

Highway Safety Performance Plan

For more information contact:
Highway Safety Grant Manager
Office of Traffic and Highway Safety
Phone: (208) 334-8100
FAX: (208) 334-4430

Description of the Program

The Office of Traffic and Highway Safety, (OTHS), administers the Federal Highway Safety Grant Program, which will be funded by formula through the new transportation act currently being debated in Congress, and the Highway Safety Act of 1966. The goal of the program is to reduce deaths and serious injuries resulting from motor-vehicle collisions 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 collision experience than normal expectations. Problem identification involves the study of relationships between collisions and the population, licensed drivers, registered vehicles, and vehicle miles traveled, as well as characteristics of specific subgroups that may contribute to collisions.

In the fall of 2002, OTHS staff and the Idaho Traffic Safety Commission (ITSC) jointly developed a three-year safety plan for FFY 2004-2006. 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

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

Comparison data was developed, where possible, on costs of collisions, the number of collisions, and the number of deaths and injuries. Supplementary data was gathered from the Idaho State Collision Database on helmet use for motorcycles and bicycles, child safety-restraint use, seat-belt use, and from available violation, license suspension, and arrest information.

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, 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 and serious injuries. 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 addition to the primary goal, staff responsible for each focus area establishes long-term and near-term goals.

In October 2002, the Idaho Traffic Safety Commission voted to accept the FFY 2004-2006 Idaho Focus Areas and approved the targeted funding ranges anticipated to be programmed over the three years. These were:

<u>Focus Area</u>	<u>Target Funding Range</u>
Safety Restraint Use	20-35%
Impaired Drivers	15-30%
Aggressive Driving	15-30%
Youthful Drivers	5-20%
Roadway Safety/Traffic Records	5-15%
Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety	0- 5 %
Emergency Medical Services	5-10%
Other	0-10%

Each October, the ITSC reviews the identified focus areas, goals, and funding ranges. Adjustments for the upcoming fiscal year, as warranted and supported by data analysis, are made at that time. Progress toward achieving goals is presented and reviewed by the ITSC each October.

Paid Advertising Assessment

As required by NHTSA, an assessment of OTHS' paid media will measure and document audience exposure to paid advertised messages and the number of airings and/or print ads devoted to each campaign. Arbitron and Nielsen ratings will be used to estimate the size of the audience reached for radio and TV. The assessment will include:

- The number of paid airings and/or print ads that occurred for each campaign and the size of the audience reached.

- The number of free airings and/or print ads that occurred for each campaign and the size of the audience reached.

Using telephone surveys, the OTHS will also assess how the target audience's knowledge, attitude, or actions were affected by the messages.

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 the end of 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. OTHS develops priority and funding recommendations using evaluation criteria that assess each project's potential to:

- make a reduction in traffic collisions,
- reduce the severity of traffic collision injuries,
- improve the operation of an important traffic safety system,
- fit in as part of an integrated community-wide, collision-reduction project, and
- increase the coordination of efforts between several traffic safety agencies.

Funding recommendations are incorporated into the *Statewide Transportation Improvement Program* (STIP) and presented to the ITSC each June. Final project adjustments are made after a 30-day public comment period is complete. The Idaho Transportation Board approves the Highway Safety Performance Plan in August. A flow chart depicting the entire process is contained on the following page.

Overview Of The Highway Safety Performance Plan Process

FLOW	TIME	PURPOSE
Traffic Safety Problem Identification Activities ▼	September	Analyze data – causes and trends. Define problems and problem areas of state.
ITSC/Staff Planning Session ▼	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.
Grant Application Period ▼	January/February	Provide notice of fund availability and solicit applications for targeted problem areas.
Draft Highway Safety Performance Plan (HSPP) ▼	March/April/ May	Clarify project proposals, prioritize projects, and develop draft language and spending plans.
ITSC Approval ▼	June	ITSC formal approval of the Highway Safety Performance Plan. Last preparations before submittal to Transportation Board within the draft <i>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program</i> (STIP) document.
Public Notification Period for STIP ▼	July	Public comment period required by law.
Transportation Board Approval ▼	August	Formal approval is through the Transportation Board. Allows OTHS to start grant process. HSPP due to NHTSA and FHWA.
Projects Start	October	Field implementation.

Goals and Performance Measures

Mission Statement

The Office of Traffic and Highway Safety supports the Division of Highway's safety goals by reducing 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.

Primary Goal

Reduce traffic-related deaths and serious injuries

Primary Performance Measures and Benchmarks

Goals are set and performance will be measured using five-year rates, and the years below represent the final year of the five-year rate.

Reduce the five year fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		1.93
2002	-	1.90	1.91
2003	-	1.87	1.93
2004	-	1.85	

Reduce the five year serious injury rate per 100 million VMT

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		12.86
2002	-	12.35	12.44
2003	-	11.78	12.00
2004	-	11.23	

Strategy

The strategy used to reach the primary goal is to identify secondary objectives for each focus area that will cumulatively accomplish the primary goal. Performance measures are also identified. For measurement purposes, 2001 has been used as the benchmark year, with targeted objectives identified for 2002-2004.

