

JONES COUNTY



Safety Action Plan

July 2025

JONES COUNTY SAFETY ACTION PLAN

Prepared for:



19501 Highway 64 East
Anamosa, IA 52205

Prepared by:

Kimley»Horn

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
767 Eustis Street
Suite 100
Saint Paul, MN 55114
651.645.4197

This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

July 2025
017842001
Jones County Safety Action Plan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Jones County employees and partners were instrumental in the development, review, and refinement of this Safety Action Plan. Iowa County Engineers Association (ICEA) and Kimley-Horn would like to express their appreciation to the supporting staff and partners for their participation and contributions. The identified partners are responsible for monitoring and implementing the plan in collaboration with ICEA and the Iowa DOT.

Iowa County Engineers Association (ICEA)

Andrew McGuire, Vice President
Brian Moore, Executive Director
Lindsey Schroeder, Grants Coordinator
Lee Bjerke, Secondary Roads Research Engineer

Consultant Team

Kimley-Horn
InTrans
LT Leon

Partners

Derek Snead, County Engineer
Brad Knudson, Jones County Public Health
Brenda Leonard, Jones County Emergency Management
Darren Hanna, Anamosa School District Superintendent
Dawn Graver, Monticello Police
Eric Werling, Anamosa Police Chief
Greg Graver, Jones County Sheriff
Jeff Swisher, Jones County Board of Supervisors
Peyton Richie, Jones County Farm Bureau
Travis McNally, Iowa State Patrol

STATUTORY NOTICE

23U.S.C. § 407: US Code - Section 407: Discovery and admission as evidence of certain reports and surveys

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential accident sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings, pursuant to sections 130, 144, and 148 of this title or for the purpose of developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented utilizing Federal-aid highway funds shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.

E. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the United States over 40,000 people lost their lives in motor vehicle crashes in 2023. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), rural fatalities account for 40 percent of all fatalities across the United States, yet less than 20 percent of the population lives in rural areas. In addition, the fatality rate on rural roads is 1.5 times higher than the fatality rate on roads in urban areas, resulting in a focus on rural road safety.

In Iowa, while county roads account for 17% of the total statewide vehicle miles of travel (VMT), they account for 78% of the mileage and 35% of the fatal and serious injury crashes. These serious crashes are overrepresented based on VMT and are spread over an extensive roadway network. County road crash patterns are typically characterized by similar types of crashes that occur at unique locations. In Jones County, there was an average of 5.6 fatal and serious injury crashes per year on approximately 850 miles of county roads between 2019-2023. Therefore, Jones County, in consultation with partners, prepared this Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (SAP) to present a holistic, well-defined strategy to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries in the county. Consistent with strategies included within Iowa's Five-Year Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) 2024-2028, this SAP identifies high-risk locations and prioritizes strategies to address them, allowing for the proactive implementation of safety countermeasures. The County has also pledged their commitment to a goal zero roadway fatalities and serious injuries by 2050. The signed pledge is included in **Appendix A**.

"Reducing rural roadway departure crashes requires an integrated, disciplined approach. A safety action plan is a powerful way to prioritize safety improvements and justify investment decisions."

A formal plan will also help to communicate more clearly with stakeholders and access funding opportunities."

FHWA - Office of Traffic Safety

E.1. Jones County

Jones County is located in northeastern Iowa and was named for George Wallace Jones, a U.S. Senator from Iowa. According to the 2020 census, the population of Jones County is 20,646. The county seat is Anamosa which is the largest city in the county and the birthplace of artist Grant Wood, most known for his painting American Gothic. Jones County contains the largest prison in the state of Iowa, Anamosa State Penitentiary. According to the Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT), the county maintains 841 miles of county roads which includes 165 miles of paved roads. From 2019 to 2023 there were 440 crashes on Jones county roads of which 28 crashes resulted in fatal and serious injuries.

E.2. Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Program

This SAP was prepared with funding from the Safe Street and Roads for All (SS4A) discretionary program as well as a local match from Iowa DOT Traffic & Safety Bureau. The Iowa County Engineers Association (ICEA), with lead applicant Mahaska County, received an SS4A planning grant to prepare SAPs for 97 counties in the state. The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) established the SS4A discretionary program to fund improvements and strategies to prevent roadway fatalities and serious injuries of all users of highways, streets, and roadways: pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, personal conveyance and micro-mobility users, and commercial vehicle operators. The SS4A program supports the U.S. Department of Transportation's (USDOT's) National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS) and a goal of zero roadway deaths using a Safe System Approach. The program includes \$5 billion in appropriated funds over five years: 2022-2026. This SAP meets eligibility requirements that allow local jurisdictions to apply for implementation grants and additional funding through the USDOT SS4A discretionary program.

E.2.1. Safe System Approach

The USDOT has adopted a Safe System Approach as the guiding paradigm to address roadway safety. The Safe System Approach has been embraced as an effective way to address and mitigate the risks inherent in our complex transportation system. It works by building and reinforcing multiple layers of protection to both prevent crashes from happening in the first place and minimize the harm caused to those involved when crashes do occur. The Safe System Approach is founded on the principles that humans make mistakes and that human bodies have limited ability to tolerate crashes. It provides a holistic and comprehensive approach to roadway safety and is governed by the framework shown in **Figure E-1** to make places safer for people. The Safe System Approach is a shift from the conventional approach to roadway safety because it focuses on both human mistakes and human vulnerability, and designs for a system with many redundancies in place to protect everyone.




Figure E-1 - USDOT Safe System Approach

E.2.2. National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS)

USDOT's NRSS is a comprehensive approach to reduce fatal and serious injuries on highways, roads, and streets. This strategy outlines the USDOT's long-term goal of reaching zero roadway fatalities, the adoption of the Safe System Approach, and actions the department will take to target urgent problems. The NRSS states that across the nation, rural roads face safety impacts that largely outnumber their relative population and number of miles traveled. This leads to a fatality rate that is approximately two times higher on rural roads than on urban roads.

E.3. What is an SAP?

A Safety Action Plan (SAP) is intended to result in holistic, well-defined strategies intended to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries within a specific locality, tribal area, or region. SAPs can take many forms; however, to be eligible for Implementation and/or Planning and Demonstration funding through the USDOT SS4A discretionary grant program, the SAP is required to be completed within the time period specified for the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) period (generally within the last five years) and must include the following two components: (1) Safety Analysis and (2) Strategy and Project Selections, as well as at least three of the following elements:

- Leadership commitment and goal setting
- Planning structure
- Engagement and collaboration
- Policy and process changes
- Progress and transparency

More information about SAPs is available on the [USDOT SS4A website](#).

This SAP uses a risk factor analysis to identify and prioritize locations for proactive safety improvements that can be implemented by the county, allowing practitioners to make informed, prioritized safety decisions. The recommendations focus on systemic transportation improvements with high crash reduction benefits and include driver-related countermeasures.

The planning process takes into consideration constraints within the local county network and incorporates feedback from the County Engineer and local stakeholders, including partners within Iowa's 5 Es of safety (Engineering, Emergency Response, Education, Enforcement, and Everyone), as shown in **Figure E-2**. While engineering improvements can make the roadways safer, engineering improvements alone cannot prevent all motor vehicle crashes.

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), over 90 percent of all crashes are the result of driver-related factors. Because such a high percentage of crashes are a result of driver-related factors, making roadways safer requires all five Es to be involved.



Figure E-2 - Iowa's Five Es of Safety

E.4. SAP Development Process

The development of this SAP includes seven primary steps as illustrated in **Figure E-3**. More detailed descriptions of the process are included in subsequent sections of this document.




Figure E-3 - SAP Project Process


E.5. Recommendations

This SAP identifies both engineering and driver-related countermeasures intended to be implemented over the next five to ten years. The following sections summarize the recommended countermeasures and improvements for Jones County.

E.5.1. Engineering Countermeasures

Systemic safety improvement projects were developed with input from the county for high-ranking roadway segments, intersections, and horizontal curves on Jones County paved roads. Each project location is shown in **Figure E-4**, and **Table E-1** provides a cost summary of the recommended projects. Detailed information for each safety countermeasure is provided in **Section 6**, as well as in **Appendix B1**, **Appendix C1**, and **Appendix D1**. Detailed information for each project is provided in **Section 6**, as well as in project sheets in **Appendix B2**, **Appendix C2**, and **Appendix D2** for roadway segments, intersections, and horizontal curves, respectively. These sheets may require updating for funding applications in future years. The County Engineer may also make changes to the prepared project sheets based on local knowledge of the site, available funding, and/or specific needs.

Jones County Safety Action Plan



Legend

- County Paved Roads
- County Unpaved Roads
- State Roads
- Corporate Limits

Locations with Project Recommendations

- County Paved Segments
- County-County/County-Other Intersections
- County-State Intersections
- County Paved Curves



Figure E-4 - Jones County Prioritized Project Locations Selection Summary

Table E-1 - Engineering Countermeasure Cost Summary

Facility Type	Number of Locations	Estimated Project Cost
Segment	13	\$7,639,000
Intersection	10	\$2,337,000
Curve	10	\$1,223,000
Total Improvement Costs	33	\$11,253,000

E.5.2. Driver-Related Countermeasures

A workshop was conducted in Jones County on Wednesday, September 4, 2024, to discuss driver related crashes occurring in the county and to identify strategies aimed at improving driver behavior to enhance road safety. A wide range of individuals were invited to the workshop, including elected officials, partner agencies that operate within the County, stakeholders representing the 5 Es of traffic safety, and the general public. The flyer used to publicize the workshop and the sign-in sheet is included in **Appendix F**. A summary of the workshop discussion is provided in **Section 5.2**. Based on these discussions, the status of implementing driver-related strategies in the county is summarized in **Table E-2**. It is recommended that the county partner with all five Es of safety to implement countermeasures that are not currently underway/ongoing and look for opportunities to introduce additional countermeasures that are not currently being implemented.

Jones County Safety Action Plan

Table E-2 - County Driver-Related Countermeasures Summary

Countermeasure	Status
Speed Related	
Conduct targeted speed enforcement	Ongoing/Opportunity
Prosecute and impose sanctions on drivers not obeying school bus stop bars	Underway/Ongoing
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Occupant Protection	
Conduct targeted enforcement of restraint use	Ongoing/Opportunity
Instruction in proper child restraint use	Underway/Ongoing
Check for proper child restraint use in all motorist encounters	Ongoing/Opportunity
Positive reinforcement	Completed in the Past
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Younger Drivers	
Enforcement of minor school license and graduated driver's license laws	Ongoing/Opportunity
Additional training in schools	Underway/Ongoing
Conduct education awareness campaigns	Ongoing/Opportunity
Impairment Involved	
Conduct targeted OWI enforcement	Opportunity
Compliance checks for alcohol sales	Underway/Opportunity
Alternative transportation choices	Opportunity
Prosecute, impose sanctions on, and treat OWI offenders	Ongoing/Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Older Drivers	
Promote safe mobility choices	Opportunity
Encourage external reporting of at-risk drivers to licensing authorities	Ongoing/Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Distracted Driving	
Visibly enforce existing statutes to deter distracted driving	Opportunity
Agency policy for hands-free devices	Ongoing/Opportunity
Mobile simulator for distracted driving	Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity

E.6. Implementation

The SAP project aims to provide a document that is both practical and frequently referenced by the county for requesting funding and completing traffic safety improvement projects on county-maintained roads. The following outlines key opportunities that can be used to implement the recommendations included within this plan. ICEA staff is available to assist counties in identifying and pursuing funding opportunities.

SS4A Implementation Grant: With the completion of this SAP, Jones County is eligible to apply for additional funding through the SS4A program. An SS4A Implementation Grant provides federal funds to implement projects and strategies identified in an SAP to address roadway safety issues, including infrastructural, behavioral, and/or operational activities. The county should consider applying for an Implementation Grant to secure funding to implement the engineering projects and driver-related strategies recommended in this plan.

Iowa Transportation Funding Opportunities: The county should leverage funding opportunities available through Iowa DOT local funding programs such as Highway Safety Improvement Program - Local (HSIP-Local) or the Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP) to implement the projects identified in this plan. The various funding opportunities are outlined in **Section 2.2**.

Five-Year Transportation Improvement Program: The county should review projects within the five-year program and consider including safety recommendations from the project sheets into those projects, where applicable. In future cycles of the program, it is recommended that safety projects included on the project sheets are considered for inclusion.

Maintenance Activities: Maintenance activities and upcoming design projects offer a great opportunity to incorporate safety countermeasures into already funded projects, often with minimal increases to the overall project cost. As such, it is recommended that when the county is designing projects and/or addressing a maintenance issue, the countermeasure selection thresholds (detailed in **Section 6.1.3**) are reviewed and countermeasures appropriate for the location are incorporated into the design. Doing so can help prioritize projects and emphasize safety in design and maintenance activities. In addition, the countermeasure information within this document should be used to provide instruction or education to maintenance crews about their ability to enhance safety in the county through their work.

Countywide Partnerships: It is recommended that the County continue to foster cooperation with safety stakeholders and look for opportunities to improve and expand the implementation of driver-related countermeasures.

E.7. Next Steps

The county should continue its history of implementing safety improvement projects annually. Based on current funding levels, it is anticipated that many of the engineering improvements listed in this plan could be implemented within five to ten years, or sooner. Additionally, this SAP should be updated within five to ten years to reflect improvements that have been implemented, additional availability of roadway feature data, and changes in crash types and patterns.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
1.1.	Jones County	1
1.2.	Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Program.....	2
1.2.1.	Safe System Approach.....	2
1.2.2.	National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS)	2
1.3.	What is an SAP?.....	3
1.4.	SAP Development Process	3
1.5.	Document Organization	4
2.	Background	5
2.1.	Iowa SHSP	5
2.2.	Iowa Safety Funding Opportunities	5
2.2.1.	County-State Traffic Engineering Program (C-STEP)	5
2.2.2.	Governor’s Traffic Safety Bureau (GTSB)	5
2.2.3.	Highway Safety Improvement Program - Local (HSIP-Local)	6
2.2.4.	Iowa DOT Roundabout Design Review	6
2.2.5.	Sign Replacement Program for Cities and Counties	6
2.2.6.	Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP).....	6
2.2.7.	Traffic Engineering Assistance Program (TEAP).....	6
2.3.	Safety Resources	6
2.3.1.	Bike Safety	6
2.3.2.	Child Passenger Safety	7
2.3.3.	Diminished Driving	7
2.3.4.	Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS).....	7
2.3.5.	Iowa Department of Public Safety	7
2.3.6.	Iowa DOT Crash Analysis Tool (ICAT)	7
2.3.7.	Iowa DOT Potential for Crash Reduction (PCR)	7
2.3.8.	Iowa DOT Roadside Chats.....	7
2.3.9.	Iowa DOT Safety Analysis Guide	7
2.3.10.	Iowa Strategic Highway Safety Plan	8
2.3.11.	Multi-Disciplinary Safety Teams (MDSTs).....	8
2.3.12.	NHTSA.....	8
2.3.13.	NRSS.....	8
2.3.14.	Road Safety Audits (RSAs)	8

2.3.15.	Teen Drive 365	9
2.3.16.	Teen Driving Safety Resource Guide	9
2.3.17.	Traffic Safety Marketing	9
3.	Data Collection	10
3.1.	Crash Data	10
3.2.	Roadway Data	10
3.2.1.	RAMS Database	10
3.2.2.	Horizontal Curve Database	11
3.2.3.	Intersection Database	11
3.2.4.	PCR Paved Public Road Intersection Database	11
3.2.5.	PCR Paved Secondary Road Database.....	11
3.2.6.	International Roughness Index (IRI) Database	12
3.2.7.	911 Address Database	12
3.2.8.	Stop Sign Locations	12
3.2.9.	Existing Condition Updates to the Database.....	12
3.3.	Demographic Data	12
	Underserved Communities	12
3.3.1.	Equity	13
4.	Data Analysis	15
4.1.	Comparison of County Crashes to SHSP Safety Emphasis Areas	15
4.2.	Crashes on County Roads	17
4.2.1.	Crash Maps	17
4.2.2.	Comparison by Roadway Type	20
4.2.3.	Crash Rate Comparisons	21
4.3.	PowerBI Dashboard	22
4.4.	County-Specific Data Analysis.....	23
4.5.	Underserved Community Analysis	26
4.6.	Equity Analysis	27
5.	Countermeasure Selection	28
5.1.	Potential Engineering Countermeasures	28
5.1.1.	Countermeasure Effectiveness.....	28
5.1.2.	County Paved Roadway Segment Countermeasures	29
5.1.3.	County Paved Intersection Countermeasures	30
5.1.4.	County Paved Curve Countermeasures	31

5.1.5.	Additional Potential Safety Countermeasures.....	31
5.2.	Driver-Related Countermeasures.....	31
5.2.1.	Speed-Related.....	33
5.2.2.	Occupant Protection	34
5.2.3.	Younger Drivers	35
5.2.4.	Impairment Involved	36
5.2.5.	Older Drivers.....	37
5.2.6.	Distracted Driving.....	39
6.	Safety Project Development.....	40
6.1.	Methodology	40
6.1.1.	GIS Data	40
6.1.2.	Risk Factor Ranking.....	41
6.1.3.	Countermeasure Selection Thresholds.....	42
6.1.4.	Draft Project Sheets.....	46
6.1.5.	County Input	46
6.1.6.	Final Project Sheets	47
6.2.	Segments	47
6.2.1.	Risk Factor Summary	47
6.2.2.	Risk Factor Rankings.....	50
6.2.3.	Prioritized Segment Recommendations	52
6.3.	Intersections.....	54
6.3.1.	Risk Factor Summary	54
6.3.2.	Risk Factor Rankings.....	57
6.3.3.	Prioritized Intersection Recommendations	59
6.4.	Horizontal Curves	61
6.4.1.	Risk Factor Summary	61
6.4.2.	Risk Factor Rankings.....	62
6.4.3.	Prioritized Horizontal Curve Recommendations	65
6.5.	Unpaved Roadways	67
7.	Candidate Locations Based on Crash History (CLCH)	68
8.	Summary	70
8.1.	Overview of SAP Development Process.....	70
8.2.	Recommended Improvements	71
8.2.1.	Engineering Countermeasures	71

8.2.2.	Driver-Related Countermeasures	73
8.3.	Implementation	74
8.4.	Next Steps.....	75

LIST OF APPENDICES

A	County Commitment Pledge
B	Segments
B1	Segment Safety Countermeasures
B2	Segment Project Sheets
B3	Segment Risk Factor Ranking Results
C	Intersections
C1	Intersection Safety Countermeasures
C2	Intersection Project Sheets
C3	Intersection Risk Factor Ranking Results
D	Curves
D1	Curve Safety Countermeasures
D2	Curve Project Sheets
D3	Curve Risk Factor Ranking Results
E	Unpaved Roadway Countermeasures
F	Workshop Materials

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - USDOT Safe System Approach	2
Figure 2 - Iowa's Five Es of Safety	3
Figure 3 - SAP Development Process.....	4
Figure 4 - Iowa's Five-Year SHSP.....	5
Figure 5 - Iowa's 2024 SHSP Emphasis Areas	15
Figure 6 - Total Crashes Jones County Roads (2014-2023)	18
Figure 7 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Jones County Roads (2014-2023).....	19
Figure 8 - Jones County Crashes by Roadway Type (2019-2023)	20
Figure 9 - Total 5-Year Crash Rates (2019-2023)	21
Figure 10 - Fatal and Serious Injury 5-Year Crash Rate (2019-2023)	21
Figure 11 - Comparison of Jones County Roads to All Iowa Roads (2019-2023).....	22
Figure 12 - Map of Animal Related Crashes (2014-2023)	24
Figure 13 - Map of Speed Related Crashes (2014-2023).....	25
Figure 14 - Jones County Underserved Communities.....	26
Figure 15 - Jones County Disadvantaged Communities	27
Figure 16 - CMF Calculation	28
Figure 17 - CMF Application	29
Figure 18 - CRF Calculation	29
Figure 19 - Driver-Related Emphasis Areas	31
Figure 20 - Jones County Workshop.....	32
Figure 21 - Project Development Methodology	40
Figure 22 - Project Sheet Layout	46
Figure 23 - Jones County Segment Risk Factor Scores	50
Figure 24 - Jones County Segment Risk Factor Map	51
Figure 25 - Jones County Prioritized Segment Project Locations Map	54
Figure 26 - Jones County Intersection Risk Factor Scores.....	57
Figure 27 - Jones County Intersection Risk Factor Map	58
Figure 28 - Jones County Prioritized Intersection Project Locations Map	60
Figure 29 - Jones County Horizontal Curve Risk Scores.....	63
Figure 30 - Jones County Horizontal Curve Risk Factor Map	64
Figure 31 - Prioritized Horizontal Curve Project Locations Map	66
Figure 32 - Prioritized Project Locations.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Jones County Fatalities and Serious Injuries by Safety Emphasis Area	16
Table 2 - Jones County Fatalities and Serious Injuries Rank by Safety Emphasis Area	17
Table 3 - Jones County Crashes by Roadway Type (2019-2023)	20
Table 4 - Speed-Related Countermeasures	34
Table 5 - Occupant Protection Countermeasures.....	35
Table 6 - Younger Driver-Related Countermeasures	36
Table 7 - Impaired Driving Countermeasures.....	37
Table 8 - Older Driver Countermeasures	38
Table 9 - Distracted Driving Countermeasures	39
Table 10 - Segment Countermeasure Project Selection Thresholds	43
Table 11 - Intersection Countermeasure Project Selection Thresholds	44
Table 12 - Horizontal Curve Countermeasure Project Selection Thresholds	45
Table 13 - Segment Risk Factor Scores	49
Table 14 - Prioritized Segment Recommendations	52
Table 15 - Intersection Risk Factor Scores	56
Table 16 - Prioritized Intersection Recommendations	59
Table 17 - Horizontal Curve Risk Factor Scores	62
Table 18 - Prioritized Horizontal Curve Recommendations	65
Table 19 - Segment High-Crash Locations	68
Table 20 - Intersection High-Crash Locations	69
Table 21 - Curve High-Crash Candidate Locations.....	69
Table 22 - Engineering Countermeasure Cost Summary	73
Table 23 - County Driver-Related Countermeasures Summary	73

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APP	Area of Persistent Poverty
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
ARIDE	Advance Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement
BIL	Bipartisan Infrastructure Law
CEJST	Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool
CLCH	Candidate Locations based on Crash History
CMF	Crash Modification Factor
CRF	Crash Reduction Factor
C-STEP	County-State Traffic Engineering Program
DEV	Daily Entering Volume
DOT	Department of Transportation
DRE	Drug Recognition Expert
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
ETC	Equitable Transportation Community
FARS	Fatality Analysis Reporting System
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
Five Es	Engineering, Emergency Response, Education, Enforcement, and Everyone
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
GTSB	Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau
HFST	High Friction Surface Treatment
HSIP-Local	Highway Safety Improvement Program - Local
HSM	Highway Safety Manual
HMVMT	Hundred Million Vehicle Miles Traveled
ICAT	Iowa DOT Crash Analysis Tool
ICE	Intersection Control Evaluation
ICEA	Iowa County Engineers Association
ICWS	Intersection Conflict Warning System
InTrans	Institute for Transportation at Iowa State University
IRI	International Roughness Index
KABCO	All Crashes (letter identifiers for crash severity)
K	Fatal Crash
A	Suspected Serious Injury Crash
B	Suspected Minor Injury Crash

Jones County Safety Action Plan

C	Possible/Unknown Injury Crash
O/PDO	Property Damage Only Crash
LED	Light-Emitting Diode
LRS	Linear Referencing System
LRSP	Local Road Safety Plan
LTAP	Local Technical Assistance Program
MIRE	Model Inventory of Roadway Elements
MDST	Multi-Disciplinary Safety Team
mph	Miles Per Hour
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NOFO	Notice of Funding Opportunity
NRSS	National Roadway Safety Strategy
OWI	Operating While Intoxicated
PCR	Potential for Crash Reduction
RAMS	Roadway Asset Management System
RSA	Roadway Safety Audit
SAG	Iowa DOT Safety Analysis Guide
SAIPE	Small Area Income Poverty Estimates
SAP	Comprehensive Safety Action Plan
SHSP	Strategic Highway Safety Plan
SPF	Safety Performance Functions
SS4A	Safe Streets and Roads for All
STEP	Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs
TEAP	Traffic Engineering Assistance Program
TIPS	Training for Intervention Procedures
TSIP	Traffic Safety Improvement Program
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
USDOT	US Department of Transportation

1. INTRODUCTION

In the United States over 40,000 people lost their lives in motor vehicle crashes in 2023. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), rural fatalities account for 40 percent of all fatalities across the United States, yet less than 20 percent of the population lives in rural areas. In addition, the fatality rate on rural roads is 1.5 times higher than the fatality rate on roads in urban areas, resulting in a focus on rural road safety.

In Iowa, while county roads account for 17% of the total statewide vehicle miles of travel (VMT), they account for 78% of the mileage and 35% of the fatal and serious injury crashes. These serious crashes are overrepresented based on VMT and are spread over an extensive roadway network. County road crash patterns are typically characterized by similar types of crashes that occur at unique locations. In Jones County, there was an average of 5.6 fatal and serious injury crashes per year on approximately 850 miles of county roads between 2019-2023. Therefore, Jones County, in consultation with partners, prepared this Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (SAP) to present a holistic, well-defined strategy to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries in the county. Consistent with strategies included within Iowa's Five-Year Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) 2024-2028, this SAP identifies high-risk locations and prioritizes strategies to address them, allowing for the proactive implementation of safety countermeasures. The County has also pledged their commitment to a goal zero roadway fatalities and serious injuries by 2050. The signed pledge is included in **Appendix A**.

"Reducing rural roadway departure crashes requires an integrated, disciplined approach. A safety action plan is a powerful way to prioritize safety improvements and justify investment decisions."

A formal plan will also help to communicate more clearly with stakeholders and access funding opportunities."

FHWA - Office of Traffic Safety

1.1. Jones County

Jones County is located in northeastern Iowa and was named for George Wallace Jones, a U.S. Senator from Iowa. According to the 2020 census, the population of Jones County is 20,646. The county seat is Anamosa which is the largest city in the county and the birthplace of artist Grant Wood, most known for his painting American Gothic. Jones County contains the largest prison in the state of Iowa, Anamosa State Penitentiary. According to the Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT), the county maintains 841 miles of county roads which includes 165 miles of paved roads. From 2019 to 2023 there were 440 crashes on Jones county roads of which 28 crashes resulted in fatal and serious injuries.

1.2. Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Program

This SAP was prepared with funding from the Safe Street and Roads for All (SS4A) discretionary program as well as a local match from Iowa DOT Traffic & Safety Bureau. The Iowa County Engineers Association (ICEA), with lead applicant Mahaska County, received an SS4A planning grant to prepare SAPs for 97 counties in the state. The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) established the SS4A discretionary program to fund improvements and strategies to prevent roadway fatalities and serious injuries of all users of highways, streets, and roadways: pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, personal conveyance and micro-mobility users, and commercial vehicle operators. The SS4A program supports the U.S. Department of Transportation's (USDOT's) National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS) and a goal of zero roadway deaths using a Safe System Approach. The program includes \$5 billion in appropriated funds over five years: 2022-2026. This SAP meets eligibility requirements that allow local jurisdictions to apply for implementation grants and additional funding through the USDOT SS4A discretionary program.

1.2.1. Safe System Approach

The USDOT has adopted a Safe System Approach as the guiding paradigm to address roadway safety. The Safe System Approach has been embraced as an effective way to address and mitigate the risks inherent in our complex transportation system. It works by building and reinforcing multiple layers of protection to both prevent crashes from happening in the first place and minimize the harm caused to those involved when crashes do occur. The Safe System Approach is founded on the principles that humans make mistakes and that human bodies have limited ability to tolerate crashes. It provides a holistic and comprehensive approach to roadway safety and is governed by the framework shown in **Figure 1** to make places safer for people. The Safe System Approach is a shift from the conventional approach to roadway safety because it focuses on both human mistakes and human vulnerability, and designs for a system with many redundancies in place to protect everyone.




Figure 1 - USDOT Safe System Approach

1.2.2. National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS)

USDOT's NRSS is a comprehensive approach to reduce fatal and serious injuries and deaths on highways, roads, and streets. This strategy outlines the USDOT's long-term goal of reaching zero roadway fatalities, the adoption of the Safe System Approach, and actions the department will take to target urgent problems. The NRSS states that across the nation, rural roads face safety impacts that largely outnumber their relative population and number of miles traveled. This leads to a fatality rate that is approximately two times higher on rural roads than on urban roads.

1.3. What is an SAP?

An SAP is intended to result in holistic, well-defined strategies intended to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries within a specific locality, tribal area, or region. SAPs can take many forms; however, to be eligible for Implementation and/or Planning and Demonstration funding through the USDOT SS4A discretionary grant program, the SAP is required to be completed within the time period specified for the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) period (generally within the last five years) and must include the following two components: (1) Safety Analysis and (2) Strategy and Project Selections, as well as at least three of the following elements:

- Leadership commitment and goal setting
- Planning structure
- Engagement and collaboration
- Policy and process changes
- Progress and transparency

More information about SAPs is available on the [USDOT SS4A website](#).

This SAP uses a risk factor analysis to identify and prioritize locations for proactive safety improvements that can be implemented by the county, allowing practitioners to make informed, prioritized safety decisions. The recommendations focus on systemic transportation improvements with high crash reduction benefits and include driver-related countermeasures.

The planning process takes into consideration constraints within the local county network and incorporates feedback from the County Engineer and local stakeholders, including partners within Iowa's 5 Es of safety (Engineering, Emergency Response, Education, Enforcement, and Everyone), as shown in **Figure 2**. While engineering improvements can make the roadways safer, engineering improvements alone cannot prevent all motor vehicle crashes. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), over 90 percent of all crashes are the result of driver-related factors. Because such a high percentage of crashes are a result of driver-related factors, making roadways safer requires all five Es to be involved.



Figure 2 - Iowa's Five Es of Safety

1.4. SAP Development Process

The development of this SAP includes seven primary steps as illustrated in **Figure 3**. More detailed descriptions of the process are included in subsequent sections of this document.

Jones County Safety Action Plan




Figure 3 - SAP Development Process

1.5. Document Organization

This document is organized into the following sections:

- **Section 1. Introduction:** introduces SAPs and their purpose.
- **Section 2. Background:** provides a summary of relevant background information reviewed as part of the study.
- **Section 3. Data Collection:** summarizes the data collected and geodatabase developed for the analysis.
- **Section 4. Data Analysis:** describes the county crash data analysis.
- **Section 5. Countermeasure Selection:** provides a summary of potential engineering countermeasures and a summary of the driver-related countermeasure discussion from the Stakeholder Workshop.
- **Section 6. Safety Project Development:** describes the data analysis methodology used to select project locations and to identify safety improvements for roadway segments, intersections, and horizontal curves.
- **Section 7. Candidate Locations Based on Crash History (CLCH):** includes a list of high-crash segments, intersections, and curves for reference.
- **Section 8. Summary:** includes a summary of recommended improvements, implementation methods, and next steps.

2. BACKGROUND

Relevant safety documents were reviewed to gather background information for the SAP, including the Iowa SHSP, Iowa safety funding opportunities, and safety resources. The following subsections summarize the background information gathered from each document.

2.1. Iowa SHSP

Iowa released its Five-Year SHSP 2024-2028, to meet the significant challenge of reducing fatal and serious injury crashes on public roadways within the state, shown in **Figure 4**. To understand fatality and serious injury trends within the state, the SHSP reviewed and analyzed five years of crash data for crashes resulting in fatalities and serious injuries from 2017 to 2021. The SHSP used a data-driven process that included input from safety stakeholders to determine seven Key Emphasis Areas, which are emphasis areas that have the greatest potential to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on public roads. The plan includes strategies, developed with input from professionals across the state, to address safety for each of the seven Key Emphasis Areas and to support the targets and goals defined annually by the state in support of Iowa's long-term vision of Zero Fatalities¹.



Figure 4 - Iowa's Five-Year SHSP

2.2. Iowa Safety Funding Opportunities

There are a wide variety of transportation safety funding sources available to counties within the State of Iowa. These funding programs can be used to implement treatments and recommendations for roadways and locations identified for improvements as part of this SAP. The following safety programs are available for the County to apply for funding to aid in implementation of the safety countermeasures identified within this SAP.

2.2.1. County-State Traffic Engineering Program (C-STEP)

C-STEP helps solve traffic operation and safety problems involving primary roads outside incorporated cities. Project types include both spot and linear improvements.

<https://iowadot.gov/grants-programs/County-State-Traffic-Engineering-Program>

2.2.2. Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau (GTSB)

GTSB is a subdivision of the Iowa Department of Public Safety. GTSB's mission is to identify traffic safety issues through partnership with city, county, state, and local organizations to develop and implement strategies to reduce serious injury and fatal crashes on Iowa's roads.

<https://dps.iowa.gov/bureaus-iowa-department-public-safety/gtsb>

¹ <https://zerofatalities.com/>

2.2.3. Highway Safety Improvement Program - Local (HSIP-Local)

This program promotes the installation of low-cost to medium-cost systemic improvements, with the goal of reducing fatal and serious injury crashes. HSIP-Local overlaps with TSIP but is more focused on implementing systemic, risk-factor improvements.

<https://iowadot.gov/traffic/sections/hsip>

2.2.4. Iowa DOT Roundabout Design Review

The Iowa DOT offers complimentary roundabout design review services to municipalities and counties throughout Iowa. Representatives from a nationally-known roundabout consulting firm are able to provide assistance during the feasibility, planning, concept, design, and operational planning stages of roundabout projects to help ensure early success.

