

The background features a large, light gray watermark of the Idaho Department of Transportation logo. The logo is circular and contains the text "IDAHO" at the top, "TRANSPORTATION" on the left, and "DEPARTMENT" on the right. In the center is a stylized map of Idaho with a star above it.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PERFORMANCE PLAN

FFY 2011

Prepared by:

**Idaho Department of Transportation
Office of Highway Operations and Safety
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707-1129
(208) 334-8100**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HIGHWAY SAFETY PERFORMANCE PLAN	1
Description of the Program	1
Process Descriptions	1
Traffic Safety Problem Identification	1
Establishing Goals and Performance Measures	2
Project Development	2
Overview of the Highway Safety Performance Plan Process	4
Idaho Traffic Safety Commissioners.....	5
GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES	6
Mission Statement	6
Primary Goal	6
Primary Performance Measures, Benchmarks, & Strategy	6
REFERENCE MATERIALS	10
EQUIPMENT REQUEST	11
HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN COST SUMMARY	12
FFY 2011 HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANT PROGRAM – PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS	14
Impaired Driving.....	14
Aggressive Driving.....	14
Youthful Drivers	15
Safety Restraints – Adults	16
Safety Restraints – Child Passenger Safety.....	16
Emergency Medical Services.....	17
Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety.....	18
Motorcycle Safety	18
Traffic Records/Roadway Safety.....	18
Distracted Driving	19
Paid Advertising	19
Community Projects.....	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

Planning and Administration 20
410 Planning and Administration 20
410 Alcohol - Impaired Driving 21
410 Paid Advertising 21
Section 408 SAFETEA-LU Data Program..... 22
Section 1906 Racial Profiling..... 22
Section 2010 Motorcycle Safety 22

CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES 23

IDAHO PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION REPORT FFY 2011 32
Statewide 33
Aggressive Driving..... 35
Distracted Driving 36
Safety Restraints 37
Impaired Driving..... 38
Youthful Drivers 39
Mature Drivers..... 40
Motorcyclists..... 41
Pedestrians and Bicyclists 42
Emergency Medical Services..... 43
Commercial Motor Vehicles 44
Drowsy Driving..... 45
Single-Vehicle Crashes 46
Intersection Crashes 47
Head on and Side Swipe Opposite Direction Crashes 48
Work Zone Crashes 49
Cross-Median Crashes..... 50
Crashes with Trains 51
School Bus Crashes 52

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS 53

ORGANIZATION COMPLEMENT.....56

Highway Safety Performance Plan

For more information contact:
Mary Hunter
Highway Safety Manager
Office of Highway Operations & Safety
Phone: (208) 334-8100
FAX: (208) 334-4430

Description of the Program

The Office of Highway Operations & Safety, (OHOS), administers the Federal Highway Safety Grant Program, which will be funded by formula through the transportation act entitled Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), and the Highway Safety Act of 1966. The goal of the program is to reduce deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from traffic crashes by implementing programs designed to address driver behaviors. The purpose of the program is to provide grant funding, at the state and community level, for a highway safety program addressing Idaho’s own unique circumstances and particular highway safety needs.

Process Descriptions

Traffic Safety Problem Identification

A “traffic safety problem” is an identifiable subgroup of drivers, pedestrians, vehicles, or roadways that is statistically higher in crash experience than normal expectations. Problem identification involves the study of relationships between traffic crashes and the population, licensed drivers, registered vehicles, and vehicle miles traveled, as well as characteristics of specific subgroups that may contribute to crashes.

In the fall of 2008, OHOS staff and the Idaho Traffic Safety Commission (ITSC) jointly developed a three-year safety plan for FFY 2010-2012. In accordance with Federal requirements, one element of the plan is to discuss how traffic safety problems would be identified and addressed over the course of the three years. The process used to identify traffic safety problems began by evaluating Idaho’s experience in each of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA), eight highway safety priority areas. These program areas were determined by NHTSA to be most effective in reducing motor vehicle

crashes, injuries, and deaths. Consideration for other potential traffic safety problem areas came from problems noted by ITSC Commissioners, OHS staff, and by researching issues identified by other states.

Comparison data was developed, where possible, on costs of crashes, the number of crashes, and the number of deaths and injuries. Crash data, from the Idaho State Collision Database, was analyzed to determine problem areas as well as helmet use for motorcycles and bicycles, child safety-restraint use, and seat-belt use. Population data from the Census Bureau, Violation and license suspension data from the Economics and Research Section, Idaho Transportation Department and arrest information from the Bureau of Criminal Identification, Idaho State Police was also used in the problem identification.

Ultimately, Idaho's most critical driver behavior-related traffic safety problems were identified. The areas were selected on the basis of the severity of the problem, economic costs, and availability of grantee agencies to conduct successful programs, and other supportable conclusions drawn from the traffic safety problem identification process.

Establishing Goals and Performance Measures

The primary goal of the highway safety grant program has been, and will continue to be, reducing motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian deaths, serious injuries, and economic losses. The results of the problem identification process are used by staff to assure resources are directed to areas most appropriate for achieving the primary goal. In October 2009, OHOS staff recommended and the ITSC approved updated fatality goals because we exceeded our 2012 goal in 2008. Performance measures and goals are consistent with NHTSA requirements.

In October 2009, the Idaho Traffic Safety Commission voted to accept the FFY 2010-2012 Idaho Focus Areas and approved the targeted funding ranges anticipated to be programmed over the three years. The emphasis areas and funding ranges were revised in October 2009 reflecting the addition of distracted driving as a focus area consistent with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

The approved funding ranges are:

Focus Area	Target Funding Range
Safety Restraint Use	18-30%
Impaired Drivers	18-30%
Aggressive Driving	18-30%
Youthful Drivers	8-20%
Roadway Safety/Traffic Records	5-15%
Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety	0- 5 %
Emergency Medical Services	5-10%
Motorcycle	0- 5 %
Distracted Driving	0-15%
Other	0-10%

Project Development

The annual project selection process begins by notifying state and local public agencies involved in traffic-related activities of the availability of grant funds. A Request for Proposal (RFP), reflecting the focus areas considered for funding, is released each January. Grant applicants must complete and

submit a Letter of Intent, in accordance with the information provided on the form, by mid February. Copies of the application form and instructions are provided at the end of this document. Once the application period has closed, potential projects are first sorted according to the focus area that most closely fits the project. OHOS works with ITSC Commissioners and Strategic Highway Safety Plan Emphasis Area Team Leaders to prioritize projects and make funding recommendations. OHOS also evaluates each project's potential to reduce deaths and injuries from motor vehicle crashes. Funding decisions are based on where the crash data indicates a traffic safety problem that grant funds may be able to reduce.

Funding recommendations are incorporated into the Highway Safety Performance Plan and are presented to the ITSC for approval. Once approved, they go into the *Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)*. Final project adjustments are made after a 30-day public comment period is complete. It is then presented to the Idaho Transportation Department Board for their approval. Following that, it is sent to NHTSA for their final approval. A flow chart depicting the entire process is contained on the following page.

Overview of the Highway Safety Performance Plan Process

FLOW	TIME	PURPOSE
<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">Traffic Safety Problem Identification Activities</div> <p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>	September	Analyze data – causes and trends. Define problems and problem areas of state.
<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">ITSC/Staff Planning Session</div> <p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>	October	Review focus areas, goals, and funding ranges. Modify as necessary and supportable by data analysis. Determine and approve funding distribution for focus areas and overall direction of program.
<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">Grant Application Period</div> <p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>	January/February	Provide notice of fund availability and solicit applications for targeted problem areas.
<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">Draft Highway Safety Performance Plan (HSPP)</div> <p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>	March/April	Clarify project proposals, prioritize projects, and develop draft language and spending plans.
<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">ITSC Approval</div> <p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>	May	Formal presentation to the ITSC of programs and projects to address problem areas determined in the Problem Identification. ITSC formal approval of the Highway Safety Performance Plan.
<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">Transportation Board Approval</div> <p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>	August	Formal approval is through the Transportation Board. HSPP due to NHTSA and FHWA.
<div style="border: 1px dashed gray; padding: 5px;">Projects Start</div>	October	Field implementation once funding is received.

Idaho Traffic Safety Commissioners

The Idaho Traffic Safety Commission has input throughout the development process of our Highway Safety Plan. The OHOS maintains contact primarily through regular email and our Highway Safety Newsletter. The current commissioners are:

Public Education

Karla Merrill
Post Falls High School

Medical

Ginger Floerchinger-Franks Dr PH
Director Idaho Trauma Registry

State Law Enforcement

Major Ralph Powell
Idaho State Police

Private Sector

James L. Pline, President
Pline Engineering, Inc.

Private Sector

Paula Hornbeck, RN, MSN
Director – Emergency Dept and Minor Care Svcs
St. Joseph’s Regional Medical Center

Legislative

Representative JoAn E. Wood
Idaho House of Representatives

Legislative

Senator John McGee
Idaho State Senate

Judicial (Court)

The Hon Linda J. Cook
Bonneville County Magistrate Div.

Judicial (Attorney)

Mark Hiedeman
Bannock County Prosecutor

Local Law Enforcement

Capt. Ben Wolfinger
Kootenai County Sheriff's Office

Local Government

Tony Poinelli, Deputy Director
Idaho Association of Counties

Idaho Transportation Department

L. Scott Stokes, Deputy Director assigned by
Brian Ness, Governor’s Rep
Brent Jennings, Highway Operations and Safety
Engineer
Mary Hunter, Highway Safety Manager

Goals and Performance Measures

Mission Statement

We support the Department's mission of "Your Mobility" by conducting programs to reduce traffic deaths, serious injuries, and economic losses through funding programs and activities that promote safe travel on Idaho's transportation systems, and through collecting and maintaining crash data and utilizing reliable crash statistics.

Vision Statement

To be a leader in promoting safety on Idaho's roads in an efficient and effective manner.

Primary Goal

Consistent with our performance measures approved by the ITSC in October 2008 later updated on October 2009, our primary goal is to reduce traffic deaths to a 5-year average of no more than 218 by 2012.

Primary Performance Measures, Benchmarks, & Strategy

This is the second year of a three-year Highway Safety Performance Plan (HSPP). Goals are set and performance will be measured using five-year averages and five-year rates. For example, the 2007 benchmark is comprised of five years of crash data and exposure data for the years 2003 through 2007. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has instituted a set of ten core outcome performance measures and one core behavioral performance measure for which the States shall set goals and report progress. There are three additional activity measures for which the states are required to report progress on. For more information, see "Traffic Safety Performance Measures for States and Federal Agencies (DOT HS 811 025).

The data to be used in determining goals for the performance measures is provided to every State by the National Center for Statistics and Analysis (NCSA) and can be found at the State Traffic Safety Information website:

<http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/departments/nrd-0/ncsa/STSI/USA%20WEB%20REPORT.HTM>).

The goals listed below were presented to the Idaho Traffic Safety Commission in the October 2009 Performance Planning meeting and will be updated with new benchmarks in 2011.

C-1. Reduce the five year average number of fatalities.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		269
2008	-	268	257
2009	-	251	
2010	-	240	
2011	-	228	
2012	-	218	

C-2. Reduce the five year average number of serious injuries.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		1,716
2008	-	1,705	1,695
2009	-	1,687	
2010	-	1,670	
2011	-	1,652	
2012	-	1,634	

C-3. Reduce the five year fatality rate per 100 million Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (AVMT).

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		1.80
2008	-	1.80	1.70
2009	-	1.64	
2010	-	1.55	
2011	-	1.46	
2012	-	1.38	

C-4. Reduce the five-year average number of unrestrained passenger motor vehicle occupants killed.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		121
2008	-	120	113
2009	-	118	
2010	-	114	
2011	-	108	
2012	-	100	

C-5. Reduce the five-year average number of fatalities involving a driver with a BAC greater than or equal to 0.08.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		84
2008	-	84	79
2009	-	82	
2010	-	80	
2011	-	78	
2012	-	76	

C-6. Reduce the five-year average number of fatalities resulting from crashes involving speeding.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		82
2008	-	80	80
2009	-	79	
2010	-	79	
2011	-	78	
2012	-	77	

C-7. Reduce the five-year average number of motorcyclists killed.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		27
2008	-	29	29
2009	-	29	
2010	-	28	
2011	-	25	
2012	-	24	

C-8. Reduce the five-year average number of motorcyclists killed that were not wearing helmets.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		17
2008	-	17	16
2009	-	17	
2010	-	16	
2011	-	14	
2012	-	13	

C-9. Reduce the five-year average number of fatal crashes involving drivers 20 years old and younger.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		48
2008	-	47	47
2009	-	46	
2010	-	45	
2011	-	44	
2012	-	42	

C-10. Reduce the five-year average number of pedestrians killed by motor vehicles.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		13
2008	-	13	12
2009	-	12	
2010	-	11	
2011	-	10	
2012	-	10	

B-1. Increase the yearly observed seat belt use rate.