Impaired Driving

Goal statement: Reduce the five-year impaired driving fatality and serious injury rate per 100 million VMT.

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		3.12
2002	-	2.96	3.06
2003	-	2.82	3.00
2004	-	2.70	

Youthful Drivers

Goal statement: Reduce the five-year youthful driver fatality and serious injury involvement rate. The youthful fatal and serious injury involvement rate is the ratio of 15-19 year old drivers involved in fatal and serious injury collisions to all 15-19 year old drivers divided by the ratio of all drivers involved in fatal and serious injury collisions to all drivers.

		Five Year Average	
		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		1.98
2002	-	1.95	1.95
2003	-	1.93	1.98
2004	-	1.91	

Safety-Restraint Use

Goal statement: Increase the yearly statewide observed seat belt use rate.

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		60%
2002	-	63%	63%
2003	-	70%	72%
2004	-	72%	

Aggressive Driving

Goal statement: Reduce the five-year aggressive driver behavior fatality and serious injury rate per 100 million VMT.

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		8.18
2002	-	7.67	7.95
2003	-	7.15	7.60
2004	-	6.64	

Bicycle and Pedestrian Actions

Goal statement: Reduce the five-year bicycle fatality and serious injury rate per 100 thousand people.

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		3.85
2002	-	3.64	3.99
2003	-	3.50	3.76
2004	-	3.37	

Goal statement: Reduce the five-year pedestrian fatality and serious injury rate per 100 thousand people.

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		5.74
2002	-	5.51	5.22
2003	-	5.16	5.11
2004	-	4.82	

Traffic Records and Roadway Safety Systems

Goal statement: Increase the percentage of vehicle crash reports that are electronically uploaded by law enforcement agencies to the OTHS collision database.

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		0%
2002	-	25%	31%
2003	-	50%	83%
2004	-	65%	

Goal statement: Increase the number of agencies accessing the Crash Analysis Reporting System (CARS) software to identify motor vehicle crash problems. Note: The different years are a result of the new crash analysis reporting system not being implemented until 2004.

		Goal	Actual
2002 Benchmark	-		12
2003	-	20	12
2004	-	30	13 Agencies (36 Users)
2005	-	40	

Emergency Medical Services Systems

Goal statement: Provide improvements that enhance local EMS extrication and communication capabilities.

		Goal	Actual
2001 Benchmark	-		6
2002	-	7	8
2003	-	7	11
2004	-	7	

Planning and Administration

Goal statement for FFY 2006: Implement the agreed upon recommendations that result from the 2005 NHTSA management review by September 30, 2006.

Reference Materials

- ***Highway Safety Performance Plan Cost Summary, (HS form 217) for Section 402, Section 410, Section 157, Section 2003(b), Section 411, and Section 412.***

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 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 OTHS staff, reviewed by the ITSC, 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.

Certifications 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
- 49 CFR Part 19 – Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations
- 23 CFR Chapter II – (§§1200, 1205, 1206, 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

In accordance with 49 CFR 18.11(c), I hereby certify that the state of Idaho will comply with all applicable Federal statutes and regulations, and give assurances that:

1. 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 programs under 23 USC 402 (b)(1)(A).
2. 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 in compliance with 23 USC 402(b)(1)(B).
3. At least 40 percent 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 subdivisions of the state in carrying out local highway safety programs authorized in accordance with 23 USC 402(b)(1)(C), unless this requirement is waived in writing.
4. 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.
5. 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.
 6. 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 to comply with 23 USC 402 (b)(1)(D).
 7. Cash drawdowns will be initiated only when actually needed for disbursements; cash disbursements and balances will be reported in a timely manner as required by NHTSA; and the same standards of timing and amount, including the reporting of cash disbursements and balances, will be imposed upon any secondary recipient organizations in accordance with 49 CFR 18.20, 18.21 and 18.41. Failure to adhere to these provisions may result in the termination of drawdown privileges.
 8. 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).
 9. 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 to comply with 23 CFR 1200.21.
 10. 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.
 11. 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), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps (and 49 CFR Part 27); (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.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; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE:

In accordance with the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 (49 CFR Part 29 Subpart F), the state certifies that it will provide a drug-free workplace by:

1. 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.
2. Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:
 - a. The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
 - b. The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
 - c. Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee-assistance programs; and
 - d. The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug violations occurring in the workplace.
3. Making it a requirement that each employee engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph 1.
4. Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph 1 that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
 - a. Abide by the terms of the statement; and
 - b. Notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction.
5. Notifying the agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph 4 (b) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction.
6. Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph 4(b), with respect to any employee who is so convicted.
 - a. Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination; or
 - b. 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.
7. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

BUY AMERICA ACT:

In accordance with the provisions of the Buy America Act, the state will comply with the reference 23 USC 101 Note, which contains the following requirements:

Only steel, iron and manufactured items 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 are of an unsatisfactory 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 with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1508 and implementing regulations of 5 CFR Part 151, concerning political activity of state or local offices, or employees.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING FEDERAL LOBBYING:

Certification for contracts, grants, loans, and cooperative agreements.

