United States 1994 - 2009					
All fatalities		Pedestrian		Cyclist	
#	%	#	%	#	%
661,403	100%	78,866	12%	11,781	2%
Source: FARS www.fars.nhtsa.dot.gov/Trends/TrendsGeneral.aspx					

Appendix: State HSIP spending on Bicycle and Pedestrian projects

State HSIP spending on Bicycle and Pedestrian projects				
State	2010		2009	
	\$	per capita	\$	per capita
Alabama	-	-	\$ 4,500	\$ 0.00
California	\$ 776,250	\$ 0.02	\$ 184,253	\$ 0.00
Florida	\$ 5,548,207	\$ 0.30	\$ 5,095,716	\$ 0.27
Minnesota	-	-	\$ 138,600	\$ 0.03
New Jersey	\$ 197,995	\$ 0.02	-	-
North Carolina	-	-	\$ 490,500	\$ 0.05
Ohio	\$ 101,124	\$ 0.01	-	-
Virginia	\$ 292,881	\$ 0.04	\$ 133,761	\$ 0.02
Washington	\$ 1,380,833	\$ 0.21	-	-

Source: FHWA Financial Management Information System. States typically code projects as bike/ped if they are exclusive to bicyclist and/or pedestrian safety, therefore other HSIP funds presumable address bicycle and pedestrian safety, which are not included in the above table.

It can be difficult to account from FMIS the extent of bicycling and walking investments. If your state has successes and projects not listed in FMIS above, let us know at info@advocacyadvance.org. We would like to hear about them. We will update this report as we learn additional best practices.

-
- ⁱ Advocacy Advance Report, “Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP),” http://www.bikeleague.org/resources/reports/pdfs/highway_safety_improvement_program.pdf
- ⁱⁱ Advocacy Advance Report, “Section 402 – State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program” http://www.bikeleague.org/resources/reports/pdfs/section_402.pdf
- ⁱⁱⁱ FHWA, “SAFETEA-LU Obligation Rates for the Highway Safety Improvement Program,” http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/gen_info/slorhsip/; Flusche, Darren, “States still slow to spend safety funds,” BikeLeagueBlog.org <http://www.bikeleague.org/blog/2010/10/states-still-slow-to-spend-safety-funds/>
- ^{iv} FARS <http://www-fars.nhtsa.dot.gov/Main/index.aspx>; <http://www-fars.nhtsa.dot.gov/Common/ViewTextOrExcel.aspx>
- ^v Link to Strategic Highway Safety Plan report and priority matrix
- ^{vi} Macek, Ian, Washington State Bicycle Coordinator, phone conversation, January 2011
- ^{vii} Hubsmith, Deb and Jessica Meaney, phone conversation, January, 20th, 2011
- ^{viii} Advocacy Advance Report, “Section 402 – State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program” http://www.bikeleague.org/resources/reports/pdfs/section_402.pdf
- ^{ix} Letourneau, Darla, “ANALYSIS OF FLORIDA’S HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS, PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION,” BikeWalkLee, 2/22/1. http://bikewalklee.com/BWL/BWL_PDFs/BWL_facts/BWLSafetyfundingFINAL100222.pdf
- ^x Link to Strategic Highway Safety Plan report and priority matrix
- ^{xi} Email from Laura Dierenfield, Executive Director of PATH: Peoples Advocacy for Trails Hawaii, January 17, 2011
- ^{xii} Kefalos, Rachael, email to author Tue 11/9/2010 1:00 PM
- ^{xiii} Hubsmith, Deb, email to author, Fri 11/5/2010 10:21 PM
- ^{xiv} http://www.virginiadot.org/programs/resources/HSIP_Guidelines_FY08-09_.pdf
- ^{xv} <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/trafficeng/safety/funding/pdf/2013-14%20HSIP%20Program%20Final.pdf>
- ^{xvi} <http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/traffic/safety/programs/2010HSIP-Overview.pdf>
- ^{xvii} http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/Documents/HSIP_Guidelines.pdf
- ^{xviii} Kenley, Erin, email to the author, Wed, 4/27/2011 PM
- ^{xix} <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/guides/guide040506.cfm>
- ^{xx} <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0935.pdf>

Strategic Highway Safety Plan Emphasis Areas

Bicycle areas are highlighted in blue.

Pedestrian areas are highlighted in green.

Combined bicycle and pedestrian safety and vulnerable road user areas are highlighted in orange.