		Goal	Actual
2007 Benchmark	-		78%
2008	-	77%	77%
2009	-	80%	79%
2010	-	81%	
2011	-	83%	
2012	-	84%	

Activity Measures: Number of citations issued during grant funded activities.

	A-1 Seat Belt	A-2 DUI	A-3 Speeding
FFY2008 Benchmark	6,576	1,453	9,868*
FFY2009	10,763	2,110	20,773
FFY2010			
FFY2011			
FFY2012			

*The speeding citations for FFY2008 had to be estimated based on the percentage of speeding citations issued during enforcement mobilizations. "Traffic Safety Performance Measures for States and Federal Agencies" was not released until August 2008. This was near the end of FFY2008 and the sub-grantees were not required to specifically report speeding violations as a part of their grant performance.

Reference Materials

- **List of items over \$5,000 for NHTSA approval**
This list provides information about equipment which needs NHTSA approval for items over the \$5,000 threshold.
- **Highway Safety Performance Plan Cost Summary, (HS form 217) for Section 402, Section 410, Section 408, Section 1906, and Section 2010.**
These budget summary forms are based on projects outlined in the Highway Safety Grant Program-Project Descriptions Document, and are estimates based on expected funding. Revised initial obligating HS 217 forms will be submitted within 30 days of being notified of the actual funding level approved by Congress.
- **Highway Safety Grant Program Project Descriptions**
This document includes brief descriptions of each project for which funding approval is sought. The Section 402 projects are sorted by focus area and can be identified by project number. Project numbers assigned correlate with the Federal financial grant tracking system and the numbering system used to geographically identify Highway Safety Grant projects in the first portion of the STIP. The document also provides information as to the source of funds (NHTSA or FHWA) and identifies the match amounts as well as the benefit to local percentage requirements for grant funds.
- **Certifications and Assurances**
This document contains specific certifications and language required under law, updated by NHTSA in July 2010, in order to receive highway safety grant funds.
- **Idaho Problem Identification Report**
This report contains the data and information used to identify Idaho's most critical traffic safety problems. This report is updated annually by Highway Safety staff, reviewed by the Idaho Traffic Safety Commission, and used to support funding allocations.
- **Request for Proposal – Highway Safety Grants**
A Request for Proposal form is used to apply for highway safety grant funding. Applicants provide information about problem areas and proposed solutions that address one or more of the identified focus areas.
- **ITD Organization Chart**
This is the ITD organization chart, excluding the Governor's office.

List of Equipment over \$5,000

Below is the list of equipment request from various agencies for equipment over \$5,000. The extrication equipment and Lidar funds will be generated from Section 402 funds. The Intoxilyzer will be funded with Section 410 and Section 402.

	Agency	Equipment	Model/Maker	Price
1	Kootenai County Fire and Rescue	Amkus Cutters and Spreaders	AMK 25E / AMK 30CRT	\$13,470
		Rams	20R & 60R	\$3,800
		Pump with Coupler Package	GH2S2 XL	\$6,840
2	Sagle FD	Low Pressure Air Bags		\$7,080
		Cribbing and Step Chocks		\$3,154
3	J-K Ambulance	Outlaw Simo Pump (Mach III)	Genesis	\$6,895
		Hydraulic hoses and fittings	Genesis	\$2,855
		Spreader (S49-XL)	Genesis	\$6,330
		Cutter (C165)	Genesis	\$5,730
		Shipping		\$356
4	Teton County FPD	Cutter	C236	\$6,730
		Spreader	S49-XL	\$6,330
		Pump	Mach III	\$6,595
5	Placerville VFD	Combi Tool	Genesis	\$13,867
6	Snowville FD	Vehicle Stabilization Kit		\$13,195
7	Central FD	Working Air Cart with Cylinders	Paratech	\$5,095
		Model 92 Maxiforce 9 lift bag set	Paratech	\$6,210
		Master Control Package (hoses & fittings)	Paratech	\$2,673
8	Lewiston PD	Tru-Cam Lidar	Laser Technology	\$6,000
9	Nampa PD	Video DBC Lidar	Laser Technology	\$6,000
10	Multiple	Intoxilyzer (4)	CMI	\$24,400

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM COST SUMMARY

State ID Number 1
 Date 05/12/10

	Program Area	Approved Program Costs	State/Local Funds	Federally Funded Programs			Federal Share to Local
				Previous Balance	Increase/(Decrease)	Current Balance	
PA-2011-00-00-00	Planning and Admin		\$ 70,410.00	\$ -	\$ 117,000.00	\$ 117,000.00	\$ -
AL-2011-00-00-0A	Impaired Driver		\$ 266,533.00	\$ -	\$ 356,000.00	\$ 356,000.00	\$ 236,500.00
EM-2011-00-00-00	Emergency Medical Services		\$ 47,133.00	\$ -	\$ 141,400.00	\$ 141,400.00	\$ 125,500.00
MC-2011-00-00-00	Motorcycle		\$ 4,500.00	-	\$ 33,500.00	\$ 33,500.00	\$ -
OP-2011-00-00-00	Safety Restraints		\$ 136,716.00	\$ -	\$ 331,200.00	\$ 331,200.00	\$ 245,000.00
PS-2011-00-00-00	Bike/Pedestrian		\$ 8,667.00	\$ -	\$ 59,000.00	\$ 59,000.00	\$ 34,000.00
PT-2011-00-00-00	Aggressive Driver - Adult		\$ 142,817.00	\$ -	\$ 426,500.00	\$ 426,500.00	\$ 361,000.00
PT-2011-00-00-0Y	Aggressive Driver - Youth		\$ 92,000.00	\$ -	\$ 276,000.00	\$ 276,000.00	\$ 180,000.00
TR-2011-00-00-00	Traffic Records		\$ 7,333.00	\$ -	\$ 137,000.00	\$ 137,000.00	\$ -
CP-2011-00-00-00	Community Traffic Safety		\$ 7,233.00	\$ -	\$ 144,700.00	\$ 144,700.00	\$ 80,000.00
RS-2011-00-00-00	Roadway Safety		\$ 1,133.00	\$ -	\$ 107,400.00	\$ 107,400.00	\$ -
RS-2011-00-00-DR	Distracted Driving		\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	\$ 53,000.00	\$ 53,000.00	\$ -
CR-2011-00-00-00	Child Passenger Safety		\$ 2,000.00	\$ -	\$ 81,000.00	\$ 81,000.00	\$ 45,000.00
PM-2011-00-00-00	Paid Media		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 672,500.00	\$ 672,500.00	\$ 326,250.00
	Total NHTSA		\$ 787,475.00	\$ -	\$ 2,936,200.00	\$ 2,936,200.00	\$ 1,633,250.00
	Total FHWA						
	Total NHTSA & FHWA						

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM COST SUMMARY

State ID Number 1
 Date 05/12/10

	Program Area	Approved Program Costs	State/Local Funds	Federally Funded Programs			Federal Share to Local
				Previous Balance	Increase/(Decrease)	Current Balance	
K9-2011-00-00-00	408 SAFETEA-LU		\$ 252,927.00	\$ -	\$ 1,011,706.00	\$ 1,011,706.00	\$ -
K8-2011-00-00-00	410 SAFETEA-LU		\$ 1,490,000.00	\$ -	\$ 936,000.00	\$ 936,000.00	\$ 300,000.00
K8PA-2011-00-00-00	410 SAFETEA-LU Planning and Admin		\$ 12,036.00	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -
K8PM-2011-00-00-00	410 SAFETEA-LU Paid Media		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 400,000.00	\$ -
K6-2011-00-00-00	2010 SAFETEA-LU		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130,000.00	\$ 130,000.00	\$ -
K10-2011-00-00-00	1906 SAFETEA-LU		\$ 70,445.00	\$ -	\$ 281,779.00	\$ 281,779.00	\$ -
Total NHTSA		\$ -	\$ 1,825,408.00	\$ -	\$ 2,779,485.00	\$ 2,779,485.00	\$ 300,000.00
Total FHWA							
Total NHTSA & FHWA			\$ 2,612,883.00	\$ -	\$ 5,715,685.00	\$ 5,715,685.00	\$ 1,933,250.00

State Official Authorized
Signature:

NAME: _____
 TITLE: _____
 DATE: _____

Federal Official Authorized
Signature:

NHTSA

NAME: _____
 TITLE: _____
 DATE: _____

HS Form 217

Effective Date: _____

FFY 2011 HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANT PROGRAM - PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

IMPAIRED DRIVING

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SAL1101	AL-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	This grant will provide funding for: overtime for compliance checks to prevent the sale of alcohol to minors; overtime for "overservice" bar checks; overtime and equipment for impaired driving mobilizations; training and conferences for judicial, law enforcement, probation, and prosecutorial professionals; traffic safety and enforcement equipment, support of the Drug Recognition Expert Program, start up funds for DUI courts and county probation officer positions; consultant fees, travel, and educational materials, to reduce impaired traffic crashes and fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses.	\$259,000	\$112,200	\$200,000
SAL1103	AL-2011-03	Canyon County Sheriff	Year 3 STEP funds for officer salary expenses and equipment will focus on education and enforcement to reduce impaired driving fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SPT1103 and SSB1103.)	\$5,000	\$46,500	\$5,000
SAL1104	AL-2011-04	Lewiston Police	Year 3 STEP funds for officer salary expenses and approved equipment will focus on education and enforcement to reduce impaired driving traffic related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SPT1104.)	\$11,500	\$69,000	\$11,500
SAL1106	AL-2011-06	Idaho County Sheriff	Year 2 STEP funds for officer salary expenses and approved equipment will focus on education and enforcement to reduce impaired driving traffic related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SPT1106.)	\$15,000	\$30,000	\$15,000
SAL1107	AL-2011-07	Bonneville County Sheriff	This grant will fund overtime and equipment to focus on education and enforcement to reduce impaired driving fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SPT1107 and SSB1107.)	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
SAL1108	AL-2011-08	Idaho State Police Region 3	This grant will fund overtime and mileage expenses for enforcement and education activities to reduce impaired driving fatalities, serious injuries and economic losses. Enforcement will focus on high accident locations. (See additional description in SPT1108 and SSB1108).	\$4,000	\$0	\$0
SAL1109	AL-2011-09	Idaho State Police	This grant will fund overtime and mileage expenses for enforcement and education activities to reduce traffic fatalities, serious injuries and economic losses. Administrative expenses will be included. (See additional description in SSB1109, SPT1109, and SRS1129.)	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
S0011AL	AL-2011-AL	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidental costs will provide program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$26,500	\$8,833	\$0
IMPAIRED DRIVING TOTAL				\$356,000	\$266,533	\$236,500

POLICE TRAFFIC SERVICES - AGGRESSIVE DRIVING

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SPT1101	PT-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding will provide overtime enforcement (include targeting aggressive "riders"), incentive equipment reimbursement, training, public awareness materials, presentations, consultant fees, printing costs, and travel. The goal is to coordinate cooperation of stakeholders and to focus on reducing aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses.	\$275,000	\$117,650	\$280,000

SPT1102	PT-2011-02	Nampa Police	Grant funding will provide overtime reimbursement and equipment to increase enforcement and education activities to reduce number of aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses.	\$24,000	\$8,000	\$24,000
SPT1103	PT-2011-03	Canyon County Sheriff	Year 3 STEP funds for officer salary expenses and equipment will focus on education and enforcement to reduce aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SAL1103 and SSB1103.)	\$5,500	\$0	\$5,500
SPT1104	PT-2011-04	Lewiston Police	Year 3 STEP funds for officer salary expenses and approved equipment will focus on education and enforcement to reduce aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SAL1104.)	\$11,500	\$0	\$11,500
SPT1105	PT-2011-05	Coeur d'Alene Police	Grant funding will provide overtime reimbursement and equipment to increase enforcement and education activities to reduce number of aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses.	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
SPT1106	PT-2011-06	Idaho County Sheriff	Year 2 STEP funds for officer salary expenses and approved equipment will focus on education and enforcement to reduce aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SAL1106.)	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000
SPT1107	PT-2011-07	Bonneville County Sheriff	This grant will fund overtime and equipment to focus on education and enforcement to reduce aggressive driving fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See additional description in SAL1107 and SSB1107.)	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
SPT1108	PT-2011-08	Idaho State Police Region 3	This grant will fund overtime and mileage expenses for enforcement and education activities to reduce aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries and economic losses. Enforcement will focus on high accident locations. (See additional description in SAL1108 and SSB1108.)	\$4,000	\$0	\$0
SPT1109	PT-2011-09	Idaho State Police	This grant will fund overtime and mileage expenses for enforcement and education activities to reduce aggressive driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. Administrative expenses will be included. (See additional description in SAL1109, SSB1109, and SRS1129.)	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
S0011PT	PT-2011-PT	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$36,500	\$12,167	\$0
AGGRESSIVE DRIVING TOTAL				\$426,500	\$142,817	\$361,000