In accordance to certification regarding lobbying, 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 or 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-awards at all tiers (including subcontracts, sub-grants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all sub-recipients 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:

1. 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:

In accordance with the provisions of 49 CFR Part 29, the state agrees that it shall not knowingly enter into any agreement under its Highway Safety Plan with a person or entity that is barred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in the Section 402

program, unless otherwise authorized by NHTSA. The state further agrees that it will include the following clause and accompanying instruction, without modification, in all lower-tier covered transactions, as provided by 49 CFR Part 29, and in all solicitations for lower-tier covered transactions.

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.

LOWER TIER CERTIFICATION:

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 whom 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 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 participants shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

The Governor's Representative for Highway Safety has reviewed the State's Fiscal Year 2006 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 U.S.C. 4321 et. seq.) and the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR Parts 1500-1517).

Governor's Representative for Highway Safety

Date

Idaho
Problem
Identification
Report
FY 2006

Prepared by the Office of Traffic and Highway Safety

Statewide

The Problem

- In 2003, 293 people were killed and 14,601 people were injured in traffic collisions.
- The fatality rate was 2.03 per 100 million Annual Vehicle Miles of Travel (AVMT) in Idaho in 2003. Idaho's fatality rate remains higher than the U.S. fatality rate. The US fatality rate was 1.50 per 100 million AVMT in 2003.
- Motor vehicle collisions cost Idahoans over \$1.7 billion in 2003. Fatal and serious injuries represented 74 percent of these costs.

Idaho Collision Data and Measures of Exposure, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Collisions	25,076	26,241	26,090	26,477	26,700	1.6%
Fatal Collisions	245	241	225	230	261	1.9%
Total Deaths	278	276	259	264	293	1.5%
Injury Collisions	9,256	9,392	9,231	9,688	9,661	1.1%
Total Injured	14,069	14,276	14,021	14,762	14,601	1.0%
Property-Damage-Only Collisions (Severity >\$750)	15,575	16,608	16,634	16,559	16,778	1.9%
Idaho Population (thousands)	1,252	1,294	1,321	1,341	1,366	2.2%
Licensed Drivers (thousands)	881	893	901	911	926	1.2%
Vehicle Miles Of Travel (millions)	14,328	13,728	14,299	14,303	14,400	0.2%
Registered Vehicles (thousands)	1,316	1,340	1,247	1,331	1,316	0.1%

Economic Costs* of Idaho Collisions, 2003

Incident Description	Total Occurrences	Cost Per Occurrence	Cost Per Category
Fatalities	293	\$3,129,653	\$916,988,325
Serious Injuries	1,607	\$216,668	\$348,185,932
Visible Injuries	4,922	\$43,334	\$213,288,258
Possible Injuries	8,072	\$22,871	\$184,611,007
Property Damage Only	16,778	\$2,407	\$40,391,783
Total Estimate of Economic Cost			\$1,703,465,305

*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 1994 estimates released by the Federal Highway Administration and updated to reflect 2003 dollars.

Statewide – (Continued)

Fatal and Injury Collision Involvement by Age of Driver, 2003

Age of Driver	# of Drivers in F&I Collisions	% of Drivers in F&I collisions	# of Licensed Drivers	% of Total Drivers	Over/Under Representation*
19 & Under	2,728	16%	65,605	7%	2.3
20-24	2,694	16%	88,332	10%	1.7
25-34	3,249	19%	161,222	17%	1.1
35-44	2,711	16%	172,264	19%	0.9
45-54	2,458	15%	179,543	19%	0.7
55-64	1,464	9%	126,503	14%	0.6
65 & Older	1,310	8%	132,306	14%	0.5
Missing	311	2%			
Total	16,925		925,775		

*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 Collisions, 1999-2003

Roadway Information	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Local:						
VM T (100 millions)	68.2	61.7	65.9	63.7	64.0	-1.4%
Fatal Collision Rate	1.3	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.5	7.7%
Injury Collision Rate	76.4	86.8	79.2	85.1	86.5	3.5%
Total Collision Rate	215.7	255.1	232.9	242.6	244.2	3.6%
State System (Non-Interstate):						
VM T (100 millions)	41.0	44.3	45.1	46.2	47.7	3.9%
Fatal Collision Rate	2.8	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.4	-2.4%
Injury Collision Rate	64.4	59.7	66.9	72.1	69.2	2.1%
Total Collision Rate	168.3	153.1	178.9	183.6	183.6	2.6%
Interstate:						
VM T (100 millions)	34.1	31.3	32.0	33.1	32.3	-1.2%
Fatal Collision Rate	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.0	1.5	8.2%
Injury Collision Rate	41.3	44.5	31.3	28.2	25.6	-10.3%
Total Collision Rate	101.7	118.9	83.7	76.6	71.6	-6.9%
Statewide Totals:						
VM T (100 millions)	143.3	137.3	143.0	143.0	144.0	0.2%
Fatal Collision Rate	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.8%
Injury Collision Rate	64.6	68.4	64.6	67.7	67.1	1.1%
Total Collision Rate	175.0	191.1	182.5	185.1	185.4	1.6%

Prepared by: Office of Traffic and Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Report 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 \$750.