Updated Strategic Highway Safety Plan

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Alabama	2006	Emergency Medical Services Safety legislation Older/Restricted drivers Risky driving Run-off-road crashes
Complete report:	<i>Strategic Highway Safety Plan for Alabama</i> http://www.safehomealabama.gov/Portals/0/SHSP_2006_Final-30Sep06.pdf	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Alaska	2011	Driver behavior Roadways Special users of the transportation system
Complete report:	<i>Alaska Strategic Traffic Safety Plan</i> http://dot.alaska.gov/stwdplng/stsp/plan-2011update-emphasis.shtml	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Arizona	2007	Restraint Usage Speeding Young Drivers Impaired Driving Roadway / Roadside (lane departure and intersections) Data Improvement
Complete report:	<i>Arizona Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/traffic/TSS/SHSP/AZ_Strategic_Highway_Safety_Plan.pdf	

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Arkansas	2007	Serious crash types
		High-risk drivers
		Special vehicles
		Special Roadway Users
		Emergency Medical Services
		Traffic records: data collection and analysis
Complete report: <i>Arkansas' Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.arkansashighways.com/planning_research/traffic_safety/strategichighwaysafetyplan.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
California	2006	Reduce impaired driving related fatalities
		Reduce the occurrence and consequence of leaving the roadway and head-on collisions
		Ensure drivers are licensed and competent
		Increase use of safety belts and child safety seats
		Improve driver decisions about rights of way and turning
		Reduce young driver fatalities
		Improve intersection and interchange safety for roadway users
		Make walking and street crossing safer
		Improve safety for older roadway users
		Reduce speeding and aggressive driving
		Improve commercial vehicle safety
		Improve motorcycle safety
		Improve bicycling safety
		Enhance work zone safety
Improve post crash survivability		
Improve safety data collection, access, and analysis		
Complete report: <i>California Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Version 2</i> http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/survey/SHSP/SHSP-Booklet-version2_%20PRINT.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Colorado	2006	Locations with potential for crash reductions Rockfall Railroad crossings Access management Roadway engineering safety Traffic crash data systems Work Zones Wildlife Occupant Protection Impaired drivers Young drivers Aggressive drivers (distracted drivers) Aging drivers Motorcycles Bicycles and pedestrians Safe routes to school Large trucks EMS vehicles
Complete report: <i>Colorado Strategic Plan for Improving Roadway Safety</i> http://www.coloradodot.info/library/traffic/traffic-manuals-guidelines/safety-crash-data/problem-id-annual-		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Connecticut	2006	Impaired driving Police Traffic Services Occupant protection & child passenger safety Roadway safety Motorcycle safety Traffic records Hazard elimination Traffic records Other areas & factors (Young drivers, mature drivers, vehicle types: school buses, tractor-trailers, emergency vehicles, bicycles & pedestrians)
Complete report: <i>Connecticut Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.ct.gov/dot/lib/dot/documents/dsafety/shsp.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Delaware	2010	Reduce frequency and severity of roadway departure crashes Curb aggressive driving Increasing seatbelt use Reduce impaired driving Improve the design and operation of highway intersections Make walking and street crossing safer Improve motorcycle safety and awareness Sustain proficiency in older drivers (secondary) Make heavy vehicle travel safer (secondary) Design safer work zones (secondary) Improve traffic records (secondary)
Complete report: <i>Delaware Strategic Highway Safety Plan: Toward Zero Deaths</i> http://www.deldot.gov/information/pubs_forms/manuals/shsp/2006_delaware_shsp-updated-9-08.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
District of Columbia	2007	High-risk drivers Pedestrian & bicycle safety Engineering/facilities infrastructure Special vehicles Special target areas
Complete report: <i>The District of Columbia Strategic Highway Safety Plan: Towards Zero Fatalities and Injuries</i> http://ddot-hso.com/ddot/hso/documents/Safety_Program_Documents/Strategic%20Plan%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Florida	2007 with 2010 update	Reduce the rate of fatalities and serious injuries involving aggressive driving Improve the safety of intersections Vulnerable road users: pedestrians and bicyclists Reduce fatalities and serious injuries due to lane departures
Complete report: <i>Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.dot.state.fl.us/safety/posted%20documents/Florida%20Comp%20SHSP%20for%20print.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Georgia	2009	Aggressive driving Occupant protection Serious crash type: intersection safety Impaired driving Age related issues: young and older drivers Non-motorized user: pedestrians & bicyclists Vehicle type: heavy trucks, motorcycles Trauma system/Increasing EMS capabilities Traffic/Crash records data analysis Traffic incident management
Complete report:		<i>2009 Governor's Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.gahighwaysafety.org/shsp/shsp2009final.pdf
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Hawaii	2007	Aggressive driving Impaired driving Occupant protection Pedestrian & bicyclists Motorcycle & moped safety Facility design (roadway & intersection operations) Data & safety management
Complete report:		<i>Hawaii Strategic Highway Safety Plan: 2007 Through 2012</i> http://hawaii.gov/dot/highways/shsp-1/SHSP2007-2012.pdf