YOUTHFUL DRIVERS

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SPT1121	PT-2011-21	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Overtime enforcement and local agency administrative support reimbursement, incentive and instructional equipment reimbursement, training, educational materials, presentations, consultant fees, printing and travel, and will develop partnership to focus on reducing youthful driving related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses, and increase teen accountability.	\$237,000	\$79,000	\$180,000
S0011YP	PT-2011-YD	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$39,000	\$13,000	\$0
YOUTHFUL DRIVERS TOTAL				\$276,000	\$92,000	\$180,000

SAFETY RESTRAINTS--ADULTS

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SSB1101	OP-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding for seat belt enforcement, seat belt survey, website hosting and administration, educational materials, consultant fees, travel, and training costs will increase seat belt use and decrease traffic fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses.	\$250,000	\$117,650	\$230,000
SSB1103	OP-2011-03	Canyon County Sheriff (STEP)	Year 3 STEP funds for officer salary expenses will focus on increasing seat belt education and enforcement to increase seat belt use and reduce traffic fatalities, serious injuries and economic losses. (See additional description in SAL1103 and SPT1103.)	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
SSB1107	OP-2011-07	Bonneville County Sheriff	Overtime expenses and equipment will increase enforcement and education to increase seat belt use and reduce traffic fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. (See SAL1107 and SPT1107 for additional description.)	\$10,000	\$8,333	\$10,000
SSB1108	OP-2011-08	Idaho State Police Region 3	This grant will fund overtime and mileage expenses for enforcement and education activities to increase seat belt use rate and reduce traffic fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. Enforcement will focus on high accident locations. (See additional description in SAL1108 and SPT1108)	\$4,000	\$0	\$0
SSB1109	OP-2011-09	Idaho State Police	This grant will fund overtime and mileage expenses for enforcement and education activities to increase seat belt use rate and reduce traffic fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses. Administrative expenses will be included. (See additional description in SAL1109, SPT1109, and SRS1129.)	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
S0011SB	OP-2011-SB	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidentals to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$32,200	\$10,733	\$0
SAFETY RESTRAINT TOTAL				\$331,200	\$136,716	\$245,000

CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SSB1131	CR-2011-31	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Educational materials, presentations, consultant fees, and travel will focus on reducing traffic deaths, serious injuries, and economic losses among Idaho's children.	\$25,000	\$0	\$0
SSB1132	CR-2011-32	Idaho Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics	Funding will provide statewide distribution of child safety seats and supervision of Idaho's Child Passenger Safety Technician Training program including educational materials, travel, and expenses related to the training through ICAAP.	\$50,000	\$0	\$45,000
S0011CS	CR-2014-CS	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidentals to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$0
CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY TOTAL				\$81,000	\$2,000	\$45,000

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SEM1101	EM-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funds will support training of emergency responders and may be used to improve safety at crash scene.	\$5,200	\$1,733	\$5,200
SEM1102	EM-2011-02	Kootenai County Fire and Rescue	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$18,000	\$6,000	\$18,000
SEM1103	EM-2011-03	Sagle Fire District	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$8,300	\$2,767	\$8,300
SEM1104	EM-2011-04	JK Ambulance	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$16,600	\$5,533	\$16,600
SEM1105	EM-2011-05	Teton County Fire Protection District	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$14,700	\$4,900	\$14,700
SEM1106	EM-2011-06	Donnelly Rural Fire Protection Asso. Inc.	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$5,900	\$1,967	\$5,900
SEM1107	EM-2011-07	Placerville Fire and Rescue	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$10,400	\$3,467	\$10,400
SEM1108	EM-2011-08	Snowville Fire District	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Closest extrication equipment is 1 hour away.	\$7,800	\$2,600	\$7,800
SEM1109	EM-2011-09	Castleford Rural Fire District	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$3,200	\$1,067	\$3,200
SEM1110	EM-2011-10	Central Fire District	Extrication equipment purchases will aid rescue personnel in removal of crash victims to reduce time elapsed from the crash incident to victim's arrival at a medical facility. Air lifting equipment is essential to stabilize a crash vehicle when extricating the victim.	\$10,400	\$3,467	\$10,400
SEM1111	EM-2011-11	Idaho EMS Bureau	This grant will fund the development & deployment web-based extrication awareness training for over 4,000 EMS personnel in order to comply with the EMS Physician Commission mandate. Course is an entry level self-paced curricula.	\$25,000	\$8,333	\$25,000
S0011EM	EM-2011-EM	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$15,900	\$5,300	\$0
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES TOTAL				\$141,400	\$47,133	\$125,500

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SPS1101	PS-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding will provide bicycle and pedestrian safety awareness materials, bicycle helmets, bicycle/pedestrian safety training, education, outreach, and enforcement.	\$35,000	\$0	\$25,000
SPS1102	PS-2011-02	Boise Bicycle Project	Funding will provide bicycle commuting safety and skills classes for refugee community. Instructor certification, course materials, helmets, repair kits, bicycle lights.	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$4,000
SPS1103	PS-2011-03	Treasure Valley YMCA	Funding will target teen bike safety and repair classes and provide helmets and safety lights.	\$5,000	\$1,667	\$5,000
S0011PS	PS-2011-PS	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$0
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY TOTAL				\$59,000	\$8,667	\$34,000

MOTORCYCLE SAFETY

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SMC1101	MC-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding will provide educational materials and dedicated enforcement with a primary goal being to focus on reducing traffic related fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses for motorcyclists.	\$20,000	\$0	\$0
S0011MC	MC-2011-MC	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$13,500	\$4,500	\$0
MOTORCYCLE TOTAL				\$33,500	\$4,500	\$0

TRAFFIC RECORDS/ROADWAY SAFETY

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
STR1101	TR-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding will provide consultant fees, printing costs, technical services, computer equipment hardware and software, and travel for improving and coordinating crash data collection, evaluation, and reporting on transportation safety. Funding will be used to maintain and enhance Impact software.	\$115,000	\$0	\$0
S0011TR	TR-2011-TR	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$22,000	\$7,333	\$0
SRS1101	RS-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding will provide consultant fees, technical services, computer equipment software and hardware purchases, and travel for improving and reporting roadway safety crash analysis development, maintenance, and support. Funding will be used to maintain and enhance WebCars software.	\$104,000	\$0	\$0
S0011RS	RS-2011-RS	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$3,400	\$1,133	\$0
TRAFFIC RECORDS/ROADWAY SAFETY TOTAL				\$244,400	\$8,467	\$0

DISTRACTED DRIVING

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SRS1121	RS-2011-21	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding will provide educational materials, media development, distribution, consultant fees and travel to focus on reducing distracted driving fatalities, serious injuries, and economic loss from traffic crashes.	\$40,000	\$0	\$0
SRS1129	RS-2011-29	Idaho State Police	This grant will fund overtime and mileage expenses for enforcement and education of youth and adult drivers to reduce traffic crash fatalities, serious injuries and economic losses. Administrative expenses will be included. (See additional description in SAL1109, SPT1109, and SSB1109.)	\$10,000	\$0	\$0
S0011DR	RS-2011-DR	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$0
DISTRACTED DRIVING TOTAL				\$53,000	\$1,000	\$0

PAID ADVERTISING

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SPM1101	PM-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Paid media buys and media development for the general public, or targeted audiences, will raise awareness and change behavior in an effort to reduce death, injuries and economic losses in traffic crashes in the areas of youthful drivers safety, impaired driving, aggressive driving, safety restraint use, child passenger safety, bike/pedestrian, motorcycle safety, and distracted driving. Funding will purchase radio, TV, printed materials, outdoor advertising, and other communication tools and methods.	\$652,500	\$0	\$326,250
SPM1102	PM-2011-02	Office of Highway Operations and Safety - Media Survey	Contractor technical fees and services will evaluate the effectiveness of paid media communications tools and marketing strategies utilized to raise awareness and effect behavioral changes in reducing death and serious injuries in traffic crashes.	\$20,000	\$0	\$0
PAID ADVERTISING TOTAL				\$672,500	\$0	\$326,250

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SCP1101	CP-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety - Highway Safety Summit	The summit will deliver technical and practical training to increase knowledge of traffic safety issues and strategies, provide opportunity for attendees to network and share best practices for effective enforcement and education in reducing deaths, injuries and economic losses in traffic crashes.	\$40,000	\$0	\$25,000
SCP1102	CP-2011-02	Office of Highway Operations and Safety - LEL	Funding of regional law enforcement liaisons to increase participation and effectiveness of state and local law enforcement agencies and officers for statewide mobilizations, education and outreach.	\$65,000	\$0	\$55,000
SCP1103	CP-2011-03	Office of Highway Operations and Safety - Coalition Building	Funding will be used to support and promote the Idaho Highway Safety Coalition program, workshops, activities, website hosting and administration, partnerships, outreach and education to promote highway safety. These efforts will increase effectiveness of our education, outreach and enforcements efforts statewide.	\$18,000	\$0	\$0
S0011CP	CP-2011-CP	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$21,700	\$7,233	\$0
COMMUNITY PROJECT TOTAL				\$144,700	\$7,233	\$80,000

PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
S0011PA	PA-2011-PA	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel, operating costs, and contractual services will provide the statewide program direction, financial and clerical support, property management, and audit for the 402 statewide program.	\$117,000	\$70,410	\$0
PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION TOTAL				\$117,000	\$70,410	\$0

410 PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SK811PA	K8-2011-PA	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel, operating costs, and contractual services will provide the statewide program direction, financial and clerical support, property management, and audit for the 410 statewide program.	\$20,000	\$12,036	\$0
410 PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION TOTAL				\$20,000	\$12,036	\$0

410 ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SK81101	K8-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	This grant will provide funding for: overtime for compliance checks to prevent the sale of alcohol to minors; overtime for "overservice" bar checks; overtime and equipment for impaired driving mobilizations; training and conferences for judicial, law enforcement, probation, and prosecutorial professionals; traffic safety and enforcement equipment, support of the Drug Recognition Expert Program, start up funds for DUI courts and county probation officer positions; consultant fees, travel, and educational materials, to reduce impaired traffic crashes and fatalities, serious injuries, and economic losses.	\$591,533	\$1,476,465	\$300,000
SK81102	K8-2011-02	Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor	Salary, benefits, travel, training, education, and professional equipment purchases for a Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor will provide critical support, enhancing the capability of law enforcement to effectively pursue impaired driving and traffic safety violations and Idaho's prosecutors to successfully convict those violations. Administrative expenses will be included.	\$163,862	\$0	\$0
SK81103	K8-2011-03	DRE State Co-ordinator	The DRE state coordinator must ensure that the DEC program is properly and effectively administered. The state coordinator must be able to work in partnership with federal, state, and local groups and organizations, and must ensure that DRE training is conducted within their state whenever needed and when resources and personnel allow.	\$100,000	\$0	\$0
SK81104	K8-2011-04	Elmore County DUI Court	Salary and benefits for DUI Court Coordinator, travel/training, alcohol test equipment, and DUI Court Probation Officer.	\$40,605	\$13,535	\$0
S0011K8	K8-2011-K8	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Personnel costs, data analysis, travel expenses, and other incidental to administer program development, monitoring, and evaluation.	\$40,000	\$0	\$0
SECTION 410 TOTAL				\$936,000	\$1,490,000	\$300,000

410 PAID ADVERTISING

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SK811PM	K8PM-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety - Paid Advertising Section 410	Paid media buys and media development will raise awareness and affect behavioral changes to reduce impaired driving using radio, TV, news, printed material, outdoor advertising, and other communication tools and methods.	\$400,000	\$0	\$0
410 PAID ADVERTISING TOTAL				\$400,000	\$0	\$0

SECTION 408 SAFETEA-LU DATA PROGRAM

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SK91101	K9-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding will provide improvements to the crash, roadway, driver, vehicle, citation/adjudication and injury surveillance traffic records systems with salaries and consultant services, computer software and hardware, travel and technical services, printing costs, and meeting or training expenditures to develop, document and collect traffic crash and citation data for accurate, uniform, consistent, accessible and integrated data and analysis.	\$1,011,706	\$252,927	\$0
SECTION 408 TOTAL				\$1,011,706	\$252,927	\$0

Section 1906 RACIAL PROFILING

OHOS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SK11101	K10-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	This grant will allow Idaho to implement and establish a statewide Unbiased Policing program to assess the occurrence of racial profiling by law enforcement officers. Funds will be used to implement a training program designed to address biased-based policing.	\$281,779	\$70,445	\$0
SECTION 1906 TOTAL				\$281,779	\$70,445	\$0

Section 2010 MOTORCYCLE SAFETY

OHS NUMBER	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER	REQUESTING AGENCY	DESCRIPTION	NHTSA \$	STATE/ LOCAL MATCH	LOCAL BENEFIT \$
SK61101	K6-2011-01	Office of Highway Operations and Safety	Funding provides for educational and development materials, printed materials and evaluation of program impact.	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
SK61102	K6-2011-02	Office of Highway Operations and Safety - Paid Advertising Section 2010	Paid media buys and media development for motorcycle awareness by the general public will raise awareness and affect behavioral changes through multi-media radio, TV, news, printed material, outdoor advertising, and other communication tools and methods.	\$100,000	\$0	\$0
SECTION 2010 TOTAL				\$130,000	\$0	\$0

State Certification and Assurances

Failure to comply with applicable Federal statutes, regulations and directives may subject State officials to civil or criminal penalties and/or place the State in a high risk grantee status in accordance with 49 CFR 18.12.