<https://iowadot.gov/traffic/roundabouts/roundabout-resources>

2.2.5. Sign Replacement Program for Cities and Counties

This program provides funds to replace damaged, worn out, obsolete, or substandard signs and signposts for cities and counties in Iowa. The grant program is not used for ordering new signs that do not exist at the location specified in the application.

https://iowadot.gov/local_systems/City-Reports-Funding-and-Resources/Sign-Replacement-Program

2.2.6. Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP)

The TSIP distributes funds for roadway safety improvements, traffic control devices, studies, and outreach. TSIP provides safety funds to cities, counties, and the Iowa DOT in three separate categories: site-specific, traffic control devices, and studies and outreach. TSIP overlaps with HSIP-Local but is more focused on reactive improvements based on a location's documented crash-history and the proposed project's benefit-cost ratio.

<https://iowadot.gov/traffic/traffic-and-safety-programs/tsip/tsip-program>

2.2.7. Traffic Engineering Assistance Program (TEAP)

TEAP provides up to 150 hours of free traffic engineering expertise to local units of government in the form of a traffic study. Studies identify cost-effective traffic safety and operational improvements as well as potential funding sources to implement the recommendations.

<https://iowadot.gov/traffic/traffic-and-safety-programs/traffic-engineering-assistance-program-teap>

2.3. Safety Resources

This section describes various transportation safety resources that are available for counties to improve safety on their roadways. It is recommended that the County Engineer review these resources and find programs or resources that are valuable and could be applied within the county.

2.3.1. Bike Safety

The Blank Children's Hospital has an *All Heads Covered: Our Wheeled-Sports Safety Program*. This program includes a curriculum kit that is designed to help educators teach bike and wheeled-sports safety in the classroom or community for elementary-aged children. They also have a Bike Safety Van that houses all the equipment to host a bike rodeo and is offered free of charge. Additionally, low-cost helmets are available through the program.

<https://www.unitypoint.org/locations/unitypoint-health---blank-childrens-hospital/advocacy-and-outreach/safe-kids#helmetsafety>

2.3.2. Child Passenger Safety

The Unity Point Health - Blank Children's Hospital, Center for Advocacy & Outreach provides an entire webpage focused on child passenger safety in Iowa for parents and caregivers.

<https://www.unitypoint.org/blankchildrens/child-passenger-safety.aspx>

2.3.3. Diminished Driving

The Iowa DOT has resources intended for family members, caregivers, or other concerned individuals who are responsible for evaluating the options for older Iowans, particularly those dealing with dementia. It provides useful information on how dementia can impact driving safety and what actions can be taken to protect both the affected individual and the community.

<https://iowadot.gov/drivers-licenses-ids/other-services/safety-concerns>

2.3.4. Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS)

FARS is a nationwide census that provides yearly data regarding fatal injuries suffered in motor vehicle traffic crashes. Users are able to create their own data run online by using the query system.

<https://www.nhtsa.gov/research-data/fatality-analysis-reporting-system-fars>

2.3.5. Iowa Department of Public Safety

The Iowa Department of Public Safety has traffic safety information available for the public to review, which includes access to crash reports, real-time roadway conditions, construction, road closures, and more.

<https://dps.iowa.gov/>

2.3.6. Iowa DOT Crash Analysis Tool (ICAT)

The Iowa DOT crash mapping website, ICAT, can be used to develop crash maps and summarize data to compare crash history within a county. Crash maps and data summaries can be created by anyone with an internet connection.

<https://icat.iowadot.gov/>

2.3.7. Iowa DOT Potential for Crash Reduction (PCR)

The Iowa DOT PCR website can be used to understand the potential for safety improvement or PCR at intersections as well as primary and secondary roadway segments within the state. The tool compares segments or intersections with similar sites in the same category (e.g. speed, cross-section, traffic control). Archives of prior 5-year PCR maps are also available.

<https://pcr.iowadot.gov/>

2.3.8. Iowa DOT Roadside Chats

The Iowa DOT has created Roadside Chats, a traffic safety campaign that focuses on specific areas where drivers can make a difference in decreasing the number of fatalities: buckle up, slow down, drive sober, and pay attention.

<http://www.transportationmatters.iowadot.gov/>

2.3.9. Iowa DOT Safety Analysis Guide

Iowa DOT Safety Analysis Guide (SAG) for Practitioners, was developed to assist practitioners with conducting safety analyses in Iowa.

<https://iowadot.gov/media/1597/download?inline=>

2.3.10. Iowa Strategic Highway Safety Plan

As previously summarized, the Iowa SHSP was developed to meet the significant challenge of reducing fatal and serious injury crashes on public roadways within the state. The document establishes statewide goals, objectives and key emphasis areas developed in consultation with federal, state, local and private sector safety stakeholders.

<https://iowadot.gov/traffic/shsp/home>

2.3.11. Multi-Disciplinary Safety Teams (MDSTs)

Iowa's MDST Program facilitates the development and operations of local multi-discipline safety teams to help identify and resolve local crash causes and enhance local crash response practices. By coordinating communication and collaborating with other stakeholders, participants gain a broader perspective on safety issues and learn best practices from professionals outside their area of expertise. This ultimately leads to the development of solutions that may not have been considered otherwise.

If you are interested in developing an MDST for your area, contact the Statewide MDST Facilitator for more information. Contact information for the Statewide MDST Facilitator is available on the program website. As of November 2024, the Statewide MDST Facilitator is Theresa Litteral (515.294.7465 or litteral@iastate.edu).

<http://www.iowaltap.iastate.edu/MDST/>

2.3.12. NHTSA

NHTSA offers materials for numerous traffic safety campaigns, including drunk driving, car seats, vehicle safety, distracted driving, and motorcycles. These marketing tools offer a way to get involved through traditional media and online media.

<https://www.nhtsa.gov/>

2.3.13. NRSS

The USDOT NRSS outlines the Department's comprehensive approach to significantly reducing serious injuries and deaths on our nation's highways, roads, and streets. This is the first step in working toward an ambitious long-term goal of reaching zero roadway fatalities.

<https://www.transportation.gov/NRSS>

2.3.14. Road Safety Audits (RSAs)

An RSA is a formal safety performance examination that reviews, in detail, the geometry of a roadway facility. As part of an RSA, an independent, multi-disciplinary team assesses the condition of a given roadway and provides short-, mid-, and long-term recommendations for safety improvements for all modes provided or planned to be provided by the facility. RSAs have been conducted throughout the United States and are generally accepted as a proactive, low-cost approach to improve safety. This countermeasure cost estimate listed in the project sheets does not include the cost of implementing the recommendations of the RSA.

If you are interested in identifying funding for and conducting an RSA in your county, contact the Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) Safety Circuit Rider for more information. Contact information for the LTAP Safety Circuit Rider is available on the program website. As of November 2024, the LTAP Safety Circuit Rider is David Veneziano (dvenez@iastate.edu or 515.294.5480).

<https://iowaltap.iastate.edu/safety-circuit-rider/>

2.3.15. Teen Drive 365

Teen Drive 365 provides safe driving tips for educators, teens, and parents. It is a free resource that helps promote defensive driving behavior among the youngest drivers on the road. Teen Drive 365 created an educational program called HeadsUP, which is an online distracted driving challenge.

<https://www.teendrive365inschool.com/sites/default/files/headsup/index.html>

2.3.16. Teen Driving Safety Resource Guide

This resource guide provides drivers with organizations, programs, publications, and resources focused on teen driving safety.

<https://www.childrenssafetynetwork.org/resources/teen-driving-safety-resource-guide>

2.3.17. Traffic Safety Marketing

Traffic Safety Marketing is an online resource for safety materials that can be used for safety campaigns. There are various materials that are free of charge and others that can be purchased. Counties are encouraged to download and use the traffic safety materials provided during campaigns and throughout the year.

<https://www.trafficsafetymarketing.gov/>

3. DATA COLLECTION

As part of the SAP project, a comprehensive geographic information system (GIS) project database was developed utilizing available crash, roadway, and disadvantaged community databases. The following sections describe the databases utilized for creation of the project geodatabase and later used for analysis.

3.1. Crash Data

The Iowa DOT statewide crash database includes crash history for all crashes occurring on a public roadway in the state that involve a personal injury or that satisfy a minimum property damage threshold of \$1,500. The Iowa DOT ICAT tool was used to obtain crashes occurring on roadways of interest between January 1, 2014 and December 31, 2023. The crash database provides crash-, vehicle-, and person-level attributes in addition to several derived crash-level attributes, such as key emphasis area indicators. Additionally, each crash is classified using the KABCO Injury Classification Scale, which categorizes the crash based on the most severe injury sustained by any person involved in the crash, where K represents a fatal crash, A represents suspected serious injury crash, B represents a minor injury crash, C represents a possible/unknown injury crash, and O represents a property damage only crash. All crashes are geocoded with respect to the Iowa DOT Roadway Asset Management System (RAMS) roadway database.

This SAP utilizes five years (2019-2023) of crash data for analysis purposes and ten years (2014-2023) of data for crash mapping. Crashes included in the crash database were identified based on their “County” and “Concatenated System” attribute values. “Concatenated System” is an Iowa DOT-derived attribute, conveying the roadway system(s) on which a crash was located. The three roadway systems in Iowa are the Primary System (State-owned), the Secondary System (County-owned or maintained), and the Municipal System (City-owned). All crashes with a “Concatenated System” value containing “Secondary,” including intersections with state roadways, were selected for analysis. “County” attributes were added to the database to clearly identify on which system a crash likely occurred, as well as address any possible ambiguities in the initial “Concatenated System” derivation. This was initially accomplished by analyzing the spatial proximity of crashes with respect to secondary roads, as defined in the RAMS database. Additional analysis was performed for a limited number of crashes not identified through this technique.

3.2. Roadway Data

Various databases were used that contain different roadway data elements, including the RAMS, horizontal curve, intersection, and pavement management databases. Information on the locations of existing stop signs and updates to the databases were also considered.

3.2.1. RAMS Database

The Iowa DOT RAMS database includes various roadway characteristics for all public roads in Iowa. Roadway attributes are regularly updated by the Iowa DOT from various sources, including local agency submittals. The Iowa DOT regularly updates a road network snapshot with integrated RAMS attributes and publishes it on the Iowa DOT Open Data Portal. This SAP utilized a 2023 road network snapshot.

3.2.2. Horizontal Curve Database

A horizontal curve geospatial database was created for the Iowa DOT by Pathway Services Inc. in conjunction with their video log and pavement distress collection efforts. Kimley-Horn reviewed and refined the horizontal curve dataset for this SAP.

3.2.3. Intersection Database

In August 2017, the Institute for Transportation at Iowa State University (InTrans) and the Iowa DOT completed initial development of an intersection database. The foundation of this database was a GIS-based intersection point file created by the Iowa DOT's Traffic and Safety Bureau. A selected set of Model Inventory Roadway Elements (MIRE) were captured for each intersection and each intersection approach, including aerial imagery and street-level images.

The Iowa DOT Research and Analytics Bureau has been in the process of developing a new intersection database based on, and integrated with, the RAMS linear referencing system (LRS). In this database, a single functional intersection may be represented by multiple points. For example, the intersection of two divided roads, with no channelization, is represented by four intersection points, comprising a "complex" intersection. InTrans has collaborated with the Research and Analytics Bureau to conflate the original intersection database and corresponding elements to a May 2023 RAMS-based intersection database version. Intersection database elements have not been compressively updated since completion of the original intersection database; however, elements for a limited number of intersections (included in the May 2023 RAMS-based version) have been updated as part of other research efforts.

3.2.4. PCR Paved Public Road Intersection Database

The Iowa DOT Traffic and Safety Bureau, with assistance from InTrans, has developed safety performance functions (SPFs) for paved public road intersections by category. An SPF predicts the average number of crashes at an intersection based on various characteristics (e.g. speed, cross-section, and traffic control) and exposure (traffic volume). The difference between the SPF predicted crashes and adjusted, observed crashes at an intersection represents the Potential for Crash Reduction (PCR). The Traffic and Safety Bureau has established three categories for resulting PCR values: negligible, medium and high.

Two types of SPFs, one that includes all crashes and another that includes fatal, serious injury, and minor injury crashes, were first developed for the 2014 to 2018 analysis period and then the 2016-2018 analysis period based on the August 2017 intersection database and intersection crash definition. More recently, three types of SPFs, one that includes all crashes, another that includes fatal, serious injury, and minor injury crashes, and a third that includes possible injury and property damage crashes, were developed for a 2018 to 2022 analysis period, based on the May 2023 RAMS-based intersection database and an updated intersection crash definition.

This SAP utilizes the resulting 2018 to 2022 intersection PCR values for all crashes.

3.2.5. PCR Paved Secondary Road Database

Similar to the SPFs developed for paved public road intersections, Iowa DOT's Traffic and Safety Bureau has also developed SPFs for paved secondary road segments by category with assistance from InTrans. Two types of SPFs, one that includes all crashes and another that includes fatal, serious, and minor injury crashes, were developed for a 2016 to 2020 analysis period, considering only non-intersection crashes.

This SAP utilizes the resulting 2016 to 2020 paved secondary road PCR values for all crashes.

3.2.6. International Roughness Index (IRI) Database

InTrans summarized IRI data for paved secondary road segment and horizontal curve datasets provided by Kimley-Horn. Raw pavement condition data, collected by Pathway Services Inc. from 2018 to 2023 were utilized to provide the highest possible coverage. The most recent data was used to compute the summarized IRI. Invalid IRI measurements were excluded, and raw data was excluded within 75 feet of paved intersections.

The *Highway Safety Manual* (HSM) suggests that pavement in better condition provides a lower potential for crashes. The use of this database and the recorded IRI help determine additional potential for crashes along roadway segments and curves.

3.2.7. 911 Address Database

The Jones County 911 address database documents driveway addresses for businesses, homes, and structures within the county. It was utilized to obtain driveway locations along the County's paved roadway system for this project. While this database does not document all access points along the roadway system, such as farm access roadways, it does capture locations with a higher number of vehicular turning movements, such as homes and businesses. Roadway segments with a greater number of access points have a higher risk for crashes, due to increased potential for vehicle conflicts.

3.2.8. Stop Sign Locations

While the intersection database contains the control type for the intersection (all-way stop, two-way stop, one-way stop, etc.), stop control at the approach level is not included. ICEA provided information indicating where stop signs were located along the county paved roadway system. This information was geocoded into the GIS database.

3.2.9. Existing Condition Updates

Throughout the SAP process, the County Engineer provided feedback on locations where the information contained within the existing databases was not current (for example, location of rumble strips, shoulder type and/or width, etc.). When these locations were identified, updates to the project sheets were made.

3.3. Demographic Data

The following sections detail the demographic data that was obtained to identify areas that meet the SS4A definition of an Underserved Community as well as to conduct an equity analyses, which was previously included as an optional component of an SAP and was included as an element of the project based on the grant agreement signed with FHWA in 2023.

3.3.1. Underserved Communities

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria:

- The County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets:
 - The 1990 decennial census;
 - The 2000 decennial census; and
 - The most recent Small Area Income Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); or

- The Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; or
- Any territory or possession of the United States.

US Census Bureau Data

The *Population by Poverty Status in 1989/1999 for Counties* dataset was obtained from the US Census Bureau website for the 1990 and 2000 Decennial Census. These datasets include a geographic distribution of poverty in 1989 and 1999, respectively, with data available at the county and census tract levels. The county-level data was used to identify if greater than or equal to 20% of the county was below the poverty level.

Small Area Income Poverty Estimates (SAIPE)

The Small Area Income Poverty Estimates 2023 Poverty and Median Household Income Estimates for counties, states, and national was obtained from the US Census Bureau website. The dataset includes a geographic distribution of poverty in 2023, with data available at the county, state, and national level. The county-level data was used to identify if greater than or equal to 20% of the county was below the poverty level.

SS4A Underserved Communities Tool

The SS4A Underserved Communities tool was used to download data at the census tract level for Iowa to identify the areas that met the SS4A definition of an underserved community.

Based on a review of the US Census Bureau and SAIPE datasets, no counties in Iowa have a poverty rate of 20 percent or greater. Therefore, only the data from the SS4A Underserved Communities Tool was used to determine underserved communities in this analysis.

3.3.2. Equity

When the SS4A program was established in 2022, an equity analysis was included as an optional component of an SAP. As such the Equitable Transportation Community Explorer and the Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool were used to identify disadvantaged areas within Jones County. As of January 2025, the demographic data tools websites are currently unavailable. This information is included in this SAP as it was included as an element of the project based on the grant agreement signed with FHWA in 2023.

USDOT Equitable Transportation Community (ETC) Explorer

The USDOT ETC provided census tract data related to transportation insecurity, environmental burden, social vulnerability, health vulnerability, and climate and disaster risk burden to identify locations that can benefit from safety improvement projects. A census tract was considered in need if the final index score places it in the 65 percent of all US census tracts. USDOT ETC data was based on the 2020 US Census. The five scoring components included:

- Transportation Insecurity
- Environmental Burden
- Social Vulnerability
- Health Vulnerability
- Climate and Disaster Risk

Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST)

The CEJST provided census tract level data related to climate change, energy, health, housing, legacy pollution, transportation, water and wastewater, and workforce development to identify locations that are disadvantaged. A community was considered in need if it is at or above a predetermined threshold for a burden within any of the key categories, as well as being at or above a predetermined threshold for an associated socioeconomic burden. Thresholds for the categories vary, and data sources range from 2010 to 2022. The eight scoring components included:

- Climate Change
- Energy
- Health
- Housing
- Legacy Pollution
- Transportation
- Water and Wastewater
- Workforce Development

4. DATA ANALYSIS

From January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2023, there were a total of 440 crashes on county roads in Jones County, of which 28 resulted in serious injuries and fatalities. The following sections contain crash maps and summarize the data analysis prepared for the county, noting how it compares to the state of Iowa as a whole. High-crash locations and additional crash data analyses are included in this section.

4.1. Comparison of County Crashes to SHSP Safety Emphasis Areas

As part of Iowa's Five-Year SHSP 2024-2028, five years of crash data for crashes resulting in fatalities and serious injuries were separated into safety emphasis areas. This process determined the safety emphasis areas with the greatest number of crashes within Iowa and resulted in the focused opportunities for safety improvements on Iowa roadways. To align with the national shift to the Safe System Approach, the Iowa SHSP grouped each emphasis area into the five Safe System elements: Safer People, Safer Speeds, Safer Roads, Safer Vehicles, and Post-Crash Care. Iowa's Emphasis Areas grouped by the Safe System Approach are shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5 - Iowa's 2024 SHSP Emphasis Areas

Table 1 contains a comparison of Jones County crashes resulting in fatalities and serious injuries to the emphasis areas from Iowa's Five-Year SHSP 2024-2028. Because the latest SHSP was based on five years of crash data, five years of crash data (2019-2023) for the county was utilized to compare the crashes to the Iowa SHSP emphasis areas. For comparison, Table 2 shows the change in rank between the county and the state. As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, younger drivers, motorcycles, other special vehicles, and trains rank higher for Jones County than the statewide totals. Additionally, impairment involved, and intersections rank lower for Jones County than the statewide totals. It should be noted that this analysis includes all fatal and serious injury crashes within the county, not just those that occurred on county roads.

Jones County Safety Action Plan

Table 1 - Jones County Fatalities and Serious Injuries by Safety Emphasis Area

Category	Emphasis Area	Jones County			Statewide Totals			Iowa DOT Key Emphasis Area
		Fatal & Serious Injury	% of Total	Rank	Fatal & Serious Injury	% of Total	Rank	
		60	100%	N/A	8,653	100%	N/A	
Safer People	Occupant Protection	24	40%	4	3,428	40%	5	X
	Impairment Involved	8	13%	10	2,042	24%	7	X
	Distracted Driving	6	10%	11	1,264	15%	11	X
	Younger Drivers	14	23%	6	1,582	18%	9	
	Older Drivers	13	22%	7	1,628	19%	8	
	Pedestrians	0	0%	15	511	6%	14	
	Bicyclists	0	0%	15	199	2%	15	
Safer Vehicles	Motorcycles	13	22%	7	1,577	18%	10	
	Heavy Trucks	5	8%	12	757	9%	12	
	Other Special Vehicle	1	2%	14	149	2%	17	
	Trains	0	0%	15	32	0%	18	
Safer Speeds	Speed-Related	25	42%	3	4,547	53%	2	X
Safer Roads	Local Roads	47	78%	1	6,405	74%	1	X
	Lane Departures	32	53%	2	4,537	52%	3	X
	Intersections	9	15%	9	2,532	29%	6	X
	Roadside Collisions	22	37%	5	3,540	41%	4	
	Winter Road Conditions	4	7%	13	512	6%	13	
	Work Zones	0	0%	15	166	2%	16	

Numbers in the columns may not add up to the totals because the injuries in one crash may be associated with multiple emphasis areas. For example, there could be a lane departure crash with serious injuries involving an impaired young driver on a local road.

Source: Iowa Crash Analysis Tool (ICAT) 2019-2023

Table 2 - Jones County Fatalities and Serious Injuries Rank by Safety Emphasis Area

Category	Emphasis Area	Rank			Iowa DOT Key Emphasis Area
		County	State	Change in Rank	
Safer People	Occupant Protection	4	5	-1	X
	Impairment Involved	10	7	+3	X
	Distracted Driving	11	11	-	X
	Younger Drivers	6	9	-3	
	Older Drivers	7	8	-1	
	Pedestrians	15	14	+1	
	Bicyclists	15	15	-	
Safer Vehicles	Motorcycles	7	10	-3	
	Heavy Trucks	12	12	-	
	Other Special Vehicle	14	17	-3	
	Trains	15	18	-3	
Safer Speeds	Speed-Related	3	2	+1	X
Safer Roads	Local Roads	1	1	-	X
	Lane Departures	2	3	-1	X
	Intersections	9	6	+3	X
	Roadside Collisions	5	4	+1	
	Winter Road Conditions	13	13	-	
	Work Zones	15	16	-1	

Source: Iowa Crash Analysis Tool (ICAT) 2019-2023


4.2. Crashes on County Roads

The following sections summarize crashes occurring on county roads (2014-2023) and provide a comparison of crashes by roadway type and jurisdiction (2019-2023). The term “county roads” refers to roads defined by the Iowa DOT as Secondary Roads or roadways maintained by the county.

4.2.1. Crash Maps

Crash severity maps for the county were created by employing an InTrans-developed, GIS-based crash stacking tool. The purpose of this tool is to produce maps in which spatially proximate crashes are vertically offset to produce crash “stacks,” better conveying crash experience and severity at higher frequency locations. All crashes indicated as “County” or located within 250 feet of a secondary road, with some refinement, were selected and stacked by ascending severity. In other words, the more serious crashes were located at the bottom of the crash stack, nearer to the actual crash location on the roadway. Given the small map scale (county-level), a 250-foot spatial proximity was utilized to more accurately convey crash locations. **Figure 6** contains a map illustrating all crashes on county roads within the county stacked by ascending severity. **Figure 7** contains a map illustrating all fatal and serious injury crashes stacked by ascending severity.

Jones County Safety Action Plan



The information contained in this map was estimated from the April 15, 2024 Iowa DOT crash database.


Legend

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| County Paved Roads | Fatal Crashes (18) |
| County Unpaved Roads | Serious Injury Crashes (60) |
| State Roads | Minor Injury Crashes (116) |
| Corporate Limits | Possible/Unknown Injury Crashes (114) |
| | Property Damage Only Crashes (867) |



Figure 6 - Total Crashes Jones County Roads (2014-2023)

Jones County Safety Action Plan



The information contained in this map was estimated from the April 15, 2024 Iowa DOT crash database.

Legend

- County Paved Roads
- County Unpaved Roads
- State Roads
- Corporate Limits
- Fatal Crashes (18)
- Serious Injury Crashes (60)



Figure 7 - Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Jones County Roads (2014-2023)

Jones County Safety Action Plan

4.2.2. Comparison by Roadway Type

As shown in the previous maps, the majority of the county road crashes occurred on county paved roads as opposed to unpaved roads. **Table 3** contains a tabular summary of the county crashes by roadway type and **Figure 8** contains a graphical summary of the county crashes by roadway type. K denotes a fatality, and A denotes a serious injury.

Table 3 - Jones County Crashes by Roadway Type (2019-2023)

Jones County					
Roadway Type		Total Crashes		Fatal and Serious Injury (K & A) Crashes	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
County Paved	Intersection	113	26%	8	29%
	Curve	83	19%	7	25%
	Segment	144	33%	8	29%
	Subtotal	340	77%	23	82%
County Unpaved	Intersection	10	2%	1	4%
	Curve	7	2%	1	4%
	Segment	83	19%	3	11%
	Subtotal	100	23%	5	18%
Total		440		28	




Figure 8 - Jones County Crashes by Roadway Type (2019-2023)

4.2.3. Crash Rate Comparisons

The following sections provide a comparison of crash rates on county roads and across the state for all crash severities and fatal and serious injury crashes.

Total Five-Year Crash Rates

From 2019 to 2023 there were a total of 440 crashes on county roadways within Jones County. A comparison of the five-year crash rate on county roads in Jones County to the rates on all roads in the county and all roads in Iowa during the same timeframe is illustrated in **Figure 9**. The Jones County crash rate on county roads was higher than the Iowa crash rate from 2019 to 2021 and was lower than the Iowa crash rate from 2022 to 2023.




Figure 9 - Total 5-Year Crash Rates (2019-2023)

Fatal and Serious Injury Five-Year Crash Rates

From 2019 to 2023 there were a total of 28 fatal and serious injury crashes within Jones County. Fatal and serious injury five-year crash rates for all roads in Jones County, the county owned roads, and all roads in Iowa are illustrated in **Figure 10**. The Jones County fatal and serious injury five-year crash rate on county roads was higher than the five-year Iowa crash rate for all but one year (same in 2022) during the study period.




Figure 10 - Fatal and Serious Injury 5-Year Crash Rate (2019-2023)

Average 5-Year Crash Rates

Figure 11 shows the average crash rates for all crashes as well as fatal and serious injuries for county roads compared to all roads in Iowa from 2019 to 2023. As illustrated, the county road crash rate for all crashes is higher than the statewide crash rate and the fatal and serious injury crash rate on county roads is higher than the fatal and serious injury crash rate statewide, demonstrating the importance of a focus on fatal and serious injury crashes on county roads.




Figure 11 - Comparison of Jones County Roads to All Iowa Roads (2019-2023)

4.3. PowerBI Dashboard

An interactive dashboard was created using PowerBI that provides a comprehensive overview of crash data on secondary roads in Jones County. The dashboard provides a visual way to review crash trends and findings through charts and graphics. Users have the ability to filter the data by various attributes to find insights and trends associated with their selection(s) and the ability to export results. The dashboard includes crash data from 2019 to 2023.

The dashboard can be accessed via the secure portal on the ICEA website (<https://www.iceasb.org/>) by following these steps:

- Click on News & Updates
- Click on Headlines (which is under the News category)
- In the search bar type “crash”
- Click on headline: “County Safety Action Plans - ICEA Crash Data Dashboard”
- Click on the dashboard link: “ICEA Crash Data Dashboard”
- Bookmark the link for easy future access


4.4. County-Specific Data Analysis

After reviewing the crash data analysis, the county requested the following additional crash data information be prepared to aid them in efforts to reduce fatalities and serious injuries along county roads. The following information has been prepared to address their requests:

- Map of animal-related crashes (**Figure 12**)
- Map of speed-related crashes (**Figure 13**)

It should be noted that the Iowa DOT has made crash data available through a crash mapping website, which can be used to develop additional crash maps: <https://icat.iowadot.gov>. Crash maps can also be requested through the Iowa Traffic Safety Data Service (ITSDS). More information is available on the following website: www.ctre.iastate.edu/itsds/.

Jones County Safety Action Plan




The information contained in this map was estimated from the April 15, 2024 Iowa DOT crash database.

Legend

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| County Paved Roads | Serious Injury Crashes (5) |
| County Unpaved Roads | Minor Injury Crashes (7) |
| State Roads | Possible/Unknown Injury Crashes (1) |
| Corporate Limits | Property Damage Only Crashes (505) |

Figure 12 - Map of Animal Related Crashes (2014-2023)

Jones County Safety Action Plan



The information contained in this map was estimated from the April 15, 2024 Iowa DOT crash database.

Legend

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| County Paved Roads | Fatal Crashes (11) |
| County Unpaved Roads | Serious Injury Crashes (27) |
| State Roads | Minor Injury Crashes (71) |
| Corporate Limits | Possible/Unknown Injury Crashes (68) |
| | Property Damage Only Crashes (198) |

Figure 13 - Map of Speed Related Crashes (2014-2023)

4.5. Underserved Community Analysis

Based on the SS4A definition of Underserved Communities and the corresponding SS4A Underserved Communities tool, it was determined that Jones County does not contain any Underserved Communities as shown in **Figure 14**. Projects located in underserved communities are given a higher priority in the SS4A grant program, as these areas could benefit from additional investment.




Figure 14 - Jones County Underserved Communities

4.6. Equity Analysis

Consistent with SS4A guidance at the start of this planning process, as well as agreed upon in the executed grant agreement with FHWA for this SAP, equity data was collected using the USDOT ETC and CEJST to identify disadvantaged areas in Jones County, which are shown in **Figure 15**. Portions of Jones County (near Monticello, Martelle, Morley, and Olin) are considered to be disadvantaged based on the CEJST and ETC screening tool.




Figure 15 - Jones County Disadvantaged Communities

5. COUNTERMEASURE SELECTION

The following sections summarize engineering and driver-related safety improvement countermeasures considered for the SAP.

5.1. Potential Engineering Countermeasures

The engineering countermeasures proposed for consideration at each of the project locations are described in this section. Countermeasures are grouped by implementation at the systemic level and those that should be considered on a case-by-case basis by the County Engineer depending on the specific issues at a particular location. Nationally, there are relatively low percentages of fatal and serious injury crashes that occur on unpaved roadways when compared to paved roadways. As such, safety research has focused on paved roadways. The lack of research on the unpaved system results in very few Crash Modification Factors (CMFs) defined for safety countermeasures on unpaved roadways.

5.1.1. Countermeasure Effectiveness

The information about CMFs in this section is based on the Iowa DOT's Safety Analysis Guide and is provided for reference to demonstrate the potential positive impact the countermeasures can have on safety, if applied. The countermeasures recommended for consideration were chosen because of their effectiveness in reducing crashes. Some safety countermeasures recommended do not yet have CMF ratings (indicated by "CMF not defined" within this document), due to the amount of data and peer review that is required; however, preliminary studies show safety benefits as a result of these countermeasures. FHWA has also published a list of Proven Safety Countermeasures which is "a collection of countermeasures and strategies effective in reducing roadway fatalities and serious injuries. Transportation agencies are strongly encouraged to consider widespread implementation of [Proven Safety Countermeasures] to accelerate the achievement of local, State, and National Safety goals." <https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/>

When identifying potential safety improvements, it is important to consider CMFs relevant to the proposed improvements using the CMF Method which is detailed in Part D of the HSM. CMFs are defined as the ratio of effectiveness of one condition compared to another and represent the relative change in crash frequency due to a change in a specific condition. In other words, a CMF is a multiplicative factor used to determine the anticipated number of crashes after implementing a particular countermeasure at a specific location. Countermeasures with CMFs less than one are anticipated to reduce crashes if applied, while those countermeasures with CMFs greater than one are anticipated to increase crashes. **Figure 16** illustrates the definition of CMFs.

CMF = $\frac{\text{ANTICIPATED CRASHES WITH TREATMENT}}{\text{ANTICIPATED CRASHES WITHOUT TREATMENT}}$	CMF = 1.0 Anticipated to have no impact on safety
	CMF < 1.0 Anticipated to reduce crashes
	CMF > 1.0 Anticipated to increase crashes

Figure 16 - CMF Calculation

The CMF Method is used to calculate the anticipated number of crashes by multiplying the observed number of crashes by the applicable CMF for the proposed countermeasure. It is recommended to apply CMFs to a minimum of three years of crash data for urban and suburban

locations, and five years of crash data for rural locations. **Figure 17** provides an example calculation of the CMF method, demonstrating the application of a single CMF to a specific location for a single year.

10.1 crashes / year x 0.91 (CMF) =

9.2 crashes / year:

a reduction of 0.9 total crashes per year and a CRF of 9%

Figure 17 - CMF Application

A Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) is analogous to a CMF, but it is expressed differently. A CRF represents the percentage of crash reduction anticipated after the implementation of a specific countermeasure at a particular location. **Figure 18** illustrates the calculation of a CRF in relationship to a CMF.

$$\text{CRF} = (1 - \text{CMF}) \times 100$$

Figure 18 - CRF Calculation

Caution should be used when selecting appropriate CMFs. Section 2.3 of the Iowa DOT Safety Analysis Guide offers guidance for selecting and applying CMFs, including the following considerations:

- CMFs should primarily be selected from the Iowa Planning-Level CRF List (<https://iowadot.gov/traffic/pdfs/CRFListVersion.pdf>). If the desired CMF is not available in the list, then CMFs should be selected from the CMF Clearinghouse (<http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org>) using the guidance provided in Section 2.3.3 of the Iowa DOT Safety Analysis Guide.
- Only CMFs with a three-star rating or higher should be considered for use in analysis.
- The countermeasure abstract should be used to determine if the CMF is applicable to the proposed improvement.
- Be sure the selected CMF is applicable to the set of crash data being used for analysis. Some CMFs may only be applicable to a subset of the crash data.
- The application of multiple CMFs can overestimate the expected crash reduction. Unless each CMF addresses independent crash types, CMF should be combined using the methodologies described in Section 2.3.4 of the Iowa DOT Safety Analysis Guide. It is suggested that no more than three CMFs are applied to a particular site.