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Idaho	2010	Aggressive driving Distracted driving Safety restraints Impaired driving Youthful drivers Vulnerable users: bicyclists & pedestrians, mature drivers Commercial motor vehicles Motorcyclists Lane departure crashes Emergency response
		Complete report: <i>Idaho's Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.itd.idaho.gov/ohs/SHSPdocs/SHSP2010.pdf
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Illinois	2009	Alcohol and other impaired driving Driver behavior and awareness Highway-railroad grade crossings Information systems for decision making Intersections Large trucks Roadway departure Safety belts/occupant protection Vulnerable users (Pedestrians, pedalcyclists, motorcyclists, and other alternative transportation mode users) Work zones
		Complete report: <i>Illinois Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.dot.il.gov/illinoisSHSP/pdf/illinoisSHSP.pdf

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Indiana	2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roadway departure crashes Intersection crashes Large vehicle conflict crashes Roadway restriction related crashes Vulnerable users (motorcycles, pedestrians, bicycles) Human factor contribution to crashes
Complete report: <i>Indiana Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.in.gov/indot/files/shsp%281%29.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Iowa	2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy strategies (Legislative): Young drivers Occupant protection Motorcycle safety Traffic safety enforcement Traffic safety improvements Program strategies (administrative): Lane departure Safety corridors Intersections Local roads State traffic records Senior mobility Safety training and education Unpaved rural roads
Complete report: <i>Iowa Comprehensive Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.iowadot.gov/traffic/chsp/pdfs/chsp_final_20070420.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Kansas	2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impaired driving Occupant protection Lane departure Intersections Inexperienced/Novice/Teen drivers Driver behavior and awareness
Complete report: <i>Kansas Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://ksdot.org/burTrafficSaf/KSSHSP.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Kentucky	2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggressive driving Commercial vehicle safety Distracted driving Drive smart safety corridors Impaired driving Incident management Motorcycles Occupant protection Roadway departure Traffic records Young drivers Legislative issues
Complete report: <i>Kentucky Strategic Highway Safety Plan: Toward Zero Deaths</i> http://transportation.ky.gov/Highway-Safety/Documents/strategic_plan_draft1.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Louisiana	2006	Impaired drivers Young Drivers Aggressive driving Distracted driving Occupant protection Vulnerable road users Commercial vehicle safety Roadway departure Intersections Local road safety improvement program Information and decision support systems
Complete report:		<i>State of Louisiana Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> www.ite.org/safety/stateprograms/Louisiana_SHSP.pdf

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Maine	2010	Lane departure Speed Unbelted occupants 16-24 years old drivers Impaired driving Distracted/inattentive operation 65+ years old drivers Motorcycles Winter driving Intersections Large trucks Pedestrians & bicyclists Large animals Operating after suspension
Complete report:		<i>Maine's Strategic Highway Safety Plan: 2010 Update</i> http://www.themtsc.org/publications/databook/databook.php

