



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LANSING

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

KIRK T. STEUDLE
DIRECTOR

December 17, 2009

Mr. John D. Niemela
County Road Association of Michigan
P.O. Box 12067
Lansing, Michigan 48901-2067

Mr. David Worthams
Transportation Environmental Affairs
Michigan Municipal League
320 N. Washington Sq., Ste. 110
Lansing, Michigan 48933-1288

Dear Mr. Niemela and Mr. Worthams:

Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act
A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)
Fiscal Years 2012 Federal High Risk Rural Roads Program

The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) is pleased to announce that we are soliciting new candidate project applications for fiscal year (FY) 2012 High Risk Rural Road (HRRR) program. Federal funds for the HRRR program are derived from SAFETEA-LU and continuation of the next federal highway bill. The FY 2012 budget for this program is estimated to be \$3,000,000 federal for each fiscal year. This amount may be subject to revisions based on approval of the future federal highway bill. We are asking the County Road Association of Michigan and the Michigan Municipal League to distribute this notice to their member agencies.

MDOT will be programming projects for FY 2012 with the current call for projects. Local agencies are allowed to submit more than one project for consideration. Agencies submitting multiple projects should submit a prioritized list for consideration. If you have a specific year which you want your project selected for, please denote this on your application, otherwise your project will be programmed in order of the project's priority amongst the overall program project submittals. Selected HRRR projects are to be obligated in the fiscal year which the project is selected.

SAFETEA-LU defines a HRRR as; 1) any roadway functionally classified as rural major or minor collector or a rural local road that the accident rate for fatalities and incapacitating injuries exceeds the statewide average for those functional classes of roadway, or 2) any roadway functionally classified as rural major or minor collector or a rural local road that will likely have increases in traffic volumes that are likely to create an accident rate for fatalities and incapacitating injuries that exceeds the statewide average for those functional classes of roadway.

Mr. John D. Niemela
Mr. David Worthams
December 17, 2009

MDOT has used the following data to determine the required statewide average accident rate:

75,977	Total miles of roadway functionally classified as rural major or minor collector or rural local road.
9,999	Total number of crashes resulting in fatalities or incapacitating injuries, located on roadway classified as described above, for the time period 2003 – 2007.
0.14	Statewide average frequency of such accidents per mile of such roadway over a 5 year time period.

The FY 2012 project eligibility requirements for the HRRR program are:

1. The roadway is functionally classified as rural major or minor collector or rural local road.
2. Within the most recent 5 year time period of available crash data, at least 1 intersection crash, resulting in fatalities (K) or incapacitating (A) injuries has occurred; or 1 such serious crash has occurred within a 7.14 mile (1/0.14) long segment of such roadway. With the most recent 5 year period of time, all UD-10s having 'K' or 'A' injuries and any other UD-10s of lesser degree of severity, that support the scope of project work, shall be included with the project's application. Proposed projects with higher crash concentrations of 'K' and/or 'A' crashes may receive a higher priority than other projects.

Other program requirements:

1. Selected projects are to be obligated in the fiscal year which the project was selected. FY 2012 projects will need to be developed and obligated between October 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012. Please note that final plans, specifications, and estimate must be given to MDOT by these dates, as well as any required clearances such as ROW, permits, environmental, etc.
2. Federal funds shall not exceed \$400,000.00 per project.
3. The proposed projects must demonstrate a direct correlation to correct an area related to the fatal or incapacitating crashes. The proposed project limits must be relevant to the roadway features attributable to the crashes, and are subject to approval by MDOT.

Program administrative procedures for FY 2012:

1. The construction phase only is eligible for federal aid except as specified in item #6. Federal funds shall not exceed \$400,000.00 per project. HRRR projects may also be capped at the lesser of the original estimate plus \$20,000 or the original estimate plus 20 percent. Projects may, at MDOT's discretion, be funded by a "Pro-Rata" or "Lump Sum" method. Please see http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,1607,7-151-9625_25885_27578---,00.html to review information on the "Pro-Rata" or "Lump Sum"

Mr. John D. Niemela
Mr. David Worthams
December 17, 2009

funding methods. Right of way and construction engineering are not eligible for these funds. Design Engineering costs are also not eligible for these funds except as listed in Item #6 and #7 below. Projects are federally funded at 90 percent, with a 10 percent local match, or funded with 100 percent federal funds for projects consisting entirely of traffic control signalization, safety, pavement marking, rail-highway crossing closure, or installation of traffic signs, traffic lights, guardrails, impact attenuators, concrete barrier end treatments, breakaway utility poles, or priority control systems.