5.1.2. County Paved Roadway Segment Countermeasures

The following roadway segment safety countermeasures were identified:

Systemic

- Conduct an RSA
- Conduct an access control analysis
- Install groove-in retroreflective pavement markings
- Install wider, retroreflective, pavement markings

Location Specific

- Flatten and widen foreslopes
- Provide on-pavement markings for speed control
- Delineate roadside hazards (trees or utility poles) with retroreflective strips

Systemic (continued)

- Increase shoulder width
- Install safety edge
- Install edgeline rumble strips
- Install centerline rumble strips
- Install/enhance curve chevron, advanced curve warning, and advisory speed signs
- Remove obstructions within right-of way (clearing and grubbing)
- Improve sight distance (clearing and grubbing)

Location Specific (continued)

- Install guardrails
- Install post-mounted delineators
- Install retroreflective strips on chevron signposts
- Install transverse rumble strips prior to curves
- Remove/relocate objects in hazardous locations
- Correct superelevation on curves
- Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on curves
- Install speed-activated flashers on chevron signs

5.1.3. County Paved Intersection Countermeasures

The following paved intersection safety countermeasures were identified:

Systemic

- Coordinate with local jurisdiction on signal modifications
- Conduct signal warrant analysis to consider removal of signal
- Conduct Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE)
- Implement the results of ICE
- Conduct all-way stop analysis to convert two-way stop to all-way stop or remove stop signs
- Install destination lighting
- Increase size and/or retroreflectivity of stop signs
- Duplicate signage
- Install groove-in retroreflective pavement markings
- Install wider, retroreflective pavement markings
- Install flashing beacons or LED flashing lights on stop/yield signs
- Install transverse rumble strips
- Install intersection warning signs and advanced street name plaques
- Improve sight distance (clearing and grubbing)

Location Specific

- Provide right-turn and/or left-turn lanes
- Realign intersection approaches to reduce or eliminate skew
- Provide bypass lane on shoulder at T-intersections
- Convert offset T-intersections to four-legged intersections
- Use indirect left-turn treatments to minimize conflicts at divided highway intersections
- Convert four-legged intersections to offset T-intersections
- Install flashing beacon on intersection warning signs
- Install low-cost Intersection Conflict Warning Systems (ICWS)
- Install a roundabout
- Increase shoulder width
- Install safety edge
- Install retroreflective markers for trees or utility poles
- Install guardrails
- Install retroreflective strips on stop signposts
- Implement access management

5.1.4. County Paved Curve Countermeasures

The following horizontal curve safety countermeasures were identified:

Systemic

- Install groove-in retroreflective pavement markings
- Install wider, groove-in retroreflective, pavement markings
- Increase shoulder width (paved)
- Install safety edge
- Install edgeline rumble strips
- Install centerline rumble strips
- Install/enhance curve chevron signs
- Provide advance warning signage
- Remove obstructions within right of way (clearing and grubbing)

Location Specific

- Install additional curve signage
- Install retroreflective strips on chevron signposts
- Install transverse rumble strips prior to curve
- Correct superelevation
- Install HFST on curves
- Install speed-activated flashers on chevron signs
- Install guardrails
- Install on-pavement markings for speed control
- Install post-mounted delineators

5.1.5. Additional Potential Safety Countermeasures

For each location, there are safety enhancements that could be considered even though they were not recommended as part of this project due to the availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. These types of improvements are included when requested by the County Engineer.

5.2. Driver-Related Countermeasures

The subsequent sections discuss the driver-related workshop conducted within the county and identify driver-related countermeasures for implementation in the county as well as their current implementation status. Driver-related countermeasures are strategies aimed at improving driver behavior to enhance road safety. The 2024 Iowa SHSP has 19 Safety Emphasis Areas, six of which are driver-related as shown in **Figure 19**. Countermeasure recommendations are included to address each of the driver-related emphasis areas.




Figure 19 - Driver-Related Emphasis Areas

5.2.1. Stakeholder Workshop

A workshop was conducted in Jones County on Wednesday, September 4, 2024, aimed at fostering a culture of safety within the county and identifying activities occurring in the county to address driver-related emphasis areas. A wide range of individuals were invited to the workshop, including elected officials, partner agencies that operate within the County,

Jones County Safety Action Plan

stakeholders representing the 5 Es of traffic safety, and the general public. The flyer used to publicize the workshop and the sign-in sheet is included in **Appendix F**. During the workshop, participants discussed each of the driver-related emphasis areas and reviewed how fatal and serious injury crashes in the county aligned with statewide trends. Potential countermeasures from the NHTSA document, Countermeasures That Work, as well as previous planning efforts in the state were provided to stakeholders to facilitate discussions for each of the driver-related emphasis areas. Participants were invited to share their insights into the county's efforts to improve safety in each emphasis area and to discuss opportunities for further impact. An image from the workshop is shown in **Figure 20**. Stakeholders at the workshop included:

- Derek Snead, County Engineer
- Brad Knudson, Jones County Public Health
- Brenda Leonard, Jones County Emergency Management
- Darren Hanna, Anamosa School District Superintendent
- Dawn Graver, Monticello Police
- Eric Werling, Anamosa Police Chief
- Greg Graver, Jones County Sheriff
- Jeff Swisher, Jones County Board of Supervisors
- Peyton Richie, Jones County Farm Bureau
- Travis McNally, Iowa State Patrol



Figure 20 - Jones County Workshop

Jones County Safety Action Plan


Based on the discussion, the following statuses of implementation were assigned for each of the driver-related countermeasures discussed in the workshop:

- Underway/Ongoing (currently being done)
- Ongoing/Opportunity (ongoing, but could be enhanced)
- Opportunity (not being done, but could be implemented)
- Completed in the Past (has been completed in the past, but not planned to be implemented in the future)

It is recommended that the county continue to implement countermeasures that are currently underway/ongoing and look for additional opportunities to implement countermeasures that are not currently being implemented. This will require input from and coordination with all five Es of safety.

5.2.2. Speed-Related

Speed-related crashes account for 53 percent of fatal and serious injuries across the state of Iowa, and 42 percent of the fatalities and serious injuries in Jones County.



The Iowa SHSP recommends identifying corridors with a high frequency of speed-related crashes and implementing high-visibility enforcement in those areas. Jones County participates in GTSB funding; however, the County Engineer noted that the sporadic nature of crashes makes it difficult to do targeted enforcement. The Sheriff's office has a portable dynamic speed trailer and a traffic enforcement car that is used to enforce speed on the edge of towns within the County. The Sheriff's office also has small sign mounted recorders to collect traffic and speed data. The Iowa SHSP recommends implementing speed feedback signs at targeted locations as a speed-related countermeasure. The Iowa DOT has a program that allows eligible cities to partner with the DOT to install permanent speed feedback signs on state roadways within their city limits, and GTSB has grants available for counties to acquire mobile speed enforcement trailers. Additionally, the Iowa DOT is implementing other speed reduction strategies, as recommended in the SHSP, including using traffic calming practices such as lane reductions and installing medians, to help reduce speeds and improve safety in communities. The County Engineer noted that reducing the speed limits has not been an effective method to address speed related crashes, as drivers are more likely to drive at the speed they are comfortable with and used to, and speed limit reduction may result in a larger difference in speeds.

During the workshop, one topic of discussion involving speed-related incidents revolved around drivers illegally passing school buses. Law enforcement in most counties indicated that they are ticketing drivers for illegally passing school buses, the Sheriff's Office was able to confirm that the Keep Aware Driving - Youth Need School Safety Act (Kadyn's Law) is being enforced. This law states that driving privileges will be suspended for 30 days for a first conviction, 90 days

Jones County Safety Action Plan

for a second conviction, and 180 days for a third or subsequent conviction along with fines. School buses are equipped with interior and exterior cameras on the buses.


A summary of the speed-related countermeasures discussed during the workshop along with the county's status of implementation is included in **Table 4**.

Table 4 - Speed-Related Countermeasures

Countermeasure	Status
Conduct targeted speed enforcement - Jones County participates in GTSB funding - GTSB has grants available for funding to acquire mobile speed enforcement trailers	Ongoing/Opportunity
Prosecute and impose sanctions on drivers not obeying school bus stop bars - The Keep Aware Driving - Youth Need School Safety Act (Kadyn's Law) is being actively enforced - Some buses in the county are equipped with cameras	Underway/Ongoing
Conduct education and awareness campaigns Opportunities to develop safety education programs within the county at the elementary, middle, or junior high level	Opportunity

5.2.3. Occupant Protection

Occupant protection crashes account for 40 percent of fatal and serious injuries across the state of Iowa, and 40 percent of the fatalities and serious injuries in Jones County.



The County has historically used GTSB funding for occupant protection enforcement but noted it's getting more difficult to acquire from the State, so they have opted out in recent years. Targeted seat belt enforcement is a priority for both the State and the County, with the County's traffic enforcement car actively monitoring compliance. Over the last ten years, typical seatbelt compliance was reported to be between 90 and 97 percent based on 2024 Iowa Seat Belt Use Report, meaning 3 to 10 percent of drivers and front-seat passengers were observed not wearing a seat belt. Conversely, 40 percent of fatalities and serious injuries across Iowa are related to occupant protection. Compared to seat belt usage, the fatalities and serious injuries from occupant protection crashes are overrepresented; therefore, there is an opportunity for education on the importance of proper restraints or protective devices (seat belts, child restraint systems, helmets, or other devices).

The County has places that will supply free car seats and check to make sure they are installed correctly. GTSB produces a "cheat sheet" to assist with child restraint laws. The Sheriff's Department provides a printed version to officers, and this resource is also posted online. Officers ensure that safety seats are being used and that children are using the correct type of

Jones County Safety Action Plan

restraint when a vehicle is pulled over. Attendees also noted that Jones Regional will advertise free helmets for kids as a way to promote safety.

In some communities, law enforcement offers positive reinforcement through programs that distribute ice cream coupons for children wearing their helmets while riding their bikes and wearing their seatbelt in the car. This is an excellent opportunity for positive reinforcement and encouragement for children to wear helmets and seatbelts.


A summary of the occupant protection countermeasures discussed during the workshop along with the county's status of implementation is included in **Table 5**.

Table 5 - Occupant Protection Countermeasures

Countermeasure	Status
Conduct targeted enforcement of restraint use - Most targeted enforcement occurs through targeted seat belt enforcement and educational surveys - Opportunities to conduct targeted child restraint enforcement	Ongoing/Opportunity
Instruction in proper child restraint use - There are locations in the county where child restraints can be inspected - Jones Regional advertises free helmets for kids	Underway/Ongoing
Check for proper child restraint use in all motorist encounters - Officers have "cheat sheets" to enforce child restraint laws - Officers are told to check for proper child restraint use	Ongoing/Opportunity
Positive reinforcement Businesses used to hand out treats for children wearing helmets on their bikes	Completed in the Past
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity

5.2.4. Younger Drivers

Younger driver crashes account for 18 percent of fatal and serious injuries across the state of Iowa and 23 percent of the fatalities and serious injuries in Jones County.



Iowa passed a new law that allows 14.5-year-olds to drive to and from school/work/home. This law went into effect on July 1, 2024. The State and County have education programs and strategies for young drivers. Drivers' Education is taught in the County schools by the school resource officer. Parents are also able to teach Drivers Education, but the County requires the children who learn to drive from their parents to take the driving test with the County. The County treasurer noted that parent-taught children have been performing better on the drive tests but stated that this statistic is likely biased because the children who take Driver's

Jones County Safety Action Plan

Education through school are only required to take the driver's test if they are performing poorly in the class. As a visual resource for students, a Camaro that was involved in a crash in Dubuque County is available for educational purposes.

Attendees noted they are aware of Iowa's minor school license and GDL laws. The legislative reasoning for passing the new law involved broken families living far apart as well as children needing to go to school and assist on the farm. The County uses impaired driving simulator or "drunk goggles" for hands-on demonstrations of the effects of drunk driving. There is an opportunity for the school system to have students sign a pledge (e.g., no texting and driving, no impaired driving, etc.) and to have someone from the community talk to students about the effects of crashes and the implications it has on your life after the crash.


A summary of the younger driver countermeasures discussed during the workshop along with the county's status of implementation is included in **Table 6**.

Table 6 - Younger Driver-Related Countermeasures

Countermeasure	Status
Enforcement of minor school license and graduated driver's license laws	Ongoing/Opportunity
Additional training in schools • Camaro that was involved in a crash in Dubuque County is available for educational purposes • Schools have a drill where students would get pulled out of class throughout the day to simulate the rate at which younger drivers die in car crashes and other students would not be able to interact with those students	Underway/Ongoing
Conduct education awareness campaigns • Police Department has a Facebook page • Street Smarts within Mount Vernon is contracted to do safety programs within Jones County • Opportunity for students sign a no texting and driving/no impaired driving pledge	Ongoing/Opportunity

5.2.5. Impairment Involved

Impaired driving crashes account for 24 percent of fatal and serious injuries across the state of Iowa, and 13 percent of the fatalities and serious injuries in Jones County.



There is an opportunity for Jones County to conduct Operating While Intoxicated (OWI) enforcement at events such as County Fairs, holidays or sporting events. Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE) is a course designed such that officers become more proficient at detecting, apprehending, testing, and successfully prosecuting impaired drivers.

Jones County Safety Action Plan

Attendees noted there is one Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) trained officer and many ARIDE trained officers. It was noted that DRE training is difficult to apply for due to the class size availability.

The Police Department stated they do approximately one safety checkpoint per year due to the availability of resources that would be required to make them more frequent. Attendees could not confirm if high-visibility saturation patrols are conducted on a regular basis. Underage compliance checks are done yearly. Non-compliant places are rechecked within the same year and establishments were noted to take the checks seriously, firing employees that are underage serving. Servers in restaurants practice Training for Intervention ProcedureS (TIPS), and the police department conducts random checks at establishments that sell alcohol. The County currently does not have alternative transportation options and noted that asking a friend for a ride home is the main alternative way people get home as there are no Uber or taxi services within the County. The Police Department noted they are trying to get parking laws changed because it currently forces people to move their car at 2 AM and potentially drive impaired.

A summary of the impaired driving countermeasures discussed during the workshop along with the county's status of implementation is included in **Table 7**.


Table 7 - Impaired Driving Countermeasures

Countermeasure	Status
Conduct targeted OWI enforcement - Opportunity for targeted OWI enforcement to be conducted during the County Fair, holidays, sporting events, etc. - Opportunity for OWI enforcement to be targeted in specific locations based on past information such as prior OWIs or alcohol-related crashes	Opportunity
Compliance checks for alcohol sales - Underage compliance checks are conducted on alcohol retailers - Over-serving compliance checks are conducted at drinking establishments	Underway/Opportunity
Alternative transportation choices Opportunity for alternative transportation options within the County	Opportunity
Prosecute, impose sanctions on, and treat OWI offenders	Ongoing/Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity

5.2.6. Older Drivers

Older driver crashes account for 19 percent of fatal and serious injuries across the state of Iowa, and 22 percent of the fatalities and serious injuries in Jones County.

Jones County Safety Action Plan



There is an opportunity for Jones County to provide safe mobility options for older drivers. These efforts include long-term care facilities providing transportation to/from doctor's appointments and other activities, and veteran groups providing transportation to clinics.

The State Patrol noted that the DOT provides a resource to have older drivers retested if they are found to be at fault in a crash. State Troopers will be push the test to a primary care physician to conduct. There have historically been problems with liability and who signs off on the test results. A state trooper noted that older drivers are not often offending traffic laws to receive driving citations, rather most retesting is the result pf their involvement in a crash. Attendees could not confirm if the county regularly reports older drivers that have had their license removed and are still driving.


A summary of the older driver countermeasures discussed during the workshop along with the county's status of implementation is included in **Table 8**.

Table 8 - Older Driver Countermeasures

Countermeasure	Status
Promote safe mobility choices - Opportunity to provide paratransit or other mobility options - Opportunity to have volunteers take seniors to doctors' appointments or other activities - Opportunity to use the Farm Bureau, veterans' groups, American Association of Retired Persons, etc. to communicate transportation options to older drivers	Opportunity
Encourage external reporting of at-risk drivers to licensing authorities - Older drivers retested based on their involvement in a crash as appropriate - Opportunity for law enforcement to work with families of older drivers who have had their driver's license removed before their driving without a license becomes an issue	Ongoing/Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity

5.2.7. Distracted Driving

Distracted driving accounts for 15 percent of fatal and serious injuries across the state of Iowa, and 10 percent of the fatalities and serious injuries in Jones County.



Iowa passed a new law on April 2, 2025, which will go into effect on July 1, 2025, that prohibits all use of handheld cellphones while driving. The law replaces previous legislation that only prohibited texting while driving.

During the workshop, participants discussed the difficulty for law enforcement to prove distracted driving has occurred. Iowa DOT employees must be hands-free or may only use one earbud. Workshop attendees confirmed a policy exists regarding their employees to be hands-free while driving. Bluetooth is built into most county vehicles. The County noted some innovative ways to enforce distracted driving laws, such as the Fire Department putting a truck at the back of a crash site that will honk if they see people distracted by their phones. There is an opportunity to promote education around distracted driving, particularly with the new hands-free law. Mobile driving simulators can be obtained via GTSB and can be used to demonstrate the effects of driving while distracted.

A summary of the distracted driving countermeasures discussed during the workshop along with the county's status of implementation is included in **Table 9**.

Table 9 - Distracted Driving Countermeasures

Countermeasure	Status
Visibly enforce existing statutes to deter distracted driving	Opportunity
Agency policy for hands-free devices - Opportunity for hands-free equipment to be provided in all county vehicles - Policy requiring all agency employees be hands-free when driving agency vehicles	Ongoing/Opportunity
Mobile simulator for distracted driving - Opportunity to use GTSBs mobile simulator, free of charge - Opportunity to download various simulators online	Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity

6. SAFETY PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Safety improvement projects were developed at high-priority locations along paved roadway segments, intersections, and horizontal curves within the county. Due to limited available data, low traffic volumes, and constraints on the types of systemic safety improvement projects that can be implemented on unpaved roads, location-specific recommendations were not developed for these roadways. Nevertheless, this Safety Action Plan includes safety recommendations that may be considered for implementation on the unpaved roadway system by the County Engineer. This section describes the data analysis methodology used to select project locations and to identify safety improvements for paved roadway segments, intersections, and horizontal curves, and outlines potential projects and/or activities that could be implemented on the unpaved system.

6.1. Methodology

As shown in **Figure 21**, GIS data, as described in **Section 3**, was used to rank each of the county paved roadway segments, intersections, and curves based on risk factors. Following the ranking process, safety improvement recommendations were formulated for the highest-risk locations. Draft project sheets were created for these highest-risk locations to summarize the recommendations and estimated implementation costs. These project sheets were then provided to the County for review and feedback, before being finalized. Each step of the methodology is detailed in the following sections.



Figure 21 - Project Development Methodology

6.1.1. GIS Data

GIS data for the county paved road segments, intersections, and curves were used to perform a systemic analysis of the county-owned roadway facilities. Databases were obtained through collaboration and coordination with InTrans, the Iowa DOT, and the County. Descriptions of these databases are in **Section 3**. The data was analyzed using ArcGIS Pro software as described in the following sections. Every roadway segment, intersection, and curve of the county-owned paved roadway system was analyzed.

6.1.2. Risk Factor Ranking

This SAP uses a systemic approach to identify comprehensive safety enhancements on county roads. A systemic approach considers risk across the entire roadway network, instead of focusing improvements solely on locations with a history of crashes. As such, risk factors along roadway segments, at intersections, and along curves were assessed to determine locations that may be more susceptible to future crashes involving serious injuries and/or fatalities. Various attributes were considered in this risk assessment.

FHWA has compiled a list of potential risk factors in their Systemic Safety Project Selection Tool. The list can assist with identifying areas that might benefit from systemic safety improvements. While not all the risk factors are used for the SAP due to data limitations and the specific crash types being targeted, they are provided here for reference. The evaluated attributes that were evaluated for the SAP are detailed in the subsequent sections pertaining to segments, intersections, and curves.

“The systemic approach to safety involves widely implemented improvements based on high-risk roadway features correlated with specific severe crash types. The approach provides a more comprehensive method for safety planning and implementation that supplements and complements traditional site analysis. It helps agencies broaden their traffic safety efforts and consider risk as well as crash history when identifying where to make low-cost safety improvements.”

FHWA - Office of Traffic Safety

- Roadway and Intersection Features
 - Number of lanes
 - Lane width
 - Shoulder surface width and type
 - Median width and type
 - Horizontal curvature, superelevation, delineation, or advanced warning devices
 - Horizontal curve density
 - Horizontal curve and tangent speed differential
 - Presence of a visual trap at a curve or combinations of vertical grade and horizontal curvature
 - Roadway gradient
 - Pavement condition and friction
 - Roadside or edge hazard rating (potentially including sideslope design)
 - Driveway presence, design, and density
- Presence of shoulder or centerline rumble strips
- Presence of lighting
- Presence of on-street parking
- Intersection skew angle
- Intersection traffic control device
- Number of signal heads vs. number of lanes
- Presence of backplates
- Presence of advanced warning signs
- Intersection located in or near horizontal curve
- Presence of left-turn or right-turn lanes
- Left-turn phasing
- Allowance of right-turn-on-red
- Overhead vs. pedestal-mounted signal heads
- Pedestrian crosswalk presence, crossing distance, signal head type

- Traffic Volume
 - Average Daily Traffic volumes (ADT)
 - Average Daily Entering Vehicles (DEV)
 - Proportion of commercial vehicles in traffic stream
- Other Features
 - Posted speed limit or operating speed
- Presence of nearby railroad crossing
- Presence of automated enforcement
- Adjacent land use type (e.g., schools, commercial, or alcohol-sales establishments)
- Location and presence of bus stops

6.1.3. Countermeasure Selection Thresholds

To aid in the systemic selection of safety improvement recommendations for segments, intersections, and curves, project selection thresholds were developed and are shown in **Table 10** for segments, **Table 11** for intersections, and **Table 12** for curves. These tables were used to identify safety improvement recommendations for each of the prioritized project locations. Some countermeasures specific to curves are included with the segment countermeasures to address potential risk at curves within a certain segment. For each of the specified safety countermeasures, the tables list an associated CMF, a planning-level cost estimate, the implementation timeframe, and the project selection threshold criteria for the improvement. A more detailed description for each safety countermeasure is provided in **Appendix B1** for segments, **Appendix C1** for intersections, and **Appendix D1** for curves.

At times, the CMFs in the table are provided as a range, showing the range of potential crash modification the countermeasure can have based on differing research, specific crash types, or specific volume-level roadways (i.e., CMFs can vary based on the amount of traffic on the road, vary based on reducing crash severity, or vary between rear-end and run-off-road crashes). The SAP project does not include predictive crash analysis based on calculating the number of crashes that will be reduced by applying a specific countermeasure. The CMFs have been provided for reference to aid the counties in understanding potential reductions from crashes by different countermeasures. The planning-level costs included in the table are high-level estimates that were reviewed and approved by the County Engineer.

Countermeasures selected using the thresholds shown in the tables are shown on the front side of the project sheet. Additional data is needed to assess the suitability of some countermeasures, as this project only provides high-level data. When additional information is needed, the threshold is listed as “County Engineer’s discretion,” and the countermeasures are listed on the back side of the project sheet. These are included at the County Engineer’s request and considering their local knowledge of the roadway network. Additional potential improvements requested by the County Engineer are also included on the back side of the project sheet.

Table 10 - Segment Countermeasure Project Selection Thresholds

Safety Countermeasure	CMF	Cost	Short-Term	Long-Term	Threshold
Conduct Road Safety Assessment (RSA)	CMF varies based on recommendations	\$40,000/each	X		K and A crash rate $\geq$ 14.41 HMVMT AND Total cash rate $\geq$ 179 HMVMT
Conduct Access Control Analysis	CMF varies based on recommendations	\$30,000/each	X		Access Density $\geq$ 24 mile AND Total crash rate $\geq$ 179 HMVMT
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline and Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.76 when installed in combination with Edgelines	\$3,000/mile (centerline) \$3,000/mile (edgeline)	X		All paved roads with lane Width < 12 feet
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.63 - 0.78 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$6,000/mile	X		All paved roads with lane width $\geq$ 12 feet
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earthwork)	0.79 - 0.89 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$150,000/mile		X	Paved roads with speed limit $\geq$ 40 mph AND length > 0.5 miles without existing paved shoulder AND existing shoulder width $\geq$ 2 feet AND ADT $\geq$ 200 with lanes < 11 feet wide OR ADT $\geq$ 1000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.49 - 0.87 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$5,000/mile		X	All paved roads with speed limit $\geq$ 40 mph AND length > 0.5 miles AND ADT $\geq$ 200 or when recommending to Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.36 - 0.56 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$2,000/mile		X	All paved roads with speed limit $\geq$ 40 mph AND length > 0.5 miles AND ADT $\geq$ 200
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0.59 - 0.84 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$3,500/curve	X		On all curves within the segment that do not have signage
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage (Warning signs, Speed Advisory plaques, Chevrons) to meet Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and Iowa DOT standards	0.59 - 0.84 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$1,000/curve	X		On all curves within the segment that currently have signage
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	0.78	\$30,000/mile	X		All paved roads with speed limit $\geq$ 40 mph AND length > 0.5 miles
Flattening and Widening Foreslopes (Excludes Culvert Extensions)	0.88 - 0.92 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$85,000/mile		X	County Engineer's discretion
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control	CMF not defined	\$3,000/each	X		County Engineer's discretion
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape	CMF not defined	\$100/each	X		County Engineer's discretion
Guardrail	0.53 - 0.56 New Guardrail along Embankment	\$80/foot		X	County Engineer's discretion
Install Post-Mounted Delineators	0.55 when installed in combination with edgelines and centerlines	\$5,000/mile	X		County Engineer's discretion
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Signpost	CMF not defined	\$500/curve	X		County Engineer's discretion
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve	CMF not defined	\$5,000/curve	X		Segments prior to curves; County Engineer's discretion
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location	0.56 - 0.78 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$1,000/each		X	All (County Engineer's discretion)
Superelevation Correction on Curve	CMF not defined	\$50,000/curve	X		County Engineer's discretion
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve	0.28 - 0.52 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$50,000/curve		X	County Engineer's discretion
Speed Activated Flashers on Chevron Sign	CMF not defined	\$4,000 /each	X		County Engineer's discretion

Table 11 - Intersection Countermeasure Project Selection Thresholds

Safety Countermeasure	CMF	Cost	Short-Term	Long-Term	Threshold
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	CMF not defined	\$2,500/each	X		Signalized and DEV > 10,000
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	CMF not defined	\$5,000/each		X	Signalized and DEV < 10,000
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	CMF not defined	\$25,000/each	X		One or more K or A crash, DEV > 5,000 and All approaches are county maintained OR Five or more approaches
Implement Results of ICE	CMF not defined	\$750,000/each		X	County engineer's discretion
All-Way Stop Warrant Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0.52 - 1.12	\$5,000/each	X		Unsignalized, Total DEV > 4,500, Minor ADT > 500, Crashes >0, Major ADT = Minor ADT (within 10%) and right angle, rear end, or turning crashes > 0
All-Way Stop Warrant Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approach	CMF not defined	\$5,000/each	X		All way stop AND; Total DEV <4,500, or Minor ADT < 500, or crashes < 1
Install Destination Lighting	0.58 - 0.72 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$5,500/each		X	Unsignalized, Destination lighting not currently installed, and Minor ADT > 200
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings (Paved Approach)	0.34 - 0.91 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$2,200/leg (paved) \$1,100/leg (unpaved)	X		All unsignalized (signs only for unpaved approaches)
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	0.73 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$1,500/leg	X		Unsignalized, and Minor ADT > 200 Or; Distance from previous stop sign = 1.5 miles or more
Install Solar-Powered Beacon on Stop Signs or Stop Sign with LED Flashing Lights	0.84 - 0.95 "Beacon on Stop Sign"	\$2,500/each	X		Unsignalized, Total DEV > 4,500, Minor ADT > 500, Crashes >0, Major ADT = Minor ADT (within 10%), and right angle, rear end, or turning crashes > 0 Or; Destination lighting installed, and Minor ADT > 500 Or; Destination lighting not currently installed, Major ADT > 1,000, and Minor ADT > 500
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	0.71 - 0.79	\$2,500/leg	X		All paved, Unsignalized approaches
Install Intersection Warning Sign and Advance Street Name Plaque on Major Approach	CMF not defined	\$1,200/leg	X		Unsignalized, and Minor ADT > 200
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	0.78	\$5,000/leg	X		All unsignalized intersections
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection	0.73	\$150,000/leg		X	County Engineer's discretion
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection	0.90 - 0.99	\$150,000/leg		X	County Engineer's discretion
Realign Intersection Approaches to Reduce or Eliminate Skew (Paved and unpaved)	0.57 - 0.67	\$100,000/leg (unpaved) \$300,000/leg (paved)		X	County Engineer's discretion
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-Intersection	CMF not defined	\$100,000/each		X	County Engineer's discretion
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)	CMF not defined	\$300,000/each		X	County Engineer's discretion
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatments to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection	CMF not defined	\$75,000/leg		X	County Engineer's discretion
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection	CMF not defined	\$300,000/each		X	County Engineer's discretion
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign	CMF not defined	\$2,500/leg	X		County Engineer's discretion
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post	CMF not defined	\$500/intersection	X		County Engineer's discretion
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)	0.69 - 0.95	\$100,000/each		X	County Engineer's discretion
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign	CMF not defined	\$2,500/sign	X		County Engineer's discretion

Table 12 - Horizontal Curve Countermeasure Project Selection Thresholds

Safety Countermeasure	CMF	Cost	Short-Term	Long-Term	Threshold
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline and Centerline	0.76 when installed in combination with edgelines	\$3,000/mile (centerline) \$3,000/mile (edgeline)	X		All paved curves (centerline) Lane width < 12 feet (edgeline)
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.63 - 0.78 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$6,000/mile	X		All paved curves, Lane width ≥ 12 feet
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earthwork)	0.79 - 0.89 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$150,000/mile		X	On paved curve, ADT ≥ 200, existing shoulder width > 2 feet
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.49 - 0.87 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$5,000/mile		X	On paved curve, ADT ≥ 200
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.36 - 0.56 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$2,000/mile		X	On paved curve, ADT ≥ 1,000
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0.59 - 0.84 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$3,500/curve	X		On all curves that do not have signage
Review and Upgrade Curve Chevrons, Curve Warning Signs, and Speed Advisory Plaques to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0.59 - 0.84 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$1,000/curve	X		On all curves that currently have signage
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	0.78	\$5,000/curve	X		All
Additional Curve Signage	CMF not defined	\$1,000/curve	X		County Engineer's discretion
Install Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Signpost	CMF not defined	\$500/curve	X		County Engineer's discretion
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve	CMF not defined	\$5,000/curve	X		County Engineer's discretion
Superelevation Correction	CMF not defined	\$50,000/each		X	County Engineer's discretion
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST)	0.27 - 0.58 FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure	\$60,000/curve		X	County Engineer's discretion
Speed Activated Flashers on Chevron Sign	CMF not defined	\$4,000/each	X		County Engineer's discretion
Guardrail	0.53 - 0.56 New Guardrail along Embankment	\$80/foot		X	County Engineer's discretion
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control	CMF not defined	\$3,000/each	X		County Engineer's discretion
Install Post-Mounted Delineators	0.55 when installed in combination with edgelines and centerlines	\$5,000/mile	X		County Engineer's discretion

Jones County Safety Action Plan

6.1.4. Draft Project Sheets

Using the data gathered for this plan, draft project sheets were created for roadway segments, intersections, and curves within the county that had the highest risk factor scores. These sheets compile the data used in the risk factor analysis and outline the recommended countermeasures for each location. They are designed to provide information that could be useful for future grant applications, including the project location, systematic ranking data, crash data, geometric data, whether the project is in a disadvantaged community, and an opinion of probable cost for the recommended safety improvements. **Figure 22** summarizes the general organization and information contained within the project sheets.




Figure 22 - Project Sheet Layout

6.1.5. County Input

An in-person workshop was conducted in Jones County on Wednesday, September 4, 2024, to discuss location-specific countermeasures recommended for the high-risk roadway segment, intersection, and curve locations included on the draft project sheets. Detailed data used in the risk factor analysis and countermeasure selection threshold tables were reviewed for accuracy with the County Engineer, and necessary revisions were documented. Additionally, improvements requested by the County Engineer were noted for inclusion on the back side of the project sheet.

6.1.6. Final Project Sheets

After addressing the comments from the county, the project sheets for segments, intersections, and curves were finalized. These project sheets are included in **Appendix B2**, **Appendix C2**, and **Appendix D2**.

Project Recommendations Disclaimer

The recommended improvements contained in the project sheets were developed through a system-wide GIS database risk assessment, as described previously. Kimley-Horn could not confirm or control the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location. Our team provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. Site surveys were not conducted at the specific locations detailed in the project sheets.

The County Engineer may use these project sheets as part of due diligence, but these project sheets should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision-making. The County Engineer can make changes to the prepared project sheets using discretion for each individual location. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the project's scope, budget, and schedule. This assessment is largely based on information provided by others (Iowa DOT, County staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided.

6.2. Segments

The methodology described in **Section 6.1** was followed for county-wide analysis of roadway segments based on the determined risk factors. The road segment limits were determined based on relevant roadway attribute changes along a roadway including pavement width, shoulder width, and street name.

