APPENDIX A TO PART 1200 –
CERTIFICATION AND ASSURANCES
FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANTS (23 U.S.C. CHAPTER 4)

State: Georgia
Fiscal Year: 2017

Each fiscal year the State must sign these Certifications and Assurances that it complies with all requirements including applicable Federal statutes and regulations that are in effect during the grant period. (Requirements that also apply to subrecipients are noted under the applicable captions.)

In my capacity as the Governor's Representative for Highway Safety, I hereby provide the following certifications and assurances:

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

To the best of my personal knowledge, the information submitted in the Highway Safety Plan in support of the State’s application for Section 402 and Section 405 grants is accurate and complete. (Incomplete or incorrect information may result in the disapproval of the Highway Safety Plan.)

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

The State will comply with applicable statutes and regulations, including but not limited to:

+ 23 U.S.C. Chapter 4 - Highway Safety Act of 1966, as amended
+ 49 CFR Part 18 - Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Government
+ 23 CFR Part 1200 – Uniform Procedures for State Highway Safety Grant Programs

The State has submitted appropriate documentation for review in the single point of contact designated by the Governor to review federal programs, as required by Executive Order 13572 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs).

FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT (FFATA)

The State will comply with FFATA guidance, Final Guidance on FFATA Salaries and Executive Compensation Reporting, August 27, 2010, (https://www.fina.gov/documents/OPAF_Guidance_on_FFATA_Salaries_and_Executive_Compensation_Reporting%20%2808272010%29.pdf) by reporting to FFATA.gov for each sub-grant awarded:

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

The State highway safety agency will comply with all Federal statutes and implementing regulations relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Pub. L. 88-352), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin (49 CFR Part 21); (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq. and 34 C.F.R. 106 et seq.); (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 794 et seq.); and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336), as amended (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disabilities (49 CFR Part 27); (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100-259), which requires Federal aid recipients and all subrecipients to prevent discrimination and ensure nondiscrimination in all of their programs and activities; (f) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (Pub. L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (g) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (Pub. L. 91-618), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (h) Sections 525 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 290bb-1 and 527); (i) 42 U.S.C. 290dd-1 and 290dd-3, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (j) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental, or financing of housing; (k) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (l) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.
THE DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE ACT OF 1988 (44 USC 1160)

The State will provide a drug-free workplace by:

- Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:
  - The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.
  - The State's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace.
  - Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs.
  - The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug violations occurring in the workplace.
  - Making it a requirement that each employee engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a).

- Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
  - Adhere to the terms of the statement.
  - Notify the State if the employee has a criminal drug charge or conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction.

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

- Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:
  - Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination.
  - Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved as such purposes by a State, local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.

- Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of all of the paragraphs above.

BUY AMERICA ACT
(applies to subrecipients as well as States)

The State will comply with the provisions of the Buy America Act (49 U.S.C. 5322(i)), which contain the following requirements:

Only iron and manufactured products produced in the United States may be purchased with Federal funds unless the Secretary of Transportation determines that such domestic purchases would be inconsistent with the public interest. If such materials are not reasonably available and of satisfactory quality, or that inclusion of domestic materials will increase the cost of the overall project contract by more than 25 percent. Clear justification for the purchase of non-
domestic state must be in the form of a waiver request submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY (HATCH ACT)
(applies to subrecipients as well as states)

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

CERTIFICATION REGARDING FEDERAL LOBBYING
(applies to subrecipients as well as States)

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

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

1. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the continuation, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form L-111, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

3. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-awardor sub-awards (including subcontractors, subgrantors, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification in a pre-procurement for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1952, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.
RESTRICTION ON STATE LOBBYING
(applicable to subrecipients as well as States)

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

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DISBARMENT AND SUSPENSION
(applicable to subrecipients as well as States)

Instructions for primary certification

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

2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency's determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.

3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department or agency to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns the certification was erroneous when submitted or has become incorrect by reason of changed circumstances.

5. The terms covered transaction, debarred, suspended, ineligible, lower tier covered transaction, participant, person, primary covered transaction, principal, proposal, and voluntarily submitted, as used in this clause, have the meaning set out in the Definitions and coverage sections of 49 CFR Part 36. You may contact the department or agency to which this proposal is being submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
6. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 C.F.R. Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in the covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency entering into this transaction.

7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion (Lower Tier Covered Transactions)" provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.

8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that is not proposed for debarment under 48 C.F.R. Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the list of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-Procurement Programs.

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

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

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

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

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

(c) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of either of a criminal offense under Federal law for which a sentence of more than two years was imposed, or of a misdemeanor for which a sentence of more than one year was imposed, unless the conviction was for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations:

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of a felony offense:

(e) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal, other than for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations, been convicted of a misdemeanor for which a sentence of more than one year was imposed, unless the conviction was for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations.

(f) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal, other than for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations, been convicted of a misdemeanor for which a sentence of more than one year was imposed, unless the conviction was for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations.

(g) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal, other than for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations, been convicted of a misdemeanor for which a sentence of more than one year was imposed, unless the conviction was for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations.

(h) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal, other than for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations, been convicted of a misdemeanor for which a sentence of more than one year was imposed, unless the conviction was for a violation of a Federal law regulating commercial motor vehicle operations.
(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or Local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and
(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default.