2. Projects may be let through MDOT, or by local force account, as approved by our office. Force account work shall follow the Local Agency guidelines for "Construction by Non-Competitive Bid Contract" which can be viewed on the MDOT/Local Agency website at http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,1607,7-151-9625_25885_40414---,00.html.
3. Eligible projects must meet current ADA requirements, standards and warrants. All improvements must address the probable cause of the crash(es) in the project area. The proposed project limits must also address concerns in the area of the crash. Proposed work outside the vicinity of the crashes will be reviewed to ensure the HRRR funds are spent according to the intent of SAFETEA-LU. Examples of low cost projects can be found at www.atssa.com.
4. All project candidates should be postmarked no later than **Friday, March 19, 2010**. Projects postmarked after March 19, 2010, at MDOT's discretion, may or may not be reviewed for funding based on the strength of other submitted projects and the availability of funds. Projects are reviewed and approved by committee and selected based on criteria which include:
 - a. Submit crash history with supporting UD-10s for all 'K', 'A' and 'B' crashes and for any other lesser severity of injuries that supports the scope of work for the area, within the most current 5 year period of available data.
 - b. Accident analysis to determine the proposed project's scope.
 - c. Crash concentration in the proposed project's limits.
 - d. Existing condition and character of proposed work.
 - e. Factors to determine the future increased traffic volume anticipated to cause crashes (if applicable).
 - f. Overall safety benefits of the proposed work, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines, and Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD) warrants.
 - g. Ability to deliver a construction package for obligation within this fiscal year.
 - h. Project coordination with other construction projects.
 - i. Past history of delivering safety projects in the year the project was selected.
 - j. Completion of the enclosed MDOT Form #1627 (10/08). This form can also be found on the MDOT/Local Agency web site at:

<http://mdotwas1.mdot.state.mi.us/public/webforms/>

Mr. John D. Niemela
Mr. David Worthams
December 17, 2009

- k. A Time of Return (TOR) analysis and/or a Benefit to Cost (B/C) Analysis, with supporting documentation and calculations supplied to MDOT.
5. At a minimum, the suggested format for project consideration is an engineering report that clearly identifies the route, location (township(s)/municipalities), project termini, existing and proposed cross sections, plan views or profiles if applicable, estimated project cost and each of the criteria listed above. A map must be included with the report which clearly identifies the location of the proposed project. Pictures, graphics, preliminary plans, etc. included in the engineering report can also be used as supporting evidence and are encouraged.

Enclosed is a sheet listing MDOT accepted crash reduction factors for commonly submitted scopes of work. Also listed are acceptable reference sources for obtaining crash reduction factors for projects with scopes of work that are not provided. This enclosure is posted on the MDOT/Local Agency web site, under the Safety/HRRR tab.

For TOR and/or B/C analysis calculations, MDOT will be using the 2007 National Safety Council average economic costs for motor vehicle injuries. The following injuries will be counted separately: 'K', 'A', and 'B' type injuries, while 'C' and 'PDO' type injuries will be counted as a 'PDO' type injury. This information can be found at http://www.nsc.org/news_resources/injury_and_death_statistics/Pages/EstimatingtheCostofUnintentionalInjuries.aspx. MDOT has an Excel spreadsheet available for calculating Time of Returns and Benefit/Cost analysis. If you have any questions or would like to obtain a copy of MDOT's Excel spreadsheet for calculating Time of Returns and Benefit/Cost analysis, please contact Jim D'Lamater at (517) 335-2224 or email at dlamaterj@michigan.gov.