6.2.1. Risk Factor Summary

Each county paved road segment is assigned risk factor points based on the following seven roadway attributes:

- **Traffic Volume (ADT):** The daily average number of vehicles along the roadway segment. The average daily traffic (ADT) for all segments within the county were compared to assign higher risk factor points to segments with higher ADTs.
- **Pavement and Shoulder Width:** The width of pavement and shoulders were used to assign risk factor points to each segment. Segments with narrower pavement and shoulder widths were assigned more risk factor points. **Table 13** further describes the number of points assigned for various width combinations. No differentiation in scoring was given to the shoulder type (paved vs. gravel).
- **Access Density:** Risk factor points were assessed based on the number of driveways and/or intersections per mile. Segments with higher access densities were assigned more points.
- **Curve Density:** The number of curves per mile with a radius less than 1,000 feet and with a length greater than 100 feet. Segments with a higher curve density were assigned more risk factor points.
- **Pavement Condition:** The average of the recorded roughness indices for the length of the segment. Segments with an IRI value over 95 could potentially cause safety concerns and were assigned risk factor points. Per the FHWA, roadways with IRI values less than 95

are considered “good” condition, 95-170 are “acceptable,” and less than 170 are “poor”. Risk factor points were assigned to roadways with acceptable or poor ratings. Research has shown that a rougher ride can contribute to loss of control of a vehicle, particularly when braking or turning.

- **Crash Experience:** The number of lane departure crashes for each segment in the county was reviewed to assign risk factor points to segments where there was a history of lane departure crashes.
- **Potential for Crash Reduction (PCR):** PCR is a value that estimates the potential for safety improvements at a location based on the difference between the predicted average number of crashes per year and the actual number of crashes per year at comparable locations in the same category.

Recommendations were only made where segments were greater than 0.5 miles in length and where the posted speed limit was 40 miles per hour (mph) or higher. This was agreed upon based on the nature of the recommendations, which are more applicable to rural roadway segments, and to provide segments of sufficient length to justify mobilization of construction/maintenance crews and equipment.

Table 13 shows the risk factors for the SAP projects. The maximum possible risk factor score for a segment is 21 points.

Jones County Safety Action Plan

Table 13 - Segment Risk Factor Scores

Risk Factor	Measurement	Points	Max Points Available
Traffic volume	Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	0: ADT percentile is 0%-14.3% 1: ADT percentile is 14.3%-28.6% 2: ADT percentile is 28.6%-42.9% 3: ADT percentile is 42.9%-57.1% 4: ADT percentile is 57.1%-71.4% 5: ADT percentile is 71.4%-85.7% 6: ADT percentile is 85.7%-100%	6
Pavement and shoulder width	Pavement and shoulder width in feet (ft)	0: Pavement width $\geq$ 22 ft and shoulder width $\geq$ 2 ft 0: Pavement width $>$ 18 ft and $<$ 22 ft, and shoulder width $\geq$ 4 ft 2: Pavement width $\geq$ 22 ft and shoulder width $<$ 2 ft 2: Pavement width $>$ 18 ft and $<$ 22 ft and shoulder width $\geq$ 2 ft and $<$ 4 ft 2: Pavement width $\leq$ 18 ft and shoulder width $\geq$ 4 ft 4: Pavement width $>$ 18 ft and $<$ 22 ft, and shoulder width $<$ 2 ft 4: Pavement width $\leq$ 18 ft and shoulder width $<$ 4 ft	4
Potential for Crash Reduction (PCR)	Iowa DOT PCR level definition for all crashes	0: High (less than 0.2) 1: Medium (0.2 to 0.99) 2: Negligible (1 or greater)	2
Access density	Number of intersections and driveways per mile (driveway location per 911 address database)	0: Bottom fourth of the access density Crash Modification Factor (CMF) * 1: Second lowest fourth of the access density CMF * 2: Second highest fourth of the access density CMF * 3: Top fourth of the access density CMF *	3
Curve density	Number of curves per mile with a radius less than 1,000 ft	0: Segments with no curves 1: Curve density percentile is 1%-50% of segments with curves 2: Curve density percentile is more than 50% of segments with curves	2
Pavement condition	Average International Roughness Index (IRI)	0: Less than 95 1: 95 to 170 2: More than 170	2
Crash experience	Presence of a lane departure crash	0: No lane departure crashes 2: One or more lane departure crashes	2
Total available points			21

* Access density CMF equation as presented in the HSM (Equation 13-7)

6.2.2. Risk Factor Rankings

Segment risk factor ranking calculations were performed on all county paved roadway segments (greater than 0.5 miles in length and with posted speed limits of 40 mph or greater). The results of the rankings are shown in **Figure 23**. **Figure 24** shows the location and summary of risk factor ranking of each of the roadway segments analyzed within the SAP. Segments were identified as high, medium-high, medium-low, or low based on the risk factor points they received. These categories were determined by comparing the scores of the segments against each other. If a segment was manually selected by the County to include as a prioritized segment, it is automatically categorized as a high-risk segment.





Figure 23 - Jones County Segment Risk Factor Scores

Jones County Safety Action Plan



The information contained in this map is based on the Iowa DOT RAMS Database (August 2023)

Legend

- County Paved Roads
- County Unpaved Roads
- State Roads
- Corporate Limits

Segment Risk Score

- High
- Medium-High
- Medium-Low
- Low



Figure 24 - Jones County Segment Risk Factor Map

Jones County Safety Action Plan

6.2.3. Prioritized Segment Recommendations

Project sheets were developed for segment locations with the greatest amount of risk factor points. The segments for which project sheets were developed (those with the greatest amount of risk factor points) are summarized in **Table 14** and the project sheets are included in **Appendix B2**. Also included in the table are the high-scoring intersections and high-scoring curves that fall within the segments.

Table 14 - Prioritized Segment Recommendations

GPS ID	Segment	Segment Length (miles)	Risk Factor Points	High Scoring Intersections	High Scoring Curves (GPS ID)	Estimated Project Cost
4842	County Road E34 between US-151 NE Ramp and Wapsipinicon River	3	16		6176, 6182, 6189, 6219	\$227,000
4888	Ridge Road E28 between 0.3 miles northwest of 138 Street and 800 feet west of W Cedar Street	4	14		6064, 6112, 6157, 6174	\$1,176,000
4851	County Road X40 between Vine Street and US 151	5	13	44551		\$1,448,000
4862	Old US 151 Signed Route between 1000 feet north of S Main Street and 300 feet south of Cr E16	1	13			\$231,000
4863	Old US 151 Signed Route between 400 feet southwest of River Road and US 151	1	13	151569	6602, 6648	\$437,000
4841A	County Road X28 between Fairview Road and Wapsipinicon River	2	12			\$188,000
4841B	County Road X28 between Wapsipinicon River and Ridge Road E-28	1	12			\$97,000
4857	Stone Bridge Road between Co Road E16 and Timber Road	3	11	44793		\$185,000
4907	County Road D62 between Linn-Jones Road and 1000 feet west of Dana Avenue	9	11	44793		\$530,000
4884	Fairview Road between Linn Jones Road and Cr E34	2	11			\$122,000
4911*	248th Street between US 151 and 1st Avenue W & McKinley Street SW	1	10			-
4877*	County Road X64 between Cedar County Limit and 1st Avenue S	5	10			-

Jones County Safety Action Plan


GPS ID	Segment	Segment Length (miles)	Risk Factor Points	High Scoring Intersections	High Scoring Curves (GPS ID)	Estimated Project Cost
4898**	County Home Road E23 between 190 Avenue and IA 38	8	10	44723		\$497,000
4910	County Road D61 between 0.9 miles west of 245th Street and Jackson County Limit	5	10			\$308,000
4904	County Road E16 between Linn-Jones Road and 600 feet west of Business Highway 151	9	9			\$523,000
4850*	County Road X40 between Cedar/Jones Co Line Road and 500 feet south of Main Street	4	8			-
Total (16 Segments)†						\$7,639,000

*Segment removed at the request of the County Engineer. No project sheets will be developed.

**Segment added at the request of the County Engineer.

†Total cost excludes segments that are no longer prioritized.

Figure 25 shows the locations of the roadway segments with highest risk factor ranking, where project sheets and specific segment recommendations were made. The segment risk factor ranking results and relevant data for every analyzed roadway segment is included in **Appendix B3**.



6.3. Intersections

The methodology described in **Section 6.1** was followed for a systematic analysis of county paved intersections based on the determined risk factors. Additional details on the risk factor calculations, risk factor ranking results, project selection decision tree, and project sheets are described in the following sections.

6.3.1. Risk Factor Summary

Every intersection within each county containing at least one County-maintained paved roadway leg is analyzed for risk according to the following nine key attributes:

- **Distance from Previous Stop Sign:** if any stop-controlled approach had a distance of at least 1.5 miles from the previous stop sign, risk points were assigned. The longer the distance a driver travels without stopping, the more likely they are to fail to stop at the next stop sign because they are not expecting it.
- **Intersection Skew:** the intersection was assigned risk factor points if any of the side roads had an approach angle (skew) of less than 85 degrees. Based on Iowa crash data analyzed by InTrans, crash experience increases at intersections with skew at 85 degrees and 70 degrees. According to the *Highway Design Handbook for Older Drivers and Pedestrians*, “Skew angles in excess of 75 degrees often create special problems at stop-controlled rural intersections. The angle complicates the vision triangle for the stopped vehicle; increases the time to cross the through road; and results in a larger, more potentially confusing intersection.”
- **Horizontal Curvature:** the number of curves (with length more than 100 feet and radius less than 1,000 feet) within 250 feet of the intersection on any County- or State-maintained approach. Risk factor points were assigned to intersections with one or more curves within close proximity of the intersection. Roadway curves in close proximity to intersections can limit sight distance, increasing crash potential.
- **Traffic Volume (DEV):** the average number of vehicles entering the intersection per day. The daily entering volume (DEVs) for all the intersections in the county were compared against each other to assign higher risk factor points to intersections with higher DEVs within the county. It is understood that more vehicles entering an intersection creates more exposure and, therefore, increases the risk of a crash.
- **Minor Street Volume:** with a higher minor street volume, there is an increase in crash exposure, specifically with angle crashes. The third highest approach volume was used for the minor street volume. Minor street volumes for all the intersections in the county were compared against each other to assign higher risk factor points to intersections with higher minor street volumes within the county.
- **Access Management:** risk points were assigned if an access point (driveway or other intersection) was located within 250 feet of the intersection. Driveways and other access points located within the functional area of intersections create additional opportunities for conflict points and cause drivers to make more decisions within the functional area of an intersection, increasing risk for a crash.
- **Crash Experience:** each intersection was assigned risk factor points if a K or A crash occurred within 150 feet of the intersection. This attribute accounts for crash history, which may be indicative of improvement needs.
- **Intersection Configuration:** as an additional risk factor to capture potential conflicts at an intersection, the number of approaches were considered as a risk factor. If an intersection had four or more approaches, it was assigned a risk factor point.
- **PCR:** a value that estimates the potential for safety improvements at a location based on the difference between the predicted average number of crashes per year and the actual number of crashes per year at comparable locations in the same category.

Table 15 shows the risk factors for the SAP projects. The maximum possible risk factor score for an intersection is 24 points.

Jones County Safety Action Plan

Table 15 - Intersection Risk Factor Scores

Risk Factor	Measurement	Points	Max Points Available
Distance from previous stop sign	Stop sign locations based on information provided by the County Engineer	0: Less than 1.5 miles	4
		4: 1.5 miles or more	
Intersection skew	Skew angle of most skewed approach	0: 85-90 degrees	4
		2: 70-85 degrees	
		4: Less than 70 degrees	
Horizontal curvature	Intersection on or within 250 feet of a curve (length > 100' and radius < 1,000')	0: None	4
		4: 1 or more	
Traffic volume	DEV	0: DEV percentile is 0%-25%	3
		1: DEV percentile is 25%-50%	
		2: DEV percentile is 50%-75%	
		3: DEV percentile is 75%-100%	
Minor street volume	ADT	0: Bottom third of county minor street ADTs	2
		1: Middle third of county minor street ADTs	
		2: Top third of county minor street ADTs	
Access management	Driveways or another intersection within 250 feet of the intersection	0: None	2
		1: 1 or 2	
		2: More than 2	
Crash experience	Fatal or serious injury (K or A) crash within 150 feet of the intersection	0: None	2
		2: 1 or more	
Intersection configuration	Number of approaches	0: Less than 4 approaches	1
		1: 4 or more approaches	
PCR	Iowa DOT PCR level definition for all crashes	0: High (less than 0.2)	2
		1: Medium (0.2 to 0.99)	
		2: Negligible (1 or greater)	
Total available points			24

6.3.2. Risk Factor Rankings

Risk factor calculations were performed for each of the intersections in the county containing at least one County-maintained paved approach. The results of the risk factor rankings are provided in **Figure 26**. To further aid the county in determining which projects they may want to pursue, the intersections were divided into two categories:

- **County-State:** This includes intersections of county roads with Iowa DOT-maintained roads.
- **County-County and County-Other:** This includes intersections of county roads with other county roads as well as intersections of county roads with other roads that are not maintained by the County or the Iowa DOT (such as city streets).





Figure 26 - Jones County Intersection Risk Factor Scores

Figure 27 on the following page shows the location and risk factor score of each intersection analyzed within the SAP. Intersections were identified as high, medium-high, medium-low, or low based on the risk factor points they received. These categories were determined by comparing the scores of the intersections against each other. If an intersection was manually selected by the County to include as a prioritized intersection, it is automatically categorized as a high-risk intersection.

Jones County Safety Action Plan



The information contained in this map is based on the Iowa DOT Intersection Database provided on February 6, 2024

Legend

- County Paved Roads
- County Unpaved Roads
- State Roads
- Corporate Limits

Intersection Risk Score

- High
- Medium-High
- Medium-Low
- Low

Figure 27 - Jones County Intersection Risk Factor Map

6.3.3. Prioritized Intersection Recommendations

Project sheets were developed for intersection locations with the greatest amount of risk factor points. The intersections for which project sheets were developed (those with the greatest amount of risk factor points) are summarized in **Table 16** and the project sheets are in **Appendix C2**. For intersections located on a high-scoring roadway segment, the GPS ID of the segment is listed in the table.


Table 16 - Prioritized Intersection Recommendations

GPS ID	Intersection	Risk Factor Points	High Scoring Segment (GPS ID)	Estimated Project Cost
County-County / County-Other Intersections				
44793	County Road D62/County Road D-62 & Stone Bridge Road	14	4857, 4907	\$257,000
44723	County Road E23/County Home Road E-23 & Co Road X44/Amber Road X-44	14	4898	\$225,000
44748	County Road X31/County Road X-31 & 158 Street & 220 Avenue	13		\$1,080,000
44551	County Road X40/County Road X-40 & Green Road	13	4851	\$17,000
44939	Main Street & County Road X40	13		\$26,000
44641*	County Road E34/County Road E-34 & 215 Avenue	13	4842	-
44724*	County Road E23/County Home Road E-23 & Blacksmith Road & Bluecut Road	13	4898	-
County-County / County-Other Total (7 Intersections)[†]				\$1,605,000
County-State Intersections				
150087	US 151 & Shaw Road	14		\$596,000
151569	US 151 & Old Highway 151 Connector	14	4863	\$32,000
44450	IA 64 & Amber Road X44	14		\$23,000
44433	IA 38 & 190th Street	14		\$37,000
114935	US 151 & 130th Street	13		\$44,000
County-State Total (5 Intersections)				\$732,000
Intersection Total (12 Intersections)[†]				\$2,337,000

*Intersection removed at the request of the County Engineer. No project sheets will be developed.

[†]Total cost excludes intersections that are no longer prioritized.

Figure 28 illustrates the locations of the intersections with highest risk factor ranking, where project sheets and specific intersection improvement recommendations were made. The intersection risk factor ranking results and relevant data for every analyzed intersection is included in the summary spreadsheet included in **Appendix C3**.



6.4. Horizontal Curves

The methodology described in **Section 6.1** was followed by county-wide analysis of paved horizontal curves based on the determined risk factors. Additional details on the risk factor calculations, risk factor ranking results, project selection decision tree, and project sheets are described in the following sections.

6.4.1. Risk Factor Summary

Each paved horizontal curve that was identified in the horizontal curve database within the county is systematically analyzed for risk according to the following six key attributes:

- **Traffic Volume (ADT):** the average number of vehicles per day along the roadway curve. The ADTs for all curves within the county were compared to assign higher risk factors to curves with a higher ADT. It is understood that more vehicles traveling along a curve increases the risk of a crash.
- **Curve Radius:** all curves with radii smaller than 2,500 feet and with a length greater than 100 feet were assessed as risk factor points. Curves with smaller radii were assigned additional points based on the crash data reviewed for county paved horizontal curves, showing more crashes on curves with smaller radii.
- **Shoulder Width:** risk factor points were assigned to all curves with shoulder widths less than six feet, with more risk factor points associated with narrower shoulders. This was based on the HSM Chapter 10, Table 10-9 and 10-10, which illustrates that with wider shoulders, crash risk is reduced. No differentiation in scoring was given to the shoulder type (paved vs. gravel).
- **Access Management:** risk was assessed if a driveway was within 250 feet of the curve. Additional risk points were assessed if an intersection was within 250 feet of the curve. Driveways and other access points located on or near curves create additional opportunities for conflict points and cause drivers to make additional decisions within the curve, with a potential for reduced sight distance, increasing risk of a crash.
- **Pavement Condition:** the average of the recorded roughness indices for the length of the segment. Pavement with an IRI value over 95 could potentially cause safety concerns and were assigned risk factor points.
- **Crash Experience:** each curve was assigned risk factor points if a K or A crash occurred within 150 feet of the curve. This attribute accounts for crash history, which may be indicative of improvement needs.

Table 17 shows the risk factors in the SAP projects. The maximum possible risk factor score for a horizontal curve is 21 points.

Table 17 - Horizontal Curve Risk Factor Scores

Risk Factor	Measurement	Points	Max Points Available
Traffic volume	ADT	0: ADT percentile is 0%-14.3%	6
		1: ADT percentile is 14.3%-28.6%	
		2: ADT percentile is 28.6%-42.9%	
		3: ADT percentile is 42.9%-57.1%	
		4: ADT percentile is 57.1%-71.4%	
		5: ADT percentile is 71.4%-85.7%	
		6: ADT percentile is 85.7%-100%	
Curve radius	Radius of curve in feet	0: Greater than 2,500 feet	4
		1: 1,000 to 2,500 feet	
		3: 500 to 1,000 feet	
		4: Less than or equal to 500 feet	
Shoulder width	Shoulder width in feet	0: 6-foot shoulder and greater	4
		2: 2-foot shoulder to 6-foot shoulder	
		4: less than 2-foot shoulder	
Access management	Intersections and driveways within 250 feet of the curve	0: no intersection or driveway within 250 feet	3
		1: driveway within 250 feet	
		3: intersection within 250 feet	
Pavement condition	Average IRI	0: Less than 95	2
		1: 95 to 170	
		2: More than 170	
Crash experience	Fatal or serious injury (K or A) crash within 150 feet of the curve	0: none	2
		2:1 or more	
Total available points			21

6.4.2. Risk Factor Rankings

The risk factor calculations were performed on each of the curves on paved roads in the county which have a length greater than or equal to 100 feet and a radius less than 2,500 feet. The results of the risk factor rankings are provided in **Figure 29**. **Figure 30** on the following page shows the location and risk factor ranking of each curve analyzed within the SAP. Curves were identified as high, medium-high, medium-low, or low based on the risk factor points they received. These categories were determined by comparing the scores of the curves against each other. If a curve was manually selected by the County to include as a prioritized curve, it is automatically categorized as a high-risk curve.





Figure 29 - Jones County Horizontal Curve Risk Scores

Jones County Safety Action Plan



The information contained in this map is based on the Iowa DOT Curves Database provided on February 6, 2024.

Legend

- County Paved Roads
- County Unpaved Roads
- State Roads
- Corporate Limits

Curve Risk Score

- High
- Medium-High
- Medium-Low
- Low

Figure 30 - Jones County Horizontal Curve Risk Factor Map

6.4.3. Prioritized Horizontal Curve Recommendations

Project sheets were developed for curve locations with the greatest amount of risk factor points. The curves with the greatest amount of risk factor points are shown in **Table 18** and project sheets are in **Appendix D2**. For curves located on a high-scoring roadway segment, the GPS ID of the segment is listed in the table.

Table 18 - Prioritized Horizontal Curve Recommendations

GPS ID	Curve	Risk Factor Points	High Scoring Segment (GPS ID)	Estimated Project Cost
6189	Curve 6189 On Co Rd E-34	18	4842	\$101,000
6142*	Curve 6142 On Co Rd E-34	15	4842	-
6648	Curve 6648 On Old Us 151 Signed Route	15	4863	\$37,000
6064	Curve 6064 On Ridge Rd E-28	14	4888	\$165,000
6176	Curve 6176 On Co Rd E-34	13	4842	\$12,000
6219	Curve 6219 On Co Rd E-34	13	4842	\$96,000
6602	Curve 6602 On Old Us 151 Signed Route	13	4863	\$444,000
6174	Curve 6174 On Ridge Rd E-28	13	4888	\$113,000
6157	Curve 6157 On Ridge Rd E-28	13	4888	\$115,000
6112	Curve 6112 On Ridge Rd E-28	13	4888	\$126,000
6182	Curve 6182 On Co Rd E-34	12	4842	\$14,000
Total (11 Curves)[†]				\$1,223,000

*Curve removed at the request of the County Engineer. No project sheets will be developed.

[†]Total cost excludes curves that are no longer prioritized.

Figure 31 shows the locations of the curves where project sheets and specific curve improvement recommendations were made. The risk factor ranking results and relevant data for every analyzed curve is included in **Appendix D3**.




Figure 31 - Prioritized Horizontal Curve Project Locations Map

6.5. Unpaved Roadways

Jones County maintains 841 miles of county roads, of which 676 miles are unpaved (80%). Crashes on unpaved roads accounted for 100 of the 440 crashes (23%) in Jones County from 2019 to 2023. Unpaved roadways were not included in the analysis based on limited data availability, low traffic volumes, and limited types of safety improvements that can be systemically implemented on unpaved roads. Even though location-specific recommendations were not made as part of this project, safety along unpaved segments, at unpaved intersections, and along unpaved curves is also important. Potential projects and/or activities that could be implemented on unpaved roadways include the following items:

- Maintenance of gravel
- Major rehabilitation
- Upgrade signs
- Realign intersection
- Improve/increase shoulder/lane width
- Delineate roadside hazards with retroreflective markers
- Curve chevrons
- Advance curve warning signs and speed advisory plaques
- Driveway entrance policy
- Clear and grub
- Winter maintenance

Descriptions of each of these unpaved roadway safety countermeasures are provided in **Appendix E**.

7. CANDIDATE LOCATIONS BASED ON CRASH HISTORY (CLCH)

While the intent of the SAP is to identify systemic safety improvements at segments, intersections, and curves throughout the county, the following tables provide a list of high-crash locations which were identified using a crash experience methodology for roadway segments (**Table 19**), intersections (**Table 20**), and curves (**Table 21**). For the purposes of this project, the CLCH methodology included ten years of crash data, and was modified and applied to segments and curves, normalizing the analysis by crashes per mile.

It is recommended that the County Engineer consider applying for TSIP funding at these locations because TSIP more heavily weights benefit-cost analysis using the most recent 5-years of crash data. The County Engineer can review these locations to determine if safety improvements, similar to the ones outlined within **Section 6.2**, **Section 6.3**, and **Section 6.4** are applicable, and develop a TSIP application based on the recommended improvements.

Table 19 - Segment High-Crash Locations

Rank	GPS ID	Segment	Length (mi)	Identified as High-Risk Location
1	4848	Shaw Road between US 151 and 400 feet southeast of 3rd Street	1.47	No
2	4842	County Road E34 between US-151 NE Ramp and Wapsipinicon River	3.27	Yes
3	4839	Linn-Jones Road between US 151 and Fairview Road	1.03	No
4	4862	Old US 151 Signed Route between 1000 feet N of S Main Street and 300 feet S of Cr E16	0.87	Yes
5	4851	County Road X40 between Vine Street and US 151	5.48	Yes
6	4859	Langworthy Road between US 151 and US 151	1.09	No
7	4888	Ridge Road E28 between 0.3 miles NW of 138 Street and 800 feet W of W Cedar Street	4.46	Yes
8	4884	Fairview Road between Linn Jones Road and Cr E34	1.96	Yes
9	4880	County Road E45 between 600 feet E of Vine Street and 0.3 miles W of Resident Street	4.82	No
10	4841	County Road X28 between Fairview Road and Ridge Road E-28	3.01	Yes

Jones County Safety Action Plan

Table 20 - Intersection High-Crash Locations

Rank	GPS ID	Intersection	Control Type	Identified as High-Risk Location
1	44832	County Road E16/Co Road E-16 & 200 Avenue	Two-way stop	No
2	44488	IA 136 & E17	One-way stop	No
3	114935	US 151 & 130th Street	Two-way stop	Yes
4	44639	US 151 & X40	One-way stop	No
5	44741	County Road X31/County Road X-31 & Old Cass Road	Two-way stop	No
6	150087	US 151 & Shaw Road	Two-way stop	Yes
7	44641	County Road E34/County Road E-34 & 215 Avenue	One-way stop	No
8	44755	County Road E28/Ridge Road E-28 & Freemont Road	One-way stop	No
9	44636	County Road X28/County Road X-28 & Stone City Road	One-way stop	No
10	44502	County Road E45/County Road E-45 & County Road X75/County Road X-75	One-way stop	No

Table 21 - Curve High-Crash Candidate Locations

Rank	GPS ID	Roadway	Nearest Town	Length (ft)	Radius (ft)	Identified as High-Risk Location
1	6457	County Road D-62	Monticello	1719	2067	No
2	6064	Ridge Road E-28	Anamosa	1711	1165	Yes
3	6807	County Road E-45	Olin	1213	1249	No
4	6505	County Home Road E-23 Signed Route	Anamosa	644	828	No
5	6980	County Road X-64	Oxford Junction	928	629	No
6	6189	County Road E-34	Anamosa	619	726	Yes
7	6186	County Road D-62	Hopkinton	1418	1230	No
8	6031	Fairview Road	Anamosa	636	2086	No
9	6112	Ridge Road E-28	Anamosa	859	860	Yes
10	6215	County Road X-31	Anamosa	422	2353	No

8. SUMMARY

The Jones County SAP was developed to aid County leaders in identifying and prioritizing safety improvement projects for their paved, county-maintained roadways and to build a culture of safety within the county.

8.1. Overview of SAP Development Process

The SAP was developed through a seven-step process as outlined below.

- **Gather Background Information:** The Iowa SHSP was reviewed, and data was requested from the county to provide the location and presence of rumble strips, destination lighting, stop signs, and other pertinent safety improvements.
- **Data Collection:** A comprehensive GIS project database was developed utilizing the following databases as provided by Iowa DOT, the County, or collected as part of this project:
 - Crash
 - Roadway
 - Pavement management
 - Roadside hazard
 - Horizontal curve
 - County stop sign locations
 - Intersection
- **Data Analysis:** After development of the comprehensive GIS project database, county crash data was analyzed. Crashes were compared to the Iowa SHSP Safety Emphasis Areas and maps were prepared for the County as well as the PowerBI dashboard.
- **Countermeasure Selection:** A list of systemic safety improvement countermeasures was developed as well as list of safety topics and potential driver-related countermeasures, which were shared with County safety stakeholders for review.
- **Develop Projects for Inclusion into the SAP:** A risk factor ranking process was developed for segments, intersections, and curves, and risk factor scores were calculated for all the segments, intersections, and curves within Jones County. After conducting the risk factor analysis, safety improvement recommendations were developed for the feature types and summarized in location-specific project sheets. These project sheets, detailing the recommended safety improvements at specific locations, were then provided to the County Engineer for review.
- **County Input:** A workshop was held with the County's safety stakeholders. At the workshop, driver-related countermeasures were reviewed and stakeholders discussed existing and proposed driver-related countermeasures. In addition, a workshop was held with the County Engineer to obtain input on the developed projects. Draft project sheets were reviewed at the workshop and the County Engineer provided input for additional safety countermeasures based on engineering judgment and site-specific knowledge.
- **Develop SAP:** An SAP was developed for Jones County including a summary of the SAP process along with recommended safety projects for implementation by the County.

8.2. Recommended Improvements

The following sections summarize the engineering and driver-related countermeasures identified as part of this SAP that should be explored for implementation in the county over the next five to ten years.

8.2.1. Engineering Countermeasures

Systemic safety improvement projects were developed with input from the county for high-ranking roadway segments, intersections, and horizontal curves on Jones County paved roads. Each project location is shown in **Figure 32**, and **Table 22** provides a cost summary of the recommended projects. Detailed information for each safety countermeasure is provided in **Section 6**, as well as in **Appendix B1**, **Appendix C1**, and **Appendix D1**. Detailed information for each project is provided in **Section 6**, as well as in project sheets in **Appendix B2**, **Appendix C2**, and **Appendix D2** for roadway segments, intersections, and horizontal curves, respectively. These sheets may require updating for funding applications in future years. The County Engineer may also make changes to the prepared project sheets based on local knowledge of the site, available funding, and/or specific needs.

[illegible]

-  County Paved Roads
-  County Unpaved Roads
- State Roads
-  Corporate Limits

- County Paved Segments
- County-County/County-Other Intersections
- County-State Intersections
- County Paved Curves



Kimley»Horn

Table 22 - Engineering Countermeasure Cost Summary

Facility Type	Number of Locations	Estimated Project Cost
Segment	13	\$7,639,000
Intersection	10	\$2,337,000
Curve	10	\$1,223,000
Total Improvement Costs	33	\$11,253,000

While improvements were identified for the prioritized locations, low-cost countermeasures are recommended to be implemented for all paved roadway segments, intersections, and curves as funding becomes available. The countermeasure selection threshold tables (**Table 10** for segments, **Table 11** for intersections, and **Table 12** for curves) should be used to identify appropriate safety improvement recommendations for those locations.

8.2.2. Driver-Related Countermeasures

A workshop was conducted in Jones County on Wednesday, September 4, 2024, to discuss driver-related crashes occurring in the county and to identify strategies aimed at improving driver behavior to enhance road safety. A summary of the workshop discussion is provided in **Section 5.2**. Based on these discussions, the status of implementing driver-related strategies in the county is summarized in **Table 23**. It is recommended that the county partner with all five Es of safety to implement countermeasures that are not currently underway/ongoing and look for opportunities to introduce additional countermeasures that are not currently being implemented.

Table 23 - County Driver-Related Countermeasures Summary

Countermeasure	Status
Speed Related	
Conduct targeted speed enforcement	Ongoing/Opportunity
Prosecute and impose sanctions on drivers not obeying school bus stop bars	Underway/Ongoing
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Occupant Protection	
Conduct targeted enforcement of restraint use	Ongoing/Opportunity
Instruction in proper child restraint use	Underway/Ongoing
Check for proper child restraint use in all motorist encounters	Ongoing/Opportunity
Positive reinforcement	Completed in the Past
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Younger Drivers	
Enforcement of minor school license and graduated driver's license laws	Ongoing/Opportunity
Additional training in schools	Underway/Ongoing
Conduct education awareness campaigns	Ongoing/Opportunity

Impairment Involved	
Conduct targeted OWI enforcement	Opportunity
Compliance checks for alcohol sales	Underway/Opportunity
Alternative transportation choices	Opportunity
Prosecute, impose sanctions on, and treat OWI offenders	Ongoing/Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Older Drivers	
Promote safe mobility choices	Opportunity
Encourage external reporting of at-risk drivers to licensing authorities	Ongoing/Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity
Distracted Driving	
Visibly enforce existing statutes to deter distracted driving	Opportunity
Agency policy for hands-free devices	Ongoing/Opportunity
Mobile simulator for distracted driving	Opportunity
Conduct education and awareness campaigns	Opportunity

8.3. Implementation

The SAP project aims to provide a document that is both practical and frequently referenced by the county for requesting funding and completing traffic safety improvement projects on county-maintained roads. The following outlines key opportunities that can be used to implement the recommendations included within this plan. ICEA staff is available to assist counties in identifying and pursuing funding opportunities.

- SS4A Implementation Grant:** With the completion of this SAP, Jones County is eligible to apply for additional funding through the SS4A program. An SS4A Implementation Grant provides federal funds to implement projects and strategies identified in an SAP to address roadway safety issues, including infrastructural, behavioral, and/or operational activities. The county should consider applying for an Implementation Grant to secure funding to implement the engineering projects and driver-related strategies recommended in this plan.
- Iowa Transportation Funding Opportunities:** The county should leverage funding opportunities available through Iowa DOT funding programs such as HSIP-Local or TSIP, to implement the projects identified in this plan. The various funding opportunities are outlined in **Section 2.2**.
- Five-Year Transportation Improvement Program:** The county should review projects within the five-year program and consider including safety recommendations from the project sheets into those projects, where applicable. In future cycles of the program, it is recommended that safety projects included on the project sheets are considered for inclusion.
- Maintenance Activities:** Maintenance activities and upcoming design projects offer a great opportunity to incorporate safety countermeasures into already funded projects, often with minimal increases to the overall project cost. As such, it is recommended that when the county is designing projects and/or addressing a maintenance issue, the

countermeasure selection thresholds (detailed in **Section 6.1.3**) are reviewed and countermeasures appropriate for the location are incorporated into the design. Doing so can help prioritize projects and emphasize safety in design and maintenance activities. In addition, the countermeasure information within this document should be used to provide instruction or education to maintenance crews about their ability to enhance safety in the county through their work.

- **Countywide Partnerships:** It is recommended that the County continue to foster cooperation with safety stakeholders and look for opportunities to improve and expand the implementation of driver-related countermeasures.