Each fiscal year the State will sign these Certifications and Assurances that the State complies with all applicable Federal statutes, regulations, and directives in effect with respect to the periods for which it receives grant funding. Applicable provisions include, but not limited to, the following:

- 23 U.S.C. Chapter 4 - Highway Safety Act of 1966, as amended
- 49 CFR Part 18 - Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments
- 23 CFR Chapter II - (§§1200, 1205, 1206, 1250, 1251, & 1252) Regulations governing highway safety programs
- NHTSA Order 462-6C - Matching Rates for State and Community Highway Safety Programs
- Highway Safety Grant Funding Policy for Field-Administered Grants

CERTIFICATION AND ASSURANCES

Section 402 Requirements

The Governor is responsible for the administration of the State highway safety program through a State highway safety agency which has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized (as evidenced by appropriate oversight procedures governing such areas as procurement, financial administration, and the use, management, and disposition of equipment) to carry out the program (23 USC 402(b) (1) (A));

The political subdivisions of this State are authorized, as part of the State highway safety program, to carry out within their jurisdictions local highway safety programs which have been approved by the Governor and are in accordance with the uniform guidelines promulgated by the Secretary of Transportation (23 USC 402(b) (1) (B));

At least 40 per cent of all Federal funds apportioned to this State under 23 USC 402 for this fiscal year will be expended by or for the benefit of the political subdivision of the State in carrying out local highway safety programs (23 USC 402(b) (1) (C)), unless this requirement is waived in writing;

This State's highway safety program provides adequate and reasonable access for the safe and convenient movement of physically handicapped persons, including those in wheelchairs, across curbs constructed or replaced on or after July 1, 1976, at all pedestrian crosswalks (23 USC 402(b) (1) (D));

The State will implement activities in support of national highway safety goals to reduce motor vehicle related fatalities that also reflect the primary data-related crash factors within the State as identified by the State highway safety planning process, including:

- National law enforcement mobilizations,
- Sustained enforcement of statutes addressing impaired driving, occupant protection, and driving in excess of posted speed limits,
- An annual statewide safety belt use survey in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary for the measurement of State safety belt use rates to ensure that the measurements are accurate and representative,
- Development of statewide data systems to provide timely and effective data analysis to support allocation of highway safety resources.

The State shall actively encourage all relevant law enforcement agencies in the State to follow the guidelines established for vehicular pursuits issued by the International Association of Chiefs of Police that are currently in effect. (23 USC 402 (b)(1)(E).

Other Federal Requirements

Cash drawdowns will be initiated only when actually needed for disbursement. 49 CFR 18.20

Cash disbursements and balances will be reported in a timely manner as required by NHTSA. 49 CFR 18.21.

The same standards of timing and amount, including the reporting of cash disbursement and balances, will be imposed upon any secondary recipient organizations. 49 CFR 18.41.

Failure to adhere to these provisions may result in the termination of drawdown privileges.

The State has submitted appropriate documentation for review to the single point of contact designated by the Governor to review Federal programs, as required by Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs);

Equipment acquired under this agreement for use in highway safety program areas shall be used and kept in operation for highway safety purposes by the State; or the State, by formal agreement with appropriate officials of a political subdivision or State agency, shall cause such equipment to be used and kept in operation for highway safety purposes 23 CFR 1200.21

The State will comply with all applicable State procurement procedures and will maintain a financial management system that complies with the minimum requirements of 49 CFR 18.20;

Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act

The State will report for each **sub-grant** awarded:

- Name of the entity receiving the award;
- Amount of the award;

- Information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, the North American Industry Classification System code or Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number (where applicable), program source;
 - Location of the entity receiving the award and the primary location of performance under the award, including the city, State, congressional district, and country; , and an award title descriptive of the purpose of each funding action;
 - A unique identifier (DUNS);
 - The names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated officers of the entity if-- of the entity receiving the award and of the parent entity of the recipient, should the entity be owned by another entity;
- (i) the entity in the preceding fiscal year received—
- (I) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues in Federal awards; and(II) \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal awards; and(ii) the public does not have access to information about the compensation of the senior executives of the entity through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;
- Other relevant information specified by the Office of Management and Budget in subsequent guidance or regulation.

The State highway safety agency will comply with all Federal statutes and implementing regulations relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin (and 49 CFR Part 21); (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794) and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC § 12101, *et seq.*; PL 101-336), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disabilities (and 49 CFR Part 27); (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970(P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse of alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 *et seq.*), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, which provides that any portion of a state or local entity receiving federal funds will obligate all programs or activities of that entity to comply with these civil rights laws; and, (k) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

The Drug-free Workplace Act of 1988(41 U.S.C. 702);:

The State will provide a drug-free workplace by:

Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the

actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

1. The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.
2. The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace.
3. Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs.
4. The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug violations occurring in the workplace.

Making it a requirement that each employee engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a).

Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will --

1. Abide by the terms of the statement.
2. Notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction.

Notifying the agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction.

Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted -

1. Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination.
2. Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.

Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) above.

Buy America Act

The State will comply with the provisions of the Buy America Act (49 U.S.C. 5323(j)) which contains the following requirements:

Only steel, iron and manufactured products produced in the United States may be purchased with Federal funds unless the Secretary of Transportation determines that such domestic purchases would be inconsistent with the public interest; that such materials are not reasonably available and of a satisfactory quality; or that inclusion of domestic materials will increase the cost of the overall project

contract by more than 25 percent. Clear justification for the purchase of non-domestic items must be in the form of a waiver request submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

Political Activity (Hatch Act)

The State will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING FEDERAL LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

1. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.
3. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-award at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grant, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Restriction on State Lobbying

None of the funds under this program will be used for any activity specifically designed to urge or influence a State or local legislator to favor or oppose the adoption of any specific legislative proposal pending before any State or local legislative body. Such activities include both direct and indirect (e.g., "grassroots") lobbying activities, with one exception. This does not preclude a State official whose salary is supported with NHTSA funds from engaging in direct communications with State or local legislative officials, in accordance with customary State practice, even if such communications urge legislative officials to favor or oppose the adoption of a specific pending legislative proposal.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION

Instructions for Primary Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency's determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.
3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.
4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department or agency to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
5. The terms *covered transaction*, *debarred*, *suspended*, *ineligible*, *lower tier covered transaction*, *participant*, *person*, *primary covered transaction*, *principal*, *proposal*, and *voluntarily excluded*, as used in this clause, have the meaning set out in the Definitions and coverage sections of 49 CFR Part 29. You may contact the department or agency to which this proposal is being submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
6. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency entering into this transaction.
7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transaction," provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it

determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the list of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.

9. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.

10. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 6 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters-Primary Covered Transactions

(1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of record, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or Local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the Statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Instructions for Lower Tier Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.

2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms *covered transaction, debarred, suspended, ineligible, lower tier covered transaction, participant, person, primary covered transaction, principal, proposal, and voluntarily excluded*, as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definition and Coverage sections of 49 CFR Part 29. You may contact the person to whom this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transaction," without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions. (See below)
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion -- Lower Tier Covered Transactions:

1. The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
2. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

POLICY TO BAN TEXT MESSAGING WHILE DRIVING

In accordance with Executive Order 13513, Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving, and DOT Order 3902.10, Text Messaging While Driving, States are encouraged to:

- (1) Adopt and enforce workplace safety policies to decrease crashes caused by distracted driving including policies to ban text messaging while driving—
 - a. Company-owned or –rented vehicles, or Government-owned, leased or rented vehicles; or
 - b. Privately-owned when on official Government business or when performing any work on or behalf of the Government.
- (2) Conduct workplace safety initiatives in a manner commensurate with the size of the business, such as –
 - a. Establishment of new rules and programs or re-evaluation of existing programs to prohibit text messaging while driving; and
 - b. Education, awareness, and other outreach to employees about the safety risks associated with texting while driving.

Environmental Impact

The Governor's Representative for Highway Safety has reviewed the State's Fiscal Year highway safety planning document and hereby declares that no significant environmental impact will result from implementing this Highway Safety Plan. If, under a future revision, this Plan will be modified in such a manner that a project would be instituted that could affect environmental quality to the extent that a review and statement would be necessary, this office is prepared to take the action necessary to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 USC 4321 et seq.) and the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR Parts 1500-1517).

Brian W. Ness, Director, Idaho Transportation Department
Governor's Representative for Highway Safety

Date

State of Idaho Highway Safety Plan Certification, FFY 2011

Idaho
Problem
Identification
Report
FY 2011

Prepared by the Office of Highway Safety

Statewide

The Problem

- In 2008, 232 people were killed and 11,995 people were injured in traffic crashes.
- The fatality rate was 1.52 per 100 million Annual Vehicle Miles of Travel (AVMT) in Idaho in 2008. Idaho's fatality rate remains higher than the U.S. fatality rate. The US fatality rate was estimated to be 1.28 per 100 million AVMT in 2008.
- Motor vehicle crashes cost Idahoans over \$2.59 billion in 2008. Fatal and serious injuries represented 70 percent of these costs.

Idaho Crash Data and Measures of Exposure, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total Crashes	28,332	28,238	24,225	26,452	25,002	-2.7%
Fatal Crashes	240	243	239	218	212	-3.0%
Total Deaths	260	275	267	252	232	-2.7%
Injury Crashes	9,843	9,810	9,536	9,234	8,227	-4.3%
Total Injured	14,734	14,436	13,950	13,594	11,995	-4.9%
Property-Damage-Only Crashes (Severity >\$1,500)	18,249	18,185	14,450	17,000	16,563	-1.5%
Idaho Population (thousands)	1,393	1,429	1,466	1,499	1,524	2.3%
Licensed Drivers (thousands)	948	983	1,008	1,028	1,038	2.3%
Vehicle Miles Of Travel (millions)	14,825	14,969	15,259	15,837	15,281	0.8%
Registered Vehicles (thousands)	1,386	1,421	1,436	1,594	1,453	1.4%

Sources: Population estimates come from the U.S. Census Bureau; Licensed Drivers and Registered Vehicles come from the Economics and Research Section, Idaho Transportation Department; Vehicle Mile of Travel come from the Traffic Survey and Analysis Section, Idaho Transportation Department

Economic Costs* of Idaho Crashes, 2008

Incident Description	Total Occurrences	Cost Per Occurrence	Cost Per Category
Fatalities	232	\$5,926,150	\$1,374,866,822
Serious Injuries	1,503	\$295,127	\$443,576,259
Visible Injuries	3,396	\$82,664	\$280,725,254
Possible Injuries	7,096	\$54,794	\$388,820,809
Property Damage Only	16,563	\$6,344	\$105,070,069
Total Estimate of Economic Cost			\$2,593,059,214

*Economic Costs include: property damage, lost earnings, lost household production, medical, emergency services, travel delay, vocational rehabilitation, workplace, administrative, legal, pain and lost quality of life. Based on estimates released by the Federal Highway Administration and updated to reflect 2008 dollars.