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

Instructions for Lower Tier Certification:

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

2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person or entity to which this proposal is submitted whenever the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," lower tier transaction, participant, person, primary covered transaction, principal, proposal, and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of 49 CFR Part 9. You may contact the person in whom this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.

5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 49 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.

6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transaction," without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions. (See below)

7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 49 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered
transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.

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

9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 3 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower for second transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 49 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and debarment.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspend, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower For Covered Transactions:

1. The prospective lower for participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.

2. Where the prospective lower for participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

POLICY ON SEAT BELT USE

In accordance with Executive Order 13093, Increasing Seat Belt Use in the United States, dated April 16, 1997, the Grantee is encouraged to adopt and enforce on-the-job seat belt use policies and programs for its employees when operating company-owned, rented, or personally-owned vehicles. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is responsible for providing leadership and guidance in support of this Presidential initiative. For information on how to implement such a program, or statistics on the potential benefits and cost savings to your company or organization, please visit the Buckle Up America section on NHTSA’s website at www.nhtsa.dot.gov. Additional resources are available from the Network of Employees for Traffic Safety (NETS), a public-private partnership headquartered in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, and dedicated to improving the traffic safety practices of employers and employees. NETS is prepared to provide technical assistance, a simple, user-friendly program kit, and an award for achieving the President's goal of 90 percent seat belt use. NETS can be contacted at 1-888-921-0045 or visit its website at www.trafficsafety.org.
POLICY ON BANNING TEXT MESSAGING WHILE DRIVING

In accordance with Executive Order 13543, Federal Leadership On Reducing Text Messaging While Driving, and DOT Order 2002-10, Text Messaging While Driving, States are encouraged to adopt and enforce workplace safety policies to decrease crashes caused by distracted driving, including policies to ban text messaging while driving company-owned or -leased vehicles, Government-owned, leased or rental vehicles, or privately-owned when on official Government business or when performing any work on or behalf of the Government. States are also encouraged to conduct workplace safety initiatives in a manner commensurate with the size of the business, such as establishment of new rules and programs or re-evaluation of existing programs to prohibit text messaging while driving, and education, awareness, and other outreach to employees about the safety risks associated with texting while driving.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

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

SECTION 402 REQUIREMENTS

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

At least 40 percent (or 95 percent, as applicable) of all Federal funds appropriated to this State under 23 U.S.C. 402, for this fiscal year will be expended by or for the benefit of the political subdivisions of the State in carrying out local highway safety programs (23 U.S.C. 402(b)(1)(C)).

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

The State will provide for an evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program to prevent traffic violations, crashes, and crash fatalities and injuries in areas most at risk for such incidents (23 U.S.C. 402(b)(1)(E)).
The State will implement activities in support of national highway safety goals to reduce motor vehicle related fatalities that also reflect the primary data related crash factors within the State as identified by the State highway safety planning process, including:

- Participation in the National High-Visibility Law Enforcement mobilization;
- Sustained enforcement of statutes addressing impaired driving, excessive speed, and driving in excess of posted speed limits;
- An annual statewide crash fatality survey in accordance with 23 CFR Part 1340 for the measurement of State seat belt use rates;
- Development of statewide data systems to provide timely and effective data analysis to support allocation of highway safety resources;
- Coordination of Highway Safety Plan, data collection, and information systems with the State Strategic highway safety plan, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 408(a), (23 U.S.C. 600(b)(1)(F))

The State will actively encourage all relevant law enforcement agencies in the State to follow the guidelines established for vehicular pursuits issued by the International Association of Chiefs of Police that are currently in effect. (23 U.S.C. 402(j))

The State will not exceed Section 402 funds to carry out a program to purchase, operate, or maintain an automated traffic enforcement system. (23 U.S.C. 407(c)(4))

I understand that failure to comply with applicable Federal statutes and regulations may subject State officials to civil or criminal penalties and/or place the State in a high risk penalty status in accordance with 49 CFR 18.12.

I sign these Certifications and Assurances based on personal knowledge, after appropriate inquiry, and I understand that the Governor will rely on these representations in awarding grant funds.

[Signature] Governor's Representative for Highway Safety  
[Date]  

Harris Blackwood  
Deputy Commissioner of Governor's Representative for Highway Safety
Appendix A to Part 1300

APPENDIX A TO PART 1300 –
CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES
FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANTS
(23 U.S.C. CHAPTER 4, SEC. 1905, PUBL. L. 108-59,
AS AMENDED BY SEC. 4011, PUBL. L. 114-94)

[Each fiscal year, the Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety must sign
two Certifications and Assurances affirming that the State complies with all
requirements, including applicable Federal statutes and regulations, that are in
affect during the grant period. Requirements that also apply to subreciprocants are
noted under the applicable caption.]