8.4. Next Steps

The county should continue its history of implementing safety improvement projects annually. Based on current funding levels, it is anticipated that many of the engineering improvements listed in this plan could be implemented within five to ten years, or sooner. Additionally, this SAP should be updated within five to ten years to reflect improvements that have been implemented, additional availability of roadway feature data, and changes in crash types and patterns.

APPENDIX A


COUNTY COMMITMENT PLEDGE



JONES COUNTY PLEDGE

In this pledge, we formalize Jones County's support of the strategies outlined in Iowa's Five-Year Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) 2024-2028 and the overall vision of Zero Fatalities on Iowa's public roadways. In addition, we reaffirm Jones County's goal of a dramatic decrease in roadway fatalities and serious injuries by the years 2030 and 2050, respectively, as detailed in the resolution adopted in 2022 by our Board of Supervisors for participation in the Iowa County Engineers Association (ICEA) Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Grant Application. Jones County is committed to implementing the safety strategies outlined in this Safety Action Plan (SAP), which will assist road users with staying safe while driving, walking, or riding in Jones County. Jones County is dedicated to measuring its progress towards these goals and providing quantitative metrics as we continue to take the necessary steps to improve safety on the county's roadways in order to realize our eventual goal of zero roadway fatalities and serious injuries by 2050.

Jones County Board of Supervisors




Ned Rohwedder




John Schlarmann



Jeff Swisher



Joe Oswald



Jon Zirkelbach

APPENDIX B1

SEGMENT SAFETY COUNTERMEASURES

COUNTY PAVED ROADWAY SEGMENT COUNTERMEASURES

This appendix summarizes the **segment** safety countermeasures for consideration and provides detailed descriptions for each countermeasure from both the risk factor analysis as well as the additional potential improvements listed on the back side of the project sheets.

Systematic Countermeasures

The countermeasures in this section were included in the risk factor analysis and recommended on the segment project sheets based on the criteria described in **Section 5.1.2**.

Conduct a Road Safety Assessment (RSA)

An RSA is a formal safety performance examination that reviews, in detail, the geometry of a roadway facility. As part of an RSA, an independent, multi-disciplinary team assesses the condition of a given roadway and provides short-, mid-, and long-term recommendations for safety improvements for all modes currently or planned to be provided by the facility. RSAs have been conducted throughout the United States and are generally accepted as a proactive, low-cost approach to improve safety. This countermeasure cost estimate does not include the cost of implementing the recommendations of the RSA.

Conduct Access Control Analysis

An access control analysis can aid in determining access management decisions along a corridor. This countermeasure is intended to provide additional information on a specific facility as to the most appropriate access control treatments. Consolidating driveways reduces the number of conflict points on a given roadway and concentrates access where through-drivers can expect and anticipate left and/or right-turning vehicles, thus improving safety. The cost estimate associated with this countermeasure does not include implementing the findings of the access control analysis.

New Pavement Markings

This safety countermeasure includes new groove-in centerline and edgeline retroreflective pavement markings. The updated markings can clarify and further delineate the segment or curve, reducing the risk of a lane departure crash. If the lanes were 12 feet or wider, new edgeline pavement markings of six inches were recommended; Research suggests that widening pavement markings from four to six inches in rural areas results in a CMF of 0.64 to 0.83. Otherwise, new four-inch pavement markings were recommended. Research suggests that installing new 4" pavement markings in rural areas results in a CMF of 0.61 to 0.74.

Increase Shoulder Width/Safety Edge

Constructing or increasing the width of an existing paved shoulder can reduce the potential for a severe crash as the result of a lane departure. CMFs associated with paving the shoulder in rural areas range from 0.75 to 0.99. At locations where paved shoulders are recommended, it is suggested that the County Engineer consider a minimum of a two-foot shoulder; however, based on right-of-way and roadway characteristics, the County Engineer may choose to install a wider shoulder. According to the FHWA, a Safety Edge is "a simple but effective solution that can help save lives by allowing drivers who drift off [roadways] to return to the road safely. Instead of a vertical drop-off, the Safety Edge shapes the edge of pavement to 30 degrees." The installation of a Safety Edge has CMFs of 0.77 - 0.96 and is an FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure.

Edgeline Rumble Strips

Edgeline rumble strips provide tactile and audible warning to a driver if they are beginning to depart the lane. This safety improvement has recorded CMFs in the range of 0.61 to 0.67. Depending on the conditions of the roadway, the County Engineer may choose to install rumble strips placed in the shoulder offset from the edgeline, or they may place the rumble strips on the edgeline and provide pavement markings over them, resulting in edgeline rumble stripes. For purposes of this document, both will be called rumble strips.

Centerline Rumble Strips

CMFs of 0.55 to 0.91 represent the safety benefit from the installation of centerline rumble strips. In Iowa, rumble strips placed in the centerline of the roadway generally have pavement markings over them. To be consistent with the Iowa DOT Design Manual 3C-5, centerline rumble strips will be referred to as rumble strips even though in circumstances they may technically be “rumble stripes”. This safety improvement provides an audible and tactile warning to drivers when crossing the centerline and can aid in the avoidance of some high-severity lane departure crashes.

Curve Chevron Advanced Curve Warning or Advisory Speed Signs

This countermeasure includes the installation of Curve Chevron signs—static or dynamic—and Advisory Speed Signs to improve driver awareness and navigation through horizontal curves. As identified by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), these treatments are Proven Safety Countermeasures that significantly reduce crash risks, particularly on rural and county roads. Chevron signs, especially when enhanced with retroreflective materials or deployed in sequential dynamic formats, can reduce fatal and injury crashes by up to 60 percent. Advisory Speed Signs complement these by clearly communicating safe travel speeds based on curve geometry, helping drivers adjust their behavior in advance. Together, these low-cost, high-impact interventions provide continuous visual guidance, and improve nighttime and low-visibility navigation.

Clear and Grub

This countermeasure includes clearing and grubbing the areas within the clear zone of the roadway (defined here as 15 feet on each side of the road). This safety countermeasure decreases the hazard of a run-off-the-road crash by reducing the number of obstructions a vehicle could impact after a lane departure. A 0.78 CMF has been documented as the distance from roadside features was increased.

For descriptions on curve countermeasures see **Appendix D1**.

Location Specific Countermeasures

Safety improvements not included on the first page of the roadway segment project sheet may still merit consideration at a specific location. There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included in the risk factor analysis due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed at road segments throughout the county. The following sections additional roadway segment safety improvements that could be considered appropriate by the county and that were included on the back side of the project sheets.

Flattening and Widening Foreslopes

This improvement includes flattening the foreslopes of the roadway edge from 2V:1H (typical) to 3V:1H to increase the ability of a driver after a lane departure to return to the roadway safely. CMFs for flattening side slopes are in the range of 0.9, while flattening to 4:1 or 6:1 are in the range of 0.58 to 0.71.

On-pavement Markings for Speed Control

This improvement includes installing in-lane pavement markings, including the speed limit, to reinforce the posted speed limit. On-pavement markings can serve as additional information and reminders to drivers of the posted speed limit and the importance of observing their speed. A CMF of 0.62 has been recorded for adding additional on-pavement markings.

Delineate Roadside Hazards with Retroreflective Markers

Retroreflective markers can be applied to roadside objects and trees, increasing the visibility of hazards, and helping delineate the roadway where minimal delineation may exist.

Guardrail

Installing guardrail can help redirect vehicles after a lane departure to remain on the roadway and avoid roadside hazards. CMFs in the range of 0.53 to 0.56 have been recorded for installing new guardrail along an embankment.

Post-Mounted Delineators

As stated in the MUTCD, “delineators are particularly beneficial at locations where the [roadway] alignment might be confusing or unexpected, such as at lane-reduction transitions and curves. Delineators are effective guidance devices at night and during adverse weather. An important advantage of delineators in certain locations is that they remain visible when the roadway is wet, or snow covered.” Providing post-mounted retroreflective delineators along the roadway can give additional information to drivers as to the location of the roadside edge and alignment. The CMF for installing post-mounted delineators in combination with edgelines and centerlines has been recorded at 0.55.

Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Signposts

This countermeasure involves the application of retroreflective strips directly onto the vertical posts of Chevron Alignment signs to enhance nighttime and low-visibility curve delineation. Retroreflective strips increase the visibility of signposts from a wider range of angles and distances, providing drivers with earlier and clearer recognition of horizontal curves. This added conspicuity is especially beneficial in dark or adverse weather conditions, where traditional signage may be less effective. As a low-cost enhancement, retroreflective post treatments support the Safe System Approach by reinforcing multiple layers of visual guidance, ultimately helping to reduce crash severity and improve overall roadway safety.

Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curves

This countermeasure involves the installation of transverse rumble strips—raised or grooved patterns placed across the travel lane in advance of horizontal curves—to alert drivers through sound and vibration. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), transverse rumble strips are an effective low-cost treatment for reducing vehicle speeds and enhancing driver alertness before entering curves, particularly in rural areas where roadway departure crashes are prevalent. These strips provide a tactile and audible warning that prompts drivers to reduce speed and focus attention, especially in conditions of low visibility or driver fatigue.

Their use has been associated with measurable reductions in speed-related crashes and improved compliance with advisory speeds.

Remove/Relocate Objects in Hazardous Locations

This countermeasure includes removing or relocating objects from within the clear zone of the roadside. This allows drivers who run off the road to potentially return to the road or have a less severe consequence when departing the roadway. A CMF of 0.62 is associated with this countermeasure.

Superelevation on Curves

This countermeasure involves adjusting the roadway's cross slope (superelevation) to help vehicles safely navigate horizontal curves by counteracting lateral acceleration. Proper superelevation design significantly improves vehicle stability and reduces the likelihood of roadway departure crashes, particularly on rural two-lane highways. Superelevation allows vehicles to maintain safer speeds through curves by aligning the road surface with the natural path of travel, thereby reducing side friction demand and the risk of skidding or rollover. Correcting the superelevation variance demonstrates a measurable reduction in crash frequency when curves are properly banked.

High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curves

This countermeasure involves applying a thin layer of durable, polish-resistant aggregate—typically calcined bauxite—bonded with a high-strength resin to the pavement surface at horizontal curves. HFST dramatically improves pavement friction, especially in wet or high-demand braking conditions, helping drivers maintain control and reduce stopping distances. Though curves make up only about 5 percent of U.S. roadway miles, they account for over 25 percent of fatal crashes, underscoring the need for targeted safety interventions. HFST has been shown to reduce injury and fatal crashes by approximately 50 percent. Its long service life, rapid installation, and minimal environmental impact make it a cost-effective solution for high-risk locations.

Speed Flashers on Chevron Signs

This countermeasure involves the installation of speed-activated flashing lights on chevron alignment signs to alert drivers approaching horizontal curves at unsafe speeds. These systems, known as Sequential Dynamic Curve Warning Systems (SDCWS), use solar-powered LEDs embedded in chevron signs that flash in sequence as a vehicle approaches, creating a dynamic visual cue that enhances driver awareness and encourages speed reduction. Field studies show that these systems can reduce mean operating speeds by up to 2.6 mph even 12 months after installation, with sustained speed reductions observed up to 24 months later. By providing real-time, speed-responsive feedback, these signs are particularly effective on rural two-lane highways where roadway departure crashes are common.

For descriptions on additional curve countermeasures see **Appendix D1**.

APPENDIX B2
SEGMENT PROJECT SHEETS

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 16



SEGMENT

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD E34 between US-151 NE RAMP and WAPSIPINICON River
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: COUNTY ROAD E34
From: US-151 NE RAMP
To: WAPSIPINICON River

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No


GPS ID: 4842

Length (miles): 3.27

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.

This segment contains the following high scoring curves: GPS IDs 6176, 6182, 6189, 6219

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	3,420	6
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	24' 4'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	High	2
Access Points per Mile	37.3	3
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.9	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	160	1
Lane Departure Crashes	35	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		16

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	Yes
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	Yes
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	3
Curves with Chevrons	4

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	105
K and A Crashes	5
Lane Departure Crashes	35
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	3
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	257.3
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	12.3

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	1	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	3.27	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 19,620
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	3.27	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 9,810
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	3.27	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 6,540
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	4	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 4,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	3.27	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 98,100
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 168,070

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 16**

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD E34 between US-151 NE RAMP and WAPSIPINICON River
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4842**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 168,070
Subtotal:				\$ 168,070
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 16,810
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 8,424
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 33,696
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 227,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



SEGMENT

Project Name: RIDGE ROAD E28 between 0.3 miles NW of 138 ST and 800 feet W of W Cedar St
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: RIDGE ROAD E28
From: 0.3 miles NW of 138 ST
To: 800 feet W of W Cedar St

Project is within an Underserved Community?: No


GPS ID: 4888

Length (miles): 4.46

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.

This segment contains the following high scoring curves: GPS IDs 6064, 6112, 6157, 6174

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,000	6
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	24' 4'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Access Points per Mile	16.4	3
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.9	1
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	115	1
Lane Departure Crashes	14	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		14

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	4
Curves with Chevrons	3

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	40
K and A Crashes	2
Lane Departure Crashes	14
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	2
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	245.0
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	12.3

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	4.46	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 26,760
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	4.46	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 13,380
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	4.46	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 669,000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	4.46	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 22,300
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	4.46	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 8,920
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	3	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 3,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	4.46	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 133,800
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 880,660

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 14**

Project Name: RIDGE ROAD E28 between 0.3 miles NW of 138 ST and 800 feet W of W Cedar St
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4888**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:			\$	-
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:			\$	880,660
Subtotal:			\$	880,660
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 75,000
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 44,068
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 176,272
Estimated Project Cost			\$	1,176,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: **13**



SEGMENT

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD X40 between VINE ST and US 151
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: COUNTY ROAD X40

Project is within an Underserved Community?: No

GPS ID: 4851

From: VINE ST


To: US 151

Length (miles): 5.48

This segment contains the following high scoring intersection: GPS ID 44551

This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,290	6
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	22' 7'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Access Points per Mile	10.0	2
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.0	0
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	175	2
Lane Departure Crashes	20	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	7
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	11
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	0
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	69
K and A Crashes	6
Lane Departure Crashes	20
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	5
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	268.2
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	23.3

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	1	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	5.48	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 16,440
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	5.48	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 16,440
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	5.48	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 822,000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	5.48	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 27,400
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	5.48	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 10,960
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	5.48	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 164,400
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 1,097,640

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD X40 between VINE ST and US 151
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Sneed
E-mail: derek.sneed@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4851**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:			\$	-
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:			\$	1,097,640
Subtotal:			\$	1,097,640
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 75,000
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 55,072
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 220,288
Estimated Project Cost			\$	1,448,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



SEGMENT

Project Name: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE between 1000 feet N of S Main St and 300 feet S of CR E16
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
 From: 1000 feet N of S Main St
 To: 300 feet S of CR E16


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 4862

Length (miles): 0.87

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.
 This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	5,400	6
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	24' 6'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	High	2
Access Points per Mile	19.5	2
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.0	0
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	128	1
Lane Departure Crashes	8	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	6
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	0
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	25
K and A Crashes	1
Lane Departure Crashes	8
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	1
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	145.0
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	5.8

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.87	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 5,220
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.87	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,610
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0.87	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 130,500
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.87	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 4,350
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.87	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,740
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	0.87	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 26,100
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 170,520

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE between 1000 feet N of S Main St and 300 feet S of CR E16
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4862**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:			\$	-
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:			\$	170,520
Subtotal:			\$	170,520
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 17,060
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 8,684
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 34,736
Estimated Project Cost			\$	231,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



SEGMENT

Project Name: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE between 400 feet SW of RIVER RD and US 151
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
 From: 400 feet SW of RIVER RD
 To: US 151

Project is within an Underserved Community?: No


GPS ID: 4863

Length (miles): 1.48

This segment contains the following high scoring intersection: GPS ID 151569

This segment contains the following high scoring curves: GPS IDs 6602, 6648

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,600	6
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	24' 5'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Access Points per Mile	52.6	3
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.7	1
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	103	1
Lane Departure Crashes	9	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	5
Speed Limit (mph)	50
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	1
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	26
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	9
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	299.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	1	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	1.48	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 8,880
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	1.48	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 4,440
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	1.48	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 222,000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	1.48	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 7,400
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	1.48	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,960
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	1.48	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 44,400
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 323,580

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE between 400 feet SW of RIVER RD and US 151
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4863**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:			\$	-
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:			\$	323,580
Subtotal:			\$	323,580
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 32,360
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 16,212
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 64,848
Estimated Project Cost			\$	437,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 12



SEGMENT

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD X28 between Fairview Rd and Wapsipinicon River
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: COUNTY ROAD X28
From: Fairview Rd
To: Wapsipinicon River


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 4841A

Length (miles): 2.28

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.
This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Segment information applies to the combined segment 4841A-4841B, in addition to county comments.

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	800	5
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	22' 5'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Access Points per Mile	19.6	3
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.0	0
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	178	2
Lane Departure Crashes	7	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		12

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	5
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	11
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	1
Curves with Chevrons	1

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	17
K and A Crashes	2
Lane Departure Crashes	7
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	213.1
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	25.1

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	1	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	2.28	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 6,840
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	2.28	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 6,840
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	2.28	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 11,400
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	2.28	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 4,560
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	2.28	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 68,400
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 139,040

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 12**

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD X28 between Fairview Rd and Wapsipinicon River
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4841A**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 139,040
Subtotal:				\$ 139,040
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 13,910
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 7,010
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 28,040
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 188,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 12



Project Name: COUNTY ROAD X28 between Wapsipinicon River and Ridge Rd E-28
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT

Location Description

Road: COUNTY ROAD X28
 From: Wapsipinicon River
 To: Ridge Rd E-28


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 4841B

Length (miles): 0.73

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.
 This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Segment information applies to the combined segment 4841A-4841B, in addition to county comments.

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	560	5
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	22' 8'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Access Points per Mile	19.6	3
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.0	0
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	178	2
Lane Departure Crashes	7	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		12

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	Yes
Shoulder Width (ft)	8
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	11
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	0
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	17
K and A Crashes	2
Lane Departure Crashes	7
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	213.1
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	25.1

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	1	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.73	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,190
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.73	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,190
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.73	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,650
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.73	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,460
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	0.73	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 21,900
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 71,390

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 12**

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD X28 between Wapsipicon River and Ridge Rd E-28
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)**

GPS ID: 4841B

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 71,390
Subtotal:				\$ 71,390
Mobilization: (% +/-)*				10% \$ 7,140
Traffic Control: (% +/-)				5% \$ 3,694
Contingency: (% +/-)				20% \$ 14,776
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 97,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 11



SEGMENT

Project Name: STONE BRIDGE ROAD between Co Rd E16 and TIMBER RD
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: STONE BRIDGE ROAD
 From: Co Rd E16
 To: TIMBER RD

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No


GPS ID: 4857

Length (miles): 2.82

This segment contains the following high scoring intersection: GPS ID 44793

This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	270	1
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	26' 1'	2
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Access Points per Mile	13.1	3
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.7	1
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	240	2
Lane Departure Crashes	2	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		11

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	1
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	13
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	2
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	5
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	2
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	177.1
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	2.82	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 16,920
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	2.82	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 8,460
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	2.82	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 14,100
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	2.82	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 5,640
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	2	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 7,000
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	2.82	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 84,600
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 136,720

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 11**

Project Name: STONE BRIDGE ROAD between Co Rd E16 and TIMBER RD
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**SEGMENT****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4857**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:			\$	-
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:			\$	136,720
Subtotal:			\$	136,720
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 13,680
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 6,920
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 27,680
Estimated Project Cost			\$	185,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 11



SEGMENT

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD D62 between LINN-JONES RD and 1000 feet W of DANA AVE
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: COUNTY ROAD D62

From: LINN-JONES RD

To: 1000 feet W of DANA AVE

Project is within an Underserved Community?: No


GPS ID: 4907

Length (miles): 9.13

This segment contains the following high scoring intersection: GPS ID 44793

This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	700	5
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	22' 8'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Access Points per Mile	10.7	2
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.0	0
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	152	1
Lane Departure Crashes	6	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		11

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	8
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	11
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	0
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	28
K and A Crashes	3
Lane Departure Crashes	6
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	2
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	120.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	12.9

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	9.13	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 27,390
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	9.13	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 27,390
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	9.13	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 45,650
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	9.13	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 18,260
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	9.13	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 273,900
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 392,590

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 11**

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD D62 between LINN-JONES RD and 1000 feet W of DANA AVE
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4907**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:			\$	-
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:			\$	392,590
Subtotal:			\$	392,590
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 39,260
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 19,630
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 78,520
Estimated Project Cost			\$	530,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 11



SEGMENT

Project Name: FAIRVIEW ROAD between Linn Jones Rd and CR E34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: FAIRVIEW ROAD
From: Linn Jones Rd
To: CR E34


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 4884

Length (miles): 1.96

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.
This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,270	6
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	26' 4'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Access Points per Mile	21.5	3
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.0	0
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	90	0
Lane Departure Crashes	13	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		11

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	Yes
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	13
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	0
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	42
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	13
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	464.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	1.96	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 11,760
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	1.96	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 5,880
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	1.96	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 9,800
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	1.96	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 3,920
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	1.96	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 58,800
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 90,160

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 11**

Project Name: FAIRVIEW ROAD between Linn Jones Rd and CR E34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Sneed
E-mail: derek.sneed@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4884**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 90,160
Subtotal:				\$ 90,160
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 9,020
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 4,564
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 18,256
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 122,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 10



SEGMENT

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD D61 between 0.9 miles W of 245th St and Jackson County Limit
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: COUNTY ROAD D61
 From: 0.9 miles W of 245th St
 To: Jackson County Limit


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 4910

Length (miles): 5.22

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.
 This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	630	4
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	22' 6'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Access Points per Mile	6.7	1
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.2	1
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	145	1
Lane Departure Crashes	11	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		10

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	6
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	11
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	1
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	20
K and A Crashes	1
Lane Departure Crashes	11
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	1
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	166.9
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	8.3

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	5.22	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 15,660
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	5.22	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 15,660
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	5.22	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 26,100
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	5.22	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 10,440
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	5.22	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 156,600
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 227,960

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 10**

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD D61 between 0.9 miles W of 245th St and Jackson County Limit
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

SEGMENT**Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4910**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 227,960
Subtotal:				\$ 227,960
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 22,800
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 11,448
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 45,792
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 308,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 10



SEGMENT

Project Name: COUNTY HOME ROAD E23 between 190 AVE and IA 38
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: COUNTY HOME ROAD E23
 From: 190 AVE
 To: IA 38

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No


GPS ID: 4898

Length (miles): 8.36

This segment contains the following high scoring intersection: GPS ID 44723

This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	520	3
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	22' 6'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Access Points per Mile	9.7	2
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.4	1
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	145	1
Lane Departure Crashes	14	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		10

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	6
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	11
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	3
Curves with Chevrons	1

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	41
K and A Crashes	2
Lane Departure Crashes	14
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	2
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	260.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	12.7

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	8.36	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 25,080
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	8.36	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 25,080
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	8.36	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 41,800
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	8.36	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 16,720
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	2	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 7,000
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	8.36	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 250,800
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 367,480

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 10**

Project Name: COUNTY HOME ROAD E23 between 190 AVE and IA 38
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**SEGMENT****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4898**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 367,480
Subtotal:				\$ 367,480
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 36,750
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 18,554
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 74,216
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 497,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 9



SEGMENT

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD E16 between LINN-JONES RD and 600 feet W of BUSINESS HWY 151
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: COUNTY ROAD E16

From: LINN-JONES RD

To: 600 feet W of BUSINESS HWY 151


Length (miles): 9.00

Project is within an Underserved Community?: No

GPS ID: 4904

This segment does not contain high scoring intersections.
 This segment does not contain high scoring curves.

Project Location Maps



Segment Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	750	5
Pavement Shoulder Width (ft)	22' 6'	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Access Points per Mile	4.4	0
High Risk Curve Density/Mile	0.0	0
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	133	1
Lane Departure Crashes	8	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		9

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	6
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	11
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	0
Curves with Chevrons	0

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	19
K and A Crashes	3
Lane Departure Crashes	8
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	77.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	12.3

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Conduct Road Safety Audit (RSA)	0	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ -
Conduct Access Control Analysis	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	9.00	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 27,000
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ -
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	9.00	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 27,000
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road - Includes Earth Work)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	9.00	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 45,000
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	9.00	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 18,000
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)**	9.00	MILE	\$ 30,000	\$ 270,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 387,000

Continued on back of this page.

** Unit price varies based on average roadside risk score.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Roadway Segment Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 9**

Project Name: COUNTY ROAD E16 between LINN-JONES RD and 600 feet W of BUSINESS HWY 151
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/22/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**SEGMENT****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 4904**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Flatten and Widen Foreslopes (both sides of road)		MILE	\$ 85,000	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Delineate Roadside Hazard (tree or utility pole) with Retroreflective Tape		EA	\$ 100	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Sign Posts		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Remove/Relocate Object in Hazardous Location		EA	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:			\$	-
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:			\$	387,000
Subtotal:			\$	387,000
Mobilization: (% +/-)*			10%	\$ 38,700
Traffic Control: (% +/-)			5%	\$ 19,460
Contingency: (% +/-)			20%	\$ 77,840
Estimated Project Cost			\$	523,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

APPENDIX B3

SEGMENT RISK FACTOR RANKING RESULTS



GPS ID	Paved Road	Beginning of Segment	End of Segment	Length (mi)	Total Risk Factor Points	Average Daily Traffic (Value)	Average Daily Traffic (Points)	Pavement Width (ft) (Value)	Shoulder Width (ft) (Value)	Pavement and Shoulder Width (ft) (Points)	KABCO PCR Level (Value)	KABCO PCR Level (Points)	Access Density (points/mile) (Value)	Access Density (points/mile) (Points)	High Risk Curve Density (Value)	High Risk Curve Density (Points)	Pavement Condition (Value)	Pavement Condition (Points)	Lane Departure Crashes (Value)	Lane Departure Crashes (Points)	Total Crashes	K and A Crashes	Paved Shoulder	Speed Limit (mph)	Number of Lanes	Edgeline Rumble Strips	Centerline Rumble Strips	Curves (L>100', R≤1,000')	Curves with Chevrons
4842	COUNTY ROAD E34	US-151 NE RAMP	WAPSIPINICON River	3.27	16	3,420	6	24	4	0	High	2	37.3	3	0.92	2	160	1	35	2	105	5	Yes	55	2	Yes	No	3	4
4888	RIDGE ROAD E28	0.3 miles NW of 138 ST	800 feet W of W Cedar St	4.46	14	1,003	6	24	4	0	Medium	1	16.4	3	0.90	1	115	1	14	2	40	2	No	55	2	No	No	4	3
4851	COUNTY ROAD X40	VINE ST	US 151	5.48	13	1,286	6	22	7	0	Medium	1	10.0	2	0.00	0	175	2	20	2	69	6	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4862	OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE	1000 feet N of S Main St	300 feet S of CR E16	0.87	13	5,400	6	24	6	0	High	2	19.5	2	0.00	0	128	1	8	2	25	1	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4863	OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE	400 feet SW of RIVER RD	US 151	1.48	13	1,601	6	24	5	0	Negligible	0	52.6	3	0.67	1	103	1	9	2	26	0	No	50	2	No	No	1	0
4841	COUNTY ROAD X28	Fairview Rd	Ridge Rd E-28	3.01	12	725	5	22	5	0	Negligible	0	19.6	3	0.00	0	178	2	7	2	17	2	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4857	STONE BRIDGE ROAD	Co Rd E16	TIMBER RD	2.82	11	274	1	26	1	2	Negligible	0	13.1	3	0.71	1	240	2	2	2	5	0	No	55	2	No	No	2	0
4884	FAIRVIEW ROAD	Linn Jones Rd	CR E34	1.96	11	1,265	6	26	4	0	Negligible	0	21.5	3	0.00	0	90	0	13	2	42	0	Yes	55	2	No	No	0	0
4897	COUNTY ROAD D62	LINN-JONES RD	1000 feet W of DANA AVE	9.13	11	696	5	22	8	0	Medium	1	10.7	2	0.00	0	152	1	6	2	28	3	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4865	AMBER ROAD X44	Amber Rd. X44	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44 & 155 AVE	3.48	10	642	4	22	8	0	Negligible	0	14.1	2	0.00	0	193	2	5	2	16	1	No	55	2	No	No	0	2
4877	COUNTY ROAD X64	Cedar County Limit	1ST AVE S	5.37	10	445	3	20	6	0	Medium	1	7.3	1	0.56	1	228	2	11	2	21	0	No	55	2	No	No	3	3
4898	COUNTY HOME ROAD E23	190 AVE	IA 38	8.36	10	515	3	22	6	0	Medium	1	9.7	2	0.36	1	145	1	14	2	41	2	No	55	2	No	No	3	1
4910	COUNTY ROAD D61	0.9 miles W of 245th St	Jackson County Limit	5.22	10	828	4	22	6	0	Medium	1	6.7	1	0.19	1	145	1	11	2	20	1	No	55	2	No	No	1	0
4911	24TH STREET	US 151	1ST AVE W & McKinley St SW	1.03	10	840	5	34	5	0	Negligible	0	11.6	2	0.97	2	160	1	0	0	2	0	No	50	3	No	No	1	0
4844	COUNTY ROAD X31	700 feet of CLAY ST & SALES AVE	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	12.13	9	497	3	22	9	0	Medium	1	5.6	1	0.16	1	162	1	8	2	30	2	No	55	2	No	No	2	2
4848	SHAW ROAD	US 151	400 feet SE of 3RD ST	1.47	9	656	4	22	6	0	Negligible	0	8.2	1	1.36	2	78	0	5	2	30	6	No	55	2	No	No	2	0
4859	LANGWORTHY ROAD	US 151	US 151	1.09	9	227	1	24	9	0	Negligible	0	18.4	3	1.84	2	168	1	2	2	7	1	No	55	2	No	No	2	0
4881	COUNTY ROAD E45	Co. Rd. E45	Co Rd E45	10.25	9	364	2	22	5	0	Medium	1	6.2	1	0.49	1	191	2	14	2	35	3	No	55	2	No	No	5	6
4904	COUNTY ROAD E16	LINN-JONES RD	600 feet W of BUSINESS HWY 151	9.00	9	745	5	22	6	0	Medium	1	4.4	0	0.00	0	133	1	8	2	19	3	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4839	LINN-JONES ROAD	US 151	FAIRVIEW RD	1.03	8	660	4	22	5	0	Negligible	0	8.7	2	0.00	0	91	0	3	2	12	1	Yes	55	2	No	No	0	0
4850	COUNTY ROAD X40	OSCAR JONES CO LINE RD	500 feet S of MAIN ST	3.95	8	720	5	22	7	0	No Data	0	3.0	0	0.00	0	126	1	2	2	5	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4880	COUNTY ROAD E45	600 feet E of VINE ST	0.3 miles W of RESIDENT ST	4.82	8	660	4	22	7	0	Medium	1	3.9	0	0.00	0	95	1	10	2	23	2	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4903	190TH STREET	190th St	0.5 miles of 122 AVE	1.82	8	300	1	18	1	4	No Data	0	12.6	2	0.00	0	161	1	0	0	4	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4906	RICHLAND ROAD	RICHLAND RD	BOWENS PRAIRIE RD	2.38	8	301	2	22	9	0	Medium	1	9.2	2	0.00	0	151	1	1	2	12	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4840	OLD CASS ROAD	1100 feet of 131 ST	0.3 miles of 131 ST	0.96	7	199	6	22	1	2	Negligible	0	44.5	3	0.00	0	305	2	0	0	1	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4864	AMBER ROAD X44	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	1000 feet of AMBER RD	4.76	7	854	5	22	6	0	Negligible	0	5.2	0	0.00	0	67	0	2	2	12	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4873	RIVERVIEW ROAD	0.5 miles of ADAMS ST SE	BUCHANAN ST SW	0.99	7	340	2	22	3	0	Negligible	0	14.2	3	0.00	0	318	2	0	0	1	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4875	COUNTY ROAD X75	Co Rd X75/CO RD X-75	200 feet of STATE ST	3.42	7	410	2	22	8	0	Negligible	0	5.8	1	0.00	0	211	2	4	2	7	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4876	TEMPLE HILL ROAD	NA	Co Rd D65/Richland Rd & Co Rd E55/Temple Hill Rd	0.65	7	120	0	22	4	0	Negligible	0	16.9	3	0.00	0	178	2	1	2	2	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4900	COUNTY ROAD E17	E17	400 feet of 3RD AVE	6.57	7	510	3	22	6	0	Medium	1	4.7	0	0.00	0	170	1	5	2	23	2	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4801	COUNTY ROAD E17	Co Rd E17	E17	5.33	7	460	3	22	8	0	Negligible	0	7.1	1	0.00	0	162	1	4	2	22	2	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4909	HARDSCRABE ROAD	TIMBER RD	1300 feet of JOHN DR	0.98	7	550	3	26	2	0	Negligible	0	8.2	1	0.00	0	125	1	1	2	3	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4882	COUNTY ROAD E45	MILITARY ST	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	5.71	6	580	4	22	7	0	Negligible	0	5.1	0	0.00	0	89	0	2	2	12	1	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4890	COUNTY ROAD E29	Co. Rd. E29	ANAMOSA AVE & 4TH ST	4.01	6	350	2	22	6	0	Negligible	0	3.5	0	0.00	0	189	2	1	2	11	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4892	COUNTY ROAD E29	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	300 feet of CENTRAL PARK RD	2.15	6	176	1	22	8	0	Negligible	0	6.5	1	0.47	1	117	1	1	2	7	0	No	55	2	No	No	1	0
4854	CIRCLE DRIVE	300 feet of Circle Dr	CIRCULAR DR & 190 AVE	1.31	5	70	0	22	4	0	Negligible	0	17.5	3	0.76	1	169	1	0	0	1	0	No	55	2	No	No	1	0
4878	COUNTY ROAD E53	Co Rd E53	Co Rd X64/CO RD X-64	6.57	5	200	1	22	6	0	Negligible	0	4.6	0	0.00	0	200	2	4	2	6	1	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4891	COUNTY ROAD E29	NORTH ST & SUMMIT ST	700 feet of 120 ST	6.87	5	290	1	22	6	0	Negligible	0	7.1	1	0.00	0	108	1	5	2	9	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4899	COUNTY ROAD E17	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	0.5 miles of E17	0.53	5	120	0	22	7	0	Negligible	0	11.4	2	0.00	0	162	1	1	2	2	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4843	COUNTY ROAD X31	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	JONES-DELAWARE RD	1.01	4	390	2	22	5	0	Negligible	0	2.0	0	0.00	0	180	2	0	0	1	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4871	95TH AVENUE	0.3 miles of 155th St	95 AVE & 169 ST	0.76	4	33	0	26	1	2	Negligible	0	3.9	0	0.00	0	172	2	0	0	1	0	No	55	2	No	No	0	0
4866	CENTRAL PARK ROAD	CENTRAL PARK RD	0.6 miles of CENTRAL PARK RD	0.66	3	90	0	22	8	0	Negligible	0	4.5	0	3.02	2	114	1	0	0	1	0	No	55	2	No	No	2	0

Disclaimer: Throughout the SAP process, the County Engineer provided feedback on locations where the information contained within the existing databases was not current (for example, location of rumble strips, shoulder type and/or width, etc.). When these locations were identified, updates to the project sheets were made. As such the information in this table may vary from final information presented on the project sheets. Priority locations selected for project sheets were selected in coordination with the County and may not align with the highest scoring locations.