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Statewide – (Continued)

Fatal and Injury Crash Involvement by Age of Driver, 2008

Age of Driver	# of Drivers in F&I Crashes	% of Drivers in F&I Crashes	# of Licensed Drivers	% of Total Drivers	Fatal & Injury Crash Involvement*
19 & Under	2,187	16%	63,451	6%	2.5
20-24	1,945	14%	93,794	9%	1.5
25-34	2,692	19%	186,365	18%	1.1
35-44	2,331	17%	176,289	17%	1.0
45-54	2,063	15%	197,061	19%	0.8
55-64	1,465	10%	163,897	16%	0.7
65 & Older	1,133	8%	157,457	15%	0.5
Missing	244	2%			
Total	14,060		1,038,314		

*Representation is percent of drivers in fatal and injury collisions divided by percent of licensed drivers. Over representation occurs when the value is greater than 1.0.

Location of Idaho Crashes, 2004-2008

Roadway Information	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Local:						
AVMT (100 millions)	67.3	67.5	69.2	72.7	71.4	1.5%
Fatal Crash Rate	1.1	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.2	3.0%
Injury Crash Rate	81.2	83.6	79.7	80.1	73.4	-2.4%
Total Crash Rate	245.2	249.3	202.6	233.1	225.2	-1.4%
State System (Non-Interstate):						
AVMT (100 millions)	47.4	48.2	48.5	49.9	48.0	0.3%
Fatal Crash Rate	2.4	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.9	-5.4%
Injury Crash Rate	70.3	66.0	65.2	52.8	47.5	-9.1%
Total Crash Rate	186.0	182.2	160.8	142.2	136.1	-7.4%
Interstate:						
AVMT (100 millions)	33.5	34.0	34.9	35.8	33.4	0.0%
Fatal Crash Rate	1.6	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1	-6.6%
Injury Crash Rate	31.2	28.9	24.6	21.7	21.1	-9.2%
Total Crash Rate	89.6	77.3	68.7	67.4	71.5	-5.2%
Statewide Totals:						
AVMT (100 millions)	148.2	149.7	152.6	158.4	152.8	0.8%
Fatal Crash Rate	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.4	-3.6%
Injury Crash Rate	66.4	65.5	62.5	58.3	53.8	-5.1%
Total Crash Rate	191.1	188.6	158.8	167.0	163.6	-3.5%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Aggressive Driving

The Definition

- Aggressive driving behaviors include: Failure to Yield Right of Way, Driving Too Fast for Conditions, Exceeding the Posted Speed, Passed Stop Sign, Disregarded Signal, and Following Too Close.
- Aggressive driving crashes are those where an officer indicates that at least one aggressive driving behavior contributed to the collision. Up to three contributing circumstances are possible for each vehicle in a collision, thus the total number of crashes attributed to these behaviors is less than the sum of the individual components.

The Problem

- With increasing vehicle miles of travel, traffic congestion and travel delays, the resulting frustration and impatience is reflected in driver behavior.
- Aggressive driving was a factor in 54% of all crashes and 43% of all fatalities in 2008.
- Drivers, ages 19 and younger, are more than 4 times as likely to be involved in an aggressive driving collision as all other drivers.
- Aggressive driving crashes cost Idahoans nearly \$1.3 billion in 2008. This represented 49 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Aggressive Driving in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total Aggressive Driving Crashes	15,934	15,572	13,037	14,364	13,570	-3.5%
Fatalities	116	133	116	108	100	-3.1%
Serious Injuries	867	975	902	928	746	-2.9%
Visible Injuries	2,614	2,511	2,399	2,283	1,867	-7.9%
Possible Injuries	5,519	5,295	4,858	4,784	4,326	-5.9%
Number of Traffic Fatalities and Serious Injuries Involving:*						
Fail to Yield Right of Way	356	391	303	366	334	-0.2%
Driving Too Fast for Conditions	334	404	396	371	268	-3.8%
Exceeded Posted Speed	129	168	173	135	103	-3.1%
Passed Stop Sign	65	114	111	134	92	15.5%
Disregarded Signal	44	65	56	38	48	7.0%
Following Too Close	122	59	71	59	47	-17.1%
Aggressive Driving Fatal and Serious Injury Rate per 100 Million AVMT	6.63	7.40	6.67	6.54	5.54	-3.9%

* Three contributing circumstances possible per unit involved in each collision

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Distracted Driving

The Problem

- In 2008, 71 fatalities resulted from inattentive or distracted driving crashes. This represents 31 percent of all fatalities. Only 14 (or 31 percent) of the 45 passenger vehicle occupants killed in inattentive or distracted driving crashes were wearing a seat belt.
- The other fatalities resulting from inattentive or distracted driving in 2008 were 14 motorcyclists, 4 commercial motor vehicle occupants, 3 pedestrians, 2 ATV riders, and 1 person on a riding lawn mower.
- Inattention and/or distraction was the most prevalent contributing circumstance for multiple vehicle crashes and the second most prevalent for single-vehicle crashes. Inattention/distraction contributed to about 1 out of 5 crashes for both single and multiple vehicle crashes.
- In 2008, drivers under the age of 25 comprised 39 percent of the drivers involved in all inattentive or distracted driving crashes and 32 percent of the drivers involved in fatal inattentive or distracted driving crashes, while they only comprised 15% of the licensed drivers.
- In 2008, only 26 percent of the inattentive or distracted driving crashes involved a single vehicle, while 62 percent of the fatal inattentive or distracted driving crashes involved a single vehicle.
- Only 34 percent of the total inattentive or distracted driving crashes occurred in rural areas, while 82 percent of the fatal inattentive or distracted driving crashes occurred in rural areas.
- Inattentive or distracted driving crashes cost Idahoans just under \$828 million dollars in 2008. This represents 32 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Inattentive or Distracted Driving Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Inattentive/Distracted Driving Crashes	8,324	8,033	7,059	7,515	6,672	-5.1%
Fatalities	89	81	84	79	71	-5.3%
Serious Injuries	650	634	607	677	527	-4.3%
Visible Injuries	1,781	1,591	1,520	1,484	1,144	-10.1%
Possible Injuries	3,063	2,910	2,790	2,802	2,411	-5.7%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Safety Restraints

The Problem

- In 2008, 77 percent of Idahoans were using seat belts, based on seat belt survey observations.
- In 2008, seat belt usage varied by region around the state from a high of 88 percent in District 3 (Southwestern Idaho) to a low of 60 percent in District 6 (Northeastern Idaho).
- Only 33 percent of the individuals killed in passenger cars, pickups and vans were wearing a seat belt in 2008. Seatbelts are estimated to be 50 percent effective in preventing serious and fatal injuries. By this estimate, we can deduce that 54 lives were saved in Idaho in 2008 because they were wearing a seat belt and an additional 53 lives could have been saved if everyone had worn their seat belt.
- There were 5 children under the age of 7 killed (3 were restrained) and 25 seriously injured (15 were restrained) while riding in passenger vehicles in 2008. Child safety seats are estimated to be 69 percent effective in reducing fatalities and serious injuries. By this estimate we can deduce that child safety seats saved 7 lives in 2008. Additionally, 33 serious injuries were prevented and 7 of the 10 unrestrained serious injuries may have been prevented if they had all been properly restrained
- Unrestrained passenger motor vehicle occupants cost Idahoans just under \$799 million in 2008. This represents 31 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Occupant Protection in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Observational Seat Belt Survey						
District 1	76%	76%	87%	87%	82%	2.2%
District 2	75%	81%	83%	82%	85%	3.1%
District 3	82%	85%	89%	87%	88%	1.6%
District 4	60%	71%	67%	69%	72%	5.1%
District 5	57%	55%	63%	62%	63%	2.8%
District 6	66%	68%	66%	60%	60%	-2.5%
Statewide Average	74%	76%	80%	78%	77%	1.0%
Seat Belt Use - Age 4 and Older*						
Cars, Pickups, Vans and SUV's						
In Fatal Crashes	42.4%	40.0%	38.8%	34.8%	32.9%	-6.1%
In Serious Injury Crashes	64.7%	64.7%	67.6%	66.1%	64.6%	0.0%
Self Reported Child Restraint Use*						
in Cars, Pickups, Vans and SUV's	87.3%	70.9%	76.2%	77.9%	81.6%	-1.1%

*The child restraint law was modified in 2005 to include children under the age of 7. As of 2005, seat belt use is for persons age 7 and older and child restraint use if or children 6 and younger.

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Impaired Driving

Definition

- Impaired driving crashes are those where the investigating officer has indicated the driver of a motor vehicle, a pedestrian, or a bicyclist was alcohol and/or drug impaired or where alcohol and/or drug impairment was listed as a contributing circumstance to the crash.

The Problem

- In 2008, 96 fatalities resulted from impaired driving crashes. This represents 41 percent of all fatalities. Only 14 (or 18 percent) of the 76 passenger vehicle occupants killed in impaired driving crashes were wearing a seat belt.
- Nearly 15 percent of impaired drivers involved in crashes were under the age of 21 in 2008, even though they are too young to legally purchase alcohol.
- Impaired driving crashes cost Idahoans over \$725 million in 2008. This represents 28 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Impaired Driving in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Impaired Driving Crashes	1,944	1,952	1,877	1,936	1,783	-2.0%
Fatalities	103	100	110	101	96	-1.5%
Serious Injuries	331	367	316	309	285	-3.3%
Visible Injuries	559	522	610	568	433	-5.1%
Possible Injuries	603	630	593	628	569	-1.2%
Impaired Driving Crashes as a % of All Crashes	6.9%	6.9%	7.7%	7.3%	7.1%	1.2%
Impaired Driving Fatalities as a % of All Fatalities	39.6%	36.4%	41.2%	40.1%	41.4%	1.4%
Impaired Driving Injuries as a % of All Injuries	10.1%	10.5%	10.9%	11.1%	10.7%	1.5%
Impaired Driving Fatality & Serious Injury Rate per 100 Million AVMT	2.93	3.12	2.79	2.59	2.49	-3.7%
Annual DUI Arrests by Agency*						
Idaho State Police	1,461	817	1,744	1,654	1,977	20.9%
Local Agencies	8,674	8,255	9,637	9,997	10,195	4.4%
Total Arrests	10,135	9,072	11,381	11,651	12,172	5.5%
DUI Arrests per 100 Licensed Drivers	1.07	0.92	1.13	1.13	1.17	3.1%

*Source: Idaho State Police, Bureau of Criminal Identification

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Youthful Drivers

The Problem

- Drivers, age 15 to 19, represented 6 percent of licensed drivers in Idaho in 2008, yet they represented nearly 14 percent of the drivers involved in fatal and serious injury crashes.
- In 2008, drivers age 15 to 19 constituted 11 percent of the impaired drivers involved in crashes, despite the fact they were too young to legally consume alcohol.
- National and international research indicates youthful drivers are more likely to be in single-vehicle crashes, to make one or more driver errors, to speed, to carry more passengers than other age groups, to drive older and smaller cars that are less protective, and are less likely to wear seat belts.
- Only 3 of the 17 (18 percent) youthful drivers killed were wearing a seat belt.
- Crashes involving youthful drivers cost Idahoans over \$536 million in 2008. This represents 21 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Crashes involving Youthful Drivers in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total Crashes Involving Drivers 15-19	7,408	7,309	6,216	6,734	5,909	-5.1%
Fatalities	39	38	38	42	39	0.2%
Serious Injuries	376	377	403	426	348	-1.4%
Visible Injuries	1,258	1,156	1,233	1,127	881	-8.0%
Possible Injuries	2,479	2,471	2,342	2,234	1,919	-6.1%
Drivers 15-19 in Fatal & Serious Injury Crashes	335	326	339	374	296	-2.3%
% of all Drivers involved in Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes	13.8%	13.5%	14.1%	14.9%	13.8%	0.1%
Licensed Drivers 15-19	65,391	66,637	66,038	65,173	63,451	-0.7%
% of Total Licensed Drivers	6.9%	6.8%	6.6%	6.3%	6.1%	-3.0%
Fatal & Injury Crash Involvement*	2.01	1.99	2.15	2.34	2.26	3.2%
Drivers 15-19 - Fatal Crashes	36	35	35	36	36	0.0%
Impaired Drivers 15-19 - Fatal Crashes	8	10	7	9	10	8.7%
% of Youthful Drivers that were Impaired in Fatal Crashes	22.2%	28.6%	20.0%	25.0%	27.8%	8.7%

* *Fatal & Injury Crash Involvement is the percent of fatal and injury crashes divided by the percent of licensed drivers. Over-representation occurs when the value is greater than 1.0., Under-Representation when the value is less than 1.*