State: Georgia
Fiscal Year: 2017

By submitting an application for Federal grant funds under 23 U.S.C. Chapter 4 or Section 1905,
the State Highway Safety Office acknowledges and agrees to the following conditions and
requirements. In any capacity as the Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety, thereby
provide the following Certifications and Assurances:

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The State will comply with applicable statutes and regulations, including but not limited to:

- 23 CFR part 1300 – Uniform Procedures for State Highway Safety Grant Programs
- 2 CFR part 200 – Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit
  Requirements for Federal Awards
- 2 CFR part 1201 – Department of Transportation, Uniform Administrative Requirements,
  Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

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

FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT (FFATA)

The State will comply with FFATA guidance, OMB Guidance on FFATA Subward and
Guidance on FFATA Subward and Executive Compensation Reporting_08272010.pdf) by reporting to FSRS.gov for each sub-grant awarded:

- Name of the entity receiving the award;
- Amount of the award;
- Information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, the North American Industry Classification System code or Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number (where applicable), program source;
- Location of the entity receiving the award and the primary location of performance under the award, including the city, state, congressional district, and country; and an award title descriptive of the purpose of each funding action;
- A unique identifier (DUNS);
- The names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated officers of the entity if:
  (i) the entity in the preceding fiscal year received—
    (I) 50 percent or more of its annual gross revenues in Federal awards;
    (II) $25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal awards; and
  (ii) the public does not have access to information about the compensation of the senior executives of the entity through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;
- Other relevant information specified by OMB guidance.

**Nondiscrimination**

(applies to subrecipients as well as States)

The State highway safety agency will comply with all Federal statutes and implementing regulations relating to nondiscrimination ("Federal Nondiscrimination Authorities"). These include but are not limited to:

- **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964** (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq., 78 Stat. 232), (prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin) and 49 CFR part 21;
- **The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970**, (42 U.S.C. 4601). (prohibits unfair treatment of persons displaced or whose property has been acquired because of federal or Federal-aid programs and projects);
- **Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973**, (29 U.S.C. 794 et seq.), as amended, (prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability) and 49 CFR part 211;
- **The Age Discrimination Act of 1975**, as amended, (29 U.S.C. 610 et seq.), (prohibits discrimination on the basis of age);
- **The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987**, (Pub. L. 100-209), (broadens scope, coverage and applicability of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, by expanding the definition of the terms “programs or activities” to include all of the programs or activities of the Federal aid recipients, sub-recipients and contractors, whether such programs or activities are Federally-funded or not);
- **Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act** (42 U.S.C. 12131-12189) (prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the operation of public entities,
public and private transportation systems, places of public accommodation, and certain
activities and 49 CFR parts 37 and 38.

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in
Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (prevents discrimination against
minority populations by discouraging programs, policies, and activities with
disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority
and low-income populations), and

Executive Order 13166, Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited
English Proficiency (guards against Title VI national origin
discrimination because of limited English proficiency (LEP) by ensuring
that funding recipients take reasonable steps to ensure that LEP persons have meaningful
access to programs (79 FR at 74387 to 74100).

The State highway safety agency—

• Will take all measures necessary to ensure that no person in the United States shall, on
  the grounds of race, color, national origin, disability, sex, age, limited English
  proficiency, or membership in any other class protected by Federal Nondiscrimination
  Authorities, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise
  subjected to discrimination under any of its programs or activities, so long as any portion
  of the program is Federally-assisted.

• Will administer the program in a manner that reasonably ensures that any of its
  subrecipients, contractors, subcontractors, and consultants receiving Federal financial
  assistance under this program will comply with all requirements of the Non-
  Discrimination Authorities identified in this Assurance,

• Agrees to comply (and require any of its subrecipients, contractors, subcontractors, and
  consultants to comply) with all applicable provisions of law or regulation governing US
  DOT’s or NHTSA’s access to records, accounts, documents, information, facilities, and
  staff, and to cooperate and comply with any program or compliance review, and/or
  complaint investigations conducted by US DOT or NHTSA under any Federal
  Nondiscrimination Authority;

• Acknowledges that the United States has a right to seek judicial enforcement with regard
to any matter arising under these Non-Discrimination Authorities and this Assurance;

• Insert in all contracts and funding agreements with other State or private entities the
  following clause:

  “During the performance of this contract/funding agreement, the contractor/funding
  recipient agrees—

  a. To comply with all Federal nondiscrimination laws and regulations, as may be
     amended from time to time;
b. Not to participate directly or indirectly in the discrimination prohibited by any Federal non-discrimination law or regulation, as set forth in Appendix B of 49 CFR part 21 and herein,

c. To permit access to its books, records, accounts, other sources of information, and its facilities as required by the State highway safety office, US DOT or NHTSA,

d. That, in event a contractor/funding recipient fails to comply with any nondiscrimination provisions in this contract/funding agreement, the State highway safety agency will have the right to impose such contract/agreement sanctions as it or NHTSA determine are appropriate, including but not limited to withholding payments to the contractor/funding recipient under the contract/agreement until the contractor/funding recipient complies; and/or cancelling, terminating, or suspending a contract or funding agreement, in whole or in part; and

e. To insert this clause, including paragraphs a through e, in every subcontract and subagreement and in every solicitation for a subcontract or sub-agreement, that receives Federal funds under this program.


The State will provide a drug-free workplace by:

a. Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee’s workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

b. Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:
   ○ The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.
   ○ The grantee’s policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace.
   ○ Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs.
   ○ The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug violations occurring in the workplace.
   ○ Making it a requirement that each employee engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a).

c. Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will –
   ○ Abide by the terms of the statement.
   ○ Notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction.

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

e. Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (c)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted –
Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination;
- Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.
f. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of all of the paragraphs above.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY (HATCH ACT)
(applies to subrecipients as well as States)

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

CERTIFICATION REGARDING FEDERAL LOBBYING
(applies to subrecipients as well as States)

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

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

1. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-114, “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” in accordance with its instructions.

3. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-award at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grant, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

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

RESTRICTION ON STATE LOBBYING
(applies to subrecipients as well as States)

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

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION
(applies to subrecipients as well as States)

Instructions for Primary Certification (States)

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the
certification set out below and agrees to comply with the requirements of 2 CFR. Parts 180 and
1300.

2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result
in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an
explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or
explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency’s determination
whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to
furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this
transaction.

3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was
placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later
determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous
certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department
or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default or may pursue suspension or
debarment.

4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department
or agency to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant
leaves its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of
changed circumstances.

5. The terms covered transaction, debarment, suspension, ineligible, lower tier, participant,
person, primary tier, principal, and voluntarily excluded, as used in this clause, have the
meaning set out in the Definitions and coverage sections of 2 CFR Part 180. You may contact the department or agency to which this proposal is being submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of these regulations.

6. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by NHTSA.

7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled “Instructions for Lower Tier Certification” including the “Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion—Lower Tier Covered Transaction,” provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions and will require lower tier participants to comply with 2 CFR Parts 180 and 1300.

8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the list of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.

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

10. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 6 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, the department or agency may disallow costs, annul or terminate the transaction, issue a stop work order, debar or suspend you, or take other remedies as appropriate.

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

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

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency;
(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against him for commission of a fiduciary or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction. Violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, fraud, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property.

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

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

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

Instructions for Lower Tier Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below and agrees to comply with the requirements of 2 CFR Parts 180 and 1900.

2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

4. The terms covered transaction, debarment, suspension, ineligible, lower tier participant, person, primary tier, principal, and voluntarily excluded, as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of 2 CFR Part 180. You may contact the person to whom this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.

5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by NHTSA.

6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled “Instructions for Lower Tier Certification” including the “Certification
Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transactions: lower tier covered transactions and will require lower tier participants to comply with 2 CFR Parts 180 and 1300.

7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.

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

9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may disallow costs, annul or terminate the transaction, issue a stop work order, debar or suspend you, or take other remedies as appropriate.

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

1. The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.

2. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

BUY AMERICA ACT
(Applies to subrecipients as well as States)

The State and each subrecipient will comply with the Buy America requirement (23 U.S.C. 313) when purchasing items using Federal funds. Buy America requires a State, or subrecipient, to purchase only steel, iron and manufactured products produced in the United States with Federal funds, unless the Secretary of Transportation determines that such domestically produced items would be inconsistent with the public interest, that such materials are not reasonably available, or that inclusion of domestic materials will increase the cost of the overall project contract by more than 25 percent. In order to use Federal funds to purchase...
foreign produced item, the State must submit a waiver request that provides an adequate basis and justification to and approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

**PROHIBITION ON USING GRANT FUNDS TO CHECK FOR HELMET USAGE**  
(appplies to subrecipients as well as States)

The State and each subrecipient will not use 23 U.S.C. Chapter 4 grant funds for programs to check helmet usage or to create checkpoints that specifically target motorcyclists.

**POLICY ON SEAT BELT USE**

In accordance with Executive Order 13043, Increasing Seat Belt Use in the United States, dated April 16, 1997, the Grantee is encouraged to adopt and enforce on-the-job seat belt use policies and programs for its employees when operating company-owned, rented, or personally-owned vehicles. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is responsible for providing leadership and guidance in support of this Presidential initiative. For information on how to implement such a program, or statistics on the potential benefits and cost savings to your company or organization, please visit the Buckle Up America section on NHTSA’s website at www.nhtsa.dot.gov. Additional resources are available from the Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS), a public private partnership headquartered in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, and dedicated to improving the traffic safety practices of employers and employees. NETS is prepared to provide technical assistance, a simple, user friendly program kit, and an award for achieving the President’s goal of 90 percent seat belt use. NETS can be contacted at 1 (888) 221-0045 or visit its website at www.trafficsafety.org.

**POLICY ON BANNING TEXT MESSAGING WHILE DRIVING**

In accordance with Executive Order 13513, Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving, and DOT Order 3902.10, Text Messaging While Driving, States are encouraged to adopt and enforce workplace safety policies to decrease crashes caused by distracted driving, including policies to ban text messaging while driving company-owned or rented vehicles, Government-owned, leased or rented vehicles, or privately-owned when on official Government business or when performing any work on or behalf of the Government. States are also encouraged to conduct workplace safety initiatives in a manner commensurate with the size of the business, such as establishment of new rules and programs or re-evaluation of existing programs to prohibit text messaging while driving, and education, awareness, and other outreach to employees about the safety risks associated with texting while driving.

**SECTION 402 REQUIREMENTS**

1. To the best of my personal knowledge, the information submitted in the Highway Safety Plan in support of the State’s application for a grant under 23 U.S.C. 402 is accurate and complete.

2. The Governor is the responsible official for the administration of the State highway safety program, by appointing a Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety who shall be responsible for a State highway safety agency that has adequate powers and is suitably
equipped and organized (as evidenced by appropriate oversight procedures governing such areas as procurement, financial administration, and the use, management, and disposition of equipment) to carry out the program. (23 U.S.C. 402(b)(1)(A))

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

4. At least 40 percent of all Federal funds apportioned to this State under 23 U.S.C. 402 for this fiscal year will be expended by or for the benefit of political subdivisions of the State in carrying out local highway safety programs (23 U.S.C. 402(b)(1)(C)) or 95 percent by and for the benefit of Indian tribes (23 U.S.C. 402(b)(2)), unless this requirement is waived in writing. (This provision is not applicable to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.)