APPENDIX C1

INTERSECTION SAFETY COUNTERMEASURES

COUNTY PAVED ROADWAY INTERSECTION COUNTERMEASURES

This appendix summarizes the **intersection** safety countermeasures for consideration and provides detailed descriptions for each countermeasure from both the risk factor analysis as well as the additional potential improvements listed on the back side of the project sheets.

Systematic Countermeasures

The countermeasures in this section were included in the risk factor analysis and recommended on the intersection project sheets based on the criteria described in **Section 5.1.2**.

Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications

Although there are not many traffic signals along the county road system that are operated and maintained by the county, the recommendations from this Safety Action Plan (SAP) include a coordination item with the local jurisdiction at locations where signalized intersections scored high on the risk factor rankings. This coordination could include the installation of retroreflective backplates, installing larger signal heads, signal retiming, flashing yellow arrow implementation, and/or overhead signal installation.

Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal

At locations where a signalized intersection may not be warranted, based on reported daily entering vehicles (DEVs), it is recommended that a signal warrant analysis, including the required traffic counts, be conducted to determine if the traffic signal is warranted. Removing an unwarranted traffic signal has a documented crash modification factor (CMF) as high as 0.76. The cost associated with this recommendation includes only the counts and analysis, not the physical removal of the traffic signal.

Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE)

Per the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT),

“ICE is a process that identifies the best intersection control through a comprehensive analysis and documentation of the technical (safety and operational), economic, and political issues of viable alternatives” (<https://www.dot.state.mn.us/trafficeng/safety/ice/>).

This evaluation broadens the framework for considering intersection control beyond the traditional traffic signal. Through this process, the optimal control is recommended based on an objective analysis. Possible outcomes of an ICE include stop signs, yield signs, channelized movements, access control, grade separation, roundabouts, or fully signalized intersections. MnDOT’s most recent guidance on ICE is available on their official ICE webpage (linked above), which outlines the current process and expectations for ICE studies.

Many states now require ICE to be completed prior to determining intersection control and configurations, including California, Indiana, Florida, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin. Iowa is also in the process of finalizing its own ICE guidelines.

The recommended ICE process includes identifying intersections, collecting data, performing warrant analyses, analyzing alternatives, and selecting a preferred option. This is followed by conceptual design, right-of-way assessment, life-cycle cost estimation, political impact consideration, reevaluation of alternatives, and staff approval. The final step is compiling an ICE report that documents the entire process and its conclusions.

Additional guidance on ICE can be found in the FHWA ICE Primer, which provides a comprehensive overview of the Intersection Control Evaluation process, including its purpose, benefits, and implementation.

(<https://highways.fhwa.dot.gov/sites/fhwa.dot.gov/files/2022-06/fhwasa18076.pdf>).

Implement Results of ICE

Along with the recommendation of the ICE, this recommendation includes implementing the selected intersection configuration. Since the evaluation is necessary to determine which configuration to implement, the cost associated with this recommendation is the estimated average of potential intersection configurations. Intersection configurations that could be considered include: roundabouts, multi-way stop control, traffic signals, restricting left-turn movements, median U-turn intersections, and grade separation.

All-Way Stop Warrant Analysis (Install)

This safety countermeasure includes conducting an all-way stop warrant analysis on an existing minor-leg stop-controlled intersection. The analysis should include a review of traffic volumes, crash history and sight distance as detailed in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) for an intersection that is not currently controlled by stop signs for all approaches. This safety countermeasure was recommended based on the CMFs in the range of 0.39 for converting a two-way stop-controlled intersection to all-way stop control. An engineering study is required to warrant the installation of all-way stop control. Only the analysis was recommended in the risk factor analysis, based on traffic volumes that could potentially meet the minimum volume thresholds for an all-way stop to be warranted.

All-Way Stop Warrant Analysis (Remove)

This safety countermeasure includes conducting an all-way stop warrant analysis on an existing all-way stop-controlled intersection. The analysis should include a review of traffic volumes, crash history and sight distance as detailed in the MUTCD. An engineering study is required to warrant the removal of all-way stop control, converting to minor-leg stop-control. Only the analysis was recommended in the risk factor analysis, based on traffic volumes that would potentially not meet the minimum volume thresholds for an all-way stop to be warranted.

Destination Lighting

The Iowa DOT has a Destination Lighting Specifics and Best Practices (2018) document that should be consulted prior to installation of destination lighting. Various options are available including replacing existing High-Pressure Sodium (HPS) lights, new installations, and solar installations. The document provides detail on luminaire type, pole design, mounting height, pole placement, preferred luminaires, and sample specifications.

Destination lighting is different than typical intersection lighting, in that the purpose of destination lighting is to inform drivers, from a distance, that an intersection is located near the light. HPS lighting option has traditionally provided a better spreading of light to the approaching driver when the Light-Emitting Diode (LED) system does not have a drop lens. LED lighting options without a drop lens dissipate less light outward and typically focus light down, towards the roadway. For the purpose of destination lighting, HPS or LED with drop lenses are preferred due to their dispersion of light. In rural situations, especially during nighttime conditions, intersections can be difficult to identify without the presence of destination lighting. For this purpose, destination lighting is recommended when certain volume thresholds defined in the risk factor analysis are exceeded.

Larger/Retroreflective Stop Signs

This countermeasure includes the use of oversized Stop signs and Stop signs with enhanced retroreflective sheeting to improve visibility and driver compliance at stop-controlled intersections. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), intersections account for over 40 percent of all reported crashes, with a significant portion occurring due to drivers failing to recognize or respond to stop control. Larger Stop signs increase conspicuity, especially in rural or high-speed environments, while retroreflective materials enhance nighttime and low-visibility recognition by reflecting headlights directly back toward the driver's eyes. FHWA evaluations have shown that Stop signs with higher retro-reflectivity can significantly reduce crashes related to driver unawareness, particularly at unsignalized intersections.

Duplicate Signage

Installing a second stop sign and stop ahead sign on the left side of the roadway for reinforcement of the stop-controlled condition was another safety countermeasure that was suggested where certain volume thresholds were met. Installing the second stop sign and stop ahead signs on the left side of the roadway provides for additional visibility and reinforces the stop-controlled condition ahead.

New Pavement Markings

This countermeasure includes the installation of groove-in retroreflective pavement markings and the use of wider, high-visibility markings at intersections to improve lane guidance and driver awareness, particularly in low-light and wet conditions. Retroreflective pavement markings significantly enhance nighttime visibility by reflecting headlights back toward the driver, improving lane discipline and reducing lane departure crashes. Grooving the markings into the pavement protects them from snowplow damage and wear, extending their service life and maintaining visibility in adverse weather. Additionally, wider markings—typically 6 inches or more—at intersections and stop bars increase conspicuity and help drivers better identify lane boundaries and stopping points.

Flashing Beacons/LED Lights on Stop Signs

This countermeasure includes installing flashing beacons on top of all stop signs and/or yield signs at an intersection. It is anticipated that the flashing beacons would be solar-power LED beacons to expedite the installation and reduce the monthly cost associated with power for the lights. This countermeasure provides enhanced visibility and reinforcement of the stop/yield-controlled condition.

Transverse Rumble Strips

Installing transverse rumble strips can alert drivers of an upcoming stop sign. In the case of an all-way stop-controlled intersection, rumble strips are recommended on all approaches. For a one-way or two-way stop-controlled intersection, only the minor paved approaches (those that are stop-controlled) are recommended for rumble strip installation. Installing transverse rumble strips on stop-controlled approaches in rural areas has a CMF of 0.79 to 0.87.

Advanced Intersection Warning Signs

This safety countermeasure includes the installation of cross street name signs with the intersection warning signs in advance of an intersection on the major approaches to provide additional information to drivers, increasing their decision time and distance. This improvement also provides additional emphasis of an upcoming intersection.

Clear and Grub

This includes clearing and grubbing the areas within the sight triangles of the vehicles that approach stop signs at a given intersection. This safety countermeasure increases the sight distance for vehicles prior to entering an intersection. This is particularly beneficial under two-way stop-controlled or uncontrolled situations where conflicting vehicles may not stop or yield. A budgetary cost has been included in the project sheets; however, it is recommended that the County Engineer confirm the need to clear and grub as projects move forward.

Location Specific Countermeasures

Safety improvements not included on the first page of the roadway intersection project sheet may still merit consideration at a specific location. There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included in the risk factor analysis due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed at intersections throughout the county. The following sections describe several other roadway intersection safety improvements that could be considered appropriate by the county and that were included on the back side of the project sheets.

Construction of Turn Lanes

Providing right- and left-turn lanes to remove slowing or turning vehicles from the through lanes has CMFs ranging from 0.52 to 0.74. This safety countermeasure needs to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis based on turning movement volumes, which were not available as part of this project. This improvement can be particularly effective where there are high amounts of conflicting movements at intersections. When considering turn lanes for a specific location, right-of-way constraints will need to be considered.

Realignment of Intersection to Reduce or Eliminate Skew

Intersection skew was reviewed as part of the risk factor analysis, but realignment of specific intersections was not recommended, due to constraints such as right-of-way and geometrics that could not be determined from a systemic approach. Depending on existing site conditions, this countermeasure could be particularly beneficial and should be considered where feasible. The CMF for intersection geometry reconfiguration is included in the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) and varies based on the existing skew angle. With the optimal 90-degree intersection configuration sight triangles are maximized, crossing distance is minimized, and the intersection meets typical driver expectations.

Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-Intersection

A bypass lane at a T-intersection allows through traffic a separate lane of travel from those vehicles intending to turn left at the intersection. This improvement removes some conflict points and has the potential to reduce the frequency of rear-end crashes.

Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection

Where two offset T-intersections are within close proximity, this countermeasure suggests combining the two intersections into a single four-legged intersection. The consolidation of the two intersections into one reduces conflict points and aligns better with driver expectations.

Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatments

Restricting or eliminating turning maneuvers by providing channelization or closing median openings can have significant safety benefits. This safety countermeasure could be

implemented as part of an access management policy, referenced below. A CMF of 0.8 has been determined for providing indirect left-turn treatments.

Convert Four-Legged Intersections to T-Intersections

Where a four-legged intersection has high opposing turning movements, two offset T-intersections may provide the needed traffic flow while reducing conflicts.

Install LED Flashing Beacons on Intersection Warning Signs

Flashing beacons draw the attention of drivers to the associated signage. This improvement enhances the conspicuity of intersection warning signs for drivers approaching the intersection. This sign/beacon combination can help increase awareness of drivers to potential upcoming vehicle conflicts. Flashing beacons on stop signs and curve chevron signs have measured safety benefits and are expected to provide safety benefits when applied to intersection warning signs as well.

Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)

This safety improvement warns vehicles on the major approach of a two-way stop-controlled intersection when there is a vehicle present/stopped at the upcoming intersection. According to the FHWA,

“These systems usually use a double set of detectors on the stop approach to identify approaching and stopped vehicles and warn traffic on the through approach of their presence using activated flashing beacons on passive intersection warning signs to indicate that a vehicle from the cross street may enter the intersection. They are often deployed at rural stop-controlled intersections that have either a history of crash experience or limited sight distance. Missouri, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia have deployed these systems or variations of them.”

The FHWA also states that, this technology “has been successfully deployed... at a relatively low cost per intersection and has generally resulted in substantial intersection crash reductions.”

Install a Roundabout

Roundabouts are a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) proven safety countermeasure with marked safety improvements thoroughly documented. CMFs for converting a stop-controlled rural intersection to a roundabout have been recorded from 0.18 - 0.42 showing reductions in crashes as high as 82%. In addition to providing significant safety benefits, roundabouts are also able to accommodate abnormal intersections, such as intersections with more than four approaches or an angled minor or major approach. Many of the safety benefits of roundabouts stem from the fact that they have fewer conflict points as compared to a four-legged intersection. In a conventional intersection, 32 conflict points exist at which a crash may occur. This is reduced to eight conflict points in a typical one-lane roundabout. Furthermore, the vehicle conflict points at a roundabout are unlikely to result in right-angle or head-on collisions which tend to be more severe crash types. Instead, the majority of crashes are rear-end or side-swipe collisions. In addition to less-severe crash types, crashes at roundabouts tend to occur at lower speeds which results in fewer injuries and fatalities.

Increase Shoulder Width/Safety Edge

Constructing or increasing the width of an existing paved shoulder can reduce the potential for a severe crash as the result of a lane departure. CMFs associated with paving the shoulder in

rural areas range from 0.75 to 0.99. At locations where paved shoulders are recommended, it is suggested that the County Engineer consider a minimum of a two-foot shoulder; however, based on right-of-way and roadway characteristics, the County Engineer may choose to install a wider shoulder. According to the FHWA, a Safety Edge is “a simple but effective solution that can help save lives by allowing drivers who drift off [roadways] to return to the road safely. Instead of a vertical dropoff, the Safety Edge shapes the edge of pavement to 30 degrees.” The installation of a Safety Edge has CMFs of 0.77 - 0.96 and is an FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure.

Guardrails

Installing guardrail can help redirect vehicles after a lane departure to remain on the roadway and avoid roadside hazards. CMFs in the range of 0.53 to 0.56 have been recorded for installing new guardrail along an embankment.

Retroreflective Strips on Stop Signposts

This countermeasure includes the installation of retroreflective strips on the posts of stop signs. The strips can increase the visibility of the stop signs and increase driver awareness of a stop-controlled intersection.

Access Management

According to the Transportation Research Board, “Access management is the systematic control of the location, spacing, design and operation of driveways, median openings, interchanges, and street connections to a roadway.” Various counties throughout Iowa have access management policies in place and substantial research has been conducted supporting the safety, operations, economic, and environmental effects of access management.

The functional area of an intersection includes regions where vehicle speeds vary in order to change lanes and complete turns. Queues may also develop on the approach legs of the intersection. Driveways should be located outside of the functional area of the intersection so as not to negatively impact the operations of the intersection.

In rural scenarios, access management is best applied by limiting left-turn movements onto highspeed roadways and providing sufficient spacing between roadway access points. Please refer to the Statewide Urban Design and Specifications (SUDAS) and AASHTO’s *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* (Green Book) for more information.


APPENDIX C2

INTERSECTION PROJECT SHEETS

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



Project Name: Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62 & STONE BRIDGE RD
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62

Road: STONE BRIDGE RD

Closest City: Monticello


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 44793

This intersection is located on the following high scoring segments: GPS IDs 4857, 4907

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	1.78 mi	4
Approach Angle (Degrees)	79	2
Intersection within Curve	No	0
Daily Entering Vehicles	1,340	3
Minor Street Volume	240	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	4	2
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	4	1
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		14

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	4
Number of Paved Approaches	4
Major ADT	1,510
Minor ADT	240
Destination Lighting	No
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	Two-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	0
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	0
Total Nighttime Crashes	0
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	1	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ 5,500
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	2	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 4,400
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	0	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ -
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	2	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 3,000
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	2	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ 5,000
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	2	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ 2,400
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	4	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 40,300

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 14**

Project Name: Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62 & STONE BRIDGE RD
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 44793**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection				1	1	LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 150,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 40,300
Subtotal:								\$ 190,300
Mobilization: (% +/-)*							10%	\$ 19,030
Traffic Control: (% +/-)							5%	\$ 9,534
Contingency: (% +/-)							20%	\$ 38,136
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 257,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



Project Name: Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23 & Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23

Road: Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44

Closest City: Anamosa


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 44723

This intersection is located on the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4898

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	5.11 mi	4
Approach Angle (Degrees)	90	0
Intersection within Curve	Yes	4
Daily Entering Vehicles	1,180	3
Minor Street Volume	305	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	1	1
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	3	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		14

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	3
Number of Paved Approaches	3
Major ADT	1,040
Minor ADT	305
Destination Lighting	Yes
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	1
Control Type	One-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	3
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	1
Total Nighttime Crashes	0
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	1	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,200
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	0	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ -
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	1	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	0	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	2	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ 2,400
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	2	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 16,100

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:


Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



Project Name: Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23 & Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 44723

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection				1	1	LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 150,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 16,100
Subtotal:								\$ 166,100
Mobilization: (% +/-)*							10%	\$ 16,610
Traffic Control: (% +/-)							5%	\$ 8,458
Contingency: (% +/-)							20%	\$ 33,832
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 225,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: **13**



INTERSECTION

Project Name: Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31 & 158 ST & 220 AVE
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31

Road: 158 ST & 220 AVE

Closest City: Anamosa


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 44748

This intersection does not contain high scoring segments.

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	< 1.5 mi	0
Approach Angle (Degrees)	67	4
Intersection within Curve	Yes	4
Daily Entering Vehicles	355	0
Minor Street Volume	80	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	4	2
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	5	1
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		13

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	5
Number of Paved Approaches	2
Major ADT	520
Minor ADT	80
Destination Lighting	No
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	Other

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	0
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	0
Total Nighttime Crashes	0
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	1	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Implement Results of ICE	1	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	0	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ -
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	3	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ 3,300
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	0	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	0	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	0	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ -
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	5	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 25,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 803,300

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31 & 158 ST & 220 AVE
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 44748**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 803,300
Subtotal:								\$ 803,300
Mobilization: (% +/-)*								10% \$ 75,000
Traffic Control: (% +/-)								5% \$ 40,340
Contingency: (% +/-)								20% \$ 161,360
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 1,080,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: **13**



Project Name: Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40 & GREEN RD
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40

Road: GREEN RD

Closest City: Morley


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 44551

This intersection is located on the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4851

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	< 1.5 mi	0
Approach Angle (Degrees)	78	2
Intersection within Curve	Yes	4
Daily Entering Vehicles	1,450	3
Minor Street Volume	90	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	3	2
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	3	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		13

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	3
Number of Paved Approaches	2
Major ADT	1,335
Minor ADT	90
Destination Lighting	No
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	One-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	0
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	0
Total Nighttime Crashes	0
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	0	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ -
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	1	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	0	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	0	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	0	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ -
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	2	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 11,100

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40 & GREEN RD
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 44551**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 11,100
Subtotal:								\$ 11,100
Mobilization: (% +/-)*							10%	\$ 2,500
Traffic Control: (% +/-)							5%	\$ 680
Contingency: (% +/-)							20%	\$ 2,720
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 17,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: **13**



Project Name: MAIN ST & COUNTY RD X40
 Agency Name: Jones County
 Contact Name: Derek Snead
 E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
 Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: MAIN ST
 Road: COUNTY RD X40
 Closest City: Morley


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 44939

This intersection does not contain high scoring segments.

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	5.5 mi	4
Approach Angle (Degrees)	76	2
Intersection within Curve	No	0
Daily Entering Vehicles	1,300	3
Minor Street Volume	330	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	3	2
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	3	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		13

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	3
Number of Paved Approaches	3
Major ADT	1,090
Minor ADT	330
Destination Lighting	Yes
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	One-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	3
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	1
Total Nighttime Crashes	1
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	1.5

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	1	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,200
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	0	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ -
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	1	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	1	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	2	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ 2,400
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	2	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 18,600

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: MAIN ST & COUNTY RD X40
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 44939**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 18,600
Subtotal:								\$ 18,600
Mobilization: (% +/-)*								10% \$ 2,500
Traffic Control: (% +/-)								5% \$ 980
Contingency: (% +/-)								20% \$ 3,920
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 26,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



Project Name: US 151 & Shaw Rd
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: US 151

Road: Shaw Rd

Closest City: Anamosa


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 150087

This intersection does not contain high scoring segments.

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	1.54 mi	4
Approach Angle (Degrees)	90	0
Intersection within Curve	No	0
Daily Entering Vehicles	28,800	3
Minor Street Volume	450	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	2	1
K or A Crashes	6	2
Number of Approaches	4	1
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		14

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	4
Number of Paved Approaches	4
Major ADT	14,400
Minor ADT	450
Destination Lighting	No
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	Two-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	23
K and A Crashes	6
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	14
Total Nighttime Crashes	6
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	1.1

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	1	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ 5,500
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	2	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 4,400
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	0	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ -
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	2	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 3,000
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	2	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ 5,000
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	2	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ 2,400
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	4	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 40,300

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan


Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14

Project Name: US 151 & Shaw Rd
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG



INTERSECTION

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 150087

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection		1			1	LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection			1		1	LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post			1	1	2	INT	\$ 500	\$ 1,000
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)					1	EA	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 401,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 40,300
Subtotal:								\$ 441,300
Mobilization: (% +/-)*								10% \$ 44,130
Traffic Control: (% +/-)								5% \$ 22,114
Contingency: (% +/-)								20% \$ 88,456
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 596,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



Project Name: US 151 & Old Hwy 151 Connector
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: US 151
Road: Old Hwy 151 Connector
Closest City: Monticello


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 151569

This intersection is located on the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4863

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	1.98 mi	4
Approach Angle (Degrees)	90	0
Intersection within Curve	Yes	4
Daily Entering Vehicles	13,350	3
Minor Street Volume	540	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	1	1
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	3	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		14

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	3
Number of Paved Approaches	3
Major ADT	9,200
Minor ADT	540
Destination Lighting	Yes
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	One-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	11
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	2
Total Nighttime Crashes	1
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	0.3

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	1	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,200
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	0	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ -
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	1	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	2	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ 5,000
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	1	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	2	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ 2,400
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	2	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 23,600

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 14**

Project Name: US 151 & Old Hwy 151 Connector
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)**

GPS ID: 151569

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 23,600
Subtotal:								\$ 23,600
Mobilization: (% +/-)*							10%	\$ 2,500
Traffic Control: (% +/-)							5%	\$ 1,180
Contingency: (% +/-)							20%	\$ 4,720
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 32,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



INTERSECTION

Project Name: IA 64 & Amber Rd. X44
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Location Description

Road: IA 64
Road: Amber Rd. X44
Closest City: Anamosa


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 44450

This intersection does not contain high scoring segments.

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	3.44 mi	4
Approach Angle (Degrees)	90	0
Intersection within Curve	Yes	4
Daily Entering Vehicles	3,075	3
Minor Street Volume	310	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	1	1
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	3	0
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		14

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	3
Number of Paved Approaches	3
Major ADT	2,760
Minor ADT	310
Destination Lighting	Yes
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	1
Control Type	One-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	3
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	2
Total Nighttime Crashes	0
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	1	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,200
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	0	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ -
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	1	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	0	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	2	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ 2,400
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	2	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 16,100

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 14**

Project Name: IA 64 & Amber Rd. X44
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 44450**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 16,100
Subtotal:								\$ 16,100
Mobilization: (% +/-)*								10% \$ 2,500
Traffic Control: (% +/-)								5% \$ 880
Contingency: (% +/-)								20% \$ 3,520
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 23,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



Project Name: IA 38 & 190th St.
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: IA 38
Road: 190th St.
Closest City: Monticello


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 44433

This intersection does not contain high scoring segments.

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	1.83 mi	4
Approach Angle (Degrees)	45	4
Intersection within Curve	No	0
Daily Entering Vehicles	1,705	3
Minor Street Volume	120	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	0	0
K or A Crashes	0	0
Number of Approaches	4	1
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Negligible	0
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		14

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	4
Number of Paved Approaches	3
Major ADT	1,740
Minor ADT	120
Destination Lighting	No
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	Two-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	1
K and A Crashes	0
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	1
Total Nighttime Crashes	0
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	1	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 2,200
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	1	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	1	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	1	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	0	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ -
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	4	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 27,300

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 14**

Project Name: IA 38 & 190th St.
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 44433**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 27,300
Subtotal:								\$ 27,300
Mobilization: (% +/-)* 10%								\$ 2,730
Traffic Control: (% +/-) 5%								\$ 1,394
Contingency: (% +/-) 20%								\$ 5,576
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 37,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.


End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Intersection Improvements

Risk Factor Points: **13**



Project Name: US 151 & 130th St
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

INTERSECTION

Location Description

Road: **US 151**

Road: **130th St**

Closest City: **Anamosa**


Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 114935

This intersection does not contain high scoring segments.

County to coordinate with local agency to implement improvements that are on right-of-way that is not under control of the County.

Project Location Maps



Intersection Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Distance from Previous Stop	< 1.5 mi	0
Approach Angle (Degrees)	90	0
Intersection within Curve	Yes	4
Daily Entering Vehicles	26,200	3
Minor Street Volume	185	2
Roads/Driveways within 250 Feet	0	0
K or A Crashes	6	2
Number of Approaches	4	1
Potential Crash Reduction (PCR)	Medium	1
Total Risk Factor Points (24 max)		13

Other Information	
Number of Approaches	4
Number of Paved Approaches	4
Major ADT	13,200
Minor ADT	185
Destination Lighting	Yes
Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	0
Control Type	Two-way stop

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	31
K and A Crashes	6
Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	14
Total Nighttime Crashes	8
Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio*	1.0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Coordinate with Local Jurisdiction on Signal Modifications	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Signal Warrant Analysis to Consider Removal of Signal	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Intersection Configuration Evaluation (ICE)	0	EA	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Implement Results of ICE	0	EA	\$ 750,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Converting Two-Way Stop to All-Way Stop	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
All-Way Stop Analysis and Removal of Stop Signs on Major Approaches	0	EA	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Destination Lighting	0	EA	\$ 5,500	\$ -
Upgrade Signs and Pavement Markings	2	LEG	\$ 2,200	\$ 4,400
Upgrade Signs (Unpaved Approaches)	0	LEG	\$ 1,100	\$ -
Install Second Stop Sign and Stop Ahead Sign	2	LEG	\$ 1,500	\$ 3,000
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon or LED Flashing Lights on Stop Sign	0	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Transverse Rumble Strips	2	LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ 5,000
Install Intersection Warning Signs and Advance Street Name Plaques on Major Approaches	0	LEG	\$ 1,200	\$ -
Clear and Grub within Sight Triangle	4	LEG	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 32,400

Continued on back of this page.

* Nighttime/Daytime Crash Ratio = 3 x nighttime crashes/daytime crashes per Iowa DOT I.M. 2.110 Attachment A.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community


Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Intersection Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: US 151 & 130th St
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 7/17/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**INTERSECTION****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 114935**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	NB	SB	EB	WB	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Provide Left-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Provide Right-Turn Lane at Intersection						LEG	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Realign Intersection Approach to Reduce or Eliminate Intersection Skew (Paved)						LEG	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Provide Bypass Lane on Shoulder at T-intersection						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Convert Offset T-Intersection to Four-Legged Intersection (Paved)						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Use Indirect Left-Turn Treatment to Minimize Conflicts at Divided Highway Intersection						LEG	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Convert Four-Legged Intersection to Offset T-Intersection						EA	\$ 300,000	\$ -
Install Solar-Powered Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						LEG	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Install Retroreflective Strip on Stop Sign Post						INT	\$ 500	\$ -
Low-Cost Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS)						EA	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Flashing Beacon on Intersection Warning Sign						SIGN	\$ 2,500	\$ -
Other:								
Other:								
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:								\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:								\$ 32,400
Subtotal:								\$ 32,400
Mobilization: (% +/-)*							10%	\$ 3,240
Traffic Control: (% +/-)							5%	\$ 1,672
Contingency: (% +/-)							20%	\$ 6,688
Estimated Project Cost								\$ 44,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

APPENDIX C3

INTERSECTION RISK FACTOR RANKING RESULTS

Jones County
Safety Action Plan
Intersection Risk Factor Points



GPS ID	Road Name	Intersecting Road	Total Risk Factor Points	Distance from Previous Stop (miles) (Value)	Distance from Previous Stop (miles) (Points)	Intersection Skew (degrees) (Value)	Intersection Skew (degrees) (Points)	Intersection Within Curve (Value)	Intersection Within Curve (Points)	Daily Entering Vehicles (Value)	Daily Entering Vehicles (Points)	Minor Street Volume (Value)	Minor Street Volume (Points)	Access Management (250 ft) (Value)	Access Management (250 ft) (Points)	K and A Crashes (Value)	K and A Crashes (Points)	Number of Approaches (Value)	Number of Approaches (Points)	KABCO PCR Level (Value)	KABCO PCR Level (Points)	Total Crashes	Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	Number of Paved Approaches	Major Street ADT	Destination Lighting	Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	Control Type	
2017044433	IA 38	190th St.	14	1.8	4	45	4	No	0	1,705	3	120	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	1	1	3	1,740	No	0	Two-way stop	
2017044450	IA 64	Amber Rd. X44	14	3.4	4	90	0	Yes	4	3,075	3	310	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	3	2	3	2,760	Yes	1	One-way stop	
2017044723	Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	14	5.1	4	90	0	Yes	4	1,180	3	305	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	3	1	3	3,060	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044793	Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62	STONE BRIDGE RD	14	1.8	4	79	2	No	0	1,340	3	240	2	4	2	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	4	4	1,510	No	0	Two-way stop	
2017150087	US 151	Shaw Rd	10	1.5	4	90	0	No	0	28,800	3	450	2	2	1	6	2	4	1	Medium	1	23	14	4	14,400	No	0	Two-way stop	
2017151569	US 151	Old Hwy 151 Connector	14	2.0	4	90	0	Yes	4	13,350	3	540	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	11	2	3	9,200	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044408	IA 38	Co. Rd. E53	13	6.6	4	90	0	Yes	4	1,180	3	100	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	3	1,080	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044425	IA 38	Co. Rd. E23	13	8.3	4	90	0	Yes	4	845	2	50	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	4	4	3	630	Yes	1	Two-way stop	
2017044546	Co Rd E53/CO RD E-53	Co Rd X64/CO RD X-64	13	6.6	4	70	2	Yes	4	595	1	100	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	3	550	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044551	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	GREEN RD	13	5.7	4	78	2	Yes	4	1,450	3	305	2	3	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	1,335	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044618	Co Rd E29/CO RD E-29	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	13	2.1	4	86	0	Yes	4	1,740	2	90	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	3	0	2	660	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044641	Co Rd E34/CO RD E-34	215 AVE	13	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	3,325	3	75	2	8	2	1	2	3	0	Negligible	0	7	1	2	3,190	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044724	Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23	BLACKSMITH RD & BLUECUT RD	13	< 1.5	0	85	2	Yes	4	1,120	3	60	2	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	1,040	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044748	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	158 ST & 220 AVE	13	< 1.5	0	67	4	Yes	4	355	0	80	2	4	2	0	0	5	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	520	No	0	Other	
2017044799	Co Rd E16/CO RD E-16	MILITARY RD	13	< 1.5	0	63	4	Yes	4	1,080	3	30	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	0	2	1,050	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044894	EXT CO RD	MILITARY ST	13	5.9	4	75	2	No	0	1,015	3	215	2	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	1,020	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044839	MAIN ST	COUNTY RD X40	13	5.5	4	76	2	No	0	1,300	3	330	2	3	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	3	1	3	1,090	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017114935	US 151	130th St	13	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	26,200	3	185	2	0	0	6	2	4	1	Medium	1	31	14	4	13,200	Yes	0	Two-way stop	
2017044390	OLD HWY 151	HOLLYWOOD RD	12	< 1.5	0	19	2	Yes	4	1,895	3	25	1	13	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	4	0	2	1,835	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044643	Co Rd E34/CO RD E-34	FISH HOUSE RD	12	< 1.5	0	65	4	Yes	4	3,290	3	40	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	1	2	3,190	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044646	Co Rd E34/FAIRVIEW RD/CO RD E-34	NA	12	11.8	4	90	0	No	0	4,410	3	605	2	9	2	0	0	3	0	Medium	1	11	4	3	4,260	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044647	Co Rd E34/FAIRVIEW RD	Co Rd X28/CO RD X-28	12	2.1	4	77	2	No	0	1,695	3	395	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	3	0	3	1,335	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044725	Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44 & 155 AVE	12	3.4	4	70	2	No	0	1,430	3	75	2	0	0	9	2	0	1	Negligible	0	1	1	3	1,040	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017164421	CO RD E-34, N	NA	12	< 1.5	0	61	4	No	0	4,340	3	4,340	2	5	2	0	0	4	1	No Data	0	8	5	4	4,340	Yes	0	Uncontrolled	
2017044392	OLD HWY 151	150 AVE	11	< 1.5	0	62	4	No	0	1,985	3	120	2	6	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	1,835	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044393	OLD HWY 151	RICHLAND RD	11	< 1.5	0	64	4	No	0	1,815	3	325	2	6	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	3	1,835	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044403	IA 1/IOWA 1	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	11	< 1.5	0	69	4	No	0	5,950	3	210	2	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	3	4,200	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044488	IA 196	E17	11	5.3	4	90	0	No	0	1,060	3	210	2	0	0	2	2	3	0	Negligible	0	4	2	3	920	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044556	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	NEWPORT RD	11	< 1.5	0	70	2	Yes	4	1,430	3	75	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	1,335	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044655	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	LANDIS RD	11	1.400	3	85	2	Yes	4	1,400	3	40	1	2	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	1,335	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044657	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	SLIDE ROCK RD	11	< 1.5	0	76	2	No	0	1,460	3	105	2	8	2	1	2	3	0	Negligible	0	2	1	2	1,335	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044708	LANGWORTHY RD	180 ST & E MAIN ST	11	< 1.5	0	59	4	Yes	4	350	0	20	1	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	355	No	0	Uncontrolled	
2017044755	Co Rd E28/RIDGE RD E-28	FREEMONT RD	11	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	645	2	50	2	2	1	1	2	3	0	Negligible	0	2	0	2	590	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044759	Co Rd D61/CO RD D-61	WHITTEWATER LN	11	< 1.5	0	67	4	Yes	4	625	2	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	580	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044780	Co Rd D63/CO RD D-63	245 ST & 25 AVE	11	< 1.5	0	77	2	Yes	4	1,120	4	77	4	1	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	2	0	2	580	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044816	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	215 ST	11	< 1.5	0	65	4	Yes	4	445	1	40	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	1	2	385	No	0	Two-way stop	
2017114994	US 136	Anamosa Ave	11	4.3	4	90	0	No	0	1,065	3	185	2	18	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	880	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017114997	US 136	North St	11	7.2	4	90	0	No	0	1,150	3	145	2	7	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	3	880	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017150944	US 151	E23 County Home Rd	11	8.3	4	90	0	No	0	25,000	3	650	2	1	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	11	3	4	12,800	Yes	0	Two-way stop	
2017151025	US 151	Langworthy Rd	11	< 1.5	0	85	2	Yes	4	18,300	3	705	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	3	2	3	12,200	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044379	Co Rd E28/CO RD E-28	180 ST & E MAIN ST	10	< 1.5	0	74	2	Yes	4	1,450	3	75	2	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	1,050	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044389	OLD HWY 151	RIVER RD	10	< 1.5	0	85	4	No	0	2,465	3	175	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	Negligible	0	1	0	3	2,740	No	0	Two-way stop	
2017044391	OLD HWY 151	HOLLYWOOD RD	10	< 1.5	0	26	4	No	0	1,895	3	25	1	9	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	0	2	1,835	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044429	IA 38	Co. Rd. E17	10	5.3	4	90	0	No	0	1,330	3	90	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	1	0	3	1,250	Yes	0	Two-way stop	
2017044552	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	10	5.7	4	90	0	No	0	1,410	3	285	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	1,335	Yes	0	One-way stop	
2017044635	Co Rd E28/RIDGE RD E-28	Co Rd X28/CO RD X-28	10	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	1,210	3	275	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	0	3	1,235	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044636	Co Rd X28/CO RD X-28	STONE GUTY RD	10	2.1	4	87	0	No	0	830	2	190	2	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	4	0	2	785	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044648	Co Rd E34/FAIRVIEW RD/COUNTY HOME RD	Co Rd X28/CO RD X-28	10	< 1.5	0	87	0	Yes	4	1,170	3	230	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	1,335	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044654	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	SHAW RD	10	2.040	3	83	2	Yes	4	2,040	3	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	0	2	1,335	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044673	Co Rd E17/CO RD E-17	25 AVE	10	< 1.5	0	85	2	Yes	4	535	1	25	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	500	No	0	One-way stop
2017044685	Co Rd E17/CO RD E-17	INDIGO RD	10	< 1.5	0	68	4	Yes	4	455	1	25	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	420	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044749	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	VIOLET RD	10	< 1.5	0	82	2	Yes	4	660	< 1.5	135	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	0	2	520	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044825	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	PAIRIE HILL RD	10	< 1.5	0	60	4	Yes	4	410	< 1.5	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	3	385	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044826	Co Rd E16/CO RD E-16	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	10	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	1,065	3	385	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	4	725	No	0	One-way stop	
2017044956	CO RD X-64	15T AVE S	10	< 1.5	0	49	4	No	0	655	2	115	2	8	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible									