Impaired Driving

The Problem

- In 2003, 115 fatalities resulted from impaired driving collisions. This represents 39 percent of all fatalities. Only 22 (or 22 percent) of the 98 passenger vehicle occupants killed in impaired driving collisions were wearing a seat belt.
- Nearly 18 percent of impaired drivers were under the age of 21 in 2003, even though they are too young to legally purchase alcohol.
- Impaired driving collisions cost Idahoans over \$473 million in 2003. This represents 28 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Impaired Driving in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Impaired Driving Collisions	1,676	1,790	1,655	1,886	1,973	4.5%
Fatalities	86	97	94	97	115	7.9%
Serious Injuries	320	350	312	335	315	0.0%
Visible Injuries	695	731	663	715	663	-0.9%
Possible Injuries	458	507	440	581	617	8.9%
Impaired Driving Collisions as a % of All Collisions	6.7%	6.8%	6.3%	7.1%	7.4%	2.8%
Impaired Driving Fatalities as a % of All Fatalities	30.9%	35.1%	36.3%	36.7%	39.2%	6.2%
Impaired Driving Injuries as a % of All Injuries	10.5%	11.1%	10.1%	11.0%	10.9%	1.3%
Impaired Driving Fatality & Serious Injury Rate per 100 Million AVM T	2.83	3.26	2.84	3.02	2.99	1.8%
Annual DUI Arrests by Agency *						
Idaho State Police	1,835	1,764	1,640	1,723	1,708	-1.7%
Local Agencies	9,001	8,404	8,257	8,302	8,523	-1.3%
Total Arrests	10,836	10,168	9,897	10,025	10,231	-1.4%
DUI Arrests per 100 Licensed Drivers	1.23	1.14	1.10	1.10	1.11	-2.6%

Youthful Drivers

The Problem

- Drivers, age 15 to 19, represented 7 percent of licensed drivers in Idaho in 2003, yet they were involved in 13 percent of the fatal and serious injury collisions.
- In 2003, drivers age 15 to 19 constituted 9 percent of the impaired drivers involved in collisions, 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 7 of the 18 (39 percent) youthful drivers killed were wearing a seat belt.
- Collisions involving youthful drivers cost Idahoans over \$307 million in 2003. This represents 18 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Youthful Drivers on Idaho Highways, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Collisions Involving Drivers 15-19	7,258	7,490	6,910	6,961	6,713	-1.8%
Fatalities	66	48	64	45	37	-10.4%
Serious Injuries	463	437	431	416	328	-7.9%
Visible Injuries	1,632	1,665	1,456	1,564	1,343	-4.3%
Possible Injuries	2,382	2,341	2,164	2,415	2,276	-0.9%
Drivers 15-19 in Fatal & Serious Injury Collisions	395	399	368	367	296	-6.6%
% of all Drivers involved in Fatal and Serious Injury Collisions	15.9%	16.0%	16.1%	14.7%	12.9%	-4.9%
Licensed Drivers 15-19	77,943	79,353	69,812	67,050	65,605	-4.1%
% of Total Licensed Drivers	8.8%	8.9%	7.7%	7.4%	7.1%	-5.3%
Over Representation (Involvement)*	1.80	1.81	2.07	1.99	1.82	0.8%
Drivers 15-19 - Fatal Collisions	64	47	51	40	31	-15.5%
Impaired Drivers 15-19 - Fatal Collisions	11	8	12	8	6	-8.9%
% of Youthful Drivers that were Impaired in Fatal Collisions	17.2%	17.0%	23.5%	20.0%	19.4%	4.8%

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

Safety Restraints

The Problem

- In 2003, only 72 percent of Idahoans were using seat belts, based on seat belt survey observations.
- In 2003, seat belt usage varied by region around the state from a high of 79 percent in District 3 (southwestern Idaho) to a low of 53 percent in District 5 (southeastern Idaho).
- Only 37 percent of the individuals killed in passenger cars, pickups, and vans were wearing a seat belt in 2003. Seatbelts are estimated to be 50 percent effective in preventing serious and fatal injuries. By this estimate, we can deduce that 89 lives were saved in Idaho in 2003 because they were wearing a seat belt and an additional 75 lives could have been saved if everyone had worn their seat belt.
- There were 5 children under the age of 4 killed (3 were restrained) and 13 were seriously injured (11 were restrained) while riding in passenger vehicles in 2003. The NHTSA estimates that child safety seats are 69 percent effective in reducing fatalities and serious injuries. By this estimate we can deduce that child safety seats could have saved 1 of the 2 unrestrained children killed in 2003. Additionally, 1 of the 2 unrestrained serious injuries may have been prevented if they had all been properly restrained

