



Local Road Safety

A FRAMEWORK FOR LOCAL SAFETY PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

Analysis of statewide crash data often shows a significant portion of fatalities and serious injuries occurring on locally owned roadways. To achieve the long-term goal and vision of zero fatalities on our nation's roadways, States should consider safety improvements on the local system. States use local road safety programs to supplement State roadway safety program initiatives and provide safety funding opportunities and technical expertise for local agencies. These programs can be effective in developing projects, as well as building capacity at the local level and demonstrating an agency's commitment to local roadway safety to the public.

The purpose of this guide is to establish a framework for States developing local road safety programs or policies and to provide examples of how peers administer local road safety programs. This document is not intended to suggest the best strategy. Rather it presents an array of approaches States have taken to incorporate local road safety in an overall State safety program.

DEFINING THE LOCAL SYSTEM

The local road system includes all non-State owned roads and is owned by a mix of cities, counties, and local entities. Local road safety stakeholders span engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency response, collectively known as the "4Es" and include the state and local level departments and initiatives that carry out those efforts. Local technical assistance programs (LTAPs), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), regional planning organizations (RPOs), and regional coalitions (RCs) play a role in implementing statewide transportation programs and can act as a conduit to reaching local agencies as well. Understanding stakeholder needs, building relationships, and identifying opportunities for collaboration are building blocks to starting a local road safety program.

EXAMPLES OF STAKEHOLDERS

- State Departments of Transportation
- State Highway Safety Offices
- Local Agency Public Works
- Local Technical Assistance Programs
- Regional Planning Organizations and Coalitions
- Law Enforcement Agencies
- Emergency Services
- Departments of Public Health
- Public education organizations

Program Administration

GETTING STARTED

As shown in Figure 1, local road safety programs are usually administered through one of four ways: 1) centrally managed by a local aid division or safety program office, 2) managed by a district of a State Department of Transportation (DOT), 3) by leveraging existing MPOs, RPOs, or other regional structures, or 4) some hybrid of these organizational structures. The method of program administration depends on the State DOT's culture, the technical capacity and autonomy of local agencies, and geography. A State may want to consider how similar programs within

the DOT are managed and if a local road safety program may be able to leverage those already existing structures. Another approach is for a State to establish program requirements in coordination with local stakeholders. A number of agencies have had success using this approach, then piloting the program, seeing what works and what doesn't, and making adjustments as needed. Once an approach is decided upon, it is important to document the program organization and processes as a means to communicate the program to local and State stakeholders, and garner support and buy-in.

Figure 1: Program Organization: Cambridge Systematics Inc. *Assessment of Local Road Safety Funding, Training, and Technical Assistance.*

CENTRALIZED			DECENTRALIZED		
PROGRAM ORGANIZATION					
Local-Aid Division	Centralized Local Road Safety Program/Unit	Hybrid of Local-Aid Division and Local Road Safety Program	Hybrid of Local Road Safety Program and District/Region-Level Project Coordination	District/Region-Level Project Coordination	District/Region-Level Local Project Coordinators
SCOPE/RESPONSIBILITIES					
Safety projects handled with all other local projects.	Special unit/department handles local safety projects.	Special unit/department identifies, prioritizes safety projects, local-aid division administers projects.	Special unit/department identifies, prioritizes safety projects, district-level staff administer projects.	All local projects identified, prioritized, developed, and administered at district level by district engineers.	All local safety projects identified, prioritized, developed and administered at district level by local project coordinator.

Guidance for local road safety programs may be described in legal mandates for the program, policy documents, or procedure manuals. This guidance may include the process of distributing funding to local projects, the structure of programs providing services to local entities through technical assistance and outreach, and information about program requirements (e.g., eligibility criteria, application requirements). For example, California has a [law](#) that requires them to spend transportation funds including Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) on local roads. Creating a central resource specifically for all local safety services, programs, and funding is an emerging best practice within the field because it creates transparency and promotes program longevity.

Regardless of the program organization or management approach, all local road safety programs benefit from strong leadership support. Engaging a champion can greatly improve visibility of the program throughout the organization, and particularly within the executive level leadership. Champions can provide a unifying vision to prioritize the many options available in building a sustainable local road safety program. Safety champions can be found at all levels of an organization from leadership to agency staff. A champion is typically a person who is passionate about safety, understands the value of communication, and is dedicated to implementing the program.