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Mature Drivers

The Problem

- Mature drivers, drivers over the age of 65, were involved in 3,036 crashes in 2008. This represents 12 percent of the total number of crashes. Crashes involving mature drivers resulted in 13 percent of the total number of fatalities in 2008.
- Mature drivers are under-represented in fatal and injury crashes. Drivers over the age of 65 represent nearly 14 percent of licensed drivers, but represent 8 percent of drivers involved in fatal and injury crashes.
- National research indicates drivers and passengers over the age of 75 are more likely than younger persons to sustain injuries or death in traffic crashes due to their physical fragility.
- Crashes involving drivers, age 65 and older, cost Idahoans over \$332 million dollars in 2008. This represents 13 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Crashes Involving Mature Drivers in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total Mature Driver Crashes	3,378	3,362	2,853	3,307	3,036	-2.0%
Fatalities	43	48	43	42	30	-7.4%
Serious Injuries	224	224	240	244	192	-3.1%
Visible Injuries	575	533	531	540	415	-7.3%
Possible Injuries	1,052	1,067	1,088	1,063	928	-2.9%
Mature Drivers in Fatal & Injury Crashes	1,297	1,309	1,326	1,332	1,133	-3.1%
% of All Drivers in Fatal & Injury Crashes	7.5%	7.6%	8.0%	8.3%	8.1%	1.7%
Licensed Drivers 65 & Older	134,849	140,331	146,822	153,003	157,457	4.0%
% of Total Licensed Drivers	14.2%	14.3%	14.6%	14.9%	13.5%	-1.2%
Involvement* of Drivers 65 & Older in Fatal and Injury Crashes	0.53	0.54	0.55	0.55	0.60	3.1%
Mature Drivers-Fatal Crashes	38	44	39	42	28	-5.3%
Mature Drivers-Impaired Fatal Crashes	1	3	1	4	2	95.8%
% Fatal Impaired Crashes	2.6%	6.8%	2.6%	9.5%	7.1%	85.8%

* Representation (or Involvement) is percent of fatal and injury crashes divided by percent of licensed drivers. Over-representation occurs when the value is greater than 1.0., Under-Representation when the value is less than 1.

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Motorcyclists

The Problem

- In 2008, motorcycle crashes represented just 3 percent of the total number of crashes, yet accounted for just less than 13 percent of the total number of fatalities and serious injuries.
- Just over half (55 percent) of all motorcycle crashes involved a single vehicle, while just under half (48 percent) of fatal motorcycle crashes involved a single vehicle.
- Idaho code requires all motorcycle operators and passengers under the age of 18 to wear a helmet. In 2008, only 27 of the 36 (75 percent) motorcycle drivers and passengers, under the age of 18 and involved in crashes, were wearing helmets.
- The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates helmets are 37 percent effective in preventing motorcycle fatalities. In 2008, only 61 percent of all motorcyclists killed in crashes were wearing helmets.
- Motorcycle crashes cost Idahoans over \$262 million dollars in 2008. This represents 10 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Motorcycle Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Motorcycle Crashes	508	549	516	615	678	7.9%
Fatalities	24	26	38	29	29	7.7%
Serious Injuries	145	185	149	194	192	9.3%
Visible Injuries	216	224	212	271	281	7.5%
Possible Injuries	110	110	119	123	180	14.5%
Motorcyclists in Crashes	578	625	589	718	773	8.0%
Registered Motorcycles	52,614	60,202	51,842	45,752	62,673	6.4%
Motorcyclists Wearing Helmets	246	270	286	343	423	14.7%
% Motorcyclists Wearing Helmets	42.6%	43.2%	48.6%	47.8%	54.7%	6.7%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Pedestrians and Bicyclists

The Problem

- In 2008, 11 pedestrians and 2 bicyclists were killed in traffic crashes. The 13 pedestrians and bicyclists killed represented 6 percent of all fatalities in Idaho.
- Children, ages 4 to 14, accounted for 21 percent of the fatalities and injuries sustained in pedestrian crashes and 21 percent of the fatalities and injuries sustained in bicycle crashes.
- Crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists cost Idahoans over \$138 million dollars in 2008. This represents 5 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Pedestrians and Bicyclists Involved in Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Pedestrian Crashes	235	206	224	244	212	-1.9%
Fatalities	18	9	8	17	11	4.0%
Serious Injuries	64	51	56	65	50	-4.4%
Visible Injuries	97	91	99	90	93	-0.8%
Possible Injuries	67	62	71	83	73	3.0%
Pedestrians in Crashes	249	218	236	259	230	-1.4%
Pedestrian Fatal and Serious Injuries	82	60	64	82	61	-4.4%
% of All Fatal and Serious Injuries	4.3%	2.9%	3.3%	4.0%	3.5%	-2.2%
Impaired Pedestrian F&SI	19	11	15	14	9	-12.0%
% of Pedestrian F&SI - Impaired	23.2%	18.3%	23.4%	17.1%	14.8%	-8.4%
Bicycle Crashes	276	321	328	321	344	5.9%
Fatalities	3	3	2	2	2	-8.3%
Serious Injuries	28	42	29	35	50	20.6%
Visible Injuries	142	167	180	161	146	1.4%
Possible Injuries	96	106	120	124	143	10.6%
Bicyclists in Crashes	279	327	333	333	352	6.2%
Bicycle Fatal and Serious Injuries	31	45	31	37	52	18.5%
% of All Fatal and Serious Injuries	1.6%	2.2%	1.6%	1.8%	3.0%	21.9%
Bicyclists Wearing Helmets in Collisions	35	56	55	58	58	15.9%
% of Bicyclists Wearing Helmets	12.5%	17.1%	16.5%	17.4%	16.5%	8.3%
Impaired Bicyclist F&SI	0	3	0	3	3	25.0%
% of Bicycle F&SI - Impaired	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	8.1%	5.8%	17.8%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Emergency Response (Emergency Medical Services)

The Problem

- The availability and quality of services provided by local EMS agencies may mean the difference between life and death for someone injured in a traffic crash. Improved post-crash victim care reduces the severity of trauma incurred by crash victims. The sooner someone receives appropriate medical care, the better the chances of recovery. This care is especially critical in rural areas because of the time it takes to transport a victim to a hospital.

Emergency Response (EMS) in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total Crashes	28,332	28,238	24,225	26,452	25,002	-2.7%
EMS Response to Fatal & Injury Crashes	6,624	6,550	6,519	6,471	5,826	-3.1%
% of Fatal & Injury Crashes	65.7%	65.2%	66.7%	68.5%	69.0%	1.3%
Persons Injured in Crashes	14,734	14,436	13,950	13,594	12,227	-4.5%
Injured Transported from Rural Areas	3,549	3,234	3,063	3,110	2,761	-6.0%
Injured Transported from Urban Areas	2,643	2,740	2,777	2,871	2,480	-1.3%
Total Injured Transported by EMS	6,192	5,974	5,840	5,981	5,241	-3.9%
% of Injured Transported	42.0%	41.4%	41.9%	44.0%	42.9%	0.5%
Trapped and Extricated	568	651	586	566	495	-2.8%
Fatal and Serious Injuries Transported by Helicopter	271	258	201	233	173	-9.2%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Commercial Motor Vehicles

Definition

- Commercial motor vehicles are buses, truck tractors, truck-trailer combinations, trucks with more than two axles, trucks with more than two tires per axle, or trucks exceeding 8,000 pounds gross vehicle weight that are primarily used for the transportation of property.

The Problem

- In 2008, 36 people died in crashes with commercial motor vehicles. This represents 16 percent of all motor vehicle fatalities in Idaho. Of the persons killed in crashes with commercial motor vehicles, 61 percent were occupants of passenger cars, vans, sport utility vehicles and pickup trucks.
- In 2008, 56 percent of all crashes and 73 percent of fatal crashes involving commercial motor vehicles occurred on rural roadways. Rural roadways are defined as any roadway located outside the city limits of cities with a population of 5,000 or more.
- Local roadways had the most commercial motor vehicle crashes at 45 percent, while U.S. and State highways had the most fatal commercial motor vehicle crashes at 50 percent.
- Commercial motor vehicles crashes cost Idahoans nearly \$289 million in 2008. This represents 11 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Commercial Motor Vehicle Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total CMV Crashes	1,918	1,983	1,710	1,878	1,838	-0.7%
Fatalities	32	37	30	32	36	4.0%
Serious Injuries	132	133	144	118	99	-6.3%
Visible Injuries	293	257	249	262	207	-7.8%
Possible Injuries	379	353	322	444	374	1.6%
Commercial AVMT (millions)	2,641	2,735	2,833	2,957	2,737	1.0%
% of Total AVMT	17.8%	18.3%	18.6%	18.7%	17.9%	0.2%
Fatalities per 100 Million CAVMT	1.21	1.35	1.06	1.08	1.32	3.4%
Injuries per 100 Million CAVMT	30.44	27.17	25.24	27.87	24.85	-4.6%

Source: Commercial VMT from the Traffic Survey and Analysis Section, Idaho Transportation Department

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Drowsy Driving Crashes

The Problem

- In 2008, 15 fatalities resulted from drowsy driving crashes. This represents 2 percent of all fatalities. Only 2 (or 18 percent) of the 11 passenger vehicle occupants killed in drowsy driving crashes were wearing a seat belt.
- The other fatalities resulting from drowsy driving in 2008 were 2 commercial motor vehicle occupants, 1 motorcyclist, and 1 pedestrian.
- In 2008, 78 percent of the drowsy driving crashes involved a single vehicle, while 86 percent of the fatal drowsy driving crashes involved a single vehicle.
- In 2008, 13 percent of the drowsy driving crashes also involved impaired driving.
- In 2008, 49 percent of the drowsy driving crashes occurred between 11 PM and 9 AM, while 34 percent occurred between noon and 7 PM
- Drowsy driving crashes cost Idahoans just under \$133 million dollars in 2008. This represents 5 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Drowsy Driving Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total Drowsy Driving Crashes	709	797	683	654	559	-5.2%
Fatalities	21	14	17	13	15	-5.0%
Serious Injuries	96	101	69	80	62	-8.3%
Visible Injuries	193	198	178	151	152	-5.5%
Possible Injuries	243	222	220	210	215	-2.9%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Single-Vehicle Run-Off-Road Crashes

The Problem

- In 2008, 24 percent of all crashes involved a single-vehicle leaving the roadway. The majority of these crashes (73 percent) occurred on rural roadways.
- Single-vehicle run-off-road crashes resulted in 50 percent of all fatalities in Idaho. Impaired driving was a factor in 50 percent of the 108 fatal single-vehicle run-off-road crashes.
- Overturning was attributed as the most harmful event in 75 percent of the fatal single-vehicle run off road crashes. Rollovers were responsible for 64 percent of the single-vehicle run-off road fatalities and nearly one-third (32%) of all fatalities in 2008. Of the 74 people killed in single-vehicle run-off-road rollovers, 59 (80 percent) were not wearing a seat belt.
- Single-vehicle run-off-road crashes cost Idahoans more than \$1.0 billion in 2008. This represents 39 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Crashes on Idaho Highways Involving One Vehicle that Ran Off the Road, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Ran-Off-Road Crashes	6,156	6,272	5,471	5,940	5,985	-0.4%
Fatalities	116	134	126	132	116	0.5%
Serious Injuries	564	582	546	625	515	-1.5%
Visible Injuries	1,308	1,254	1,236	1,169	1,026	-5.8%
Possible Injuries	1,670	1,566	1,504	1,507	1,415	-4.0%
Most Harmful Events of Fatal and Serious Injury Ran Off Road Crashes						
Overturn	383	367	362	377	339	-2.9%
Ditch/Embankment	37	55	35	37	41	7.2%
Tree	37	46	44	47	33	-0.7%
Poles/Posts	25	28	24	37	25	4.9%
Fence/Building/ Wall	13	15	15	16	17	7.1%
Other Fixed Object	15	14	14	8	14	6.4%
Guardrail	7	11	11	17	12	20.6%
Immersion	6	5	13	8	3	10.6%
Culvert	2	6	1	5	4	124.2%
Bridge Rail/Abutment/End	4	3	1	3	1	10.4%
All Other Most Harmful Events	21	28	33	44	40	18.9%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Intersection Crashes