6. A Federal Highway Administration website contains reports provided by the states in response to a federal requirement to describe at least 5 percent of the locations in each state currently exhibiting the most severe highway safety needs, in accordance with Sections 148(c)(1)(D) and 148(g)(3)(A), of Title 23, *United States Code*. This website (go to <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/fivepercent/> and then select "Michigan") currently has the 2006 - 2009 5 Percent Reports. In addition to funding the construction project in the areas listed on the 2006 - 2009 5 Percent Reports, MDOT will also consider funding preliminary engineering up to 10 percent of the estimated eligible construction costs to be participating costs (100% Federal or 90% Federal / 10% Local, corresponding with the applicable construction phase cost splits). Projects that are on the 5 Percent Report must be clearly identified and the estimated preliminary engineering costs listed in the application if the agency desires to have the preliminary engineering costs funded.

Mr. John D. Niemela
Mr. David Worthams
December 17, 2009

7. MDOT will consider funding 50 percent of the preliminary engineering costs, for projects that have been reviewed and identified by the MDOT – Local Safety Initiative (LSI) program. The maximum amount of preliminary engineering that MDOT will consider as eligible as a participating cost shall not exceed 10 percent of the estimated eligible construction costs. Eligible projects must be on the MDOT LSI written suggestion list and shall have a copy of this list included with the project application.
8. If there are any social, economic and environmental impacts within the project limits, all impacts must be mitigated before federal funds can be appropriated and obligated. Project applications which have significant negative responses from the public or controversial and/or may require an environmental assessment will not be considered until all outstanding issues have been resolved.
- 9 The local agency must be willing to submit a project evaluation form with benefit/cost analysis to show the effectiveness of the project after three (3) years of accident data are available after project construction. MDOT Form #1626 can be utilized to complete this evaluation.

Once projects are selected, local agencies within MPO areas must coordinate with their MPO to ensure inclusion of their project in the area's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Those agencies that are part of a rural task force should notify their members that they are applying for these funds. Rural task force approval is not necessary. Local Agency Programs will coordinate with MDOT Planning to ensure these projects are included in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Each application is evaluated based on the criteria listed above on a project by project basis and funding availability.

Local agencies are to submit eligible projects and supporting information by March 19, 2010, to the following:

Mr. Jim D'Lamater, P.E., Safety Engineer
Design Division, Local Agency Programs Unit
425 W. Ottawa Street, P.O. Box 30050
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7550

Depending upon funding availability and project selection, announcements will be made as soon as possible with notifications and project programming instructions sent to each of the local agencies. Our goal is to maintain a fiscally constrained program while maximizing the use of available federal funds.

Mr. John D. Niemela
Mr. David Worthams
December 17, 2009

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jim D'Lamater, P.E., at (517) 335-2224 or at dlamaterj@michigan.gov.

Sincerely,



Rudolph S. Cadena, P.E.
Local Agency Programs Engineer
Local Agency Programs

for Bradley C. Wieferrich
Engineer of Design

Enclosure

cc: Dave Morena, FHWA
Brad Wieferrich, MDOT
Marsha Small, MDOT
Dale R. Lighthizer, MDOT
Jim Culp, MDOT
Jim D'Lamater, MDOT
MDOT Region Engineers
MDOT TSC Managers
Metropolitan Planning Organizations
Rural Task Forces
MDOT LAP Listserv Members

LOCAL AGENCY PROGRAMS SAFETY PROJECT SUBMITTAL FORM

FUNDING TEMPLATE:

FISCAL YEAR:

LOCAL AGENCY		LOCAL AGENCY CONTACT	
PHONE NO.	FAX NO.	EMAIL ADDRESS	
ALTERNATIVE CONTACT		PHONE NO.	FAX NO.
EMAIL ADDRESS		HOUSE DISTRICT	SENATE DISTRICT