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Maryland	2006	Reduce Impaired Driving
		Improve Information and Decision Support Systems
		Keep Vehicles on the Roadway
		Improve Safety at Intersections
		Create Safer Work Zones
		Make Walking and Crossing Streets Safer
		Increase Occupant Protection
		Reduce Distracted Driving
		Enhance Safe Mobility for Older Drivers
		Develop Safe Young Drivers
		Improve Motorcycle Safety
		Make Truck and Bus Travel Safer
		Curb Aggressive Driving
		Improve Emergency Response Systems
Complete report: <i>Destination Saving Lives: Maryland Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://stko.maryland.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=hLp1XyX7%2bpo%3d&tabid=114		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Massachusetts	2006	Data systems: crashes, roadway, medical, vehicle registration, driver history, citation
		Infrastructure: Lane departure & intersection crashes
		At-risk driver behavior: occupant protection, speeding, alcohol/impaired driving
		Higher-risk transportation system users: young & older drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, motorcyclists
		Public education & media: Statewide safety marketing, media messages, public awareness
		Safety program management: developing process for institutionalizing the SHSP
Complete report: <i>Massachusetts Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.mhd.state.ma.us/downloads/MA%20Strategic%20Highway%20Safety%20Plan_Complete.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Michigan	2009	Alcohol/drug impaired driving
		Commercial vehicle safety
		Driver behavior and awareness
		Drivers ages 24 and younger
		Intersection safety
		Lane departure
		Motorcycle safety
		Occupant protection
		Pedestrian & bicycle safety
		Senior mobility and safety
		Traffic records and information systems
Complete report:	<i>State of Michigan Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.michigan.gov/documents/MI_CHSP_110103_7.pdf	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Minnesota	2007	Increasing seat belt usage
		Reducing impaired driving
		Improving the design and operation of highway intersections
		Keeping vehicles on the roadway/minimizing the consequence of leaving the road
		Curbing aggressive driving
		Instituting graduated licensing for young drivers
		Reducing head-on and across-median crashes
		Increasing driver safety awareness
		Improving information and decision support systems
		Complete report:

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Mississippi	2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impaired driving Seat belt usage Severity of lane departure crashes Over involvement of young drivers Aggressive driving EMS
Complete report: <i>Mississippi Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.gomdot.com/Divisions/Highways/Resources/TrafficEngineering/pdf/Mississippi%20SHSP_Part%20I.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Missouri	2008, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious crash types High-risk drivers and occupants Special vehicles <li style="background-color: #FFA500;">Vulnerable roadway users Special roadway environments
Complete report: <i>Missouri's Blueprint to Arrive Alive</i> http://savemolives.com/documents/FINALBlueprintdocument.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Montana	2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety belt usage Alcohol and drug impaired driving crashes Native American crashes Single vehicle run-off-the-road crashes Traffic records management Young driver crashes High-crash corridors/high crash locations Truck crashes Emergency medical services delivery Urban area crashes Motorcycle crashes Older driver crashes
Complete report: <i>Montana Comprehensive Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.mdt.mt.gov/publications/docs/brochures/safety/current_chsp.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Nebraska	2007	Increasing safety belt usage Keeping Vehicles on the Roadway, Minimizing the Consequences of Leaving the Road, & Reducing Head-On and Across-Median Crashes Reducing impaired driving Improving the design and operation of highway intersections Addressing the over involvement of young drivers
Complete report: <i>Nebraska Strategic Highway Safety Plan: Guidance for 2007-2011</i> http://www.dor.state.ne.us/highway-safety/docs/strat-hwy-sfty-plan.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Nevada	2011	Making walking and street crossing safer Reduce impaired driving Increasing seat belt usage Improving the design and operation of intersections Keeping vehicles on the roadway, minimizing the consequences of leaving the road, and reducing head-on and across-median crashes
Complete report: <i>Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.zerofatalitiesnv.com/dld/Nevada%20SHSP%202011-2015%20v061311.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
New Hampshire	2007 with 2008 update	Improving crash data Increase seat belt use Adolescent & elderly drivers Lane departure Reckless driving behavior Impaired drivers Special users: pedestrians, bicyclists, motorcyclists, commercial vehicles, buses Emergency medical services
Complete report: <i>New Hampshire Strategic Highway Safety Plan: A Collaborative Effort to Reduce Crashes on New</i> http://www.nh.gov/dot/projects/plans.htm		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
New Jersey	2007	Minimize roadway departure crashes Improve design/operation of intersections Curb aggressive driving Reduce impaired driving Reduce young driver crashes Sustain safe senior mobility Increase driver safety awareness Reduce pedestrian, bicycle, rail & vehicular conflicts
Complete report:	<i>Comprehensive Strategic Highway Safety Plan: Driving Down Deaths on New Jersey's Roadways</i> http://cait.rutgers.edu/system/files/u2/CSHSP_FINAL.pdf	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
New Mexico	2010 (updated from 2006)	Aggressive driving and speeding Alcohol-related/alcohol-impaired driving Emergency services response Fatigued/distracted drivers Intersection crashes Fatalities involving lane departures Native Americans Occupant protection Public information and education Special users (emphasis mainly on pedestrians and motorcycles, but bicycles are included) Traffic records Young driver crashes
Complete report:	<i>New Mexico Comprehensive Transportation Safety Plan: 2010 Strategies Update</i> http://dot.state.nm.us/Programs/planning/NM_Comprehensive_Transportation_Safety_Plan.pdf	