Jones County
Safety Action Plan
Intersection Risk Factor Points



GPS ID	Road Name	Intersecting Road	Total Risk Factor Points	Distance from Previous Stop (miles) (Value)	Distance from Previous Stop (miles) (Points)	Intersection Skew (degrees) (Value)	Intersection Skew (degrees) (Points)	Intersection Within Curve (Value)	Intersection Within Curve (Points)	Daily Entering Vehicles (Value)	Daily Entering Vehicles (Points)	Minor Street Volume (Value)	Minor Street Volume (Points)	Access Management (250 ft) (Value)	Access Management (250 ft) (Points)	K and A Crashes (Value)	K and A Crashes (Points)	Number of Approaches (Value)	Number of Approaches (Points)	KABCO PCR Level (Value)	KABCO PCR Level (Points)	Total Crashes	Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	Number of Paved Approaches	Major Street ADT	Destination Lighting	Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	Control Type
2017044727	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	BLUECUT RD	6	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	700	2	20	1	9	2	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	660	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044728	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	OLD DEPOT RD	6	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	680	2	10	0	9	2	1	2	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	660	No	0	One-way stop
2017044730	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	155 AVE	6	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	675	2	10	0	5	2	1	2	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	660	Yes	0	One-way stop
2017044731	HARDSOFTABLE RD	THUNDER RD	6	< 1.5	0	53	4	No	0	410	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	1	0	2	540	No	0	One-way stop
2017044732	Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62	185 AVE	6	< 1.5	0	79	2	No	0	635	2	25	1	2	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	1	2	600	No	0	One-way stop
2017044794	Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62	175 AVE	6	< 1.5	0	76	2	No	0	1,545	3	5	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	2	0	2	1,510	No	0	One-way stop
2017045131	LANGWORTHY RD	E MAIN ST & W MAIN ST	6	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	110	0	5	0	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	35	No	0	Uncontrolled
2017045166	230th Ave	River Rd	6	< 1.5	0	55	4	No	0	195	0	35	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	No Data	0	0	0	0	160	No	0	Uncontrolled
2017114966	IA 64/IOWA 64	TOWER RD	6	< 1.5	0	88	0	No	0	3,285	3	40	1	3	2	0	0	3	1	Negligible	0	3	2	2	3,680	Yes	0	One-way stop
2017114981	US 136	1st Ave S	6	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	1,365	3	15	0	10	2	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	1	1	3	750	Yes	0	Two-way stop
2017114988	MAIN ST	VINE ST	6	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	710	2	45	0	5	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	1	3	660	Yes	0	One-way stop
2017115107	1ST ST	MAIN ST & DAVENPORT ST	6	< 1.5	0	85	2	No	0	265	0	25	1	7	2	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	1	0	2	205	Yes	0	Two-way stop
2017115199	MAIN ST	ROHRBACK ST	6	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	805	2	115	2	13	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	660	Yes	0	One-way stop
2017115206	COUNTY RD X40	WURZBACHER ST	6	< 1.5	0	87	0	No	0	1,205	3	35	1	3	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	1	3	1,090	Yes	0	One-way stop
2017044428	IA 38/IOWA 38	116 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	655	2	25	1	3	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	630	No	0	One-way stop
2017044511	Co Rd X64/CO RD X-64	430 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	77	2	No	0	420	1	20	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	395	No	0	One-way stop
2017044553	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	55 ST	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	905	2	20	1	1	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	865	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044555	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	160 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	725	2	60	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	650	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044562	Co Rd E53/25 ST	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	860	2	50	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	770	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044574	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	200 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	630	2	25	1	1	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	570	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044587	Co Rd E29/CO RD E-29	15 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	310	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	285	No	0	One-way stop
2017044617	Co Rd E29/CO RD E-29	140 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	86	0	Yes	4	200	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	175	No	0	One-way stop
2017044645	Co Rd E34/FAIRVIEW RD	BENTON ST	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	1,240	3	10	0	3	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	3,210	No	0	One-way stop
2017044672	Co Rd E17/CO RD E-17	30 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	86	0	Yes	4	515	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	500	No	0	One-way stop
2017044674	Co Rd E17/CO RD E-17	CEMETERY RD	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	515	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	500	No	0	One-way stop
2017044691	Co Rd E17/CO RD E-17	NO NAME	5	< 1.5	0	84	2	No	0	530	1	10	0	9	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	510	No	0	Uncontrolled
2017044722	Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23	170 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	650	2	25	1	1	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	610	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044729	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	130 ST	5	< 1.5	0	70	2	No	0	680	2	10	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	660	No	0	One-way stop
2017044753	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	150 ST	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	525	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	520	No	0	One-way stop
2017044756	Co Rd E28/RIDGE RD E-28	239 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	78	2	No	0	605	1	5	0	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	590	No	0	One-way stop
2017044797	Co Rd E16/CO RD E-16	STONE BRIDGE RD	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	795	2	55	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	725	No	0	One-way stop
2017044798	Co Rd E16/CO RD E-16	STONE BRIDGE RD	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	1,010	2	120	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	3	1,030	No	0	One-way stop
2017044806	Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62	222 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	74	2	No	0	635	2	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	600	No	0	One-way stop
2017044812	Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62	202 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	58	4	No	0	615	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	600	No	0	One-way stop
2017044821	Co Rd D62/CO RD D-62	200 AVE	5	< 1.5	0	51	4	No	0	620	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	600	No	0	One-way stop
2017044951	Co Rd E29/CO RD E-29	ANAMOSA AVE & 4TH ST	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	435	1	60	0	3	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	370	No	0	Uncontrolled
2017044967	RIVERVIEW RD	BUCHANAN ST SW	5	< 1.5	0	72	2	No	0	330	0	65	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	340	No	0	One-way stop
2017115100	MAIN ST	ST PAUL ST	5	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	255	0	75	2	7	2	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	3	155	Yes	0	Two-way stop
2017044504	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	FOX RD	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	235	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	215	No	0	One-way stop
2017044512	Co Rd X64/CO RD X-64	25TH AVE	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	440	1	40	1	3	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	395	No	0	One-way stop
2017044515	Co Rd X64/CO RD X-64	430 AVE	4	< 1.5	0	87	0	No	0	430	1	4	0	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	387	No	0	One-way stop
2017044526	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	100 AVE	4	< 1.5	0	74	2	No	0	460	1	30	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	420	No	0	One-way stop
2017044527	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	SANDFORD ST	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	440	1	10	0	3	2	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	420	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044528	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	100 AVE	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	475	1	10	0	3	2	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	420	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044545	Co Rd E53/CO RD E-53	80 AVE	4	< 1.5	0	86	0	Yes	4	215	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	195	No	0	One-way stop
2017044559	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	35 ST	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	835	2	35	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	2	0	2	770	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044600	Co Rd X75/CO RD X-75	75 ST	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	475	1	35	1	2	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	405	No	0	One-way stop
2017044623	Co Rd E29/CO RD E-29	136 AVE	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	Yes	4	195	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	175	No	0	One-way stop
2017044656	Co Rd X40/CO RD X-40	90 ST	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	1,380	3	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	1,335	No	0	One-way stop
2017044700	Co Rd E23/CO HOME RD E-23	130 AVE	4	< 1.5	0	79	2	No	0	410	1	30	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	375	No	0	One-way stop
2017044706	180 ST	SPRING ST	4	< 1.5	0	84	2	No	0	150	0	15	0	7	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	165	No	0	One-way stop
2017044717	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	150 ST	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	710	2	15	0	1	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	2	670	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044726	Co Rd X44/AMBER RD X-44	BLICKSMITH RD	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	675	2	5	0	10	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	660	No	0	One-way stop
2017044753	Co Rd D61/CO RD D-61	15 AVE	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	620	1	30	2	2	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	580	No	0	One-way stop
2017044773	Co Rd E57/202 ST/TEMPLE HILL RD	NA	4	< 1.5	0	85	2	No	0	110	0	15	0	4	2	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	1	120	No	0	All-way stop
2017044780	Co Rd D65/RICHLAND RD	BOWENS PRAIRIE RD	4	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	305	0	60	2	1	1	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	1	0	2	295	No		

Jones County
Safety Action Plan
Intersection Risk Factor Points



GPS ID	Road Name	Intersecting Road	Total Risk Factor Points	Distance from Previous Stop (miles) (Value)	Distance from Previous Stop (miles) (Points)	Intersection Skew (degrees) (Value)	Intersection Skew (degrees) (Points)	Intersection Within Curve (Value)	Intersection Within Curve (Points)	Daily Entering Vehicles (Value)	Daily Entering Vehicles (Points)	Minor Street Volume (Value)	Minor Street Volume (Points)	Access Management (250 ft) (Value)	Access Management (250 ft) (Points)	K and A Crashes (Value)	K and A Crashes (Points)	Number of Approaches (Value)	Number of Approaches (Points)	KABCO PCR Level (Value)	KABCO PCR Level (Points)	Total Crashes	Right Angle, Rear-end, or Turning Crashes	Number of Paved Approaches	Major Street ADT	Destination Lighting	Transverse Rumble Strips (Number of Approaches)	Control Type
2017044622	Co Rd E29/CO RD E-29	CENTRAL PARK RD	1	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	155	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	3	175	No	0	One-way stop
2017044666	Co Rd E17/CO RD E-17	SAND DITCH RD	1	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	515	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	500	No	0	One-way stop
2017044678	190 ST	130 AVE	1	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	305	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	295	No	0	One-way stop
2017044683	Co Rd E17/CO RD E-17	100 AVE	1	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	440	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	1	0	2	420	No	0	One-way stop
2017044684	95 AVE	160 ST	1	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	40	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	Negligible	0	0	0	3	40	No	0	Two-way stop
2017044735	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	180 ST	1	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	550	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	520	No	0	One-way stop
2017044736	Co Rd X31/CO RD X-31	180 ST	1	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	545	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	520	No	0	One-way stop
2017044503	Co Rd E45/CO RD E-45	50 AVE	0	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	225	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	Negligible	0	0	0	2	215	No	0	One-way stop
2017044612	Co Rd E29/CO RD E-29	90 AVE	0	< 1.5	0	90	0	No	0	355	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	No Data	0	0	0	2	345	No	0	One-way stop

Disclaimer: Throughout the SAP process, the County Engineer provided feedback on locations where the information contained within the existing databases was not current (for example, location of rumble strips, shoulder type and/or width, etc.). When these locations were identified, updates to the project sheets were made. As such the information in this table may vary from final information presented on the project sheets. Priority locations selected for project sheets were selected in coordination with the County and may not align with the highest scoring locations.

APPENDIX D1

CURVE SAFETY COUNTERMEASURES

COUNTY PAVED ROADWAY CURVE COUNTERMEASURES

This appendix summarizes the **curve** safety countermeasures for consideration and provides detailed descriptions for each countermeasure from both the risk factor analysis as well as the additional potential improvements listed on the back side of the project sheets.

Systematic Countermeasures

The countermeasures in this section were included in the risk factor analysis and recommended on the curve project sheets based on the criteria described in **Section 5.1.2**.

New Pavement Markings

This safety countermeasure includes new centerline and edgeline pavement markings along the curve. The updated markings can clarify and further delineate the curve, reducing the risk of a lane departure crash. If the lanes were 12 feet or wider, new edgeline pavement markings of six inches were recommended; Research suggests that widening pavement markings from four to six inches in rural areas results in a crash modification factor (CMF) of 0.64 to 0.83. Otherwise, new four-inch pavement markings were recommended. Research suggests that installing new 4' pavement markings in rural areas results in a CMF of 0.61 to 0.74.

Pave Shoulder with Safety Edge

Constructing or increasing the width of an existing paved shoulder can reduce the potential for a severe crash as the result of a lane departure. CMFs associated with paving the shoulder in rural areas range from 0.82 to 0.9. At locations where paved shoulders are recommended, it is suggested that the County Engineer consider a minimum of a two-foot shoulder; however, based on right-of-way and roadway characteristics, the County Engineer may choose to install a wider shoulder.

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), a Safety Edge is “a simple but effective solution that can help save lives by allowing drivers who drift off [roadways] to return to the road safely. Instead of a vertical drop-off, the Safety Edge shapes the edge of pavement to 30 degrees.” The installation of a Safety Edge has CMFs ranging from 0.85 to 0.92. According to the FHWA, from a maintenance standpoint, “because the Safety Edge provides an additional level of consolidation on the edge, edge raveling is decreased. This contributes to longer pavement life.”

Edgeline Rumble Strips

Edgeline rumble strips provide tactile and audible warning to a driver if they are beginning to depart the lane. This safety improvement has recorded CMFs in the range of 0.61 to 0.67 for rural run-off-the-road injury crashes. Depending on the conditions of the roadway, the County Engineer may choose to install rumble strips placed in the shoulder offset from the edgeline, or they may place the rumble strips on the edgeline and provide pavement markings over them, resulting in edgeline rumble strips. For purposes of this document, both will be called rumble strips.

Centerline Rumble Strips

CMFs of 0.55 to 0.91 represent the safety benefit from the installation of centerline rumble strips. In Iowa, rumble strips placed in the centerline of the roadway generally have pavement markings over them. To be consistent with the Iowa DOT Design Manual 3C-5, centerline rumble strips will be referred to as rumble strips even though in circumstances they may technically

be “rumble stripes”. This safety improvement provides an audible and tactile warning to drivers when crossing the centerline and can aid in the avoidance of some high-severity lane departure crashes on curves.

Curve Chevron Advanced Curve Warning or Advisory Speed Signs

This countermeasure includes the installation of Curve Chevron signs—static or dynamic—and Advisory Speed Signs to improve driver awareness and navigation through horizontal curves. As identified by the FHWA, these treatments are proven safety countermeasures that significantly reduce crash risks, particularly on rural and county roads. Chevron signs, especially when enhanced with retroreflective materials or deployed in sequential dynamic formats, can reduce fatal and injury crashes by up to 60 percent. Advisory Speed Signs complement these by clearly communicating safe travel speeds based on curve geometry, helping drivers adjust behavior in advance. Together, these low-cost, high-impact interventions provide continuous visual guidance, and improve nighttime and low-visibility navigation.

Clear and Grub

Clearing and grubbing the areas within the clear zone of the roadway increases the sight distance for vehicles prior to entering, during, and after exiting a curve. This safety countermeasure also reduces the hazard of a run-off-the-road crash by reducing the number of obstructions a vehicle could impact after a lane departure. A 0.78 CMF has been documented as distance from roadside features was increased.

Location Specific Countermeasures

Safety improvements not included on the first page of the curve project sheet may still merit consideration at a specific location. There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included in the risk factor analysis due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed at curves throughout the county. The following sections describe several other curve safety improvements that could be considered appropriate by the county and that were included on the back side of the project sheets.

Additional Curve Signage

Curve signage in addition to the signage included in the project sheets could be considered, including the one direction large arrow sign (W1-6 48”x24”) and the combination horizontal alignment/advisory speed sign (W1-1a 36”x36”). This additional curve signage could be appropriate in some situations to provide further emphasis to the change in horizontal alignment of the roadway.

Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Signposts

The installation of retroreflective strips on signposts is currently under study by Iowa State University (InTrans) and the preliminary results are positive. This countermeasure includes the installation of retroreflective strips on the posts of curve chevron signs. The strips can increase the visibility of curve chevron signs and increase driver awareness of changes in horizontal alignment. Public response to this countermeasure has been very positive.

Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve

This treatment can provide additional tactile and audible warning to the driver of an upcoming curve. It is recommended that this treatment be used with caution as the driver may misinterpret the warning since transverse rumble strips in Iowa are typically installed prior to

stop-controlled intersections. Transverse rumble strips installed as a traffic calming device have seen CMFs of 0.66.

Superelevation Correction

The use of superelevation, where none exists, or the correction of existing superelevation, can provide a safety benefit, helping to keep vehicles within the travel lanes while negotiating a curve, particularly at high speeds. This countermeasure requires substantial reconstruction of a curve and could reduce the amount of friction needed for vehicles to remain on the roadway in wet or snowy conditions. This recommendation is site-specific and would need additional attention by the County Engineer in order to be implemented at a specific location.

High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST)

This countermeasure involves applying a thin layer of durable, polish-resistant aggregate—typically calcined bauxite—bonded with a high-strength resin to the pavement surface at horizontal curves. HFST dramatically improves pavement friction, especially in wet or high demand braking conditions, helping drivers maintain control and reduce stopping distances. Though curves make up only about 5 percent of U.S. roadway miles, they account for over 25 percent of fatal crashes, underscoring the need for targeted safety interventions. HFST has been shown to reduce injury and fatal crashes by approximately 50 percent. Its long service life, rapid installation, and minimal environmental impact make it a cost-effective solution for high-risk locations.

Speed Activated Flashers on Chevron Signs

This countermeasure includes the installation of speed activated flashers either as beacons or as LED lights around the border of curve chevron signs. This improvement can provide additional warning to drivers exceeding the suggested speed limit prior to a curved section of roadway. The flashers can increase the visibility of curve chevron signs and increase driver awareness of changes in horizontal alignment, specifically when they are exceeding a designated speed. Where speed activated flashers have been installed in combination with curve chevrons and curve warning signage, CMFs of 0.59 to 0.61 have been recorded.

Guardrail

Installing guardrail can help redirect vehicles after a lane departure to remain on the roadway and avoid roadside hazards. CMFs in the range of 0.53 have been recorded for installing new guardrail along an embankment.

On-pavement Markings for Speed Control

This improvement includes painting the speed limit on the pavement to reinforce the posted speed limit. On-pavement markings can serve as additional information and reminders to drivers of the posted speed limit and the importance of observing their speed. Research has shown a CMF of 0.62 for additional in-lane pavement markings.

Post-Mounted Delineators

As stated in the MUTCD, “delineators are particularly beneficial at locations where the [roadway] alignment might be confusing or unexpected, such as at lane-reduction transitions and curves. Delineators are effective guidance devices at night and during adverse weather. An important advantage of delineators in certain locations is that they remain visible when the roadway is wet, or snow covered.” Providing post-mounted retroreflective delineators along the roadway can give additional information to drivers as to the location of the roadside edge

and alignment. The CMF for installing post-mounted delineators in combination with edgelines and centerlines has been recorded at 0.55.

APPENDIX D2

CURVE PROJECT SHEETS

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 18



Project Name: Curve 6189 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description

Road: CO RD E-34

Length (feet): 620

Closest City: Anamosa


Length (Miles): 0.12

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6189

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4842

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	3,420	6
Curve Radius (ft)	726	3
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	181	2
Intersections Driveways	1 12	3
K or A Crash	1	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		18

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	Yes
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	Yes
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	Yes

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	10
K and A Crashes	1
Lane Departure Crashes	7
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	1
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	667.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	66.8

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.12	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 720
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.12	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 360
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.12	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 240
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 7,320

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 18



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6189 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6189

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve	1	CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign	1	EA	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control	1	EA	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 67,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 7,320
Subtotal:				\$ 74,320
Mobilization: (% +/-)* 10%				\$ 7,440
Traffic Control: (% +/-) 5%				\$ 3,848
Contingency: (% +/-) 20%				\$ 15,392
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 101,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 15



Project Name: Curve 6648 on OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description


Road: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
Length (feet): 590 Length (Miles): 0.11
Closest City: Monticello

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6648

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4863

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,601	6
Curve Radius (ft)	485	4
Shoulder Width (ft)	5	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	182	2
Intersections Driveways	0 4	1
K or A Crash	0	0
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		15

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	5
Speed Limit (mph)	50
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	No

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	1
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	0
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	155.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.11	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 660
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.11	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 330
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0.11	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 16,500
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.11	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 550
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.11	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 220
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 26,760

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 15



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6648 on OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6648

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 26,760
Subtotal:				\$ 26,760
Mobilization: (% +/-)*				10% \$ 2,680
Traffic Control: (% +/-)				5% \$ 1,512
Contingency: (% +/-)				20% \$ 6,048
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 37,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



Project Name: Curve 6064 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description

Road: RIDGE RD E-28

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6064


Length (feet): 1,710

Length (Miles): 0.32

Closest City: Anamosa

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4888

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,003	6
Curve Radius (ft)	1,165	1
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	71	0
Intersections Driveways	1 4	3
K or A Crash	1	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		14

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	No

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	4
K and A Crashes	1
Lane Departure Crashes	3
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	1
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	341.4
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	85.4

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.32	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 1,920
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.32	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 960
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0.32	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 48,000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.32	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,600
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.32	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 640
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 61,620

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 14



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6064 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6064

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post	1	CURVE	\$ 500	\$ 500
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve	1	CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 60,500
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 61,620
Subtotal:				\$ 122,120
Mobilization: (% +/-)* 10%				\$ 12,220
Traffic Control: (% +/-) 5%				\$ 6,132
Contingency: (% +/-) 20%				\$ 24,528
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 165,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



Project Name: Curve 6112 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description


Road: RIDGE RD E-28
Length (feet): 860 Length (Miles): 0.16
Closest City: Anamosa

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6112

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4888

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,003	6
Curve Radius (ft)	860	3
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	116	1
Intersections Driveways	0 3	1
K or A Crash	0	0
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	Yes

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	6
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	3
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	1,024.3
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.16	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 960
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.16	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 480
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0.16	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 24,000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.16	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 800
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.16	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 320
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 32,560

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6112 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6112

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post	1	CURVE	\$ 500	\$ 500
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve	1	CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 60,500
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 32,560
Subtotal:				\$ 93,060
Mobilization: (% +/-)*				10% \$ 9,310
Traffic Control: (% +/-)				5% \$ 4,726
Contingency: (% +/-)				20% \$ 18,904
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 126,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



Project Name: Curve 6157 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description


Road: RIDGE RD E-28
Length (feet): 560 Length (Miles): 0.11
Closest City: Anamosa

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6157

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4888

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,003	6
Curve Radius (ft)	584	3
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	117	1
Intersections Driveways	0 7	1
K or A Crash	0	0
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	Yes

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	3
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	0
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	745.0
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.11	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 660
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.11	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 330
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0.11	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 16,500
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.11	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 550
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.11	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 220
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 24,260

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6157 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6157

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post	1	CURVE	\$ 500	\$ 500
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve	1	CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 60,500
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 24,260
Subtotal:				\$ 84,760
Mobilization: (% +/-)* 10%				\$ 8,480
Traffic Control: (% +/-) 5%				\$ 4,352
Contingency: (% +/-) 20%				\$ 17,408
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 115,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



Project Name: Curve 6174 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description


Road: RIDGE RD E-28
Length (feet): 540 Length (Miles): 0.10
Closest City: Anamosa

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6174

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4888

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,003	6
Curve Radius (ft)	926	3
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	118	1
Intersections Driveways	0 5	1
K or A Crash	0	0
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	Yes

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	1
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	0
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	273.2
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.10	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 600
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.10	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 300
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0.10	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 15,000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.10	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 500
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.10	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 200
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 22,600

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6174 on RIDGE RD E-28
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6174

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post	1	CURVE	\$ 500	\$ 500
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve	1	CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 60,500
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 22,600
Subtotal:				\$ 83,100
Mobilization: (% +/-)* 10%				\$ 8,310
Traffic Control: (% +/-) 5%				\$ 4,318
Contingency: (% +/-) 20%				\$ 17,272
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 113,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



Project Name: Curve 6176 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description

Road: CO RD E-34

Length (feet): 460

Closest City: Anamosa


Length (Miles): 0.09

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6176

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4842

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	3,420	6
Curve Radius (ft)	883	3
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	159	1
Intersections Driveways	0 1	1
K or A Crash	0	0
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	Yes
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	Yes
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	Yes

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	8
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	4
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	712.1
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.09	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 540
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.09	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 270
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.09	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 180
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ -
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 6,990

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan**Project Description for Curve Improvements****Risk Factor Points: 13**

Project Name: Curve 6176 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

**CURVE****Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)****GPS ID: 6176**

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 6,990
Subtotal:				\$ 6,990
Mobilization: (% +/-)*				10% \$ 2,500
Traffic Control: (% +/-)				5% \$ 502
Contingency: (% +/-)				20% \$ 2,008
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 12,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description**Back Page**

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



Project Name: Curve 6219 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description

Road: CO RD E-34

Length (feet): 900

Closest City: Anamosa


Length (Miles): 0.17

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6219

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4842

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	3,420	6
Curve Radius (ft)	1,499	1
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	116	1
Intersections Driveways	0 9	1
K or A Crash	1	2
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	Yes
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	Yes
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	No

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	7
K and A Crashes	1
Lane Departure Crashes	0
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	329.9
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	47.1

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.17	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 1,020
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.17	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 510
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.17	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 340
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 10,370

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6219 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6219

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve	1	CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 60,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 10,370
Subtotal:				\$ 70,370
Mobilization: (% +/-)*				10% \$ 7,040
Traffic Control: (% +/-)				5% \$ 3,718
Contingency: (% +/-)				20% \$ 14,872
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 96,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



Project Name: Curve 6602 on OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description


Road: OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
Length (feet): 610 Length (Miles): 0.12
Closest City: Monticello

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6602

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4863

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	1,601	6
Curve Radius (ft)	1,763	1
Shoulder Width (ft)	5	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	134	1
Intersections Driveways	1 17	3
K or A Crash	0	0
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		13

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	No
Shoulder Width (ft)	5
Speed Limit (mph)	50
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	No
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	No

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	6
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	3
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	855.6
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.12	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 720
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.12	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 360
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0.12	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ 18,000
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0.12	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ 600
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.12	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 240
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 28,420

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 13



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6602 on OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6602

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Realign Minor Approach	1	EA	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 300,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 28,420
Subtotal:				\$ 328,420
Mobilization: (% +/-)* 10%				\$ 32,850
Traffic Control: (% +/-) 5%				\$ 16,546
Contingency: (% +/-) 20%				\$ 66,184
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 444,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 12



Project Name: Curve 6182 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

CURVE

Location Description

Road: CO RD E-34

Length (feet): 180

Closest City: Anamosa


Length (Miles): 0.03

Project is within an Underserved Community?†: No

GPS ID: 6182

This curve is located within the following high scoring segment: GPS ID 4842

Project Location Maps



Curve Information and Systemic Ranking Summary

Systemic Ranking Summary	Value	Points
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	3,420	6
Curve Radius (ft)	1,726	1
Shoulder Width (ft)	4	2
Avg. Pavement Condition (IRI)	180	2
Intersections Driveways	0 4	1
K or A Crash	0	0
Total Risk Factor Points (21 max)		12

Other Information	
Paved Shoulder	Yes
Shoulder Width (ft)	4
Speed Limit (mph)	55
Lane Width (ft)	12
Number of Lanes	2
Edgeline Rumble Strips	Yes
Centerline Rumble Strips	No
Existing Curve Chevrons	No

Crash Data, 2014-2023	
Total Crashes	1
K and A Crashes	0
Lane Departure Crashes	0
Lane Departure K and A Crashes	0
Total Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	267.0
K and A Crash Rate (per HMVMT)	0

Opinion of Probable Cost (Countermeasure Selection Threshold Results)

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Install 4" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Install 6" Retroreflective Edgeline (Both Sides of Road)	0.03	MILE	\$ 6,000	\$ 180
Install 4" Retroreflective Centerline	0.03	MILE	\$ 3,000	\$ 90
Pave 2' Shoulder with Safety Edge (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 150,000	\$ -
Install Edgeline Rumble Strips (Both Sides of Road)	0	MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Install Centerline Rumble Strips	0.03	MILE	\$ 2,000	\$ 60
Review Curve and Provide Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	1	CURVE	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Review and Upgrade Curve Signage to Meet MUTCD and Iowa DOT Standards, if Needed	0	CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Clear and Grub (15 ft Both Sides of Road)	1.00	CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 8,830

Continued on back of this page.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Front Page

Safety Action Plan

Project Description for Curve Improvements

Risk Factor Points: 12



CURVE

Project Name: Curve 6182 on CO RD E-34
Agency Name: Jones County
Contact Name: Derek Snead
E-mail: derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov

Date: 5/23/25

Prepared By: SMA
Checked By: DJG

Opinion of Probable Cost (Additional Potential Improvements)

GPS ID: 6182

There are a variety of other safety improvements that could be considered that were not included on the front page of the project sheet due to availability of data, the need for site-specific information, and/or the appetite for the countermeasure to be deployed throughout the county. The following countermeasures could be considered appropriate by the county and included below as additional potential improvements.

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Item Cost
Additional Curve Signage		CURVE	\$ 1,000	\$ -
Retroreflective Strip on Chevron Sign Post		CURVE	\$ 500	\$ -
Transverse Rumble Strips Prior to Curve		CURVE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Superelevation Correction		EA	\$ 50,000	\$ -
Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) on Curve		CURVE	\$ 60,000	\$ -
Speed Activated Flasher on Chevron Sign		EA	\$ 4,000	\$ -
Guardrail		FOOT	\$ 80	\$ -
On-Pavement Marking for Speed Control		EA	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Post-Mounted Delineators		MILE	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Other:				
Additional Potential Improvements Subtotal:				\$ -
Project Selection Decision Tree Systemic Improvements Subtotal:				\$ 8,830
Subtotal:				\$ 8,830
Mobilization: (% +/-)* 10%				\$ 2,500
Traffic Control: (% +/-) 5%				\$ 534
Contingency: (% +/-) 20%				\$ 2,136
Estimated Project Cost				\$ 14,000

*Mobilization is 10% +/- of the subtotal with a minimum of \$2,500 and a maximum of \$75,000

†Note on Underserved Communities Indicator:

As part of the SS4A program an Underserved Community shares the same definition as an Area of Persistent Poverty (APP). According to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, an area is defined as an APP if it meets the following criteria: (A) the County consistently had greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty in all three of the following datasets: the 1990 decennial census, the 2000 decennial census; and the most recent (2023, for the purposes of this report) Small Area Income Poverty Estimates; OR (B) the Census Tract has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2014-2018 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census; OR (C) any territory or possession of the United States.