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

6. The State will provide for an evidenced-based traffic safety enforcement program to prevent traffic violations, crashes, and crash fatalities and injuries in areas most at risk for such incidents. (23 U.S.C. 402(b)(1)(E))

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

- Participation in the National high-visibility law enforcement mobilizations as identified annually in the NHTSA Communications Calendar, including not less than 3 mobilization campaigns in each fiscal year to—
  - Reduce alcohol-impaired or drug-impaired operation of motor vehicles; and
  - Increase use of seatbelts by occupants of motor vehicles;
- Submission of information regarding mobilization participation into the HVE Database;
- Sustained enforcement of statutes addressing impaired driving, occupant protection, and driving in excess of posted speed limits;
- An annual statewide seat belt use survey in accordance with 23 CFR part 1340 for the measurement of State seat belt use rates, except for the Secretary of Interior on behalf of Indian tribes;
- Development of Statewide data systems to provide timely and effective data analysis to support allocation of highway safety resources;
- Coordination of Highway Safety Plan, data collection, and information systems with the State strategic highway safety plan, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 148(a). (23 U.S.C. 402(b)(1)(F))
8. The State will actively encourage all relevant law enforcement agencies in the State to follow the guidelines established for vehicular pursuits issued by the International Association of Chiefs of Police that are currently in effect (28 U.S.C. 409(c)).

9. The State will not expend Section 502 funds to carry out a program to purchase, operate, or maintain an automated traffic enforcement system (23 U.S.C. 402(c)(3)).

The State: [CHECK ONLY ONE]

☐ Certifies that automated traffic enforcement systems are not used on any public road in the State.

☐ Certifies that automated traffic enforcement systems are not used on any public road in the State, and therefore will conduct a survey meeting the requirements of 23 CFR 1300.13(0)(3) and will submit the survey results to the NHTSA Regional office no later than March 1 of the fiscal year of the grant.

I understand that my statements in support of the State’s application for Federal grant funds are statements upon which the Federal Government will rely to determine qualification for grant funds; and that knowing misstatements may be subject to civil or criminal penalties under 18 U.S.C. 1001. I sign these Certifications and Assurances based on personal knowledge, and after appropriate inquiry.

[Signature]
Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety

[Signature]
Printed name of Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety
Appendix B to Part 1300

APPENDIX B TO PART 1300
APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS
FOR SECTION 405 AND SECTION 1086 GRANTS

[certified fiscal year, to apply for a grant under 23 U.S.C. 405 or Section 1086 of Pub. L. 105-159, as amended by Section 4811, Pub. L. 114-94, the State must complete and submit all required information in this appendix, and the Governor's Representative for Highway Safety must sign the Certifications and Assurances.]

State: Georgia
Fiscal Year: 2017

In my capacity as the Governor's Representative for Highway Safety, I hereby provide the following certifications and assurances:

- I have reviewed the above information in support of the State's application for 23 U.S.C. 405 and Section 1086 grants, and based on my review, the information is accurate and complete to the best of my personal knowledge.

- As a condition of each grant awarded, the State will use these grant funds in accordance with the specific statutory and regulatory requirements of that grant, and will comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and financial and programmatic requirements for Federal grants.

- I understand and accept that inaccurate, incomplete, or misleading information submitted in support of the State's application may result in the denial of a grant award.

I understand that my statements in support of the State's application for Federal grant funds are statements upon which the Federal Government will rely in determining qualification for grant funds, and that knowing misconceptions may be subject to civil or criminal penalties under 18 U.S.C. 1001. I sign these Certifications and Assurances based on my personal knowledge and after appropriate inquiry.

Signature: Governor's Representative for Highway Safety
Date: 06/01/2016

Harris Blackwood
Printed name of Governor's Representative for Highway Safety
SECTION 7: APPENDIX
FFY 2017 CORE PERFORMANCE
DETAILED DATA JUSTIFICATION
C-1: To decrease traffic fatalities 2.5% from 1,178 (2012-2014 average) to 1,149 (2015-2017 average) in 2017.

Based on the data from 2011-2014 there has been steady decrease of 3-year moving averages of traffic fatalities. The average decrease between calendar year 2010-2013 is 21 fatalities per year. If Georgia continues this trend to the end of the 2017 year, there will be 1,138 roadway fatalities. Since it is difficult to predict human behavior using 3-year smooth averaging method and using natural log regression modeling (R² of 0.99), GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease roadway fatalities to the 3-year average fatalities of 1,149. This would equate to reducing roadway fatalities to 1,138 or fewer in years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

* represents preliminary data obtained from GEARS.

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.
Moving 3-Year & 5-Year Averages
C-2*: To decrease serious traffic injuries below the 2015 calendar base year average of 114,643 to 107,868 by 2017.

Based on the data from 2006-2014 there has been great variability in the number of traffic injuries with the most injuries occurring in 2006 with 133,555 injuries. The average decrease between calendar year 2010-2015 is 1,386 injuries per year. To continue the downward trend experienced in previous years, GOHS has the 2017 target to steady decrease all traffic injuries at or below 107,868 injuries.