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
New York	2010	Driver behavior: impaired driving, speeding and other aggressive driving behavior Occupant protection Pedestrians Large trucks Motorcycles Highways: data analysis, design & operation of intersections, travel lane departures, work zone safety Emergency medical services: EMS pre-hospital patient care registry, pre-hospital training programs, road condition & incident response, EMS responder crash prevention Traffic safety information systems
Complete report: <i>2010 New York State Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> https://www.nysdot.gov/divisions/operating/osss/highway-repository/SHSP%202010%20Final.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
North Carolina	2007	Lane departure Ensuring drivers are fully licensed Curbing aggressive driving Increasing safety belt usage Keeping drivers alert Speed Intersection safety Older drivers Motorcycles Commercial motor vehicles Bicycle & pedestrian safety Incident management Driver's education
Complete report: <i>North Carolina's Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/traffic/ECHS/DOCS/NCSHSP.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
North Dakota	2010	Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving Increase the Use of Seat Belts for All Occupants Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety Curb Aggressive Driving Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Enhance Survivability. Improve Intersection Safety
Complete report:	<i>North Dakota Department of Transportation Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/docs/strategic-highway-safety-plan-2010.pdf	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Ohio	2008	Data & support systems Serious crash types High risk behaviors/drivers Special vehicles/roadway users (motor carriers, motorcycles, pedestrians/bicycles) Incident & congestion related crashes
Complete report:	<i>Ohio's Road Map to Fewer Fatalities</i> http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Planning/SPPM/MajorPrograms/Safety/Pages/StateSafetyPlan.aspx	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Oklahoma	2007	Unsafe driver behavior Intersection crashes Young drivers/crashes Lane departure crashes Reduce overall fatalities and injuries Improve crash data/availability Facilitate safer vehicle fleet
Complete report:	<i>Oklahoma Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.okladot.state.ok.us/oshsp/pdfs/OSHS-Plan_Final.pdf	

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Oregon	2012	<p>Improve key infrastructure safety (bike/pedestrian crashes)</p> <p>Safety weighted as highest consideration</p> <p>Communications to raise acceptance and awareness of the need for law enforcement</p> <p>Establish processes to train enforcement personnel</p> <p>Pass legislation to establish 0.4% BAC</p> <p>Expand driver education</p> <p>Education regarding proper use of restraint systems</p> <p>Consider safety gear requirements with new bicycles</p> <p>World class and affordable EMS system</p> <p>EMS volunteer recruitment and retention strategies</p>
<p>Complete report: <i>Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan: An Element of the Oregon Transportation Plan</i> http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TS/docs/TSAP_revised_03-20-12.pdf</p>		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Pennsylvania	2009	<p>Reducing aggressive driving</p> <p>Reducing impaired driving (DUI)</p> <p>Increasing seat belt usage</p> <p>Infrastructure improvements</p> <p>Improving traffic records data</p> <p>Motorcycle safety</p> <p>Mature driver safety</p> <p>Improving pedestrian safety</p> <p>Enhancing safety on local roads</p> <p>Improving teen driver safety</p> <p>Advancing heavy truck safety</p> <p>Reducing crashes involving inattentive & drowsy drivers</p> <p>Improving bicycle safety</p> <p>Improving emergency/incident response time</p> <p>Enhancing safety in work zones</p> <p>Reducing vehicle-train crashes</p>
<p>Complete report: <i>Drive Safe PA: Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.vhb.com/508/padot_shsp_508/index.htm</p>		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Rhode Island	2007	Occupant protection Impaired driving Speed & aggressive driving Intersections & run-off-road Young drivers
Complete report:	<i>Rhode Island Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.dot.state.ri.us/documents/trafmgt/RISHSPFinal.pdf	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
South Carolina	2007	Serious crash types High risk drivers Special vehicles Vulnerable roadway users: pedestrians & bicyclists Management information and exchange
Complete report:	<i>South Carolina Strategic Highway Safety Plan: The Road Map to Safety</i> http://www.scdot.org/inside/multimodal/pdfs/road_map.pdf	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
South Dakota	2007	Impaired drivers Occupant protection Run off road crashes & head on collisions Preventing crash fatalities & injuries among young drivers Speed management Emergency response services Preventing deer-auto crashes Improving data collection Improving data analysis
Complete report:	<i>South Dakota Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.sddot.com/docs/SouthDakotaStrategicHighwayPlan.pdf	