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

Kimley-Horn has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Kimley-Horn at this time and represent only Kimley-Horn's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. Kimley-Horn cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Description Form Disclaimer:

The recommended improvements contained in this project description form were developed through a Geographic Information System (GIS) database risk assessment and project decision tree selection process, as specifically stated in our scope of services. Kimley-Horn has no control over the accuracy of the GIS databases nor the suitability of the specific improvements for the location, and has provided recommended improvements for consideration by the County Engineer. The County Engineer may use this project description form to aid in the selection and development of projects, but this project description form should not be used as the sole basis for the County Engineer's decision making process. Kimley-Horn endeavored to research issues and constraints to the extent practical given the scope, budget, and schedule agreed to with the Client. The assessment is based in large part on information provided to us by others (DOT, county staff, etc.) and therefore is only as accurate and complete as the information provided to us. No formal assessment was made for the improvement recommendations contained on this page. If in question, it is recommended that a study/analysis of this location be made to warrant the above indicated improvements. This project description form is based on our knowledge as of July 2024.

End of Project Description

Back Page

APPENDIX D3

CURVE RISK FACTOR RANKING RESULTS



GPS ID	Paved Road	Length (ft)	Total Risk Factor Points	Average Daily Traffic (Value)	Average Daily Traffic (Points)	Curve Radius (ft) (Value)	Curve Radius (Points)	Shoulder Width (ft) (Value)	Shoulder Width (Points)	Pavement Condition (Value)	Pavement Condition (Points)	Intersections Driveways (Value)	Intersections Driveways Risk (Points)	K and A Crashes (Value)	K and A Crashes Risk (Points)	Total Crashes	Paved Shoulder	Speed Limit (mph)	Lane Width (ft)	Rumble Strips	Existing Curve Chevrons
6189	CO RD E-34	618.7	18	3,420	6	726	3	4	2	181	2	1 12	3	1	2	10	Yes	55	12	Yes	Yes
6142	CO RD E-34	843.3	15	3,420	6	661	3	4	2	140	1	1 1	3	0	0	4	Yes	55	12	Yes	Yes
6648	OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE	593.4	15	1,601	6	485	4	5	2	182	2	0 4	1	0	0	1	No	50	12	No	No
6064	RIDGE RD E-28	1710.7	14	1,003	6	1,165	1	4	2	71	0	1 4	3	1	2	4	No	55	12	No	No
6112	RIDGE RD E-28	859.3	13	1,003	6	860	3	4	2	116	1	0 3	1	0	0	6	No	55	12	No	Yes
6157	RIDGE RD E-28	556.0	13	1,003	6	584	3	4	2	117	1	0 7	1	0	0	3	No	55	12	No	Yes
6174	RIDGE RD E-28	543.4	13	1,003	6	926	3	4	2	118	1	0 5	1	0	0	1	No	55	12	No	Yes
6176	CO RD E-34	457.8	13	3,420	6	883	3	4	2	159	1	0 1	1	0	0	8	Yes	55	12	Yes	Yes
6219	CO RD E-34	904.3	13	3,420	6	1,499	1	4	2	116	1	0 9	1	1	2	7	Yes	55	12	Yes	No
6602	OLD US 151 SIGNED ROUTE	611.2	13	1,601	6	1,763	1	5	2	134	1	1 17	3	0	0	6	No	50	12	No	No
6031	FAIRVIEW ROAD	635.6	12	1,265	6	2,086	1	4	2	92	0	1 3	3	0	0	8	No	55	13	Yes	No
6049	RIDGE RD E-28	1069.5	12	1,003	6	884	3	4	2	77	0	0 8	1	0	0	3	No	55	12	No	No
6080	RIDGE RD E-28	429.0	12	1,003	6	2,461	1	4	2	82	0	1 1	3	0	0	3	No	55	12	No	No
6182	CO RD E-34	182.6	12	3,420	6	1,726	1	4	2	180	2	0 4	1	0	0	1	Yes	55	12	Yes	No
6323	CO RD X-40	691.1	12	1,286	6	1,508	1	7	0	188	2	1 1	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6346	CO RD X-40	1121.9	12	1,286	6	1,760	1	7	0	193	2	1 1	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6366	CO RD X-40	782.3	12	1,286	6	1,849	1	7	0	207	2	1 3	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6807	CO RD E-45	1212.7	12	364	2	1,249	1	5	2	232	2	1 0	3	2	2	2	No	55	11	No	No
6931	248TH STREET	468.2	12	840	5	566	3	5	2	152	1	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	50	17	No	No
7030	CO RD E-45	1203.4	12	364	2	791	3	5	2	199	2	1 0	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	Yes
6167	CO RD E-34	434.2	11	3,420	6	1,108	1	4	2	159	1	0 1	1	0	0	2	Yes	55	12	Yes	Yes
6192	RIDGE RD E-28	1250.8	11	1,003	6	1,095	1	4	2	170	1	0 1	1	0	0	1	No	55	12	No	No
6200	CO RD X-31	1353.0	11	497	3	857	3	9	0	212	2	1 0	3	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	Yes
6216	CO RD X-31	1390.8	11	497	3	877	3	9	0	192	2	1 0	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	Yes
6249	HOLT STREET	197.7	11	230	1	320	4	1	4	164	1	0 5	1	0	0	0	No	55	14	No	No
6312	CO RD X-40	1199.2	11	1,286	6	1,151	1	7	0	141	1	1 0	3	0	0	4	No	55	11	No	No
6357	CO RD X-40	1376.6	11	1,286	6	1,608	1	7	0	163	1	1 3	3	0	0	5	No	55	11	No	No
6417	STONE BRIDGE ROAD	504.3	11	274	1	831	3	1	4	310	2	0 4	1	0	0	0	No	55	13	No	No
6429	STONE BRIDGE ROAD	820.7	11	274	1	815	3	1	4	242	2	0 5	1	0	0	0	No	55	13	No	No
6505	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	644.1	11	515	4	828	3	6	0	134	1	0 1	1	1	2	3	No	55	11	No	Yes
6625	AMBER RD X-44	1744.1	11	642	5	1,674	1	8	0	181	2	1 4	3	0	0	5	No	55	11	No	Yes
6723	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	693.7	11	515	4	977	3	6	0	147	1	0 3	1	1	2	1	No	55	11	No	No
7113	CO RD D-61	1457.7	11	628	4	955	3	6	0	138	1	1 3	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6073	RIDGE RD E-28	648.9	10	1,003	6	1,325	1	4	2	75	0	0 2	1	0	0	3	No	55	12	No	No
6074	FAIRVIEW ROAD	914.2	10	1,265	6	1,918	1	4	2	95	0	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	13	Yes	No
6091	RIDGE RD E-28	1276.6	10	1,003	6	1,561	1	4	2	94	0	0 10	1	0	0	2	No	55	12	No	No
6094	FAIRVIEW ROAD	507.9	10	1,265	6	2,368	1	4	2	95	0	0 2	1	0	0	2	No	55	13	Yes	No
6125	RIDGE RD E-28	1466.7	10	1,003	6	1,178	1	4	2	88	0	0 6	1	0	0	2	No	55	12	No	No
6186	CO RD D-62	1418.4	10	696	5	1,230	1	8	0	212	2	0 0	0	1	2	3	No	55	11	No	No
6187	BUFFALO ROAD	151.8	10	435	2	502	3	4	2	325	2	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	20	11	No	No
6277	SHAW ROAD	212.9	10	656	5	531	3	6	0	116	1	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6361	CO RD X-40	481.7	10	1,286	6	1,903	1	7	0	216	2	0 1	1	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
6457	CO RD D-62	1719.2	10	696	5	2,067	1	8	0	133	1	0 18	1	2	2	3	No	55	11	No	No
6516	CO RD E-16 SIGNED ROUTE	1126.7	10	745	5	1,066	1	6	0	113	1	1 1	3	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
6545	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	978.7	10	515	4	1,269	1	6	0	211	2	1 1	3	0	0	6	No	55	11	No	No
6564	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	822.5	10	515	4	992	3	6	0	176	2	0 4	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6960	248TH STREET	351.6	10	840	5	1,255	1	5	2	178	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	50	17	No	No
6971	CO RD X-64	770.2	10	445	2	615	3	6	0	289	2	1 0	3	0	0	2	No	55	10	No	Yes
6975	CO RD E-45	521.9	10	364	2	639	3	5	2	209	2	0 1	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	Yes
6976	CO RD X-64	755.7	10	445	2	625	3	6	0	276	2	1 0	3	0	0	2	No	55	10	No	Yes
6980	CO RD X-64	927.5	10	445	2	629	3	6	0	247	2	1 0	3	0	0	6	No	55	10	No	Yes
7033	CO RD E-45	916.3	10	364	2	591	3	5	2	177	2	0 2	1	0	0	3	No	55	11	No	Yes
7148	CO RD E-17	1408.8	10	510	3	1,207	1	6	0	134	1	1 2	3	1	2	2	No	55	11	No	No
6165	CO RD X-31	530.7	9	390	2	2,300	1	5	2	168	1	1 0	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6215	CO RD X-31	422.3	9	497	3	2,353	1	9	0	199	2	0 2	1	1	2	2	No	55	11	No	No
6297	SHAW ROAD	438.4	9	656	5	643	3	6	0	50	0	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6426	STONE BRIDGE ROAD	431.6	9	274	1	1,297	1	1	4	279	2	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	13	No	No
6441	CO RD E-45	790.8	9	660	5	1,786	1	7	0	82	0	1 0	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	Yes	No
6445	TIMBER ROAD	192.6	9	117	0	924	3	1	4	236	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	13	No	No
6481	HARDSCRABBLE ROAD	401.3	9	550	4	1,569	1	2	2	126	1	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	13	No	No
6498	HARDSCRABBLE ROAD	547.6	9	550	4	1,911	1	2	2	100	1	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	13	No	No
6554	SOUTH MAIN STREET	811.2	9	5,400	6	2,310	1	6	0	118	1	0 4	1	0	0	7	No	55	12	No	No
6591	AMBER RD X-44	1105.9	9	642	5	1,057	1	8	0	289	2	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	Yes
6935	248TH STREET	169.9	9	840	5	1,189	1	5	2	126	1	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	50	17	No	No
6969	CO RD E-45	542.9	9	364	2	604	3	5	2	147	1	0 1	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	Yes
7019	CO RD E-45	547.3	9	364	2	928	3	5	2	227	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	Yes
7123	CO RD D-61	598.0	9	628	4	2,181	1	6	0	120	1	1 0	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7127	CO RD D-61	1860.9	9	628	4	1,057	1	6	0	133	1	1 6	3	0	0	3	No	55	11	No	No

Disclaimer: Throughout the SAP process, the County Engineer provided feedback on locations where the information contained within the existing databases was not current (for example, location of rumble strips, shoulder type and/or width, etc.). When these locations were identified, updates to the project sheets were made. As such the information in this table may vary from final information presented on the project sheets. Priority locations selected for project sheets were selected in coordination with the County and may not align with the highest scoring locations.



GPS ID	Paved Road	Length (ft)	Total Risk Factor Points	Average Daily Traffic (Value)	Average Daily Traffic (Points)	Curve Radius (ft) (Value)	Curve Radius (Points)	Shoulder Width (ft) (Value)	Shoulder Width (Points)	Pavement Condition (Value)	Pavement Condition (Points)	Intersections Driveways (Value)	Intersections Driveways Risk (Points)	K and A Crashes (Value)	K and A Crashes Risk (Points)	Total Crashes	Paved Shoulder	Speed Limit (mph)	Lane Width (ft)	Rumble Strips	Existing Curve Chevrons
7173	CO RD E-17	1358.3	9	510	3	1,225	1	6	0	173	2	1 0	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6134	CO RD X-31	1328.0	8	497	3	2,010	1	9	0	132	1	1 0	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6149	CO RD X-31	1331.3	8	497	3	2,034	1	9	0	119	1	1 0	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6164	CO RD X-31	1532.7	8	497	3	2,169	1	9	0	138	1	1 2	3	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
6191	CO RD X-31	585.4	8	497	3	1,204	1	9	0	118	1	1 3	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6208	CO RD D-62	674.1	8	696	5	1,499	1	8	0	136	1	0 3	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6352	CO RD D-62	661.1	8	696	5	1,151	1	8	0	149	1	0 2	1	0	0	3	No	55	11	No	No
6465	HARDSCRABBLE ROAD	634.3	8	550	4	1,138	1	2	2	104	1	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	13	No	No
6478	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	533.1	8	515	4	1,378	1	6	0	176	2	0 4	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6490	CO RD E-16 SIGNED ROUTE	677.2	8	745	5	2,039	1	6	0	161	1	0 5	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6624	AMBER RD X-44	322.7	8	642	5	1,786	1	8	0	214	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6790	CO RD E-45	1291.2	8	364	2	1,297	1	5	2	192	2	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6894	CO RD E-17	1564.3	8	460	3	1,977	1	8	0	143	1	1 0	3	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
6907	CO RD E-17	2392.7	8	460	3	1,980	1	8	0	169	1	1 1	3	0	0	3	No	55	11	No	No
6986	CO RD X-75	1245.6	8	410	2	1,153	1	8	0	249	2	1 2	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7012	CO RD E-45	499.4	8	364	2	1,306	1	5	2	295	2	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	Yes
7085	CO RD X-64	245.8	8	445	2	1,840	1	6	0	220	2	1 1	3	0	0	0	No	55	10	No	No
6171	CO RD X-31	785.3	7	497	3	1,576	1	9	0	209	2	0 1	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6193	CO RD E-45	557.3	7	580	4	2,131	1	7	0	95	1	0 2	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6345	CIRCLE DRIVE	1057.5	7	70	0	881	3	4	2	149	1	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6371	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	389.2	7	515	4	1,043	1	6	0	171	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6459	OLD HWY 151	290.1	7	227	1	301	4	8	0	172	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	12	No	No
6491	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	621.2	7	515	4	1,339	1	6	0	130	1	0 2	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6522	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	1153.4	7	515	4	1,602	1	6	0	127	1	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6550	CO RD E-45	893.0	7	660	5	1,130	1	7	0	119	1	0 0	0	0	0	3	No	55	11	Yes	No
6585	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	399.0	7	515	4	1,643	1	6	0	169	1	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6623	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	728.6	7	515	4	1,352	1	6	0	152	1	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6634	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	2060.7	7	515	4	1,989	1	6	0	166	1	0 2	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6641	CO RD E-29	1180.4	7	176	0	983	3	8	0	151	1	1 1	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6647	CO RD E-45	394.2	7	660	5	2,232	1	7	0	91	0	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	Yes	No
6945	248TH STREET	250.9	7	170	0	1,630	1	3	2	145	1	1 1	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6957	CO RD E-17	1443.4	7	460	3	1,234	1	8	0	185	2	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7065	CO RD E-17	632.8	7	510	3	2,132	1	6	0	207	2	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7077	CO RD E-17	698.6	7	510	3	1,340	1	6	0	175	2	0 1	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7078	CO RD E-29	1337.6	7	290	1	1,006	1	6	0	174	2	1 0	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7126	CO RD D-61	602.0	7	628	4	2,061	1	6	0	170	2	0 0	0	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
7129	CO RD E-17	1082.6	7	510	3	1,290	1	6	0	113	1	0 0	0	1	2	1	No	55	11	No	No
7140	CO RD D-61	643.0	7	628	4	1,527	1	6	0	133	1	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6156	CO RD X-31	1603.2	6	497	3	2,202	1	9	0	145	1	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6331	CIRCLE DRIVE	222.9	6	70	0	1,119	1	4	2	216	2	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6336	CIRCLE DRIVE	370.0	6	70	0	1,062	1	4	2	173	2	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6339	CIRCLE DRIVE	240.8	6	70	0	1,606	1	4	2	210	2	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6375	CO HOME RD E-23 SIGNED ROUTE	364.6	6	515	4	1,325	1	6	0	151	1	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6436	OLD HWY 151	347.6	6	227	1	1,499	1	8	0	138	1	3 4	3	0	0	0	No	55	12	No	No
6437	OLD HWY 151	294.3	6	227	1	653	3	8	0	152	1	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	12	No	No
6440	OLD HWY 151	581.2	6	227	1	1,310	1	8	0	119	1	2 0	3	0	0	0	No	55	12	No	No
6942	CO RD E-53	1211.8	6	200	0	1,687	1	6	0	259	2	1 1	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6946	CO RD E-17	1316.4	6	460	3	1,732	1	8	0	162	1	0 2	1	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
7016	CO RD E-29	1223.5	6	290	1	1,031	1	6	0	113	1	1 1	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7081	CO RD X-64	191.4	6	445	2	1,421	1	6	0	269	2	0 1	1	0	0	1	No	55	10	No	No
7105	CO RD E-17	662.2	6	510	3	2,095	1	6	0	328	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7111	CO RD E-29	520.6	6	290	1	1,206	1	6	0	121	1	1 2	3	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7122	CO RD E-29	488.3	6	290	1	1,169	1	6	0	150	1	1 0	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7135	CO RD E-17	1163.7	6	510	3	1,188	1	6	0	155	1	0 1	1	0	0	5	No	55	11	No	No
7154	CO RD D-61	566.0	6	628	4	2,256	1	6	0	122	1	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7167	CO RD E-17	2063.4	6	510	3	1,975	1	6	0	117	1	0 1	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7172	CO RD E-29	1385.6	6	290	1	1,056	1	6	0	113	1	1 4	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6341	CIRCLE DRIVE	223.7	5	70	0	1,947	1	4	2	151	1	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6344	CIRCLE DRIVE	247.1	5	70	0	1,210	1	4	2	114	1	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6354	CIRCLE DRIVE	754.4	5	70	0	1,183	1	4	2	154	1	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6673	RICHLAND ROAD	533.5	5	301	2	2,118	1	9	0	151	1	0 4	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6753	CENTRAL PARK ROAD	191.5	5	90	0	557	3	8	0	111	1	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6936	CO RD E-17	744.0	5	460	3	2,084	1	8	0	113	1	0 0	0	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
6990	CO RD X-75	1407.0	5	410	2	1,272	1	8	0	261	2	0 0	0	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
7009	CO RD E-29	1277.7	5	290	1	1,067	1	6	0	86	0	1 0	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7038	TEMPLE HILL ROAD	725.6	5	120	0	1,751	1	4	2	143	1	0 3	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7047	CO RD E-17	1255.8	5	510	3	1,940	1	6	0	144	1	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7059	CO RD X-64	385.6	5	445	2	2,123	1	6	0	197	2	0 0	0	0	0	2	No	55	10	No	No

Disclaimer: Throughout the SAP process, the County Engineer provided feedback on locations where the information contained within the existing databases was not current (for example, location of rumble strips, shoulder type and/or width, etc.). When these locations were identified, updates to the project sheets were made. As such the information in this table may vary from final information presented on the project sheets. Priority locations selected for project sheets were selected in coordination with the County and may not align with the highest scoring locations.



GPS ID	Paved Road	Length (ft)	Total Risk Factor Points	Average Daily Traffic (Value)	Average Daily Traffic (Points)	Curve Radius (ft) (Value)	Curve Radius (Points)	Shoulder Width (ft) (Value)	Shoulder Width (Points)	Pavement Condition (Value)	Pavement Condition (Points)	Intersections Driveways (Value)	Intersections Driveways Risk (Points)	K and A Crashes (Value)	K and A Crashes Risk (Points)	Total Crashes	Paved Shoulder	Speed Limit (mph)	Lane Width (ft)	Rumble Strips	Existing Curve Chevrons
7159	CO RD E-17	683.2	5	510	3	1,294	1	6	0	142	1	0 0	0	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
7178	CO RD E-29	1236.0	5	290	1	1,092	1	6	0	93	0	1 1	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6695	CO RD E-29	988.2	4	176	0	1,201	1	8	0	92	0	1 0	3	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6749	CENTRAL PARK ROAD	1029.7	4	90	0	958	3	8	0	109	1	0 0	0	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6952	CO RD E-53	925.9	4	200	0	2,475	1	6	0	220	2	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7107	CO RD E-29	1038.5	4	290	1	1,108	1	6	0	144	1	0 3	1	0	0	2	No	55	11	No	No
7133	CO RD E-29	600.4	4	290	1	1,602	1	6	0	119	1	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7176	CO RD E-29	898.1	4	290	1	1,095	1	6	0	103	1	0 2	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6632	CO RD E-29	711.7	3	176	0	1,245	1	8	0	114	1	0 1	1	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6663	CO RD E-29	1035.4	3	176	0	1,220	1	8	0	104	1	0 4	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6687	CO RD E-29	523.7	3	176	0	1,233	1	8	0	120	1	0 2	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
6933	CO RD E-53	1066.6	3	200	0	1,584	1	6	0	287	2	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7068	CO RD E-29	1583.4	3	290	1	1,020	1	6	0	107	1	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
7093	CO RD E-29	939.8	3	290	1	1,076	1	6	0	87	0	0 3	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7098	CO RD E-29	1290.8	3	290	1	1,231	1	6	0	84	0	0 4	1	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7137	CO RD E-29	818.9	3	290	1	1,091	1	6	0	142	1	0 0	0	0	0	1	No	55	11	No	No
7165	CO RD E-29	781.6	3	290	1	1,774	1	6	0	102	1	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No
6727	CENTRAL PARK ROAD	649.6	1	90	0	1,185	1	8	0	94	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	No	55	11	No	No

Disclaimer: Throughout the SAP process, the County Engineer provided feedback on locations where the information contained within the existing databases was not current (for example, location of rumble strips, shoulder type and/or width, etc.). When these locations were identified, updates to the project sheets were made. As such the information in this table may vary from final information presented on the project sheets. Priority locations selected for project sheets were selected in coordination with the County and may not align with the highest scoring locations.

APPENDIX E

UNPAVED ROADWAY COUNTERMEASURES

COUNTY UNPAVED ROADWAY COUNTERMEASURES

This appendix summarizes various unpaved road safety countermeasures for consideration and provides descriptions for each countermeasure.

Gravel Roads Construction & Maintenance Guide

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) 2015

A thorough resource on unpaved roads is provided by the FHWA entitled: *Gravel Roads Construction & Maintenance Guide*, which can be found at the following website: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/construction/pubs/ots15002.pdf>. This guide is quoted throughout this appendix. The guide includes detailed sections on the following topics:

- Routine Maintenance and Rehabilitation
- Drainage
- Surface Gravel
- Dust Control/Stabilization
- Innovations

The summary of the guide states: “The first and most basic thing to understand in road maintenance and construction is proper shape of the cross section. The road surface must have enough crown to drain water to the shoulder, but not excessive crown which impacts roadway safety.” “When proper shape is established and good surface gravel is placed, many gravel road maintenance problems simply go away, and road users are provided the best possible service from gravel roads” (Gravel Roads Construction & Maintenance Guide, FHWA, 2015).

Unpaved Roadway Safety Countermeasures

The following sections provide general information on additional safety countermeasures for unpaved roadways.

Maintenance of Gravel

It is important to preserve and maintain a proper road crown (four to six percent) for proper drainage to avoid ponding in potholes and/or ruts. Regular grading can help keep the roadway surface maintained, reducing water infiltration, and enhancing erosion control. According to the FHWA, “improper maintenance can lead to very quick deterioration of a gravel road, especially in wet weather”. It is also important to perform preventive maintenance to ensure that high shoulders, secondary ditches, berms, or curbs do not form. Per the FHWA, “when a gravel road develops high shoulders, it restricts the surface water from draining into the designed ditch. This creates a serious safety hazard. The time spent in eliminating a high shoulder (secondary ditch) will result in a road that is easier to maintain afterwards.”

Similar to the information provided on the paved Safety Edge, the maintenance of edge slopes on unpaved roads can allow vehicles that depart the travel lane to safely return to the roadway.

Major Rehabilitation

“At certain intervals, virtually every gravel road requires some major rehabilitation” (FHWA, 2015). This countermeasure involves not only reshaping the road surface, but the shoulder, foreslope and ditches. It is important that the redeveloped cross section be uniform, and that good drainage is provided, prior to replacing the surface gravel - failure to provide proper

drainage or crown in the road surface can lead to corrugation or washboarding, which can lead to loss of vehicle control.

The use of electronic slope controls has proven useful in gravel road maintenance, rehabilitation, and basic reconstruction. It is recommended that the county consider installing electronic slope controls on existing equipment to create a proper profile for new surfaces more efficiently.

Upgrade Signs

The following countermeasures relate to potential sign upgrades on the unpaved roadway system.

Stop Signs

A low-cost safety countermeasure that could be considered along unpaved roadways includes upgrading existing stop signs. Increasing the retroreflectivity of stop signs (or replacing signs with new signs) has crash modification factors (CMFs) from 0.75 to 0.91. This improvement increases the visibility of the signs, giving drivers more time to react to the stop-controlled condition.

Curve Chevron

This safety countermeasure includes the installation of curve chevrons placed along the outer radius of the curved roadway segment. In some instances, County Engineers have relocated older curve chevrons, when replaced on their paved system, along curves located on their unpaved system. Installing curve chevron signs has CMFs ranging from 0.75 to 0.96, and when installed in combination with other advance warning signage, has CMFs ranging from 0.59 to 0.61.

Advance Curve Warning Signs and Speed Advisory Plaques

Providing advance warning of unexpected changes in horizontal alignment in conjunction with curve chevron signs has reported CMFs ranging from 0.59 to 0.61.

Delineate Roadside Hazards with Retroreflective Markers

Retroreflective markers can be applied to roadside objects and trees, increasing the visibility of hazards and helping delineate the roadway where minimal delineation may exist.

Realign Intersection

Based on right-of-way and site conditions, this countermeasure could be particularly beneficial and should be considered where feasible at locations where there is intersection skew. The CMF for intersection geometry reconfiguration is included in the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) and varies based on the existing skew angle. With the optimal 90-degree intersection configuration, sight triangles are maximized, crossing distance is minimized, and the intersection meets typical driver expectations.

Improve/Increase Shoulder/Lane Width

The County Engineer could consider the recommendation to improve/increase the shoulder width or lane width to accommodate traffic volumes and/or speed. This countermeasure could add safety benefits when applied properly, but could also encourage driving in excess of the speed limit, so it should be applied with caution.

Driveway Entrance Policy

It is recommended by the FHWA that, “to reduce maintenance problems [at driveways along unpaved roadways], [counties should] implement a permitting process. It should address the proper control of grade to match road edge, adequate width, and drainage.”

Clear and Grub

Vegetation should be kept clear of the roadway, although a natural vegetation buffer between the roadway and any ditches or waterways can help reduce runoff velocity and provide some erosion control. This safety countermeasure reduces the hazard of a run-off-the-road crash by reducing the number of obstructions a vehicle could impact after a lane departure. In addition, clearing and grubbing the areas within the sight triangles of the vehicles at intersections should also be considered. This safety countermeasure increases the sight distance for vehicles prior to entering an intersection. This is particularly beneficial under two-way stop controlled or uncontrolled situations where conflicting vehicles may not stop or yield. Per the FHWA, “there is yet another great benefit of mowing [clearing and grubbing]; by removing the standing vegetation, drifting snow will not be trapped on the roadway, resulting in drastically reduced snow removal costs.”

Winter Maintenance

As salt cannot be used on gravel roads and frozen ground cannot be graded, sand is recommended for increased traction on curves and corners during winter events.

APPENDIX F

WORKSHOP MATERIALS



County Safety Workshop

WHAT IS A SAFETY ACTION PLAN (SAP)?

A Safety Action Plan (SAP) is a document that provides local governments the means to make strategic roadway safety improvements. The plan will identify the most significant roadway safety concerns in your community and outline the projects and strategies to address them. In addition to assisting local practitioners in understanding crash trends within their jurisdiction, a SAP will also be a locally focused plan for practitioners to make informed, prioritized safety decisions.



WHAT IS SAFE STREETS AND ROADS FOR ALL (SS4A)?

The Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) discretionary grant program was established by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) and has \$5M in appropriated funds for the 5-year period from 2022 to 2026. This federal grant supports local jurisdictions planning, infrastructure, behavioral, and operational initiatives to prevent death and serious injury for all roadway users, with an emphasis on equity to improve roads and streets under local ownership.

DRIVER-RELATED EMPHASIS AREAS



SPEED-RELATED



OCCUPANT PROTECTION



YOUNGER DRIVERS



IMPAIRMENT INVOLVED



OLDER DRIVERS



DISTRACTED DRIVING

YOU ARE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE, WE NEED YOUR HELP!

While engineering improvements can make the roads safer, they cannot prevent motor vehicle crashes alone. Because a high percentage of crashes are a result of driver-related factors, making roadways safer requires individuals representing the Es of safety (education, emergency medical services, engineering, and enforcement) to be involved. Each discipline has a unique perspective on improving traffic safety while also remaining connected to the other disciplines. The success of your SAP relies on input from roadway safety stakeholders as your input will help define driver-related countermeasures to improve safety in your county.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF A SAP?

- The results will allow local jurisdictions to apply for SS4A funding
- Strengthens a community's approach to eliminating roadway fatalities and serious injuries
- Focus on all of the five Es of safety (Enforcement, Engineering, Emergency Response, Education and Everyone)
- Provides the opportunity to prioritize safety improvements and justify investment decisions in coordination with various partner agencies.

WORKSHOP INFORMATION:

When:

Location:

Contact:



JONES COUNTY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP SIGN-IN SHEET

Date/Time: September 4, 2024, 8:30 AM - 11:30 AM

Location: Jones County Courthouse, Board Room, 500 W Main St, Anamosa, IA 52205

Initials	Name	Agency/Role	E-Mail	Phone Number
	Lindsey Schroeder	ICEA	lindsey.schroeder@iceasb.org	319-230-8444
✓	David Giacomini	Kimley-Horn	david.giacomini@kimley-horn.com	775-200-1981
SMH	Shane Hochstetler	LT Leon	shochstetler@ltleon.com	515-422-7016
✓	Derek Snead	County Engineer	derek.snead@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-462-3785
	Greg A. Graver	Sheriff's Office		319-462-4371
	Britt Smith	Monticello Police Department	britt@ci.monticello.ia.us	319-465-3526
	Brenda Leonard	Jones County Emergency Management	ema@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-462-4386
	Joe Bayne	Monticello Fire Department	firechief@ci.monticello.ia.us	
	Lori Lynch	Monticello Ambulance Service	ambulance@ci.monticello.ia.us	319-465-3526
	Kristofer J. Lyons	Jones County Attorney	kristofer.lyons@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-462-3961
	Ned Rohwedder	Jones County board of Supervisors	supv4@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-509-2693



Safety Action Plan

JONES COUNTY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP SIGN-IN SHEET

Date/Time: September 4, 2024, 8:30 AM - 11:30 AM

Location: Jones County Courthouse, Board Room, 500 W Main St, Anamosa, IA 52205

Initials	Name	Agency/Role	E-Mail	Phone Number
	John Schlarmann	Jones County Board of Supervisors	supv1@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-480-0694
	Jeff Swisher	Jones County Board of Supervisors	supv5@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-361-8596
	Joe Oswald	Jones County Board of Supervisors	supv2@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-480-5255
	Jon Zirkelbach	Jones County Board of Supervisors	supv3@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-480-9550
	Darren Hanna	Anamosa	dhanna@anamosa.k12.i.us	319-462-4321
	Teresa Jurgensen	Midland	midlandsuperintendent@midland.k12.ia.us	319-259-5340
	Brain Jaeger	Monticello	brain.jaeger@monticello.k12.ia.us	319-465-3000
	Nathan Carlson	Olin Consolidated	info@olin.k12.ia.us	319-484-2170
	Dan Butler	Western Dubuque	dan.butler@wdbqschools.org	563-663-9461
	David Husmann	Monticello Ambulance/ Monticello Fire Dept	mfd013@gmail.com	319-480-0148
	Luke Hank	Public Resource Officer	hank@dps.state.ia.us	563-554-8617

Travis Medley Iowa State Patrol +medally@dps.state.ia.us 319 480 6582



Safety Action Plan

JONES COUNTY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP SIGN-IN SHEET

Date/Time: September 4, 2024, 8:30 AM - 11:30 AM

Location: Jones County Courthouse, Board Room, 500 W Main St, Anamosa, IA 52205

Initials	Name	Agency/Role	E-Mail	Phone Number
	Susan Yario	Jones County Veterans Affairs	Susan.yario@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-462-5311
EW	Eric Werling	Anamosa Police Chief	eric.werling@anamosa-ia.org	319-462-4434
PR	Peyton Richie	Jones County Farm Bureau	Peyton.Richie@itbf.org	815-474-1664
Bh	Brad Knudson	Public Health	Brad.knudson@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-480-9506
GR	Greg Graver	Jones County Sheriff	greg.graver@jonescountysheriff.gov	(319) 462-4371
DAWG	Dawn Graver	Monticello Police Chief	dawng@ci.monticello.ia.us	319-465-8028
B	Brenda Leonard	Jones EMA	brenda.leonard@jonescountyiowa.gov	319-462-4386
JS	Jeff Swisher	Jones 6	jswissh532@gmail.com	319-361-8596
DH	Dawn Hance	Anamosa Superintendent	dhanne@anamosa-ia.org	319-462-4321