The Problem

- In 2008, 40% of all crashes occurred at or were related to an intersection, while 17% of fatal crashes occurred at or were related to an intersection.
- The majority of all intersection-related crashes (82%) occurred on urban roadways in 2008, while 60% of the fatal intersection-related crashes occurred on rural roadways.
- While total intersection related crashes were fairly evenly split among intersections with stop signs, signals, and no control, 51% of fatal intersection crashes occurred at intersections with stop signs, 35% at intersections with no control, and 11% at intersections with traffic signals. There was 1 fatal crash that occurred at a pedestrian crossing signal. All of the fatal intersection related crashes at traffic signals occurred in urban areas, while 60% of the fatal intersection related crashes at stop signs occurred in rural areas and 85% of the fatal intersection related crashes with no control device occurred in rural areas.
- Of the 38 people killed in crashes at intersections, 26 were passenger motor vehicle occupants. Of the 26 passenger motor vehicle occupants, 12 (46%) were not restrained.
- Intersection related crashes cost Idahoans nearly \$733 million in 2008. This represents 28 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Intersection-Related Crashes on Idaho Highways, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Intersection Crashes	11,355	11,514	9,818	10,972	9,974	-2.7%
Fatalities	42	53	69	49	38	1.2%
Serious Injuries	575	645	651	619	545	-0.9%
Visible Injuries	1,820	1,745	1,767	1,738	1,391	-6.1%
Possible Injuries	3,920	4,042	3,917	3,914	3,504	-2.6%
Traffic Control Device at Intersection						
Stop Sign	4,236	4,241	3,764	4,039	3,506	-4.3%
%	37%	37%	38%	37%	35%	-1.4%
Signal	3,775	3,903	3,189	3,709	3,543	-0.8%
%	33%	34%	32%	34%	36%	1.7%
None	2,956	3,000	2,563	2,848	2,612	-2.6%
%	26%	26%	26%	26%	26%	0.2%
Yield	214	219	160	213	187	-0.9%
%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0.6%
All Other	174	151	142	163	126	-6.8%
%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-4.1%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Head-On and Side Swipe Opposite Direction Crashes

The Problem

- In 2008, just 3% of all crashes were a head-on or side swipe opposite direction crash, while 17% of fatal crashes were the result of a head-on or side swipe opposite direction.
- While all head-on and sideswipe opposite crashes were pretty evenly distributed between urban (48%) and rural (52%) roadways in 2008, 84% of the fatal head-on and sideswipe opposite crashes occurred on rural roadways.
- Drivers involved in a head-on or side swipe opposite crash that drove left of center were primarily just driving straight ahead (55%), while another 35% were negotiating a curve.
- Of the 42 people killed in head on or side swipe opposite crashes, 34 were passenger motor vehicle occupants. Of the 34 passenger motor vehicle occupants, 13 (38%) were not restrained.
- Head-on and side swipe opposite direction crashes cost Idahoans more than \$330 million in 2008. This represents 13 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Head-On and Side Swipe Opposite Crashes on Idaho Highways, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Head-On/Side Swipe Opposite Crashes	902	826	815	823	841	-1.6%
Fatalities	45	49	34	26	42	4.1%
Serious Injuries	186	205	180	165	138	-6.7%
Visible Injuries	274	279	252	244	222	-5.0%
Possible Injuries	384	370	348	356	352	-2.1%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Work Zone Crashes

The Problem

- Work zone crashes are fairly rare, yet can often be severe when they occur. Of particular concern is the vulnerability of the workers in work zones.
- Single-vehicle crashes comprised 26% of the crashes in work zones in 2008. Overturn was the predominant most harmful event for single vehicle crashes, while rear end was the predominant most harmful event for multiple vehicle crashes.
- Crashes in work zones cost Idahoans nearly \$61 million dollars in 2008. This represents just more than 2 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Work Zone Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Work Zone Crashes	265	197	198	297	279	4.7%
Fatalities	8	0	2	2	7	62.5%
Serious Injuries	23	14	21	20	27	10.3%
Visible Injuries	42	27	32	46	54	11.0%
Possible Injuries	85	71	71	68	108	9.5%
% All Crashes	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%	1.1%	1.1%	7.1%
Workers Injured	1	0	2	3	2	29.2%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Cross-Median Crashes

Definition

- Cross-median crashes are those where a vehicle crosses the raised or depressed median, separating the direction of travel, and results in a head-on or side swipe opposite crash. Cross-median crashes are a subset of head-on or sideswipe opposite crashes.

The Problem

- Cross-median crashes are extremely rare, yet are often very severe when they occur. Of the 10 cross-median crashes in 2008, 8 (80 percent) resulted in an injury.
- Cross-median crashes cost Idahoans nearly \$20 million dollars in 2008. This represents less than 1 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Cross-Median Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Cross Median Crashes	9	9	9	14	10	6.7%
Fatalities	1	5	2	5	3	112.5%
Serious Injuries	3	10	3	8	4	70.0%
Visible Injuries	3	6	3	10	4	55.8%
Possible Injuries	4	1	2	6	6	56.3%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

Crashes with Trains

The Problem

- Train-vehicle crashes are rare, yet are often very severe when they occur. Of the 16 crashes in 2008, 7 (44 percent) resulted in an injury.
- The majority of train-vehicle crashes occur in rural areas. Rural railroad crossings typically do not have crossing arms or flashing lights to indicate an approaching train. In 2008, 81 percent of the train-vehicle crashes occurred in rural areas.
- Crashes with trains cost Idahoans nearly \$13 million dollars in 2008. This represents less than 1 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

Vehicle Crashes with Trains in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total Train Crashes	17	20	17	18	16	-0.6%
Fatalities	2	0	3	2	2	41.7%
Serious Injuries	5	3	1	0	1	-26.7%
Visible Injuries	4	1	2	4	4	31.3%
Possible Injuries	3	8	5	4	3	54.4%
Location of Crashes						
Rural Roads	14	14	12	14	13	-1.2%
Urban Roads	3	6	5	4	3	9.6%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

School Bus Crashes

The Problem

- School bus crashes are rare, but when they occur they have the potential of producing many injuries. In 2007, there were 2 single-vehicle bus crashes that resulted in 16 visible injuries and 61 possible injuries. Typically, however, occupants of vehicles that collided with the school buses sustain most of the injuries and fatalities.
- Crashes with school buses cost Idahoans over \$3 million in 2008. This represents less than 1 percent of the total economic cost of crashes.

School Bus Crashes in Idaho, 2004-2008

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Avg. Yearly Change 2004-2008
Total School Bus Crashes	83	94	72	97	102	7.4%
Fatalities	0	1	0	0	0	0.0%
Serious Injuries	6	5	1	10	4	185.8%
Visible Injuries	13	13	13	29	5	10.1%
Possible Injuries	23	26	19	82	23	61.4%

Source: Idaho Statewide Crash Database, Office of Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Crash Data is based on information provided by law enforcement agencies on collisions resulting in injury, death or damage to one person's property in excess of \$1500.

OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY



Highway Safety Grant Request for Proposal Federal Fiscal Year 2011

Each year, the Office of Highway Safety (OHS) awards grants to state and local governmental units and non-profit organizations to help solve Idaho's most critical behavioral traffic safety problems. Our goal is to reduce deaths and injuries from motor vehicle crashes through funding programs and activities that promote safe travel on Idaho's transportation systems, and through collecting, maintaining and disseminating reliable crash statistics. Projects that are considered for funding must address the emphasis areas identified in Idaho's Strategic Highway Safety Plan. They are: safety restraint use, impaired driving, aggressive driving, inattentive driving, youthful drivers, vulnerable users (bicycle, pedestrian, mature drivers), commercial vehicles, motorcycle, and crash response (EMS), primarily EMS extrication equipment and/or education. Other highway safety problem areas may also be considered. Funding is also available for electronic citation projects.

The highway safety grant year is the Federal Fiscal Year 2011, which begins October 1, 2010 and runs through September 30, 2011. The grants can provide startup or "seed" money for new programs, provide new direction to existing safety programs, or support state planning to identify and quantify highway safety problems. Grant money may also be used for the one-time acquisition of technology, system upgrades, and/or equipment purchases that will be used to solve highway safety problems where a demonstrated need exists.

Depending on the type of project, funding may be considered for one, two, or at a maximum of three years. Letters of Intent for successful projects in their second or third year normally receive priority. Consideration is then given to new applicants that **show the greatest potential for injury or fatality reduction or system improvement.**

Highway safety projects typically require the grantee agency provide a portion of the funding for the project, called matching funds. In first year projects, grant money will generally reimburse 75 percent of the total project costs, in the second year 50 percent, and in the third year 25 percent. Matching funds can be in the form of agency funds or resources to support the proposed project. Highway safety programs are "seed money" programs, and agencies are expected to assume the full cost of programs and provide program continuation at the conclusion of the grant funding. **Agencies pay 100 percent of the project costs up-front as accrued, and then request reimbursement monthly or quarterly in the amount of the approved federal share.**

Highway safety funds, by law, cannot be used for highway construction, maintenance, or design. Requests for grant funds are not appropriate for projects such as safety barriers, turning lanes, traffic signals, and pavement/crosswalk markings. Additionally, funds cannot be used for facility construction or purchase of office furniture. Because of limited funding, the OHS does not fund the purchase of vehicles.

FOCUS AREA PROJECT EXAMPLES

Safety Restraint: The overall goal of the Safety Restraint Program is to reduce deaths and injuries from motor vehicle crashes by increasing the proper use of safety restraints, booster seats, and child safety seats. Projects may include a combination of safety restraint law enforcement, public awareness programs, purchase of traffic enforcement equipment, and creative education activities. Projects can include adult, teen, and/or child safety restraint use education as a program emphasis, as well as funding to start or to improve a local child safety seat distribution program. We encourage jurisdictions with these projects to work closely with their local media to bring visibility to their activities to increase program effectiveness.

Impaired Driving: The goal of this program area is to remove alcohol and drug-impaired drivers from the roads and reduce recidivism. A project may include establishing DUI Courts, DUI probation positions, or enforcement combined with public information outreach activities. We encourage jurisdictions with these projects to work closely with their local media to "advertise" their enforcement activities and inform their community about highway safety. This program area can also fund alcohol breath testing equipment, training for judges, prosecutors, probation officers, and education programs like alcohol server training, designated driver

awareness, underage alcohol consumption, outreach and enforcement. The OHS is searching for creative programs that could reduce impaired driving in your community. All grants will also include seat belt usage emphasis/enforcement to reduce the injuries and deaths resulting from impaired driving crashes.

Aggressive Driving: The goal of this program area is to reduce the incidence of aggressive driving behaviors, such as speeding, failing to yield, following too close, or disregarding signs or signals. The goal is accomplished by enforcing and encouraging compliance with traffic laws through the development and implementation of Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP), Accident Reduction Teams, model programs to address aggressive driver behavior, and other similar projects which usually combine effective law enforcement and public awareness activities. All grants will also include seat belt usage emphasis/enforcement to reduce the injuries and deaths resulting from aggressive driving crashes.

Youthful Drivers: Funding is provided to reduce the number of fatal and injury crashes by 15-19 year old drivers. Emphasis is placed on prevention through education and enforcement activities. Grant funding is directed toward youthful drivers and pre-teen drivers, grades K-12. Agencies are encouraged to work with local teen populations such as community service for impaired driving offenses, student governments, and other student organizations dedicated to traffic safety. Proposed projects will create a comprehensive program to change teen driving behaviors. The OHS urges agencies to think creatively and work closely with the OHS when developing a youth program.

Crash Response (EMS): The goal of this program area is to enhance appropriate, timely, and safe response to crashes and to reduce the time that it takes first responders to remove injured crash victims from the crash site and transport them to advanced medical treatment. Funding priorities for this area are for the purchase of extrication equipment and/or educational opportunities.

Vulnerable Users: The overall goal of this program is to reduce roadway fatalities and injuries by reducing bicycle, pedestrian, and/or mature driver crashes through education, equipment, and providing direction and support for local communities. Emphasis is on public awareness materials designed to reach all age groups.

Other: This category includes all other potential focus areas such as motorcycle, commercial vehicles, etc. The goal of any project in this category must be to reduce roadway fatalities and injuries in Idaho.

Electronic Citation: Section 408 funding is available for improving timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration and accessibility of traffic safety data, and to demonstrate improvement in an agency's traffic records system for measurement-driven data. A separate 2-page Letter of Intent is provided for the application to fund electronic citation equipment. Complete and submit both pages to be considered for the limited funding available. Grants may be available prior to October 1, 2010.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. *Grant awards can only be made to local and state governmental entities, and non-profit organizations.*
2. There must be a data driven highway safety problem. Grant requests will be evaluated based on crash data.
3. *Agencies must have a safety restraint use policy in place prior to the start of grant funding.*
4. Law enforcement agencies must demonstrate that they are enforcing the safety restraint laws.