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

*As of June 2016, the state of Georgia does not describe the severity of the injury to motor vehicle crash occupants using the KABCO scale (O= no injury; C= possible injury; B= non-capacitating evident injury;

[Graph showing traffic injuries from 2006 to 2017, with 3-year moving averages and predicted values using linear modeling.]
C-3: To decrease fatalities per 100M VMT 3.6% from 1.08 (2012-2014 average) to 1.04 (2015-2017 average) in 2017.

The average decrease of fatalities/VMT from 2011-2014 decreased on average by 0.02 fatalities per VMT. It is expected that there will be a 3.6% or greater decrease by December 2017. The 2017 EOY fatality rates are calculated under the assumption that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in 2014 did not change significantly. GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease roadway fatality rates below the 3-yr average fatalities to 1.01 fatalities/VMT by 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Overall Traffic Fatality Rate</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015*</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* represents preliminary data obtained from GEARS.

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

2005-2014 Georgia Traffic Fatality Rates (Fatalities per 100M VMT) & 2015-2017 Predicted Fatality Rates Moving 3-Year Averages
C-3a: To decrease rural fatalities per 100M VMT 1.1% from 1.88 (2012-2014 average) to 1.86 (2015-2017 average) in 2017.

The average decrease of rural fatalities/VMT from 2010-2014 decreased on average by 0.01 fatalities per VMT. However, in 2013 the rural fatality rate per 100M VMT increased by 29.2% — from 1.73 in 2012 to 1.86 in 2013. GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease rural fatality rates below the 3-yr average fatalities to 1.88 fatalities/VMT by 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Rural Traffic Fatality Rate</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015*</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* represents preliminary data obtained from GEARS.

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

2005-2014 Georgia Rural Fatality Rates (Fatalities per 100M VMT) & 2015-2017 Target Rural Fatality Rates Moving 3-Year Averages
C-3b: To decrease urban fatalities per 100M VMT 5% from 0.80 (2012-2014 average) to 0.76 (2015-2017 average) in 2017.

The average decrease of urban fatalities/VMT from 2010-2014 decreased on average by 0.07 fatalities per VMT. However, in 2014 the urban fatality rate per 100M VMT increased by 10.8% — from 0.74 in 2013 to 0.82 in 2014. Using 3-year smooth averaging method and using natural log regression modeling (R² of 0.9304), GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease rural fatality rates below the 3-yr average fatalities to 0.76 urban fatalities/VMT by 2017. This would equate to reducing the rural fatality rates to below 0.77 in years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Urban Traffic Fatality Rate</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015*</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* represents preliminary data obtained from GEARS.

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

2005-2013 Georgia Urban Fatality Rates (Fatalities per 100M VMT) & 2014-2016 Target
Urban Fatality Rates Moving 3-Year Averages

Based on the data from 2010-2014 there has been an unsteady decrease of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupants’ fatalities. However, in 2013 the number of unrestrained fatalities increased by 2.1% —from 368 in 2012 to 376 unrestrained fatalities. The average decrease between calendar year 2010-2014 is 18.6 fatalities per year. GOHS has the 2017 target to steady decrease roadway unrestrained fatalities below the 3-yr average of 336 fatalities. This equates to 334 unrestrained fatalities in 2017. This target would ideally account for 29% of all roadway fatality passengers that were unrestrained in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent of Unrestrained Fatalities</th>
<th>Unrestrained Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

Based on the data from 2010-2014 there has been an unsteady decrease of alcohol impaired driving fatalities. The average decrease between calendar year 2010-2014 is 11 alcohol related fatalities per year. However, in 2013 the number of alcohol impaired driving fatalities increased by 9.5%—from 271 in 2011 to 297 alcohol impaired driving fatalities. Using 3-year smooth averaging method and using logarithmic modeling, GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease alcohol impaired driving fatalities to the 3-yr average of 263 fatalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent Alcohol Related Fatalities</th>
<th>Alcohol Related Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

2002-2014 Georgia Alcohol Related Fatalities & 2015-2017 Predicted Alcohol Related Fatalities Moving 3-Year Averages
C-6: To decrease speed related fatalities 0.2% from 197 (2012-2014 average) to 196 (2015-2017 average) in 2017.

Based on the data from 2010-2014 there has been an unsteady decrease of speeding related fatalities. The average decrease between calendar year 2009-2012 is 5.2 speeding related fatalities per year. However, in 2014 the number of speed related fatalities increased by 18%—from 180 in 2012 to 213 speed related fatalities in 2014. Using 3-year smooth averaging method and using logarithmic regression modeling, GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily and conservatively decrease speed related fatalities below the 3-yr average of 197 fatalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent Speed Related Fatalities</th>
<th>Speed Related Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.
C-7: To decrease motorcyclist’s fatalities 3.4% from 129 (2012-2014 average) to 125 (2015-2017 average) in 2017.