PROPOSED PROJECT LOCATION, LIMITS AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROPOSED COST	TIME OF RETURN (YEARS)	IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY (CHECK THE CATEGORY THAT APPLIES) Intersection Improvements Roadway and Structure Improvements Roadside Improvements Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Other _____
BENEFIT TO COST RATIO	TOWNSHIP/CITY	
PLEASE LIST THE CRASH REDUCTION FACTORS USED:		
DOES A PROJECT IMPACT A SCHOOL OR OTHER SENSITIVE ORGANIZATION? PLEASE DESCRIBE:		

ROADWAY DATA

CROSS ROAD DATA (If an intersection improvement)

PRIMARY ROUTE NAME		ROUTE NAME	
ADT		ADT	
PERCENT COMMERCIAL	*NO. OF CRASHES	PERCENT COMMERCIAL	*NO. OF CRASHES
* NO. OF FATAL CRASHES	*NO. OF "A" TYPE CRASHES	*NO. OF FATAL CRASHES	*NO. OF "A" TYPE CRASHES
*PERIOD OF CRASH DATA	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	*PERIOD OF CRASH DATA	FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

*Please attach Crash Summary and UD-10's to your project submittal with the most recent 5 years of available data.

EXPLANATION OF HOW THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT WILL IMPROVE SAFETY AND REDUCE CRASHES

HAS YOUR LOCAL AGENCY RECEIVED APPROVAL OF A SAFETY PROJECT OR HRRR PROJECT THROUGH MDOT'S LAP UNIT IN THE PAST 5 YEARS?

YES NO SAFETY PROJECT HRRR PROJECT

IF YES, HAVE ALL PROJECTS BEEN COMPLETED?

YES NO

IF NO, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY

OTHER PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS

INTERSECTION CRASH REDUCTION FACTORS		
Proposed Improvement	% Reduction	Associated Crash Types
Signal Timing / Hardware Enhancements		
All-Red Clearance Interval - Add per ITE recommendations	10%	All Crash Types
Rural Box Span Signal - Upgrade from Stop Control	75%	Angle
	40%	All other Crashes
Urban Box Span Signal - Upgrade from Stop Control	65%	Angle
	20%	All other Crashes
Box Span Signal - Upgrade from Diagonal Span	10%	All Crashes
Left-Turn Signal Phase - Add	30%	Left-Turn
Signal Head Size - Increase to 12 "	10%	All Crash Types
Signal Optimization & Timing Updates	10%	All Crash Types
Yellow-Change Interval - Increase	10%	All Crash Types
Pedestrian / Bicycle Enhancements		
Bump Out / Curb Extension - Remove Parking / Install	30%	All Crashes
Bicycle Lanes - Install per standards	25%	Bicycle Crashes
Intersection Lighting - Install	30%	Pedestrian Fatal and A-Injuries
	20%	Other Crashes
Ped. Countdown Signals - Install w/o existing signal	30%	Pedestrian, Bicycle
Ped. Countdown Signals - Upgrade from existing signal	25%	Pedestrian, Bicycle
Sidewalk for Pedestrians - Construct	85%	Pedestrian Crashes
Intersection Geometric Enhancements		
Bump Out / Curb Extension - Remove Parking / Install	30%	All Crashes
Center Left-Turn Lane - Construct	80%	Rear-End, Left-Turn
	50%	Head-On Left-Turn
	20%	Head-On, Angle, Other
	15%	Non Left-Turn Rear-End
Intersection Improvements (Realignment, Sight-Distance Improvements, Radii Improvements, Etc.)	30%	Angle
	15%	Rear-End
	10%	Head-On, Sideswipe, Pedestrian, Bicycle, Left-Turn Related
Offset Left-Turn Lanes	10%	Head-On Crashes
Right-Turn Lane - Construct	65%	Rear-End Right-Turn
	20%	Non Right-Turn Rear-End, Sideswipe Same Direction
Roundabout - Refer to Roundabout TOR	76% K&A	Contact Jim D'Lamater (517) 335-2224 for Roundabout TOR form
	39% Minor Crh	
General Intersection Enhancements		
All-Way Stop Control Operation at Intersection - Provide	60%	All Crash Types
Flashing Traffic Signals - Install/Upgrade	20%	All Crash Types
Intersection Lighting - Install	30%	Pedestrian Fatal and A-Injuries
	20%	Other Crashes
Reflective Sheeting on Sign Posts (lollipops)	15%	All Crashes
Ground Mounted Flashing Beacons (Red) - Install**	30%	All Crashes On Install Approach
Ground Mounted Flashing Beacons(Amber) - Install**	20%	All Crashes On Install Approach
Signing and Pavement Markings - Improve/Upgrade	30%	Angle, Rear-End
	10%	Head-On, Pedestrian