Occupant Protection in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Observational Seat Belt Survey						
District 1	52%	62%	58%	71%	77%	10.7%
District 2	58%	57%	57%	68%	74%	6.6%
District 3	65%	62%	65%	63%	79%	5.6%
District 4	42%	46%	51%	54%	59%	8.9%
District 5	45%	47%	54%	55%	53%	4.5%
District 6	52%	52%	56%	58%	59%	3.5%
Statewide Average	58%	59%	60%	63%	72%	5.6%
Seat Belt Use - Age 4 and Older Cars, Pickups, Vans and SUV's						
In Fatal Collisions	22.8%	28.7%	29.7%	37.5%	37.2%	13.7%
In Serious Injury Collisions	50.0%	49.7%	51.0%	57.6%	58.4%	4.1%
Self Reported Child Restraint Use in Cars, Pickups, Vans and SUV's	77.9%	81.7%	82.7%	85.5%	86.2%	2.6%

*The observational seat belt survey was revised in 1998 to meet national guidelines. The survey was completely redesigned including both site selection and analysis methods. Comparing surveys prior to 1998 and surveys done in 1998 and after should be done with this caveat in mind.

Aggressive Driving

The Definition

- Aggressive driving behaviors include: Failure to Yield Right of Way, Following Too Close, Passed Stop Sign, Disregarded Signal, Exceeded Posted Speed, and Driving Too Fast for Conditions.
- Aggressive driving collisions 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 collisions 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.
- Drivers, ages 19 and younger, are nearly 4 times as likely to be involved in an aggressive driving collision as all other drivers.
- Aggressive driving collisions cost Idahoans nearly \$917 million in 2003. This represented 54 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Aggressive Driving in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Aggressive Driving Collisions	14,817	15,388	15,398	15,066	14,649	-0.3%
Fatalities	147	120	128	138	128	-2.8%
Serious Injuries	1,043	951	949	963	838	-5.1%
Visible Injuries	3,256	3,358	3,254	3,223	2,895	-2.8%
Possible Injuries	4,721	4,807	4,770	5,023	5,065	1.8%
Number of Traffic Fatalities and Serious Injuries Involving:*						
Driving Too Fast for Conditions	459	395	359	357	311	-9.1%
Fail to Yield Right of Way	410	344	356	373	353	-3.3%
Exceeded Posted Speed	174	188	202	184	133	-5.3%
Passed Stop Sign	130	74	122	127	97	0.6%
Following Too Close	103	104	127	106	95	-1.0%
Disregarded Signal	67	75	48	44	53	-3.0%
Aggressive Driving Fatal and Serious Injury Rate per 100 Million AVM T	8.31	7.80	7.53	7.70	6.71	-5.0%

* Three contributing circumstances possible per unit involved in each collision

Pedestrians and Bicyclists

The Problem

- In 2003, 13 pedestrians and 2 bicyclists were killed in traffic collisions. The 15 bicyclists and pedestrians killed represented 5 percent of all fatalities in Idaho.
- Children, ages 4 to 14, accounted for 26 percent of the fatalities and injuries sustained in pedestrian collisions and 34 percent of the fatalities and injuries sustained in bicycle collisions.
- Collisions involving pedestrians and bicyclists cost Idahoans over \$81 million dollars in 2003. This represents 5 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Pedestrians and Bicyclists Involved in Collisions in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Pedestrian Collisions	181	198	175	199	213	4.6%
Fatalities	14	6	12	15	13	13.6%
Serious Injuries	59	60	53	53	51	-3.4%
Visible Injuries	74	77	68	96	91	7.1%
Possible Injuries	38	64	54	41	65	21.8%
Pedestrians in Collisions	185	210	190	208	223	5.2%
Pedestrian Fatal and Serious Injuries	73	66	65	68	64	-3.1%
% of All Fatal and Serious Injuries	3.5%	3.3%	3.5%	3.4%	3.4%	-0.7%
Impaired Pedestrian F&SI	8	4	15	13	13	52.9%
% of Pedestrian F&SI - Impaired	11.0%	6.1%	23.1%	19.1%	20.3%	56.3%
Bicycle Collisions	354	334	274	314	319	-1.9%
Fatalities	4	3	2	3	2	-10.4%
Serious Injuries	53	49	44	51	36	-7.8%
Visible Injuries	197	190	161	170	186	-1.0%
Possible Injuries	101	93	70	92	92	-0.3%
Bicyclists in Collisions	364	338	283	326	324	-2.2%
Bicycle Fatal and Serious Injuries	57	52	46	54	38	-8.1%
% of All Fatal and Serious Injuries	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	2.7%	2.0%	-6.5%
Bicyclists Wearing Helmets in Collisions	46	49	31	39	49	5.3%
% of Bicyclists Wearing Helmets	12.6%	14.5%	11.0%	12.0%	15.1%	6.5%
Impaired Bicyclist F&SI	3	2	1	3	1	12.5%
% of Bicycle F&SI - Impaired	5.3%	3.8%	2.2%	5.6%	2.6%	8.1%

Prepared by: Office of Traffic and Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Report 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 \$750.

Roadway Safety / Traffic Records

The Problem

- Much of the process of capturing and storing data at the law enforcement level and transferring data to the Office of Traffic and Highway Safety is time consuming and costly.
- The quality of certain data elements in the database varies, often prohibiting useful analysis. For example, blood alcohol content for many drivers is missing even though the law enforcement officer indicated that alcohol was involved.
- Widespread use and analysis of the collision data among local agencies is limited because of the need for training and the costs associated with the current analysis software.
- Collision reports are filled out inconsistently because of a lack of thorough training of the hundreds of law enforcement officers across the state in completing the collision report form.