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Tennessee	2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve crash data Reduce lane departures Improve intersection safety Improve work zone safety Improve motor carrier safety Improve driver behavior Strengthen legislation Enhance educational & awareness programs
Complete report:	<i>State of Tennessee Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/incident/StrategicHighwayplan09.pdf	
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Texas	2009, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crash type & location System users User behavior System administration
Complete report:	<i>Texas Strategic Highway Safety Plan: A Report of Progress for 2009</i> ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/library/pubs/gov/final_shsp_2009.pdf	

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Utah	2006	Roadway departure crashes Use of Safety Restraints Impaired Driving Aggressive Driving Drowsy Driving Distracted Driving Improving Intersection Safety Young Driver Safety Pedestrian Safety School Zone Safety Work Zone Safety Safer Truck Travel Motorcycle Safety Railroad Crossing Safety Older Driver Safety Bicycle Safety Transit System Safety Rural Road Safety
Complete report:		<i>Utah Comprehensive Safety Plan</i> http://ut.zerofatalities.com/dld/Final_CompSafetyPlan_WEB.pdf
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Vermont	2006	Young Drivers Increasing Seat Belt Usage Reducing Impaired Driving Curbing Aggressive Driving Keeping Drivers Alert Improving the Design & Operation of Highway Intersections Keeping Vehicles on the Roadway & Minimizing the Consequences of Leaving the Road
Complete report:		<i>Strategic Highway Safety Plan for Vermont: A Public/Private Collaborative & Multi-Discipline Framework for</i> http://highwaysafety.vermont.gov/

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Virginia	2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Driver behavior Special users <li style="background-color: #FFA500;">Pedestrian and bicycle safety Intersection safety Roadway departures Work zone safety Traffic records Transportation safety planning
Complete report:		<p><i>Commonwealth of Virginia's Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.virginiadot.org/info/resources/Strat_Hwy_safety_Plan_FREPT.pdf</p>
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Washington	2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impaired Driving Run-off-the-Road Collisions Speeding Young Drivers Unrestrained Vehicle Occupants Distracted Drivers Intersections Traffic Data Systems Unlicensed Drivers Opposite Direction Multi-Vehicle Collisions Motorcycles <li style="background-color: #90EE90;">Pedestrians Heavy trucks Emergency medical services Older drivers Drowsy drivers <li style="background-color: #ADD8E6;">Bicyclists Work zones Wildlife Vehicle train collisions School bus related collisions
Complete report:		<p><i>Target Zero: Washington State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan 2010</i> http://www.targetzero.com/PDF/TargetZeroPlan.pdf</p>

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
West Virginia	2007	Lane Departure & Minimizing its Effects Impaired Driving Speeding/Aggressive Driving Occupant Protection Crash Survivability & Emergency Medical Services At Risk Driver and User Groups Highway Safety Data Improvements Commercial Motor Vehicles Continuing Successful Safety Programs & Initiatives
Complete report: <i>West Virginia Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.transportation.wv.gov/communications/Documents/WestVirginiaStrategicHighwaySafetyPlan.pdf		
State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Wisconsin	2011	Improve design and operation of intersections Reduce speed-related crashes Reduce/mitigate head-on, cross-median, and roadway departure crashes Create safer work zones Reduce alcohol/drug impaired driving Improve driver alertness/reduce driver distraction Improve occupant protection Improve teen and older driver performance and competency Improve motorcycling safety Create more efficient safe decision processes/safe travel in bad weather
Complete report: <i>Wisconsin Strategic Highway Safety Plan 2011-2013</i> http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/library/publications/topic/safety/hwy-strategic-safety-plan.pdf		

State	SHSP date	Emphasis areas
Wyoming	2006	Roadway Departure Crashes Use of Safety Restraints Impaired Driving Speeding Intersection Safety Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety School Zone Safety Work Zone Safety Freight Safety Motorcycle Safety Railroad Crossing Safety Safety Management System Traffic Records System
Complete report: <i>Wyoming Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> http://www.dot.state.wy.us/files/content/sites/wydot/files/shared/Highway_Safety/Strategic_Highway_Safety_Plan.pdf		