Based on the data from 2009-2014 there has been an unsteady decrease of motorcyclist fatalities. The average decrease between calendar year 2009-2014 is 7 fatalities per year. However, in 2014 the number of motorcyclist’s fatalities increased by 18%—from 116 in 2013 to 137 motorcyclist’s fatalities in 2017. Using 3-year smooth averaging method and using logarithmic regression modeling (R² of 0.97), GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease roadway motorcyclist’s fatalities to the 3-yr average fatalities of 125. This would equate to reducing roadway fatalities to 130 or fewer in years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent Motorcyclist Fatalities</th>
<th>Motorcyclist Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

Based on the data from 2010-2014 there has been a small decrease of motorcyclist fatalities un-helmeted. The average between calendar year 2010-2014 is 0.6 un-helmeted motorcyclist's fatalities per year. The biggest decrease occurred between 2011 and 2012 with 7 less un-helmeted motorcyclist fatalities. However, in 2014 the number of un-helmeted motorcyclist’s fatalities increased by 60% —from 5 in 2013 to 8 un-helmeted motorcyclist’s fatalities in 2017. Using 3-year smooth averaging method and using logarithmic modeling (R2 of 0.71), GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease un-helmeted motorcyclist’s fatalities to the 3-yr average fatalities of 6. This would equate to reducing roadway fatalities to below 7 in years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Motorcyclist Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent Un-helmeted Fatalities</th>
<th>Un-helmeted Motorcyclist Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.


Based on the data from 2010-2014 there has been a steady decrease of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes. Most fatal crashes involving drivers age 20 or younger occurred in 2005 when 326 young drivers were killed. The average decrease between calendar year 2011-2014 is 6.5 young drivers in fatal crashes per year. Using 3-year smooth averaging method and using logarithmic modeling (R2 of 0.93), GOHS has the 2017 target to steadily decrease drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes to the 3-yr average fatalities of 145 drivers. This would equate to 146, 145, and 143 young drivers involved in fatal crashes in years 2015, 2016, and 2017, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Young Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

2002-2014 Georgia Young Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes & 2015-2017 Predicted Young Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes, Moving 3-Year Averages

![Graph showing trend of young drivers involved in fatal crashes from 2002 to 2017.](image-url)

Based on the data from 2007-2014 there has been unsteady change in pedestrian fatalities with the most fatalities occurring in 2013 with 176 fatalities. In fact, pedestrian fatalities, in the state of Georgia, is on a rise. In 2013 the count of pedestrian fatalities increased by 5% — from 167 in 2012 to 176 pedestrian fatalities. In 2014, the count of pedestrian fatalities decreased by 7.4%. Because the counts of pedestrian fatalities were growing in 2012-2013 and the 3-year averages will increase, GOHS has the 2017 target to reduce the count of pedestrian fatalities from 163 pedestrian fatalities in 2014 to 160 pedestrian fatalities in 2017.

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.

Moving 3-Year Averages

Based on the data from 2010-2014 there has been an unsteady decrease in bicyclist fatalities. The average decrease between calendar year 2010-2014 is 0.4 fatalities per year. In 2013 the count of bicyclist fatalities increased by 100% (doubled)—from 14 in 2011 to 28 pedestrian fatalities. GOHS has the 2017 target to decrease pedestrian fatalities below the 3-yr average of 18 bicyclist fatalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traffic Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent Bicyclist Fatalities</th>
<th>Bicyclist Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.
B-1: Increase statewide observed safety belt use of front seat outboard occupants in passenger vehicles from baseline 97.3% in 2015 to 97.7% in 2017.

Statewide safety belt usage in 2015 for drivers and passengers of passenger cars, trucks, and vans was 97.3%, an increase of 1.8% from 2013. GOHS has the 2017 target to increase the seatbelt utilization by a net 0.4% from the 2015 baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Observed Seatbelt Use</th>
<th>3-Year Moving Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow rows represent data predicted using trending methodology described in the figure to the right.

Cells with red text represent recent data points that demonstrate an increase in comparison to previous years, therefore, inversely impacting the 3-year moving average modeling used to establish and inform 2017 targets.
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APPENDIX D TO PART 1200 —
CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES
FOR NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAM GRANTS (23 U.S.C. 405)

State: Georgia
Fiscal Year: 2017

Each fiscal year the State must sign these Certifications and Assurances that it complies with all requirements, including applicable Federal statutes and regulations that are in effect during the reporting period.

In my capacity as the Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety, I:

- certify that, to the best of my personal knowledge, the information submitted to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in support of the State’s application for Section 405 grants below is accurate and complete.
- understand that incorrect, incomplete, or untimely information submitted in support of the State’s application may result in the denial of an award under Section 405.
- agree that, as a condition of the grant, the State will use these grant funds in accordance with the specific requirements of Section 405(b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), if applicable.
- agree that, as a condition of the grant, the State will comply with all applicable laws and regulations and fiscal and programmatic requirements for Federal grants.

Signature: Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety

Harris Blackwood
Printed name of Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety
Part I: Occupant Protection (23 CFR 1200.21)

All States (Fill in all blanks below):

- The State will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all State and local sources for occupant protection programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in fiscal years 2010 and 2011. (23 U.S.C. 402(o)(1)(C))

- The State will participate in the Click it or Ticket national mobilization in the fiscal year of the grant. The certification of the State’s planned participation is provided as HSR attachment on page 4.

- The State’s occupant protection plan for the upcoming fiscal year is provided as HSR attachment on page 8.

- Documentation of the State’s active network of child restraint inspection stations is provided as HSR attachment on page 8.