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 collision. Improved post-crash victim care reduces the severity of trauma incurred by collision 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 Medical Services in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Collisions	25,076	26,241	26,090	26,477	26,700	1.6%
EM S Response to Fatal & Injury Collisions	3,972	4,124	4,142	4,842	6,282	12.7%
% of Fatal & Injury Collisions	41.8%	42.8%	43.8%	48.8%	63.3%	11.5%
Persons Injured in Collisions	14,069	14,276	14,021	14,762	14,601	1.0%
Injured Transported from Rural Areas	2,401	3,536	3,332	3,596	3,567	12.2%
Injured Transported from Urban Areas	3,739	2,637	2,577	2,732	2,570	-7.9%
Total Injured Transported by EM S	6,140	6,173	5,909	6,328	6,137	0.1%
% of Injured Transported	43.6%	43.2%	42.1%	42.9%	42.0%	-0.9%
Trapped and Extricated	546	578	576	583	554	0.4%
Fatal and Serious Injuries Transported by Helicopter	148	184	226	243	280	17.5%

Single-Vehicle Collisions

The Problem

- In 2003, 32 percent of all collisions involved a single-vehicle. The majority of these collisions (78 percent) occurred on rural roadways.
- Single-vehicle collisions resulted in 55 percent of all fatalities in Idaho. Impaired Driving was a factor in 47 percent of the 148 fatal single-vehicle crashes.
- Overturning was attributed as the most harmful event in 73 percent of the single-vehicle collisions. Single-vehicle rollovers were responsible for nearly two-thirds of the single-vehicle fatalities and more than one-third of all fatalities in 2003. Of the 107 people killed in single-vehicle rollovers, 84 (more than 3 out of every 4) were not wearing a seat belt.
- Single-vehicle collisions cost Idahoans over \$786 million in 2003. This represents 46 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Crashes on Idaho Highways Involving One Vehicle, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Single Vehicle Collisions	7,629	8,139	8,156	8,190	8,527	2.9%
Fatalities	139	147	140	114	161	5.9%
Serious Injuries	728	712	640	684	684	-1.4%
Visible Injuries	1,921	1,889	1,882	1,852	1,768	-2.0%
Possible Injuries	1,619	1,660	1,617	1,752	1,959	5.0%
Location of Collisions						
Rural	6,088	6,432	6,224	6,457	6,690	2.4%
Urban	1,541	1,706	1,932	1,733	1,837	4.9%
Impaired Single Vehicle Collisions	926	1,017	938	1,044	1,062	3.8%
% of All Single Vehicle Crashes	12.1%	12.5%	11.5%	12.7%	12.5%	0.9%
Youthful Driver Single Vehicle Collisions	1,591	1,724	1,503	1,520	1,576	0.1%
% of All Single Vehicle Crashes	20.9%	21.2%	18.4%	18.6%	18.5%	-2.8%
Aggressive* Single Vehicle Collisions	3,096	3,442	3,525	3,288	3,248	1.4%
% of All Single Vehicle Crashes	40.6%	42.3%	43.2%	40.1%	38.1%	-1.5%

* Aggressive Driving includes: Failure To Yield Right of Way, Passed Stop Sign, Exceeded Posted Speed, Driving Too Fast for Conditions, Following Too Close, and Disregarded Signal.

Prepared by: Office of Traffic and Highway Safety, Idaho Transportation Department. Report 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 \$750.

Motorcyclists

The Problem

- In 2003, motorcycle collisions represented just over 1.6 percent of the total number of collisions, yet accounted for over 8 percent of the total number of fatalities and serious injuries.
- Just over half (54 percent) of all motorcycle collisions involved a single vehicle, while 58 percent of fatal motorcycle collisions involved a single vehicle.
- Idaho code requires all motorcycle operators and passengers under the age of 18 to wear a helmet. In 2003, only 13 of the 24 (54 percent) motorcycle drivers and passengers, under the age of 18 and involved in collisions, were wearing helmets.
- The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates helmets are 29 percent effective in preventing motorcycle fatalities. In 2003, only 26 percent of motorcyclists killed in collisions were wearing helmets.
- Motorcycle collisions cost Idahoans over \$72 million dollars in 2003. This represents 4 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Motorcycle Collisions in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Motorcycle Collisions	251	363	380	403	437	15.9%
Fatalities	12	18	19	11	19	21.5%
Serious Injuries	94	117	102	130	139	11.5%
Visible Injuries	107	171	207	185	178	16.6%
Possible Injuries	45	57	75	73	99	22.8%
Motorcyclists in Collisions	290	422	457	465	500	15.8%
Registered Motorcycles	40,968	42,165	39,434	43,245	46,935	3.7%
Motorcyclists Wearing Helmets	98	151	162	175	193	19.9%
% Motorcyclists Wearing Helmets	33.8%	35.8%	35.4%	37.6%	38.6%	3.4%