HOW TO APPLY

Interested agencies must complete a Letter of Intent and have it postmarked no later than February 19, 2010. Faxed or e-mailed Letters of Intent must be received no later than 11:59 PM MST (before Midnight) on February 19, 2010. Electronic versions of our forms can be found by going to our website at <http://itd.idaho.gov/ohs/programs.htm>. Contact the Office of Highway Safety with any questions. Proposals may be mailed, faxed or e-mailed to:

Idaho Transportation Department, Office of Highway Safety
PO Box 7129, Boise, Idaho 83707-1129
Fax: (208) 334-4430 Phone: (208) 334-8100



**OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY
HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANTS FFY 2011
LETTER OF INTENT
Submit by February 19, 2010**


MAIL TO: Office of Highway Safety PO Box 7129 Boise, ID 83707-1129 Phone No.: (208) 334-8100 FAX No.: (208) 334-4430 EMAIL TO: ohsgrants@itd.idaho.gov	FOR OHS USE ONLY Primary Program Area: OHS Staff:
--	--

1. Agency: Street Address: Mailing Address: (if different) Contact: Phone # : Fax # : Email:	2. Mark the Focus Areas that Apply <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Restraint Use <input type="checkbox"/> Aggressive Driving <input type="checkbox"/> Impaired Driving <input type="checkbox"/> Youthful Drivers <input type="checkbox"/> Crash Response (EMS) <input type="checkbox"/> Inattentive Drivers <input type="checkbox"/> Vulnerable Users <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify below)
--	--

3. **Briefly** describe the proposed activities to reduce the highway safety problem:

4. Proposed Budget		
a. PERSONNEL COSTS: (Salary, Benefits, Travel, etc)		
Example: Salary + Benefits x ___ hours x ___ officers)		
	<u>Agency Match</u>	<u>Grant Funds</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
b. Other Costs		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Totals	_____	_____

**IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
ORGANIZATION COMPLEMENT
Division of Highways -- Highway Safety**



HWY SAFETY 0808.SDR

APPROVED:


Highway Safety Staff includes:

- 1 Highway Safety Manager
- 4.5 Grant Program Coordinators
- 2 Research Analysts
- 1 Financial Specialist
- 1 Crash Analyst Unit Supervisor
- 4.5 Crash Analysts
 - .5 Law Enforcement Trainer
- 1.5 Administrative Staff Support

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM COST SUMMARY

State ID Number 1
 Date 05/12/10

	Program Area	Approved Program Costs	State/Local Funds	Federally Funded Programs			Federal Share to Local
				Previous Balance	Increase/(Decrease)	Current Balance	
K9-2011-00-00-00	408 SAFETEA-LU		\$ 252,927.00	\$ -	\$ 1,011,706.00	\$ 1,011,706.00	\$ -
K8-2011-00-00-00	410 SAFETEA-LU		\$ 1,490,000.00	\$ -	\$ 936,000.00	\$ 936,000.00	\$ 300,000.00
K8PA-2011-00-00-00	410 SAFETEA-LU Planning and Admin		\$ 12,036.00	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -
K8PM-2011-00-00-00	410 SAFETEA-LU Paid Media		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 400,000.00	\$ -
K6-2011-00-00-00	2010 SAFETEA-LU		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130,000.00	\$ 130,000.00	\$ -
K10-2011-00-00-00	1906 SAFETEA-LU		\$ 70,445.00	\$ -	\$ 281,779.00	\$ 281,779.00	\$ -
Total NHTSA		\$ -	\$ 1,825,408.00	\$ -	\$ 2,779,485.00	\$ 2,779,485.00	\$ 300,000.00
Total FHWA							
Total NHTSA & FHWA			\$ 2,612,883.00	\$ -	\$ 5,715,685.00	\$ 5,715,685.00	\$ 1,933,250.00

State Official Authorized
 Signature: 
 NAME: Brian W. Neal
 TITLE: DIRECTOR
 DATE: 8/31/2010

Federal Official Authorized
 Signature: _____
 NAME: NHTSA
 TITLE: _____
 DATE: _____

HS Form 217

Effective Date: _____

State Certification and Assurances

Failure to comply with applicable Federal statutes, regulations and directives may subject State officials to civil or criminal penalties and/or place the State in a high risk grantee status in accordance with 49 CFR 18.12.

Each fiscal year the State will sign these Certifications and Assurances that the State complies with all applicable Federal statutes, regulations, and directives in effect with respect to the periods for which it receives grant funding. Applicable provisions include, but not limited to, the following:

- 23 U.S.C. Chapter 4 - Highway Safety Act of 1966, as amended
- 49 CFR Part 18 - Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments
- 23 CFR Chapter II - (§§1200, 1205, 1206, 1250, 1251, & 1252) Regulations governing highway safety programs
- NHTSA Order 462-6C - Matching Rates for State and Community Highway Safety Programs
- Highway Safety Grant Funding Policy for Field-Administered Grants

CERTIFICATION AND ASSURANCES

Section 402 Requirements

The Governor is responsible for the administration of the State highway safety program through a State highway safety agency which has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized (as evidenced by appropriate oversight procedures governing such areas as procurement, financial administration, and the use, management, and disposition of equipment) to carry out the program (23 USC 402(b) (1) (A));

The political subdivisions of this State are authorized, as part of the State highway safety program, to carry out within their jurisdictions local highway safety programs which have been approved by the Governor and are in accordance with the uniform guidelines promulgated by the Secretary of Transportation (23 USC 402(b) (1) (B));

At least 40 per cent of all Federal funds apportioned to this State under 23 USC 402 for this fiscal year will be expended by or for the benefit of the political subdivision of the State in carrying out local highway safety programs (23 USC 402(b) (1) (C)), unless this requirement is waived in writing;

This State's highway safety program provides adequate and reasonable access for the safe and convenient movement of physically handicapped persons, including those in wheelchairs, across curbs constructed or replaced on or after July 1, 1976, at all pedestrian crosswalks (23 USC 402(b) (1) (D));

The State will implement activities in support of national highway safety goals to reduce motor vehicle related fatalities that also reflect the primary data-related crash factors within the State as identified by the State highway safety planning process, including:

- National law enforcement mobilizations,
- Sustained enforcement of statutes addressing impaired driving, occupant protection, and driving in excess of posted speed limits,
- An annual statewide safety belt use survey in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary for the measurement of State safety belt use rates to ensure that the measurements are accurate and representative,
- Development of statewide data systems to provide timely and effective data analysis to support allocation of highway safety resources.

The State shall actively encourage all relevant law enforcement agencies in the State to follow the guidelines established for vehicular pursuits issued by the International Association of Chiefs of Police that are currently in effect. (23 USC 402 (b)(1)(E).

Other Federal Requirements

Cash drawdowns will be initiated only when actually needed for disbursement. 49 CFR 18.20

Cash disbursements and balances will be reported in a timely manner as required by NHTSA. 49 CFR 18.21.

The same standards of timing and amount, including the reporting of cash disbursement and balances, will be imposed upon any secondary recipient organizations. 49 CFR 18.41.

Failure to adhere to these provisions may result in the termination of drawdown privileges.

The State has submitted appropriate documentation for review to the single point of contact designated by the Governor to review Federal programs, as required by Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs);

Equipment acquired under this agreement for use in highway safety program areas shall be used and kept in operation for highway safety purposes by the State; or the State, by formal agreement with appropriate officials of a political subdivision or State agency, shall cause such equipment to be used and kept in operation for highway safety purposes 23 CFR 1200.21

The State will comply with all applicable State procurement procedures and will maintain a financial management system that complies with the minimum requirements of 49 CFR 18.20;

Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act

The State will report for each **sub-grant** awarded:

- Name of the entity receiving the award;
- Amount of the award;

- Information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, the North American Industry Classification System code or Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number (where applicable), program source;
- Location of the entity receiving the award and the primary location of performance under the award, including the city, State, congressional district, and country; , and an award title descriptive of the purpose of each funding action;
- A unique identifier (DUNS);
- The names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated officers of the entity if-- of the entity receiving the award and of the parent entity of the recipient, should the entity be owned by another entity;
 - (i) the entity in the preceding fiscal year received—
 - (I) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues in Federal awards; and(II) \$25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal awards; and(ii) the public does not have access to information about the compensation of the senior executives of the entity through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;
- Other relevant information specified by the Office of Management and Budget in subsequent guidance or regulation.

The State highway safety agency will comply with all Federal statutes and implementing regulations relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin (and 49 CFR Part 21); (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794) and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC § 12101, *et seq.*; PL 101-336), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disabilities (and 49 CFR Part 27); (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970(P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse of alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 *et seq.*), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, which provides that any portion of a state or local entity receiving federal funds will obligate all programs or activities of that entity to comply with these civil rights laws; and, (k) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

The Drug-free Workplace Act of 1988(41 U.S.C. 702:);

The State will provide a drug-free workplace by:

Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the

actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

1. The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.
2. The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace.
3. Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs.
4. The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug violations occurring in the workplace.

Making it a requirement that each employee engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a).

Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will --

1. Abide by the terms of the statement.
2. Notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction.

Notifying the agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction.

Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted -

1. Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination.
2. Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.

Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) above.

Buy America Act

The State will comply with the provisions of the Buy America Act (49 U.S.C. 5323(j)) which contains the following requirements:

Only steel, iron and manufactured products produced in the United States may be purchased with Federal funds unless the Secretary of Transportation determines that such domestic purchases would be inconsistent with the public interest; that such materials are not reasonably available and of a satisfactory quality; or that inclusion of domestic materials will increase the cost of the overall project

contract by more than 25 percent. Clear justification for the purchase of non-domestic items must be in the form of a waiver request submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

Political Activity (Hatch Act)

The State will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING FEDERAL LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

1. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.
3. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-award at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grant, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Restriction on State Lobbying

None of the funds under this program will be used for any activity specifically designed to urge or influence a State or local legislator to favor or oppose the adoption of any specific legislative proposal pending before any State or local legislative body. Such activities include both direct and indirect (e.g., "grassroots") lobbying activities, with one exception. This does not preclude a State official whose salary is supported with NHTSA funds from engaging in direct communications with State or local legislative officials, in accordance with customary State practice, even if such communications urge legislative officials to favor or oppose the adoption of a specific pending legislative proposal.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION

Instructions for Primary Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency's determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.
3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.
4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department or agency to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
5. The terms *covered transaction*, *debarred*, *suspended*, *ineligible*, *lower tier covered transaction*, *participant*, *person*, *primary covered transaction*, *principal*, *proposal*, and *voluntarily excluded*, as used in this clause, have the meaning set out in the Definitions and coverage sections of 49 CFR Part 29. You may contact the department or agency to which this proposal is being submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
6. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency entering into this transaction.
7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transaction," provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it

determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the list of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.

9. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.

10. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 6 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters-Primary Covered Transactions

(1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of record, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or Local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the Statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Instructions for Lower Tier Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.

2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms *covered transaction, debarred, suspended, ineligible, lower tier covered transaction, participant, person, primary covered transaction, principal, proposal, and voluntarily excluded*, as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definition and Coverage sections of 49 CFR Part 29. You may contact the person to whom this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transaction," without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions. (See below)
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion -- Lower Tier Covered Transactions:

1. The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
2. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.


POLICY TO BAN TEXT MESSAGING WHILE DRIVING

In accordance with Executive Order 13513, Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving, and DOT Order 3902.10, Text Messaging While Driving, States are encouraged to:

- (1) Adopt and enforce workplace safety policies to decrease crashes caused by distracted driving including policies to ban text messaging while driving—
 - a. Company-owned or –rented vehicles, or Government-owned, leased or rented vehicles; or
 - b. Privately-owned when on official Government business or when performing any work on or behalf of the Government.
- (2) Conduct workplace safety initiatives in a manner commensurate with the size of the business, such as –
 - a. Establishment of new rules and programs or re-evaluation of existing programs to prohibit text messaging while driving; and
 - b. Education, awareness, and other outreach to employees about the safety risks associated with texting while driving.

Environmental Impact

The Governor's Representative for Highway Safety has reviewed the State's Fiscal Year highway safety planning document and hereby declares that no significant environmental impact will result from implementing this Highway Safety Plan. If, under a future revision, this Plan will be modified in such a manner that a project would be instituted that could affect environmental quality to the extent that a review and statement would be necessary, this office is prepared to take the action necessary to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 USC 4321 et seq.) and the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR Parts 1500-1517).



Brian W. Ness, Director, Idaho Transportation Department
Governor's Representative for Highway Safety

8/31/2010

Date

State of Idaho Highway Safety Plan Certification, FFY 2011