EXAMPLES OF LOCAL SAFETY PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION

CALIFORNIA

The [California Local Road Safety Manual](#) was developed by Caltrans for local agencies. It describes a framework for identifying safety problems on local roads, matching them to solutions, identifying funding, and implementing projects. Caltrans' role in local road safety is described and a listing of common countermeasures and their crash reduction factors is provided. The manual emphasizes:

- Proactive problem identification
- Providing a set of tools for effective safety analysis for beginners
- Preparation for the Caltrans statewide call-for-safety-projects process
- Using an incremental and/or systemic approach

LOUISIANA

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) developed guidance for local agencies: [Louisiana's Local Road Safety Program Guidelines and Policies](#). This document describes the full extent of Louisiana's Local Road Safety Program, including:

- Program is managed by the [Local Technical Assistance Program](#) (LTAP) which also provides [training](#) and capacity building
- Local Road Safety Improvement Plan requirements
- Local safety project funding
 - Eligibility and guidelines
 - Application process
 - Requirements for problem identification/project selection
 - Project implementation guidance

OHIO

The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) describes its efforts in working with local organizations to improve safety on all public roads in its [Other Highway Safety Programs](#) document. Ohio DOT recently created a position focused on creating a comprehensive Local Road Safety Program. Designating dedicated personnel to create a set of program guidance and policies can help create a cohesive program.

NEW JERSEY

New Jersey's Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) conducted a pilot program in conjunction with the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) to gather information on using funds for local safety projects. After two pilot projects, they created a formal [Local Safety Program](#), demonstrating that pilot projects can help a State in its program development process. NJTPA's Local Safety Program is federally funded. NJTPA works with NJDOT to advance safety initiatives on county and local roadways throughout northern New Jersey. The program focuses on easily implemented, high-impact projects.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee DOT's documentation for its local road safety program is outlined in the *Procedures Manual for Safety Projects Developed Under the Local Roads Safety Initiative Program* (developed by TDOT's Strategic Transportation Investments Division's Project Safety Office: January 2017). The Local Roads Safety Initiative Program was developed in 2010 to provide assistance to County governments by allocating HSIP funds to each county in Tennessee to address safety issues on their roadways.

Project Identification & Selection

Local road safety projects can be identified through a competitive application process, State or local-led data analysis or a Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP). A data-driven process should be used to identify and select projects. Safety programs need both crash and roadway data to be effective, so improving data accessibility and quality should be a priority for all agencies. Working closely with partners to identify safety issues through a data-driven process and choose countermeasures will result in the greatest reduction in fatalities and serious injuries.

States providing funding for local road safety projects must use a selection process to identify eligible projects and select projects that are consistent with their Strategic Highway Strategic Plan (SHSP). Selection processes can be administered at the State, regional, or local level. Models vary significantly in the State and local agency involvement, as well as the level of oversight provided by States for local projects.

EXAMPLES OF PROJECT IDENTIFICATION & SELECTION APPROACHES BY MODEL

BY DISTRICT

COLORADO

[Colorado DOT](#) solicits local agencies to apply for HSIP funding for local projects. Recipients include Transportation Planning Regions, MPOs, municipalities, and counties. CDOT Regions act as the contact for local agencies. A 10 percent match for both off-system and on-system projects is required. Local agencies may partner with CDOT for use of [FASTER Safety Mitigation](#) funds by submitting an [application](#) to the appropriate CDOT Regional contact. CDOT Regional planners and engineering staff work local partners to analyze available data and determine effective safety projects for each Region.

FLORIDA

Florida DOT uses a district based approach, with DOT Districts handling the majority of the application process and even certifying that local agencies are eligible to receive funding ([Local Agency Program Certifications](#)). In Florida, the Districts may also participate in implementation for approved projects through construction or other support.

KENTUCKY

Kentucky's [Localized Risk Mitigation Projects](#) involve both local agencies and District Offices. The Districts coordinate Road Safety Audits utilizing a multi-disciplinary team on potential projects. Projects are submitted throughout the year; project selection is coordinated with the State Highway Engineer Office.

BY LTAP

LOUISIANA

[Louisiana's program guidelines](#) describe a streamlined evaluation process for local project selection as compared to the longer process for State initiated projects.