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 2003, 43 people died in collisions with commercial motor vehicles. This represents 15 percent of all motor vehicle fatalities in Idaho. Of the persons killed in collisions with commercial motor vehicles, 77 percent were occupants of passenger cars, vans, sport utility vehicles, and pickup trucks.
- In 2003, 57 percent of all collisions and 85 percent of all fatal collisions 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.
- The majority of commercial motor vehicle collisions (40 percent) occurred on local roadways, while the majority of fatal commercial motor vehicle collisions (53 percent) occurred on U.S. and State highways.
- Commercial motor vehicles collisions cost Idahoans nearly \$188 million in 2003. This represents 11 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Commercial Motor Vehicle Collisions in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Collisions	1,868	1,878	1,893	1,766	1,704	-2.2%
Fatalities	36	29	41	37	43	7.1%
Serious Injuries	126	125	145	151	134	2.0%
Visible Injuries	314	269	352	274	301	1.1%
Possible Injuries	364	371	371	411	349	-0.6%
Commercial AVM T (millions)	2,411	2,373	2,516	2,543	2,543	1.4%
% of Total AVM T	16.8%	17.3%	17.6%	17.8%	17.7%	1.2%
Fatalities per 100 Million CAVMT	1.49	1.22	1.63	1.45	1.69	5.2%
Injuries per 100 Million CAVMT	33.34	32.24	34.49	32.87	30.83	-1.8%

Collisions with Trains

The Problem

- Train-vehicle collisions are rare, yet are often very severe when they occur. Of the 15 collisions in 2003, 6 (40 percent) resulted in an injury or fatality.
- The majority of train-vehicle collisions occur in rural areas. Rural railroad crossings typically do not have crossing arms or flashing lights to indicate an approaching train.
- Collisions with trains cost Idahoans over \$10 million in 2003. This represents less than 1 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Vehicle Collisions with Trains in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Train Collisions	17	23	16	12	15	1.2%
Fatalities	1	7	1	1	3	178.6%
Serious Injuries	4	1	3	1	4	89.6%
Visible Injuries	3	3	11	3	1	31.8%
Possible Injuries	5	0	5	0	0	-125.0%
Location of Collisions						
Rural Roads	12	17	11	11	9	-3.0%
Urban Roads	5	6	5	1	6	105.8%

Mature Drivers

The Problem

- Mature drivers, drivers over the age of 65, were involved in 3,303 collisions in 2003. This represents 12 percent of the total number of collisions. Collisions involving mature drivers resulted in 16 percent of the total number of fatalities in 2003.
- Mature drivers are underrepresented in fatal and injury crashes. Drivers over the age of 65 represent just over 14 percent of licensed drivers, but represent just under 8 percent of drivers in fatal and injury collisions.
- National research indicates drivers and passengers over the age of 75 are more likely than younger persons to sustain injuries or death in traffic collisions due to their physical fragility.
- Collisions involving drivers, age 65 and older, cost Idahoans nearly \$246 million dollars in 2003. This represents 14 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

Collisions Involving Mature Drivers in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total Mature Driver Collisions	3,257	3,293	3,271	3,286	3,303	0.4%
Fatalities	45	49	49	47	46	0.7%
Serious Injuries	253	210	198	246	214	-2.9%
Visible Injuries	662	629	655	663	603	-2.2%
Possible Injuries	940	974	927	1,023	1,056	3.1%
Mature Drivers in Fatal & Injury Crashes	1,291	1,311	1,246	1,324	1,310	0.4%
% of All Drivers in Fatal & Injury Crashes	8.0%	8.1%	7.7%	7.8%	7.7%	-0.7%
Licensed Drivers 65 & Older	120,939	120,516	124,434	128,458	132,306	2.3%
% of Total Licensed Drivers	13.7%	13.5%	13.8%	14.1%	14.3%	1.0%
Involvement of Drivers 65 & Older*	0.58	0.60	0.56	0.55	0.54	-1.7%
Mature Drivers-Fatal Collisions	41	42	49	44	44	2.2%
Mature Drivers-Impaired Fatal Collisions	1	6	4	1	5	197.9%
% Fatal Impaired Collisions	2.4%	14.3%	8.2%	2.3%	11.4%	192.7%

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

School Bus Collisions

The Problem

- School bus collisions are rare, but when they occur they have the potential of producing many injuries, as evidenced by a crash in 2001 resulted in the death of the driver and 18 visible injuries to the other occupants of the school bus and by a crash in 2003 that resulted in 31 visible injuries. Typically, however, occupants of vehicles that collided with the school buses sustain most of the injuries and fatalities.
- There was one incident in 2003 involving a child that had exited a school bus. However, the school bus had left the scene when the child ran into the street without looking and ran into the side of a passing vehicle. Otherwise, there have not been any instances of children being hit by vehicles while entering or leaving a school bus in at least the last 10 years.
- Collisions with school buses cost Idahoans nearly \$3 million in 2003. This represents less than 1 percent of the total economic cost of collisions.