* "Other" includes and other crash which might be mitigate by the addition of a center left-turn lane in the judgment of the crash analyst

** applies with overhead flashing beacon removal

REFERENCES:

The references listed below are the sources recognized by MDOT for obtaining crash reduction factors. If you have a situation that none of these sources can provide a crash reduction factor for, please contact Jim D'Lamater 517.335.2224.

- 1) MDOT Safety Programs Unit - Crash Reduction Factors (As recommended by K. Kunde. P.E.); October, 1986
- 2) Selection Process for Local High Safety Projects, - Transportation Research Record 847: 1982
- 3) UKTRP - 85-6, University of Kentucky; March, 1985
- 4) Desktop Reference for Crash Reduction Factor, Federal Highway Administration. 2007
- 5) NCHRP Report 617: Accident Modification Factors for Traffic Engineering and ITS Improvements, TRB 2008
- 6) Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse, <http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/index.cfm>, 2008

SEGMENT CRASH REDUCTION FACTORS		
Proposed Improvement	% Reduction	Associated Crash Types
Geometric Enhancements		
Center Left-Turn Lane - Construct	80%	Rear-End, Left-Turn
	50%	Head-On Left-Turn
	20%	Head-On, Angle, Other
	15%	Non Left-Turn Rear-End
Horizontal Curve Flattening	30%	Head-On, Fixed-Object, Overturn
Increase Lane Width - Per foot	10%	All Crash Types
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width	5% per ft. **	All Crash Types
Superelevation Modification	20%	Head-On, Fixed-Object, Overturn
Vertical Curve Modification	20%	Head-On, Sideswipe
	10%	Fixed-Object, Overturn
Operational Enhancements		
Access Management - Improve	15%	Drive-way Related
Centerline Rumble Strips - Install	55%	Sideswipe Opposite, Head-On, Run-Off the Road Left Crashes
Lighting - Install on segment	20%	Night Crashes
Pavement Surface - Improve	20%	Wet Crashes
Pedestrian Refuge - Install	50%	Pedestrian Crashes
Should Rumble Strips	20%	Run-Off the Road Right Crashes
Signing/Delineation on Horizontal Curves - Install	20%	Head-On, Sideswipe, Fixed-Object, Overturn
Roadside Enhancements		
Fixed Objects From Clearzone (Trees, Culverts, Etc.) - Remove	75%	Fixed-Object
Guardrail - Install	55%	Fatalities and "A" Injuries
Sidewalk for Pedestrians - Construct	85%	Pedestrian Crashes
Slope Flattening	15%	Fixed-Object, Overturn

* "Other" includes and other crash which might be mitigate by the addition of a center left-turn lane in the judgment of the crash analyst

** 5% per foot widened each side (i.e. 3 foot shoulder on each side = 15% reduction)

REFERENCES:

The references listed below are the sources recognized by MDOT for obtaining crash reduction factors. If you have a situation that none of these sources can provide a crash reduction factor for, please contact Jim D'Lamater 517.335.2224.

- 1) MDOT Safety Programs Unit - Crash Reduction Factors (As recommended by K. Kunde. P.E.); October, 1986
- 2) *Selection Process for Local High Safety Projects*, - Transportation Research Record 847: 1982
- 3) UKTRP - 85-6, University of Kentucky; March, 1985
- 4) *Desktop Reference for Crash Reduction Factor*, Federal Highway Administration. 2007
- 5) NCHRP Report 617: *Accident Modification Factors for Traffic Engineering and ITS Improvements*, TRB 2008
- 6) Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse, <http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/index.cfm>, 2008

12/9/2009