BY STATEWIDE COMMITTEE

NEBRASKA

[Nebraska's HSIP program](#) solicits proposals for HSIP funding developed by local public agencies (LPAs). The request must be submitted through the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) Local Projects Section.

Proposals are reviewed by the NDOR Safety Committee which screens and prioritizes projects. Although NDOR retains the rights to select projects and administer all funding, they do not conduct safety analysis for local road owners and do not identify projects on a statewide basis.

BY STATE DOT CENTRAL OFFICE

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania DOT (PennDOT) works with the LTAP and the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors to conduct technical reviews and identify low cost safety projects on local roads. PennDOT prepares a Directed Technical Assistance Report which identifies safety projects ready for a construction contract or force account work. Pennsylvania's model uses a strongly centralized process of administering local safety funds that requires less involvement by local agencies for project identification and selection. It should be noted that many of the local roads in Pennsylvania are the State DOT's responsibility. ([Pennsylvania Highway Safety Improvement Program 2018 Annual Report](#))

TENNESSEE

Tennessee DOT's Local Road Safety Initiative (LRSI) program identifies and addresses safety issues on local non-state route segments that are outside of an urban boundary and not represented by an MPO including: rural major collectors, rural minor collectors, or rural local routes. All candidate locations for this program are selected using a data driven process with set qualification criteria. All projects are identified by the TDOT Project Safety Office and are presented to local stakeholders based on severity. ([Tennessee Highway Safety Improvement Program 2019 Annual Report](#))

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS

VERMONT

Vermont's Agency of Transportation (VTrans) created a Systemic Local Roads Safety (SLRS) Program to implement low-cost safety solutions on low volume locally maintained roadways. The program guidelines

and workflow are outlined in [The Orange Book](#), a guide covering VTrans offerings and policies on a wide range of programs for local officials. The SLRS Program involves local agencies, Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs), outside contractors to implement projects, and VTrans. The program focuses on risk factors as opposed to crash history to evaluate proposed project sites.

Within the framework, VTrans creates an analysis of risks factors for all potential locations, which the Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) then integrate in their project selection process with feedback from local stakeholders. Proposed sites are narrowed down, and then submitted to VTrans with a participation agreement from the municipality. A second round of coordination between the three entities results in site specific interventions approved by all parties. Finally, VTrans contracts a vendor to implement the project, with 100 percent of costs covered by VTrans. The program is administered by VTrans, but involves coordination between three sets of stakeholders.

LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLANS

[Local Road Safety Plans](#) (LRSPs) are a tool used to identify, analyze, and prioritize roadway safety issues and projects on local roads. In some states, LRSPs are a requirement for receiving roadway safety funds. LRSPs can be created with a bottoms-up approach (locals create their own plans) or top-down initiated process (plans are initiated and managed at DOT headquarters). The approach is chosen based on State and local government culture, or where champions and technical capacity exist. LRSPs require data analysis, input, and commitment by all safety partners. The assistance offered by State DOTs may include funding for creating the plan, providing raw data or pre-made analyses of the region, active stakeholder or technical assistance through a Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP). Providing these resources is crucial to having a well-built plan for some localities where safety planning is a new activity or data is not available through local collection efforts.

EXAMPLES OF STATES USING LRSPS

IOWA

Iowa has sought to create LRSPs for each county. The county level safety plan provides local agencies with a prioritized listing of safety projects to focus efforts on applications to spend local safety funding. The funding for these plans comes from Iowa's HSIP program; the State has reduced costs by contracting with one consultant to complete all of the plans with a [request for proposal](#).

LOUISIANA

Louisiana DOTD encourages its [regional coalitions](#) to create regional transportation safety plans to address local safety. Details regarding assistance provided by Louisiana LTAP to create these plans are provided on its [website](#). The Louisiana LTAP works with the top 20 parishes and municipalities that are overrepresented in serious and fatal injuries as a result of roadway departure and intersection crashes. Assistance includes helping the local agencies analyze crash data, identify issues, and recommend solutions.

MINNESOTA

Minnesota DOT has worked to develop [County Road Safety Plans](#) for all 87 counties. The projects identified in these plans are given priority in the HSIP project selection process. ([Minnesota Highway Safety Improvement Program 2018 Annual Report](#))

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota DOT hired a consultant to create LRSPs for all counties, cities, and tribes. Their plan creation spanned four phases, and resulted in the complete coverage of the State with local safety plans. These plans include both jurisdiction-specific and regional plans. High priority projects with project sheets are included in the plans with cost estimates and priority

rankings. Local agencies can use this information to apply for funding. Selection of local road projects uses the same methodology as State roads; priority projects are aligned with the state's SHSP emphasis areas.

([North Dakota Highway Safety Improvement Program 2018 Annual Report](#))

WASHINGTON

[Washington State DOT](#) requires the completion of an LRSP to qualify for HSIP funding. Crash data summaries are provided to agencies with fatal/serious injury crashes including all 39 counties and 155 of 281 cities/towns (33 of the 30 counties have an LRSP). Workshops on local road safety plan development with the crash data summaries are held and followed up with technical assistance on LRSPs, countermeasure selection, and project development. Online [guidance](#) on the steps to creating an LRSP is also available. LRSPs include a list of prioritized projects with a cost estimate. Details on project selection and funding are available on WSDOT's website: [2020 City Safety Program: Call for Projects](#). Projects require a 10 percent local match per phase (preliminary engineering/design, right-of-way, and construction) for all for all eligible federal expenditures. If the construction phase is authorized by the documented deadline, then the construction phase is eligible for 100 percent funding with no local match required. Federal funds cannot be used as match for any phase.

Washington selects projects for HSIP funding for both local and State roads using a data-driven process. Washington's SHSP includes priority levels for crash types. The top two infrastructure priorities are lane departure and intersection crashes. WSDOT evaluates the total number of fatal and injury crashes for those two crash types for a five-year period and then calculates the ratio of crashes on locally owned roads to state road; HSIP funding is allocated based on the result.

Local Safety Program & Project Funding

Local road safety programs can be funded in a variety of ways including the HSIP; a portion of taxes (i.e. State Aid (gas tax), property taxes, and local transportation sales tax option); and local funds. States that allocate funds for local safety programs may set aside a specific amount (i.e. \$ or % threshold). In some cases, this split is data driven based on the percent of fatalities and

serious injuries on State versus local roads. In other cases, State and local projects compete against one another for the same funding. Another way to lessen the burden of accessing Federal funds by local agencies is to do a “funding swap” where State funds are used for local projects and the Federal funds are used for projects administered by the State.

EXAMPLES OF LOCAL SAFETY PROGRAM FUNDING APPROACHES

CALIFORNIA

California’s [Systemic Safety Analysis Report Program](#) (SSARP) is funded with HSIP funds. HSIP funds are set aside and exchanged for State funds. The program works to help local agencies gather data, analyze and identify problems, and create a list of systemic low-cost proven safety countermeasures to use for HSIP applications.

INDIANA

Indiana’s Fiscal Policy states that one-third of Indiana’s HSIP funding is available to local public agencies for safety projects on local system roads. ([Indiana Highway Safety Improvement Program 2018 Annual Report](#))

MINNESOTA

In Minnesota, 60 percent of HSIP funds are set aside for local safety projects as detailed on [MnDOT’s HSIP webpage](#).

NEW YORK

New York State provides approximately half of its HSIP funds regionally; funds are distributed based on a formula involving crashes, population, and center lane miles. The regions work with the MPOs to select projects to include in the capital program, including both State and local roads. ([New York Highway Safety Improvement Program 2018 Annual Report](#))

OHIO

[ODOT](#) allocates \$12 million annually to the County Engineers Association of Ohio to make safety improvements on the county road network. Funds may be used for spot safety improvements and systematic safety improvements.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee DOT’s Local Road Safety Initiative (LRSI) program distributes up to \$300,000 in HSIP funds to each of its 83 counties for construction cost improvements. ([Tennessee Highway Safety Improvement Program 2018 Annual Report](#))

WASHINGTON

70 percent of fatal and serious injury crashes occur on local roads, therefore WSDOT distributes 70 percent of its HSIP funding to local safety projects ([Washington State DOT Highway Safety Improvement Program 2017 Annual Report](#))

DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAM FUNDS

Local road safety program funds are used to carry out safety projects on local roads. The funds are distributed in a number of ways, usually through some type of competitive application process. Several States (e.g., Alaska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Texas, Vermont,

Virginia) distribute safety funding to locals by including local planning agencies (LPAs) in the State safety funding application processes using the same criteria as State-initiated projects. Other States (e.g., California, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon) use a single application process with slightly different eligibility criteria for local applicants.

EXAMPLES OF STATE APPROACHES FOR DISTRIBUTING LOCAL SAFETY FUNDS

ARIZONA

Arizona DOT determined that they would like to provide more local road safety funding than their 80/20 split between State/local projects. To address this issue, a mixed call for projects between State and local projects was conducted instead of its usual parallel but separate application process. After implementing this change, the project breakdown shifted to 30/60 State/local, increasing the amount of local road safety funding significantly. The remaining 10 percent is set aside for Emergency Statewide funds.

IDAHO

[Idaho's Local Highway Technical Assistance Council \(LHTAC\)](#) works with the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) to address HSIP funding for local safety projects. LHTAC provides a recommended list of projects to ITD. The funding split between ITD and LHTAC is based on the percentage of fatal/serious injury crashes on local roads. The current approved funding split for FY21 and FY22 is 50 percent. ([2018 Idaho Highway Safety Improvement Program Annual Report](#))

IOWA

Iowa DOT worked with the Iowa County Engineers Association to develop a county-focused highway safety program, [HSIP-Secondary](#) which awards \$2 million in HSIP-SWAP funds (State funds) for safety projects on the county road system. The program encourages low cost, systemic improvements. The program is managed by the Safety Programs Engineer.

KANSAS

Kansas DOT's Bureau of Local Projects created the [Federal Fund Exchange](#) to assist local agencies streamline the project development process on local roadways, including safety projects. The program provides local agencies the ability to exchange Federal funds to KDOT for State dollars. If the local agency chooses this option, KDOT agrees to accept the Federal funds and exchanges State funds at a rate determined by the Kansas Secretary of Transportation on an annual basis for every dollar of federal funds available to the local agency which saves time and money. Typically, the rate is 90 cents State funds for every dollar of Federal funds.

If a local agency participates in KDOT's Federal Fund Exchange, they must meet one of the acceptable project scopes from a list of acceptable activities, follow their own procedures, and then submit a request for reimbursement as costs are incurred. The local agency is reimbursed for 100 percent of the billings up until the maximum amount of the exchange.

MICHIGAN

Michigan DOT distributes approximately \$15,000,000 each year to local roadway safety projects: \$1.5M for the streamlined systemic safety program described below, \$6M for High Risk Rural Road projects, and \$7.5M for HSIP projects. MDOT works with the County Road Association of Michigan and the Michigan Municipal League to distribute information regarding [Michigan DOT's Streamlined Systemic Safety Program](#) to their member agencies. The solicitation states: "Local Agencies may submit no more than three streamlined

HSIP project applications for consideration including no more than two project applications for the same work type. Federal safety funds shall not exceed \$200,000 per streamlined HSIP project or a maximum amount of \$2,000,000 per Local Agency (HSIP and HRRR combined) for the fiscal year.”

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island DOT created a pilot Local Safety Program to provide funds for locally initiated projects. The Rhode Island pilot includes \$1,000,000 to be distributed annually to provide five municipalities with funding for local projects on a competitive basis. ([2017 Rhode Island Highway Safety Improvement Program Annual Report](#))

LOCAL MATCH

In general, HSIP funds require a ten percent match for Federal funds used, except for certain safety projects covered under [Title 23, Section 120 \(c\) \(1\)](#) which are eligible at 100 percent. Local match requirement is sometimes provided by the local entities receiving funding, but in some cases it is waived and provided by the State to ease funding burdens on locals. Examples of States assisting with the funding the local match include:

- [Louisiana](#): LTAP administers the Local Road Safety Program; Louisiana DOTD sets aside Section 154 and 164 Penalty Transfer funds and HSIP funds to fully fund local safety projects.
- Virginia: Local safety projects received up to 20 percent of Virginia’s HSIP funds; VDOT has been providing the State match to these safety projects for the past several years. ([2018 Virginia Highway Safety Improvement Program Annual Report](#))

LOCAL SAFETY PROJECT FUNDING ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Eligibility criteria for a local entity applying for safety funds may be identical to the requirements for State safety projects, or include special requirements. These requirements vary by State and can be derived from the existing safety funding policies, legal requirements for State distribution of funding to other entities, and

THE FOLLOWING IS THE LIST OF CERTAIN SAFETY PROJECTS ELIGIBLE FOR 100% FEDERAL SHARE AS PER TITLE 23, SECTION 120 (C) (1):

- Traffic control signalization
- Maintaining minimum levels of retroreflectivity of highway signs or pavement markings
- Traffic circles/roundabouts
- Safety rest areas
- Pavement marking
- Shoulder and centerline rumble strips and stripes
- Commuter carpooling and vanpooling
- Rail-highway crossing closure,
- Installation of traffic signs, traffic lights, guardrails, impact attenuators, concrete barrier end treatments, breakaway utility poles
- Priority control systems for emergency vehicles or transit vehicles at signalized intersections

other sources of guidance. The most basic criteria is to determine which entities are eligible to submit projects (e.g. MPOs, local governments, State DOT officials, regional DOT offices).

After making a decision on who may apply to the program, additional eligibility criteria may include any of the following stipulations:

- Locality must conduct financial analysis (benefit-cost analyses, custom tool per State) (e.g., Minnesota DOT, Caltrans, Michigan DOT, and New Jersey DOT)
- Regional coalition/MPO must approve project (e.g., Massachusetts DOT, New Jersey DOT, New York DOT)
- Project must not include more than 10 percent of costs for acquisition of right-of-way; project must not require extensive environmental review (e.g., Caltrans)

- Locality must have a local road safety plan (e.g., Connecticut DOT and Washington State DOT)
- Entity can only apply three years in a row (e.g., Florida DOT)
- Project location must have high risk for safety issues (e.g., Massachusetts DOT)
- Locality must cover maintenance costs (e.g., Minnesota DOT)
- Agency must complete technical training course or complete analysis work with safety experts to submit application (e.g., Nebraska DOT)
- Project must align with priorities of State SHSP (e.g., Michigan DOT, Virginia DOT)
- The location's calculated severe crash rate must equal or exceed the statewide average severe crash rate for similar facilities (e.g., Tennessee DOT)
- Application must estimate crash reduction potential of proposed improvement (e.g., Michigan DOT, Wisconsin DOT)
- Project must include/conduct a post-implementation evaluation (e.g., Utah DOT)

Project Delivery

Delivery of local road projects varies based on a number of factors including who is leading the effort (e.g., State versus local), the complexity and scope of the project, funding source, and if the project is being carried out by local, State, or contractor forces. Depending on the expertise, staffing, and resources of the local entity, and the structure of the local road safety program, projects may be implemented by the State, with help from the State, or entirely by the local agency. Local agencies seeking to complete a safety project are often subject to State-level requirements

for delivering the project. These requirements can be simply aligned with State contracting requirements, or could contain additional stipulations on who may perform work. Local agencies that are able to choose their own contractor shift more responsibility to the local agency, and may require greater oversight by the State to monitor sub-contracting. States may require performance tracking or project evaluation, which can help to improve the selection of future projects and program administration.

EXAMPLES OF STATE APPROACHES TO PROJECT DELIVERY

ARIZONA

[Arizona DOT's Local Public Agency Projects Manual](#) describes ADOT's role in administering the construction of federally funded transportation projects, except in cases where LPAs are authorized to manage the construction phase or when projects are being administered by an LPA under an approved Certification Acceptance agreement.

ADOT is responsible for ensuring that LPAs are in compliance with all federal procurement requirements, for providing adequate inspection and supervision during, and for meeting FHWA closeout requirements.

KANSAS

If a local agency participates in KDOT's [Federal Fund Exchange](#), they must follow the State's procedures to develop and administer the project, and then submit a request for reimbursement as costs are incurred. The local agency is reimbursed for 100 percent of the billings up until the maximum amount of the exchange.

KENTUCKY

Kentucky specifies [additional requirements for construction](#) through the standard State procurement process. All approved projects must be let through the

KY Division of Construction Procurement, must address road safety audit findings, and conform to the State policies and guidelines.

OHIO

[Ohio DOT's Township Safety Sign Grant Program](#) provides up to \$50,000 per township in safety sign materials (signs, posts and hardware) for townships meeting specific criteria. Townships then install the signs using local forces.

MINNESOTA

Minnesota has been successful with local agencies partnering together to bundle projects across multiple jurisdictions. This process involves counties working with the MnDOT District Office to combine similar projects (e.g. 6-inch wide edge stripes). An intercountry agreement is developed which identifies all counties involved; the lead agency works directly with MnDOT, the sub agencies, and the contractor. The sub agencies contact MnDOT Finance directly to apply for eligible State Aid matching funds. MnDOT has developed a project memo for local HSIP projects with minor impacts: [Environmental Documentation for Federal Projects with Minor Impacts](#).

As detailed in [Minnesota DOT Local Solicitation for HSIP Funds](#), the State requires that a municipality issue a contract for the completion of a project, sometimes requiring that they use only State pre-approved contractors.

An emerging approach to deliver low cost local safety projects is to use force accounts. [FHWA Policy on Agency Force Account Use](#) details the requirements for local project delivery by force account using HSIP funds. The benefits of the program include time and cost savings. This approach adds to the workload of

the division or State DOT engineering and construction staff, but avoids the administrative burden of providing funds directly to municipalities.

PROJECT EVALUATION

Some States conduct project evaluations after implementation is complete. These evaluations may involve financial analysis, physical inspection of the site, or review of any other project aspect. Evaluation may also be conducted through examining safety data before and after an intervention.

EXAMPLES OF STATE APPROACHES TO EVALUATION

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina DOT conducts before and after studies for every project. A package is sent to every division and/or local government 3 to 4 years post construction to determine the crash modification factor and if the crash pattern that was intended to reduce occurred. This information is used to show the benefits of and promote future projects for countermeasures that demonstrate success.

UTAH

Local projects funded by Utah DOT require project evaluation at three years post-construction. This period mirrors their application review of three years of crash data history, and allows for a systematic comparison of pre- and post-implementation incidents. Utah's [HSIP Manual](#) describes a comprehensive approach

to project evaluation that distinguishes between interventions achieved in a single spot or systemic safety improvements. For systemic improvements, the manual suggests evaluating progress using an entire stretch of roadway that was addressed in a project, or even evaluating on a statewide basis for broadly applied systemic improvements. Utah DOT then uses these metrics on project effectiveness in their reporting on the entire HSIP funding program.

Outreach & Technical Support

Successful local road safety programs provide safety related outreach and technical support for local agencies. Proactively pursuing these activities helps to build relationships between State, regional, and local safety personnel, as well as create networks for information and training. The opportunities provided to locals through these efforts can make safety work more accessible, and build long-term capacity within local agencies. FHWA Office of Safety has developed specific outreach materials for communicating with local officials: [Local Elected Officials: Leading the Way in Local Road Safety](#).

States often have programs or offices to accomplish outreach and technical support objectives, including [Safety Circuit Rider](#) (SCR) programs and [Local Technical Assistance Programs](#) (LTAPs). The programs or offices are often a first point of contact for locals

reaching out to ask for funding or analysis assistance. Some States have a dedicated outreach program coordinator, either within the State DOT office or at the division or regional level. These outreach positions help connect the DOT itself to local agencies, and can be particularly suited for long term relationship building. Outreach can be funded through a mixture of Federal and State funding.

EXAMPLES OF TECHNICAL SUPPORT

- Data analysis
- Training on maintenance and operations
- Local safety planning
- Funding applications

EXAMPLES OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OUTREACH PROGRAMS

CALIFORNIA

[Caltrans Division of Local Assistance](#), in conjunction with the FHWA California Division Office, presented two webinars hosted by the California LTAP center to assist local agencies in preparing applications for HSIP funds. The website includes a number of valuable resources including examples of successful applications.

CONNECTICUT

[Connecticut's SCR program](#) was established with a memorandum of understanding between the University of Connecticut, which houses the LTAP Center, and the Connecticut DOT. The SCR contacts local agencies throughout the State to promote safety solutions, coordinate and offer training to support their safety efforts, loan out equipment (such as retro-reflective measuring tools, safety edge boots, and ball bank indicators) and provide support on how to use them, and provide technical assistance on safety issues. As a part of the SCR program, Connecticut has a Safety Advisory Committee consisting of local and

State stakeholders and the safety circuit rider. The DOT encourages participation in the SCR program by drafting a letter to each municipality addressed to the Town's Chief Elected Official and the designated Legal Traffic Authority that outlines the process and provides the safety circuit rider as the point of contact for assistance.

KENTUCKY

[Kentucky's SCR Program](#), housed in the University of Kentucky, works to identify and implement projects on local roads. Its overall focus is to provide technical assistance to all communities in Kentucky, however it also selects six counties annually with high crash rates for focused training on low-cost safety improvements. The counties are also provided with funds for signage upgrades. In addition, Kentucky's SCR program provides a one day training course at selected areas throughout the Commonwealth. The course is designed to provide communities with effective approaches to mainstream safety into daily maintenance activities and project development process.

IDAHO

[Idaho's Local Highway Technical Assistance Council](#) (LHTAC) is a DOT partner responsible for outreach, technical assistance, project development, and funding. Often, States task partners (such as third party LTAP providers, MPOs or regional councils) with some of the same responsibilities discussed for DOT districts, including proposal development, review and implementation support.

ILLINOIS

Illinois DOT hosts in-person training and a webinar to provide local agencies with technical assistance on how to fill out the safety project funding application. The webinar provides direction on the application process and the timeline, as well as contact information for assistance.

LOUISIANA

[Louisiana's LTAP program](#) operates in conjunction with Louisiana State University. The LTAP program puts emphasis on innovative solutions, training, and funding opportunities for locals. In addition, it produces a [quarterly newsletter](#) to provide local agencies with current training opportunities and other educational opportunities. The Louisiana LTAP program also completes data analysis in tandem with the local agencies to help them identify hot spots and systemic issues within their parish. Louisiana uses HSIP funding for a safety coordinator position at each of the regional safety coalitions, providing specialized support in safety analysis, funding application and safety planning for local roads and an LRSP manager. LA DOTD also employs an LRSP manager.

MICHIGAN

[Michigan DOT's Local Safety Initiative](#) provides local agencies directly with a crash analysis of the entire local system, works jointly in the field with local officials to assess potential risks, and provides recommendations for improvements.

OHIO

[Ohio's Highway Safety Improvement Program](#) works with MPOs, the County Engineers Association, and the LTAP to offer free technical and funding assistance for a variety of initiatives including upgrading signal timing at high crash intersections and systemic safety improvements such as curve sign upgrades, cable median barriers, and reflective back plates on traffic signals. In addition, ODOT works with the LTAP and Ohio county engineers to conduct roadway safety audits; recommendations for improvements are funded through ODOT's HSIP. ODOT's local safety program added a dedicated manager in 2018 - Local Safety and Active Transportation Manager.

More Information

Addressing local road safety is critical to achieving our vision of zero fatalities on the nation’s roads. More States are partnering with local agencies to improve safety on all public roads. This guide presents a framework for States looking to develop or update their local road safety programs or policies.

In addition to the references and examples provided throughout this guide, there are a number of other resources available to support local road safety efforts:

RESOURCE TITLE	URL	DESCRIPTION
Roadway Safety Noteworthy Practices Database	https://rspcb.safety.fhwa.dot.gov/noteworthy/default.aspx	A database of data- driven practices to address roadway safety planning, implementation, and evaluation challenges.
Local and Rural Road Safety Program	https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/local_rural/	List of resources designed to provide information to agencies to assist in preventing and reducing the severity of crashes on local and rural roads.
Proven Safety Countermeasures	https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/	Treatments and strategies to address roadway departure, intersection, pedestrian and bicycle crashes.
National LTAP and TTAP Association	http://www.nltapa.org/	Contact information and resources for addressing local road safety.
The Roadway Safety Foundation: Roadway Safety Guide – A Primer for Community Leaders	https://www.e-digitaleditions.com/i/418038-roadway- safety- guide/0?m4=	The Guide to provide elected officials, community leaders, and citizens with the tools to engage with engineers, law enforcement, and safety professionals to address roadway safety.

Technical Assistance is also available through the FHWA Office of Safety at: <https://rspcb.safety.fhwa.dot.gov/technical.aspx>. Assistance is free for State and local agencies and is delivered according to an agency’s needs, including:

- Referral to an experienced peer or technical expert.
- Onsite assistance from an experienced peer or technical expert.
- Training workshop led by an experienced peer or technical expert.
- Facilitated peer exchange conducted onsite or by web conference.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT

Karen Surry,
FHWA Office of Safety HSIP Program Manager
Karen.Scurry@dot.gov
202-897-7168

Rosemarie Anderson,
FHWA Office of Safety Local and Rural Roads
Program Manager
Rosemarie.Anderson@dot.gov
202-366-5007