School Bus Collisions in Idaho, 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. Yearly Change 1999-2003
Total School Bus Collisions	48	45	93	64	74	21.2%
Fatalities	1	0	3	1	0	-25.0%
Serious Injuries	3	3	2	1	0	-45.8%
Visible Injuries	3	15	38	11	40	186.5%
Possible Injuries	22	46	43	36	31	18.1%

OFFICE OF TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY SAFETY



HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANT

Request for Proposal

Federal Fiscal Year 2006

Each year, the Office of Traffic and Highway Safety (OTHS) awards grants to state and local governmental units to help solve Idaho's most critical traffic safety problems. Projects that are considered for funding usually address highway safety problems in one or more of these focus areas: safety restraint use, impaired driving, aggressive driving, youthful drivers, roadway safety/traffic records, emergency medical services, and bicycle and pedestrian safety. Other highway safety problem areas will also be considered.

The highway safety grant year is the Federal Fiscal Year which begins October 1st and runs through September 30th. 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 moneys may also be used for 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. Successful projects in their second or third year normally receive priority. Consideration is then given to new applicants that **show the greatest potential for crash or injury reduction or system improvement.**

Highway safety projects typically require the grantee agency to 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 cash or resources that 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 from the Office of Traffic and Highway Safety 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 OTHS does not fund the purchase of vehicles.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE FOCUS AREAS AND EXAMPLES OF PROJECTS THAT HAVE BEEN FUNDED:

Safety Restraint Use: The overall goal of the Safety Restraint Program Area is to reduce deaths and serious injuries from motor vehicle crashes by increasing the proper use of seat belts, booster seats, and child safety seats. Projects may include a combination of safety restraint law enforcement, public awareness programs, purchase of speed detection equipment to determine probable cause for traffic stops, 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 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 enforcement activities to increase program effectiveness.

Impaired Driving: The goal of this program area is to remove alcohol and other drug-impaired drivers from the roads. A project may include 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 DUI arrest system equipment, training for judges and prosecutors, probation programs for repeat offenders, and education programs like alcohol server training, designated driver awareness, underage consumption outreach and enforcement, and DUI courts. The OTHS 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, Safe Community Programs, 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: The goal of this program area is to reduce the number of injury and fatal crashes by 15-19 year old drivers. Emphasis is on education, prevention, and enforcement activities directed toward youth grades K-12 and college undergraduates. Agencies are encouraged to work with local teen populations—including youth who are working community service for impaired driving offenses, or youth participating in Idaho Drug Free Youth (IDFY) programs, Safe and Drug Free Schools, student governments, and other student organizations dedicated to safety—to create a comprehensive program where teens change the driving behavior of others teens. The OTHS urges agencies to think creatively and work closely with the OTHS when developing a youth program.

Roadway Safety/Traffic Records: The goal of this program area is to improve the safety of the roadway and environment, with special emphasis on the support of record systems that aid in identifying existing and emerging traffic safety problems and evaluating program performance. Roadway projects might include funds to develop and implement systems and procedures for carrying out safety construction and operation improvements; develop guidelines and methods of highway design, construction, and maintenance related to safety issues; upgrade skills of highway personnel; and develop plans for conducting traffic engineering services. Traffic record projects might include enhancements to the crash analysis capability of the Internet version of the Crash Analysis and Reporting System (WebCARS), enhancements in crash data collection and reporting through Idaho's Mobile Program for Accident Collection 2000 (IMPACT 2K), or improvements to traffic safety data systems.

Emergency Medical Services: 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 hydraulic extrication equipment.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety: The overall goal of this program is to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries by reducing bicycle and pedestrian crashes through education, equipment, and providing direction and support for local communities. Emphasis is on public awareness materials and safety equipment, targeting school-age children, teens through adult, or a statewide campaign designed to reach all age groups.

Other: This category includes all other potential focus areas such as mature driver, motorcycle, train, school bus crashes, work zone safety, etc. The goal of any project in this category must be to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries in Idaho.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. *Grant awards can only be made to local and state governmental entities within Idaho.*
2. There must be a demonstrable highway safety crash, fatality, serious injury, and/or systems problem. Data must be provided to demonstrate need.
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 the attached Letter of Intent and have it postmarked no later than February 28, 2005. Faxed Letters of Intent must be received no later than 5:00 PM MST on February 28, 2005. Electronic versions of our forms can be found by going to our Web site at <http://itd.idaho.gov/ohs/> and then clicking on *Highway Safety Programs*. Proposals may be mailed or faxed to:

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

Feel free to contact the Office of Traffic and Highway Safety at (208) 334-8100 for questions or assistance.

4. Describe Proposed Activities to Reduce Safety Problem Identified in #3 (#4 can be completed on separate paper and attached):

5. Proposed Budget (describe in detail the expenses you anticipate):

a. Personnel Costs (salary, benefits, travel, etc)	Agency Match	Grant Funds
(Example: Salary \$ + benefits \$ X _____ hours X _____ officers = _____. If claiming benefits, be sure to use the correct rates as overtime benefit rates are lower than regular time benefits.)		
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
b. Contractual		
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
c. Commodities and Public Information Materials		
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
d. Direct Costs (Equipment, etc.)		
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
TOTALS	\$ _____	\$ _____