- The State’s plan for child passenger safety education is provided as HSR attachment on page 8.

Lower Seat Belt Use Rates: (Check at least 3 boxes below and fill in all blanks under those checked boxes):

- The State’s primary seat belt use law, requiring primary enforcement of the State’s occupant protection laws, was enacted on [date] and has remained in effect, and will be enforced during the fiscal year of the grant.

Legal citation(s):
The State’s occupant protection law, requiring occupants to be secured in a seat belt or age-appropriate child restraint while in a passenger motor vehicle and a minimum fine of $25, was enacted on and last amended on March 19, 2010, and will be enforced during the fiscal year of the grant.

Legal citations:

- Requirement for all occupants to be secured in seat belt or age appropriate child restraint:

- Coverage of all passenger motor vehicles:

- Minimum fine of at least $25:

- Exemptions from restraint requirements:

☐ The State’s seat belt enforcement plan is provided as HSP attachment on page 9.

☐ The State’s high risk population countermeasure program is provided as HSP attachment on page 2.

☐ The State’s comprehensive occupant protection program is provided as HSP attachment 6.

☐ The State’s occupant protection program assessment: [Check one box below and IA in any blanks under the checked box.]

☐ The State’s NHTSA-mailed occupant protection program assessment was conducted on

☐ The state agrees to conduct a NHTSA-facilitated occupant protection program assessment by September 1 of the fiscal year of the grant. (This option is available only for fiscal year 2013 grants.)
Part 2: State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements (23 CFR 1300.22)

- The State will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all State and local sources for the traffic safety information system programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in fiscal years 2010 and 2011.

[Fill in at least one blank for each bullet below]

- A copy of □ check one box only □ the □ TRCC charter or the □ statute legally mandating a State TRCC is provided as HSP attachment □ or submitted electronically through the TRIPRS database on _____________

- A copy of TRCC meeting minutes for 12 months following application due date and all reports and other documents prepared by the TRCC during the 12 months preceding the application due date is provided as HSP attachment □ or submitted electronically through the TRIPRS database on _____________

- A list of the TRCC membership and the organization and function they represent is provided as HSP attachment □ or submitted electronically through the TRIPRS database on _____________

- The name and title of the State’s Traffic Records Coordinator is _____________

- A copy of the State Strategic Plan, including any updates, is provided as HSP attachment □ or submitted electronically through the TRIPRS database on _____________

[Check one box below and fill in any blanks under the checked box]

- If the following pages in the state’s Strategic Plan provide a written description of the performance measures and all supporting data that the State is relying on to demonstrate achievement of the quantitative improvement in the period of 12 months of the application due date in relation to one or more of the significant data program attributes pages _____________

- If not detailed in the State’s Strategic Plan, the written description is provided as HSP attachment □

- The State’s most recent assessment or update of its highway safety data and traffic records system was completed on _____________
Part 3: Impaired Driving Countermeasures (23 CFR 1240.23)

All States:

- The State will maintain the aggregate expenditures from all State and local sources for impaired driving programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in fiscal years 2010 and 2011.
- The State will use the funds awarded under 23 U.S.C. 409(c) only for the implementation of programs as provided in 23 CFR 1240.23(b) in the fiscal year of the grant.

Mid-Range States:

[Check one box below and fill in any blanks under that checked box]

☐ The statewide impaired driving plan approved by a statewide impaired driving task force was issued on __________________________ and is provided as HSP Attachment # __________________________.

OR

☐ For the first year of the grant as a mid-range State, the State agrees to convene a statewide impaired driving task force to develop a statewide impaired driving plan and submit a copy of the plan to NHTSA by September 1 of the fiscal year of the grant.

☐ A copy of information describing the statewide impaired driving task force is provided as HSP Attachment # __________________________.

High-Range States:

[Check one box below and fill in any blanks under that checked box]

☐ A NHTSA-facilitated assessment of the State’s impaired driving program was conducted on __________________________.

OR

☐ For the first year of the grant as a high-range State, the State agrees to conduct a NHTSA-facilitated assessment by September 1 of the fiscal year of the grant.

☐ [Check one box below and fill in any blanks under that checked box]

☐ For the first year of the grant as a high-range State, the State agrees to convene a statewide impaired driving task force to develop a statewide impaired driving plan addressing recommendations from the assessment and submit the plan to NHTSA for review and approval by September 1 of the fiscal year of the grant.

OR

☐ For subsequent years of the grant as a high-range State, the statewide impaired driving plan developed or updated on __________________________ is provided as HSP Attachment # __________________________.
* A copy of the information describing the statewide impaired driving task force is provided as HSP attachment 9.

Ignition Interlock Law: [Fill in all blanks below.]

- The State’s ignition interlock law was enacted on __________ and last amended on __________, and will be enforced during the fiscal year of the grant.

Legal citation(s):
Part 4: Distracted Driving (23 CFR 1200.24)

Prohibition on Texting While Driving:
The State’s texting ban statute, prohibiting texting while driving, a minimum fine of at least $25, and associated fines for repeat offenses, was enacted on ____________ and is amended on ____________, is in effect and will be enforced during the fiscal year of the grant.

Legal citations:
- Prohibition on texting while driving:
- Definition of covered wireless communication devices:
- Minimum fine of at least $25 for first offense:
- Increased fines for repeat offenses:
- Exemptions from texting ban: