

7/31/92

Revised

**RURAL INITIATIVES
FOR TRAFFIC
SAFETY**

A GUIDE FOR THE OFFICE OF
SHERIFF
AND
OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT

OFFICIALS

IN

RURAL COMMUNITIES

Prepared by:
National Sheriffs' Association
for the National Highway Traffic Safety

Administration

CONTENTS

TABLE OF

CONTENTS:
NUMBER

PAGE

PREFACE

i

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

iv

CHARGE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATORS IN RURAL AMERICA

v

INTRODUCTION

vi

CHAPTER I INITIATIVES FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

DATA COLLECTION

1-1

DATA UNIFORMITY/CONSISTENCY

1-1

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

1-2

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

1-3

CHAPTER II PROGRAM PLANNING

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

2-1

PLAN DEVELOPMENT

2-2

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

2-2 POLICY STATEMENTS
2-3

CHAPTER III PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

3-1 SPEED ENFORCEMENT
- STRATEGIES
3-3 IMPAIRED DRIVING
3-5 - STRATEGIES
3-5 OCCUPANT PROTECTION
3-7 - STRATEGIES
3-9 AGGRESSIVE CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT
3-11 - STRATEGIES
3-13 PASSIVE ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES
3-14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER IV BUILDING COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS

4-1 STATE ASSOCIATIONS
4-2 LOCAL OFFICIALS

	STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH STATE
	ASSOCIATIONS AND LOCAL OFFICIALS
4-3	PROMOTING BROAD BASED TRAFFIC SAFETY
PROGRAMS :	THE SHERIFF AS THE CATALYST FOR ACTION
4-4	

APPENDIX A RESOURCES

	FUNDING
A-1	
	PUBLICATIONS
A-2	
	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
A-4	
	- NHTSA Regional Administrators
A-4	
	- Governor's Highway Safety Representatives
A-5	

APPENDIX B THE SOUTH CAROLINA EXPERIENCE - PHASE I & II

	PHASE I
B-1	
	PHASE II
B-19	

APPENDIX C SUPPORT MATERIALS - CITATION FLIERS

C-1	
-----	--

APPENDIX D CADRE AND THE CRASH OUTCOME DATA EVALUATION

	SYSTEM (CODES)
D-1	

PREFACE

Rural Initiatives For Traffic Safety: A Guide for the Office of Sheriff and Other Law Enforcement Administrators was developed by the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA) as part of a grant funded by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The concept for this guidebook evolved from the highly successful rural traffic enforcement experience of eleven South Carolina counties (Darlington, Dorry, Greenville, Horry, Lancaster, Lexington, Orangeburg, Pickens, Spartanburg, Sumter, Union, the municipality of Myrtle Beach, and the Horry County Police Department). It is important not only to share the results of this experience but to also share the positive effect this program has had on the involvement of sheriffs in traffic enforcement.

In September 1990, USA Today featured a front page article on the 500 "Deadliest Counties" (based on 1989 traffic fatality statistics) in the United States. Rural roads in the State of South Carolina were declared the nation's "deadliest" based on a comparison made against other counties. The State's rural roadways accounted for approximately 68 percent of the statewide total of 996 traffic fatalities experienced that year. The same roadways also accounted for approximately 87 percent of all vehicle crashes and 80 percent of all traffic-related injuries in the State.

Prior to this article, South Carolina's Office of Highway Safety had stated in its annual highway safety plan that crashes on rural roadways were a serious problem. They also noted that one of the principal issues the State had to address was the noticeable lack of interest in traffic enforcement by sheriff's agencies which have the primary responsibility for enforcement of traffic laws on these roadways. Since the statistics were evidence of a problem, the NSA entered into partnership with NHTSA to implement a pilot project for South Carolina sheriffs that would target improvement of their traffic enforcement attitudes and hopefully, a remedy of the problem. The project was called the **RURAL INITIATIVE**.

The **RURAL INITIATIVE** traffic enforcement program was inaugurated in September 1990, and involved the combined efforts of NHTSA, NSA, the South Carolina Office of Highway Safety (SCOHS), the South Carolina Sheriffs' Association (SCSA) and the South Carolina Criminal Justice Training Academy. The project was a

joint endeavor by both NHTSA and NSA to address the extraordinarily high number of crashes, fatalities and injuries experienced on South Carolina's rural, non-Interstate roadways (see Appendix B, Crash Statistics - South Carolina 1989-1991).

The specific goal of this guide is **to help sheriffs and/or other law enforcement administrators in other areas of the country (with similar problems) reduce the number, frequency and severity of crashes on their rural, non-Interstate roadways.**

The objectives of the Rural Initiatives for Traffic Safety Guide are:

- o to assist rural law enforcement administrators in identifying specific traffic safety related problems,
- o to describe successful enforcement programs and strategies that are currently being used nationwide to resolve similar problems.

The guide also focuses on public information and education programs which will help administrators involve the community in the program for greater, overall affect. The media focus, in addition to assisting administrators in gaining needed community support, will contribute greatly toward raising motorists' awareness of the local crash problem. Finally, the guide suggests ways to develop a cooperative atmosphere among other highway safety professions in order to help identify and correct specific highway safety problems within the community.

When the original Rural Initiative program was conceptualized, it was decided to move forward in several stages. Each stage, therefore, contributed to the totality of information contained in this Guide. The NSA and NHTSA appreciate and acknowledge the efforts of other agencies which assisted in providing training and/or information published in this document. They include:

- o U.S. DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION
- o FEDERAL BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS
- o FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
- o U.S. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE
- o NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, REGION IV
- o SOUTH CAROLINA CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACADEMY
- o SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

- SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY
- SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
- SOUTH CAROLINA SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION
- U.S. MARSHAL'S SERVICE

We would also like to acknowledge the efforts of the following individuals who contributed significantly to the success of this project:

Sheriff Johnny Mack Brown, Greenville County Office of the Sheriff;

Perry Brown, Director, Office of Highway Safety, State of South Carolina;

Sheriff James R. Metts, Lexington County Office of the Sheriff;

Jeff Moore, Executive Director, South Carolina Sheriffs' Association;

A.N. "Bubby" Moser, Jr., National Sheriffs' Association;

Terecia W. Wilson, Assistant Director, Department of Highway and Public Transportation; and

Max Young, Department of Highway and Public Transportation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rural America is served by some 3.2 million miles of public roads. Most rural communities depend heavily upon these vital arteries for commerce and pleasure as well as connectors or alternatives to the nation's Interstate system. A close review of statistical data for these roadways reveals that rural highways are experiencing a disproportionate amount of crashes and related trauma when compared to the rural Interstate system. For example, in the Southeast (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee), the following data were noted:

- o First in traffic fatalities: exceeding 11,000 each year.
- o Second in population: approximately 50 million residents.
- o Second in rural roadways: over 550,000 miles.
- o First in the number of registered vehicles: over 36 million.
- o Second in the number of licensed drivers: almost 31 million.

It was also noted that, in addition to a myriad of other responsibilities, the Offices of Sheriff in these States have primary responsibility for most traffic enforcement activities within rural communities, including the investigation of traffic related crashes and enforcement of violations of traffic laws. Some of the problems these sheriffs have identified, which are directly associated with this responsibility, are:

- o Lack of funds to purchase the equipment necessary to perform the
rudimentary tasks associated with crash
investigations
(computers, cameras, software, etc.), speed
enforcement (VASCAR, laser, and radar units), and
DWI (video cameras, breath testing equipment).
- o Unavailability of quality training in DWI enforcement (SFST and DRE courses), and in the use of video cameras and breathalyzer machines.

o Lack of training in the use of speed enforcement equipment.

o Attitude toward traffic enforcement. Many sheriffs feel that traffic enforcement is political "suicide." They instruct their deputies NOT to enforce traffic violations and refuse to provide them with the necessary materials to actively perform this task.

The Guide, although intended for rural sheriffs, can be a valuable instrument for any law enforcement administrator (resident deputy and/or any contract law enforcement programmer) genuinely interested and/or concerned about reducing crashes - and the related trauma associated with those crashes - on their rural or local roadways. The information presented in each chapter is designed to "walk" the reader through each process - identification, decision making and implementation - in a reasonable and practical way. The Guide should help law enforcement personnel confront the issues and resolve the problems associated with crashes on rural highways. In addition, we hope the Guide will contribute toward changing attitudes currently found in many rural communities about traffic enforcement.

If a decision is made to undertake a rural initiative, it would be very beneficial for the administrator to consider adoption or expansion of the theme used by South Carolina sheriffs in their program - the "quality of life." This theme was especially effective and instrumental in changing the mind set of law enforcement officials who were skeptical at first but willingly participated in the pilot test program. The sense of community spirit and caring contributed greatly in garnishing the support needed to implement the programs. Once the benefits of the program were realized, expansion and/or involvement of the participants grew naturally.

CHARGE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATORS IN RURAL AMERICA

The theme adopted for the rural traffic enforcement initiative, "quality of life," is not just another trivial phrase. The unnecessary suffering and expense related to crashes in rural America truly affect the heart and soul of these communities. The loss of a colleague, friend, or family member, the experience of a long term rehabilitation, or the cost of repairs and rising insurance rates extract resources, directly or indirectly, from everyone. According to latest NHTSA figures, the costs being absorbed by society for crashes (nationally) are estimated to exceed \$137 billion a year. This fact heavily underscores the meaning of "quality of life" and adds emphasis to the need for closer attention to violators of traffic laws and more uniform enforcement of all traffic violations on rural roadways.

INTRODUCTION

Traffic related motor vehicle crashes continue to be a major source of death and disability in the United States. More than 1,200,000 persons have been killed in motor vehicle crashes in the past 25 years. According to the most recent NHTSA crash data (FARS, 1991), 41,462 persons - 1.9 persons per 100 million vehicle miles travelled (VMT) died on the nation's highways. An interesting but deadly fact is that if the 1991 fatality rate were as high as the fatality rate for 1966, which was 5.5 persons per 100 million VMT, there would have been approximately 120,000 traffic fatalities in 1990. Using this same presumption, at least 67 percent (80,400) of those fatalities would have occurred on the nation's rural primary and secondary roadways. As it was, approximately 30,000 persons died on rural roadways in 1991.

Even in the more "acceptable" reality of the actual data recorded for 1991, the need for a collective effort by law enforcement agencies to improve traffic law compliance in rural America becomes a major challenge.

The Rural Initiative Traffic Safety Guide contains information designed to deal with the many issues, problems and concerns of sheriffs and other law enforcement administrators who are directly responsible for the enforcement of traffic laws and regulations on rural highways within their jurisdictions. The Guide provides law enforcement officials with practical approaches for combating the myths which sometimes stymie the level of active traffic law enforcement needed. It also identifies new enforcement techniques or strategies that can easily be incorporated into existing enforcement programs, without the need for additional personnel, and provides new ideas for expanding current programs to make them more budget "friendly."

This guidebook is available to any law enforcement agency that is interested in new or innovative approaches to rural traffic safety. The information is simplified to encourage participation within the law enforcement family and the other traffic safety disciplines. Although initially designed as a resource manual for the Office of Sheriff, the Guide may be used by any local law enforcement official who perceives a rural traffic crash/fatality/injury problem and wants to take positive steps to reduce the problem, and is truly concerned about the quality of life within communities.

Police resources traditionally have been deployed in a reactive manner. It is anticipated that with the information contained in this manual a change in attitudes and past procedures will occur. At a minimum, this manual will allow administrators to be proactive, to address specific problems in a logical manner, and to plan ahead for unscheduled events in a concise and systematic way.

CHAPTER ONE

INITIATIVES FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

DATA COLLECTION

Establishing the data base to assist administrators in determining the magnitude of a jurisdiction's rural crash problem, along with its nature and location, are essential first steps. These activities must be completed prior to developing any meaningful preventive plan and/or the decision to commit agency resources.

There are a number of computerized and manual systems available to assist agencies in the identification of crash problem areas. One low-cost system (tried but true) is the use of spot (pin) maps. This manual means of tracking crashes has proven very effective in the past and can be used instead of elaborate and costly computer programs.

Whatever data base systems are incorporated, they should have the additional capacity to record crash data from all jurisdictions located within a "rural community" (i.e., county, towns, incorporated municipalities). Check with your State Department of Transportation to be sure similar data base systems do not already exist.

All data bases should include the Critical Automated Data Reporting Elements (CADRE) - see Appendix D, entitled "CADRE and the Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System (CODES) Programs". At a minimum, the following types of crash information are very useful in the identification of problems: types of vehicles involved; primary causative collision factors; time of day; day of week; age and sex of driver; major truck routes; the seasons of the year when crashes occur; and whether or not occupant protection devices were used. Such basic information is necessary in order to effectively focus any future enforcement efforts; to evaluate past enforcement efforts; to identify training needs; and to develop specific/general public information and education programs relative to the problem.

DATA UNIFORMITY/CONSISTENCY

Law enforcement administrators must realize that both the general public and the media are concerned about the

prevention of fatal crashes. Therefore, they should make sure data are collected and evaluated properly to provide sound guidelines needed for effective action. Analysts and administrators should be aware of any inconsistencies in data collection, especially when the data are being used for problem identification, program planning and evaluation.

The issues of data uniformity and consistency are very critical in the development of any data collection system. The National Safety Council's publication, MANUAL ON CLASSIFICATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS, provides consistent definitions and classifications for traffic crash data. In addition, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) has published and periodically updates a companion document to the manual entitled, THE DATA ELEMENT DICTIONARY, which provides uniform coding for each data element. The Manual defines and classifies the crash data element while the Dictionary gives it an alpha or numerical code.

Uniform data coding is critical. With uniform data coding, a county, city or town can compare its crash problems with similar entities, other regions within the state or nationally. This means that preventive measures successfully implemented in another locale could be adopted or modified to fit specific needs (provided that crash experiences are similar). Uniformity in data collection also helps agencies like NHTSA determine crash problems across the nation. Technical assistance, i.e., alcohol, speed, heavy truck, pedestrian, etc. enforcement strategies, could then be tailored to address the reduction or elimination of the specific problem.

Another benefit of code uniformity is the flexibility it allows the traffic manager in planning future trends. By analyzing certain experiences in surrounding jurisdictions or similar jurisdictions in another state, traffic planners can project programs needed to address an increase in elderly drivers, a significant youth-related problem, pedestrian fatalities, etc.

The need for collection of uniform data is critical to many programs. For example, NHTSA has encouraged states to adopt the CRITICAL AUTOMATED DATA REPORTING ELEMENTS (CADRE), which are especially crucial for conducting analyses of highway safety issues. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has also adopted a uniform set of crash data for trucks and buses. This information helps FHWA track the safety records of thousands of shippers and motor carriers in the country.

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

An administrator should select a capable person or unit to take the lead in developing an analysis strategy and carrying it out. At a minimum, the strategy should

include the data to be normalized, the process used to collect the data, developing useful data comparisons, appropriate statistical tests, and the best format for presenting the analyzed results to management for review and acceptance. The measure of a good data collection system is the degree to which it is used. It is very important that an agency develop and implement an analysis strategy based on good "collection" programs to ensure that data will be available on a complete, accurate and timely basis.

While problem identification is usually done on an annual basis in order to provide enough time to detect trends, it may be advisable for agencies to adjust their frequency of problem identification for certain target populations, depending on the magnitude of the crash problem and anticipated changes over time.

A very important resource document for traffic safety managers is a NHTSA publication entitled Problem Identification Manual for Traffic Safety Programs, which discusses extensively the treatment of problem identification as part of planning highway safety activities. A companion document, Planning and Programming, is a publication on the management process. Both documents discuss and give examples of data analysis levels, the need and techniques for normalizing data. They suggest how program managers can present and display results of an analysis to management.

Both publications, although dated, are still available through NHTSA's Technical Reference Division, Room PL-403, 400 7th Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Every agency should conduct several post-evaluations in order to determine effectiveness of its program and overall progress. By conducting several different evaluations the program manager can measure any progress. Based on that evaluation, the program manager can then plan and implement new program strategies, if needed. Some different types of program evaluations (i.e., occupant protection) are:

- o To conduct and publicize at least one jurisdictional observation survey of safety belt and child passenger use each six months.
- o To maintain trend data on child safety seat and belt use in fatal crashes.
- o To identify target populations through these surveys and crash statistics.
- o To conduct and publicize jurisdictional surveys of public

laws and knowledge and attitudes about occupant protection systems.

o To collect monthly data from your department on the number of citations issued and if applicable, convictions obtained.

o To evaluate the use of program resources (personnel and equipment) and the effectiveness of any publicity and/or education programs.

Although these are only a few examples on conducting a safety belt program evaluation, a systematic application of any or all of the above examples should assure the program manager of an effective evaluation. It is noted here that a program manager can substitute the use of occupant protection terminology with a particular program objective (speed, DWI, etc.) and use the same evaluation approach illustrated above.

Ongoing evaluations are an integral component of any program since they are the only way of judging success or failure. The fundamental measure of success would be changes in behavior and/or voluntary compliance with the law. However, by closely monitoring the program, the manager can effectively design and/or implement improvements.

1-4

CHAPTER TWO

PROGRAM PLANNING

OVERVIEW

Planning is the key component of any management process. Planning enables administrators to determine the best allocation of resources to achieve optimum results, determine the current level of program activity and identify and prioritize problems that should be addressed. Effective planning enables management to select and implement appropriate strategies, establish goals and performance measures, itemize the resources needed for success and ensure proper evaluation.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Over the past few decades, attention to traffic safety problems on our nation's Interstate highway system has contributed significantly to its current reputation for motoring safety. At the same time, fatal crashes and serious injuries have risen disproportionately on our rural primary and secondary roads. However, law enforcement officials in areas experiencing a dramatic or steadily rising number of fatal crashes do not have to wait until a data program is in place before some type of remedial action is taken. You can access most information immediately through your State's Office of Highway Safety.

The importance of conducting a thorough needs assessment, based on factual information, is critical in the formulation of an effective action plan. Once the magnitude, location and nature of your rural traffic safety problems are identified, then resources both equipment and personnel can be focused to address them.

For example, once the pilot Rural Initiative traffic enforcement plan was conceptualized for the State of South Carolina, the State Office of Highway Safety was able to provide statistical data on fatal, injury property damage crashes and driver-related violations by county, for every type of roadway. Next, 13 of the worst (46) counties in the State were targeted for the program. Eleven of these counties, along with the municipality of Myrtle Beach, elected to participate. In an organizational meeting, specific traffic safety problems were presented to their representatives, along with a plan to address their specific needs (a county could choose between a single, a multiple, or a passive traffic enforcement program).

Participation by the law enforcement officials represented was 100 percent. The needs assessment in this case involved the identification of the county's crash problem and an assessment of each representative's traffic enforcement capabilities. Based on both assessments, a plan was specifically designed and implemented for each individual county.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Some planning development procedures go deeper than selection of the most appropriate enforcement strategy or the establishing of goals and performance measures needed to effectively implement an enforcement strategy, and/or the identification of the resources needed to bring the strategy to a successful conclusion. Extensive planning procedures enable managers to assess current and past levels of traffic enforcement and the availability and use of resources (beyond those in-house) involved in other programs. Planning allows them to outline their in-service training requirement needs, and to verify and prioritize the crash causes that should be targeted.

At a minimum, adequate planning assures that all program elements are identified. It clearly states program goals and objectives, allows for adequate personnel, delivers the required training, is able to supply or acquire essential equipment needs, and describes funding resources available or needed. Adequate planning also means providing the program with an experienced manager who has the authority to act in the absence of the sheriff (or similar head of an agency). In addition, adequate planning describes in detail how public information and education will be involved as a critical element of the program. Once all planning factors are addressed by the agency head, then the type and extent of program participation can be determined.

Further, once formalized, the plan can serve as a convenient document to describe various job classifications, outline staffing needs for both short-term personnel assignments and long-range budgeting, and be used to justify new or additional specialized training (i.e., radar operation, accident reconstruction, standardized field sobriety testing). It can be a valuable support document for budget or outside funding requests and can serve as a "memorandum of understanding" between two or more agencies involved in a joint operation.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals and objectives incorporated into any plan to remedy the problem of crashes on rural roadways can be narrow and well defined. However, the goals and

objectives should be realistic. Traffic fatalities can be cyclic and unpredictable. Multiple fatalities involved in single crashes can easily inflate data. Therefore, it is best to set long-range goals (three to five years) and develop objectives to achieve these goals. In this way, an administrator can evaluate the plan's progress.

POLICY STATEMENTS

Police administrators are charged with the responsibility of protecting life and property, and providing police related services to the citizens of their communities in the most efficient and effective manner possible. For example, one of the greatest public safety issues today is the topic of this guidebook - the ever increasing number of crashes on rural roadways. While it is recognized that many integral components are needed to maintain a safe highway transportation system, the fact remains that people play a vital and highly visible role in maintaining a problem-free driving environment. It is to the people, therefore, that this message must be directed.

Policies guide an organization toward achieving its goals and reflect on the overall plan, i.e., the rural initiative traffic enforcement program. Since a policy statement is based on the views of the administration, the desires of the community and its leaders, and the mandate of the law, it informs the public as well as department members about the purpose and direction of the program. Most important is the fact that policy statements summarize a department's position on the direction or limitations of an agency's authority in specific matters. Therefore, a policy statement from the head of the local law enforcement agency, which clearly and concisely outlines the issue, is critical to the success of any program, especially the rural initiative program. The principles contained in the policy statement are essential to the delivery of the type of effort which will favorably impact the problem. (See NHTSA publication entitled "Model Enforcement Program For Occupant Protection" for a sample model policy statement).

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Police administrators are strongly encouraged to include in the formulation of any traffic safety program a public information and education component as an integral part of any enforcement activity. This component is paramount to success and necessary in order to reap every possible benefit from their planned activity. (See NHTSA publication entitled "Law Enforcement Public Information"

for an in-depth guideline for conducting successful and effective strategies).

There are many benefits to public information projects. Of primary importance is the knowledge that is created within the community of any enforcement effort. This creates an additional "perception of risk" on part of the motoring public. The potential of being ticketed for a traffic violation or killed or injured in a crash promotes voluntary compliance which provides the greatest possibility for reducing fatalities, injuries and property damage crashes. The guide, mentioned above, discusses successful media relations, effective traffic-related public information strategies, and implementation and maintenance of a public affairs unit/function. This publication is highly recommended for any program administrator.

CHAPTER THREE

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

OVERVIEW

Once a rural traffic safety crash reduction plan is developed (all of the program data elements have been identified, the personnel and equipment resources have been defined, an evaluation process is in place, a departmental policy stating the program's goals and objectives has been clearly written and distributed, and the extent of the public information and education emphasis has been determined) then the implementation date should be determined.

A key factor in the implementation of any traffic enforcement program is "timing." Implementation that is poorly timed could scuttle the most meaningful and best designed program. For example, does the planned program kick-off date coincide with the crash problem (i.e., seasonal)? Has the community been thoroughly apprised (through the media) of the "problem" and alerted to the implementation date? Have support agencies (i.e., courts, department of motor vehicles, etc.) been notified about your program plan (if applicable)? Is there evidence that the community has shown strong support for the plan?

If the answer to any of these questions is "no," it would be best to evaluate the public information and education efforts made in conjunction with the program (if any).

SPEED ENFORCEMENT

Most highways and motor vehicles are designed and built for safe operation at the speeds travelled by most motorists. Nevertheless, exceeding posted speed limits and driving too fast for conditions are contributing factors in almost one-third of all fatal crashes on rural roadways. In fact, vehicles traveling much faster than

the posted speed on a highway have a crash potential six times greater than vehicles traveling at the posted speed. Studies have shown that a driver traveling 20 mph above the speed limit has a crash potential 11 times greater than a driver traveling at the posted speed.

The most recent NHTSA report to Congress (Effects of the 65 MPH Speed Limit Through 1990) reports that based on information from 18 of 40 states with increased rural Interstate speed limits, the 85th percentile speed (the speeds on the Interstate system being travelled by 85 percent of the motorists) was unchanged for 1990 when compared to 1989. However, even though the percent of vehicles exceeding 70 mph in 1990 (relative to 1989) experienced no change, this percent has increased from an estimated 6 percent in 1986 to 19 percent in 1990. One of the primary concerns of highway safety activists is that when a motorist leaves the freeway, speeds are not decreased to reflect the non-freeway driving conditions (spill over effect). This situation creates problems in the vicinity of major interchanges and on roadways not built to safely handle these higher speeds.

Nothing could underscore more simply the responsibility that law enforcement administrators have in the enforcement of speed laws, than the charge given to the participants at the U.S. Department of Transportation Traffic Safety Summit, held in Chicago, Illinois, April, 1990, by the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, then the Secretary of Transportation:

"It should be the goal of all law enforcement agencies to foster voluntary speed limit compliance on the part of all motor vehicle operators, through public awareness and enforcement measures, in order to create safer roadways for our nation."

In addition to speed zoning, speed enforcement can be a very effective way to reduce serious crashes on rural roadways. If used judiciously, it can provide immediate and long-term benefits. Use of speed enforcement equipment does require training, but generally speaking it is an inexpensive program to initiate. Some major factors should be considered prior to setting up a speed enforcement program:

(1) Did the needs assessment data indicate speed as a major driver factor in your highway fatalities? If so, where did fatalities occur? What time of day? What were the age, sex of drivers? Was it a single/multiple vehicle crash? Any other factors involved? What type of vehicle was the victim operating?

(2) Is there a specific type of technology needed,
e.g., radar,
photo-radar, laser speed measuring device, use
of drone
radar, electronic speed displays and/or signing,
VASCAR, etc?

(3) Will the use of physical speed control techniques such as speed bumps, rumble strips, and/or special pavement markings offer good opportunities to reduce speeds? The use of these types of physical changes are elements for safer roads rather than a measurable part of an overall speed enforcement program. **NOTE:** Highway engineers and patrol officers need to work together to identify these hazardous locations and to see that improvements are made.

(4) Is public information and education (PI&E) an integral component of any planned speed enforcement program? Studies have shown that a vigorous speed enforcement program NOT accompanied by PI&E is short lived. The most effective program is one that raises and maintains the public perception that speeders will be detected, apprehended and sanctioned.

Sheriffs must realize that writing speeding tickets does not carry the negative political ramifications once thought - provided the program is thoroughly planned and the community is fully aware of its purpose. However, failure to take action to eliminate or reduce a serious speeding-related problem could be. How a sheriff presents the program to the community is extremely important. A well thought out plan, targeting a specific problem, supported by prominent citizens and the media, could prove to be very beneficial.

(5) Will a speed enforcement program require "specialized"

training? If so, is it available? Who will
provide it? Are
there any additional costs involved? Can the
training be
conducted in-house?

These are some of the major considerations agencies should be aware of before committing themselves to a speed enforcement program. However, the value of using speed enforcement as a primary program has many positive sides. For example, speeding is involved in many other unsafe driving behaviors, including the means for avoiding apprehension if involved in some overt criminal activity. Law enforcement administrators have found that the active enforcement of speed limits has reduced not only the crash problem but drunk driving, non-use of safety belts, and many Part I criminal offenses (see ACE Program).

SPEED ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES

In addition to the common practice of "pacing" a speeding vehicle, law enforcement agencies throughout the United States use one or more of the speed enforcement techniques listed below:

- o observing traffic from fixed locations, using a time/distance measuring device or down-the-road radar, then pursuing and stopping the speeding vehicle.
- o observing approaching traffic from a fixed location, using down-the-road radar, then stepping out and stopping the vehicle.
- o observing traffic from a moving vehicle (pacing or moving radar), and then pursuing and stopping the violator.

Many variations of the above, including the use of "teams," have been incorporated into speed enforcement strategies. However, the second strategy mentioned above is losing favor with some officers who patrol 65 mph roadways.

Some innovative speed enforcement strategies used in the United States in recent years are:

- o Unattended radar (Drone radar).
- o Portable billboard-type radar.
- o Aircraft surveillance (with ground pursuit).
- o Manned automated speed enforcement (photo-radar).
- o Use of unmarked, non-descriptive police-type vehicles as enforcement or "spotter" vehicles, teamed with a marked vehicle.

Some innovative speed enforcement strategies used in

Europe are:

- o Use of stop teams (two or more officers working in unison).
- o Stationary, manned photographic systems.
- o Moving, manned photographic equipment.
- o Movable, unmanned photographic systems.
- o Fixed, unmanned, fully automated operations.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

As a nation, we have accomplished much in the last decade to elevate public awareness about impaired driving (DWI). However, impaired driving, whether it involves drugs or alcohol, continues to be one of the nation's most serious public health and safety problems. Each year one million crashes involving impaired drivers occur, resulting in approximately 540,000 injuries. In 1990, NHTSA's Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS) revealed that approximately 40 percent of all fatal crashes involved a driver or non-occupant whose blood alcohol concentration (BAC) level was above 0.10 percent. An additional 10 percent of fatal crashes involved a person whose BAC level was above 0.00 but below 0.10 percent. Further, additional information available from FARS revealed that 33 percent of all other crashes involved driver alcohol use, and that almost two-thirds of these drivers were also speeding. Also, almost two-thirds of all crashes occurring in the late evening or early morning hours involved alcohol use by the driver (see NHTSA publication Safer Streets Ahead, a community handbook to prevent impaired driving, under list of available resources).

Although there is evidence that, through the combined efforts of Federal, state and local law enforcement agencies, a significant impact has been made in reducing the DWI problem, much more needs to be done. If your data-needs-assessment reveals that a significant number of crashes are alcohol-related, then some type of impaired driving countermeasure program is warranted. Most of the same questions put forth under speed enforcement factors (see page 3-3) can be used to help you decide whether to initiate a DWI enforcement program.

IMPAIRED DRIVING ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES

Law enforcement agencies in the United States use one or more of the following strategies for enforcement of impaired driving laws:

- o Roadside sobriety checkpoints.
- o Videotape recorders (in car, station, barracks, etc.).
- o Cooperative (interagency) enforcement teams.

- o Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP) that use highly "visible" teams of officers concentrated in designated areas.
- o Officers trained in special Drug Recognition Techniques.

Roadside sobriety checkpoints have provided the most effective documented results of any of the DWI enforcement strategies. Checkpoints raise the public's perception level concerning DWI and become a valuable deterrent if used in conjunction with a strong media campaign. Checkpoints do require significant resources, both personnel and equipment, and should be thoroughly planned prior to their use. To help you in deciding whether or not to use sobriety checkpoints, the NHTSA has developed a guidebook entitled, The Use of Sobriety Checkpoints for Impaired Driving Enforcement (see list of publication resources for reference number).

The use of in-car video recorders has proven to be a very effective strategy. Many agencies strongly advocate their use while other agencies have adopted the use of Preliminary Breath Testers (PBTs) for assisting officers in establishing probable cause for further testing.

To further strengthen any DWI enforcement program, it is strongly recommended that administrators consider training their personnel in use of the Standardized Field Sobriety Tests (SFSTs). Training in the proper use of the SFSTs will enhance the motivation of all patrol personnel and is a valuable asset to any DWI countermeasure program. Currently, 35 states have adopted the NHTSA-developed DWI Detection and SFST training course as mandatory training for all recruits. Five states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico use the NHTSA curriculum as part of their in-service training. (See catalog of available NHTSA training under list of publication resources.)

It has long been known that people who operate motor vehicles while impaired by alcohol kill and maim thousands of people each year but only recently has the magnitude of drug-impaired driving (cocaine, marijuana, PCP, etc.) surfaced. A progression of the SFST training program has been the implementation of advanced training in drug recognition. This program allows qualified officers (who have successfully completed the basic SFST course) to expand their newly acquired SFST skills by learning additional procedures in the form of a battery of tests (a series of clinical and psychological examinations) to assist them in determining possible drug or multi-drug use. The evidence used in this procedure provides valuable guidance to the laboratory in narrowing the

universe of drugs for which tests need to be performed, thus decreasing the cost of the analysis, and increasing the odds that the analysis will produce a positive result. The drug recognition program also aids in the conviction of these drivers, based on the testimony of the trained officers.

This training is also available through NHTSA. A pre-requisite for any officer interested in becoming a Drug Recognition Expert is to have successfully completed the basic SFST training program and to have been a SFST practitioner for a reasonable length of time. (See catalog of available NHTSA training under list of published resources.)

Drug-impaired driving can easily become an extension of any one of the alcohol-impaired enforcement strategies. The advantage of the drug recognition program is the ability of trained officers to probe deeper into instances of obviously impaired operation of a motor vehicle whenever the suspect's breath test reveals little or no evidence of alcohol consumption.

OCCUPANT PROTECTION

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA) and the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) support an aggressive safety belt and child safety seat enforcement program. Quite simply - it saves lives!

Some facts associated with occupant protection:

- o Safety belts are the most effective life-saving and injury-reducing device in all types of motor vehicle crashes.

Safety belt use could save 15,000 deaths and reduce more than 400,000 serious injuries each year.

- o Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death among small children and adolescents. Through the proper use of child safety seats or safety belts, the number of deaths and injuries to these individuals can be dramatically reduced.

- o Traffic crashes pose a greater threat to public safety than crime because:

- a murder is committed every 22 minutes, but someone dies in a car crash every 14 minutes.

seconds, but
seconds.
a year, but
billion a year.

- an aggravated assault takes place every 30
someone is injured in a car crash every 11
- violent crimes cost society over \$14 billion
traffic crashes cost society over \$100

- o Almost half of the law enforcement officers killed
while on duty are killed in motor
vehicle-related crashes.

The NSA, through the efforts of its Traffic Safety Committee, has identified safety belts as one of the most effective ways to reduce deaths and disabling injuries in a crash. The NSA strongly advocates that all sheriffs adopt and enforce a safety belt policy within their respective agencies. NSA underscores this position with its "Saved by the Belt" program.

NHTSA has supported the enforcement of child passenger safety laws since 1978 and safety belt laws since the enactment of the first law in June 1984. Since that time, studies conducted in several states (i.e., New York, Illinois and Texas) have revealed some interesting data. Of primary value is the data which showed that safety belt usage can only be increased through publicized enforcement. In addition, studies have shown that "blitz" or "STEP" program approaches are not the only programs that work. Integrating safety belt enforcement with other traffic enforcement programs (i.e., speed, DWI, child restraint use) result in greater and longer lasting gains in usage rates. These gains are achieved because officers make the effort to increase the motoring public's perception of enforcement.

Everything NHTSA and the NSA have learned to date on this issue indicates that visible enforcement of existing occupant protection laws offers the greatest potential for increasing safety belt use, thus reducing the unnecessary death and injury rate currently being experienced. Moreover, an occupant protection enforcement program offers sheriffs an "untapped" opportunity for becoming more involved within their communities in a positive manner. One of the most effective campaigns a sheriff can initiate is one that shows concern for constituents. If traffic safety is an issue in a community, then a sheriff, or any law enforcement official for that matter, can take advantage of the situation and turn it into a positive experience. (See under NHTSA publications Model Enforcement Program for Occupant Protection - A 7-Point Program for Increasing Safety Belt and Child Restraint Usage).

One of the key advantages of an occupant protection enforcement program is that it does not require the use of additional resources (equipment or personnel), nor does it require an increase in patrol hours (i.e., overtime, etc.). A policy to ticket safety belt or child restraint violations as part of an ongoing patrol activity can be subscribed to easily. Integrated enforcement can be

conducted in secondary law states as well as in primary law states (secondary safety belt laws restrict their enforcement to occasions when a vehicle is stopped for another traffic offense, while primary safety belt laws can be enforced at any time). Both activities can effectively increase occupant protection usage, even in situations where personnel resources have been diminished.

OCCUPANT PROTECTION ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES

The sheriff or law enforcement official of any community can have a significant effect in raising safety belt usage rates (thus decreasing the likelihood that motor vehicle occupants would be injured or killed in a crash) through two commonly used programs - "blitz" and "integrated" occupant protection enforcement.

o **BLITZ PROGRAMS.** Blitz programs, sometimes referred to as Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP), concentrate specifically on safety belt law usage for short periods of time (usually one or two weeks). Initial blitz enforcement programs were generally conducted only in "primary" law states, rather than "secondary" law states. Currently, blitz programs are being conducted in most jurisdictions with excellent results. However, one of the most important factors in either program has been the timing and intensity of the media effort. Two recent "blitz" technique enforcement studies (Albany and Elmira, New York) revealed their effectiveness. In Albany, the blitz raised safety belt usage rates 12 percentage points, while in Elmira usage rates were raised 28 percent.

o **INTEGRATED PROGRAMS.** Integrated safety belt enforcement programs combine other traffic safety enforcement activities with belt enforcement. As stated before, this type of program requires no additional personnel. It can be used in both primary and secondary law states. It has proven to be very

effective when combined with "safety check" techniques (used to detect unlicensed or suspended/revoked drivers, equipment violations, etc.). Road safety checks are an excellent forum to instruct occupants about the hazards associated with not using safety belts or child restraints and usually are not employed for purposes of issuing citations. Rather, they are used to inform the public about the benefits of occupant protection. This approach is an excellent public relations tool for sheriffs and encourages voluntary compliance among the motoring public. It can be targeted toward any driving population, i.e., youths, adults and/or the elderly.

Sheriffs or other law enforcement officials considering an occupant protection enforcement or public relations program must realize that without the full support and participation of sworn personnel, the general public will not be convinced to "buckle up." Of even greater concern for administrators should be the alarming number of crashes being experienced by their officers. Studies have underscored the fact that state police officers are involved in crashes at more than twice the rate of civilians, while urban and county officers crash more than 10 times as often as the public. Officer injuries occur in about one-fourth of these crashes, with an average loss of 23 workdays per injury (over one month off the job). When you compute the lost time and consider that crashes killed 42 police officers in 1990 (one-third of the total), administrators whose agencies do not have a safety belt use policy should seriously consider adopting such a policy.

Along with adopting a mandatory use policy, there is the need to train your personnel. Training programs can be informal: remarks and/or public statements by the sheriff, roll call reminders, periodic memos or messages, staff meetings and posters. Training programs can be formal, e.g. NHTSA Occupant Protection Usage and Enforcement (OPUE) course for line officers or a police risk management workshop for police executives. The OPUE course requires approximately 4-6 hours of training while the risk management course is about 4 and 1/2 hours long. (See catalog of NHTSA training under list of available resources).

3-10

AGGRESSIVE CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT (ACE)

The strategy of aggressive traffic enforcement as a means to deter criminal activity is not a new concept. Varieties of this programs are used by many police agencies. The project employed in South Carolina is modeled after the "Operation Nighthawk Program" used by the Georgia State Patrol. Aggressive Criminal Enforcement (ACE) techniques have been used in Georgia for many years, with outstanding results. Veteran Georgia State Troopers trained in ACE procedures speak highly of the program and how it rejuvenated their interest in traffic enforcement. However, ACE does not have the singular objective of traffic enforcement. Basically, it teaches officers to use traffic enforcement as a bridge to the detection of other criminal activity.

Because of the fact that the criminal's use of the automobile is well documented in this country (FBI Uniform Crime Report - 1990), ACE is an ideal program for sheriff's department personnel since it appeals to the natural instinct and interest of all law enforcement officers - catching crooks. The combination of aggressive traffic stop techniques with in-depth training to "look beyond the ticket" has proven to be an extremely successful way to raise the public's perception regarding traffic enforcement. The ultimate goal of any enforcement program is voluntary compliance. A well managed and active ACE program will achieve this goal.

SOUTH CAROLINA'S AGGRESSIVE CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

The ACE program in South Carolina began in May 1989 with a meeting of representatives from Sheriff agencies (13 counties having the worst crash fatality rates) and representatives from the other State highway safety disciplines (see Preface). Among the issues discussed at this meeting were: the extent of the problem; the resources available; the training and equipment that could be provided; media involvement; an incentive program; the evaluation system and the achievable benefits of the program - a better "quality of life" for individuals living or visiting in South Carolina.

Following the meeting, representatives from each law enforcement agency agreed to participate in one of three

traffic enforcement-related safety projects - a multiple enforcement project, a singular enforcement project or a passive project. Projects in the 13-county pilot test areas were designed to target rural or local roads for a four-month period - September 1 to December 31, 1989.

ACE training for the participants started immediately after the planning meeting in order to coincide with the purchase of the equipment needed to supplement their choice of program(s) e.g., radar sets, video cameras, etc. Although the pilot project was scheduled in 13 pre-selected counties there was a built-in option for expansion to other counties depending upon the results of the initial evaluation.

These evaluations, conducted in early 1990, were very encouraging. A county-by-county crash/injury/fatal comparison (same months, three years - 1987, 1988 and 1989) revealed decreases in most categories. Building on this positive report, the ACE program was expanded to include projects and training for deputies and officers from 21 additional counties and law enforcement agencies. It should be noted that, of the 28 counties now participating in the program, 12 sheriff departments had NEVER enforced traffic laws and/or were NEVER involved in a highway traffic safety program. Currently, as a result of the Rural Initiative program, five departments (Dorchester, Lancaster, Orangeburg, Pickens, and Darlington) in the "never" category have full time traffic enforcement units, while four other departments (Union, Newberry, Calhoun and Chester), which partially enforced traffic laws, have adopted full-time traffic units.

Although it's still growing, the Rural Initiative program in South Carolina currently involves 32 law enforcement agencies (28 Sheriff departments and four municipal police agencies). From these agencies a total of 179 sheriffs' deputies and municipal police officers have been trained in the ACE enforcement program and NHTSA's DWI Detection and Standardized Field Sobriety Testing and OPUE courses.

South Carolina's Rural Initiative experience is beginning to bear fruit. Statistics released by the South Carolina Office of Highway Safety (SCOHS) for the three-year period (1989-1991) reveals a significant reduction in deaths/injuries and fatalities (statewide). SCOHS reports there were 12,472 fewer crashes, 2,333 fewer injuries and 106 fewer fatalities in this three-year period. In the months September - December (the original pilot test period) a comparison of 1990 and 1991 data revealed 3,107 less (total) crashes. This was further broken down to 2,576 less property damage crashes, 502 less injury crashes and 29 less fatal crashes.

3-12

South Carolina's Rural Initiative experience has also had some successes that cannot be expressed statistically. Sheriffs' deputies involved in the program have seized scores of vehicles used to transport drugs and other contraband and have seized kilos of uncut cocaine, with a street value in the millions of dollars. Deputies have also seized hundreds of pounds of marijuana, recovered hundreds of thousands of dollars identified as drug-related monies, and have made numerous felony arrests of wanted subjects. Unrelated to the Rural Initiative project, but relevant to the successful enforcement experience agencies are having with the ACE program, is a report from the South Carolina Highway Patrol which details the accomplishments of its special 14-officer ACE unit. To date, in addition to issuing over 8,000 citations for various traffic violations, the Patrol has seized over \$300,000 in drug-related currency and various illegal drugs with a total street value of over \$800,000, captured 15 fugitives, and recovered 30 weapons.

Finally, one of the most impressive bits of information coming out of the State of South Carolina is the report that the Governor's Office of Highway Safety has a waiting list of over 50 law enforcement officers who desire to be trained in the ACE program. In addition, the South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy recently decided to make the ACE program required training for all future recruits.

ACE PROGRAM ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES

o Multiple enforcement strategy. This strategy incorporates into the ACE program all the major violations (i.e., speeding, DWI, occupant protection) which are used as the focus for the traffic stop. (Note: some agencies highly recommend including equipment violations as a viable component to this strategy. It has proven to be very successful).

Training needs for this type of program are more stringent. Officers need to be trained in the ACE program, and are required to be proficient in performance of the

SFSTs and use of radar, VASCAR, laser speed measuring devices, etc.

- o Singular enforcement strategy. This strategy would incorporate the identification of the single most serious traffic violation occurring within a jurisdiction, then targeting all available resources toward its reduction.

is ACE and The only training needed for this type of effort whatever single issue you wish to resolve.

o Passive enforcement strategy. This choice is not an enforcement strategy per se, nor does it involve using the ACE program concepts. However, it does involve a willingness by a law enforcement official to initiate a major public relations effort. This effort is directed toward the reduction of a serious community traffic safety problem. Program areas include erecting fatality awareness billboards, making public service announcements, using the print media, and/or addressing civic groups and/or high school assemblies.

The passive strategy offers to sheriffs an untapped source of exposure. By reaching out into the community and showing interest in a legitimate concern, sheriffs can increase their popularity base. Participation in passive type programs has also proved to be an essential first-step in the development of more active traffic enforcement programs.

Some examples of effective passive program strategies are:

o To conduct monthly presentations on educational traffic safety issues (safety belts, pedestrian problems, bicycles, etc.) to students, retirement communities and special interest groups.

Some successful occupant restraint programs are the Buckle Bear Program, Captain Click, Woody Woodpecker, Thumbs Up and Bucklewoman.

o To issue monthly a media release on specific traffic safety problems.

o To conduct monthly a traffic safety presentation which impacts persons in civic and community groups. These could include traffic safety exhibits at county fairs, high school sporting events and other special events.

o To conduct a cellular phone 9-1-1 campaign which reports drunk drivers. This effort may include the use of billboards, bus posters and bumper stickers.

o To develop localized traffic safety promotional materials to increase public awareness about specific issues. Items could include key chains, posters, badges, stickers, wrist bands, T-shirts, pledges, press kits and pamphlets.

o To conduct child restraint/safety belt use surveys at roadside checkpoints. No citations will be issued.

Personnel conducting the checkpoints should be trained to assist citizens in proper usage of seat belts and child restraints.

o To make monthly roll call training presentations for DWI, occupant restraints, or any other traffic safety issue.

CHAPTER IV

BUILDING COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

In order for traffic safety programs to be successful at the community level, support from elected officials and other community leaders is essential. This has been proven repeatedly in campaigns against impaired driving and attempts to initiate legislation to enact child safety seat and safety belt laws, and to reduce speeding. Without the support of influential leaders in the community, traffic safety programs and policies will not get enacted, implemented or enforced.

The societal costs of traffic crashes and the dramatic impact they have on local, state and Federal governments, both in terms of services provided and loss to employers, have already been addressed. However, many local elected officials may not realize the impact traffic safety has on their community - whether rural or urban, unless they have a traffic safety program in place or have faced a particular traffic-related crisis. As responsible law enforcement managers you have the tough job of convincing local leaders of the benefits (quality of life) of having traffic safety policies and programs. Further, it is important that you and other local officials are aware of not only the negative impact of crashes on the community, but what assistance is available to help your community prevent these crashes.

STATE ASSOCIATIONS

Efforts to build support for traffic safety programs among local elected officials can also result in benefits beyond the boundaries of their individual communities. Since most local officials participate in state associations representing cities, counties, regional councils or townships, law enforcement officials can build this support through the establishment or strengthening of relationships with these associations. Associations representing these officials can serve as helpful resources in gaining access to them.

4-1

LOCAL OFFICIALS

Local elected and appointed officials play a critical role in the enactment, implementation and enforcement of traffic safety initiatives. As a result of their roles as legislators and recognized leaders in the community, local officials can lend their support to rural traffic enforcement initiatives through:

- o Passage of policies, laws and ordinances.
- o Program development and funding, and,
- o Leadership.

Local leaders can also use their influence to coordinate traffic safety programs across state and local department lines by creating special offices or assigning individuals to handle specific issues. Despite the influential role that local elected officials can play in forging traffic safety projects and programs, these leaders typically do not access their community's traffic safety networks. Some of the obstacles a law enforcement administrator might encounter while trying to develop an effective traffic safety program are:

- o demands on limited time and resources of these officials.
- o demands by other competing constituency needs, and,
- o the natural turnover of elected officials and their staffs.

Although these obstacles to forging effective partnerships with local officials are formidable, they can be overcome. One of the ways to overcome these obstacles is to work through local government associations or public interest groups. There are several key public interest groups which represent local officials:

- o State Association of Counties.
- o State Municipal League.
- o State Association of Regional Councils, and,
- o State Association of Towns and Townships.

For example, Suffolk County, New York was the first county

in the State to submit a plan to use State special traffic funds to fight DWI. The County, led by the County executive and working through the State Association of Counties, initiated a comprehensive program of enforcement, education, prosecution, rehabilitation and public information to address the problem. This effort resulted in a decline of 35 percent in alcohol-related fatalities, a 50 percent increase in DWI arrests and a 40 percent increase in safety belt use.

Another example of local officials and law enforcement collaborating to reduce a serious traffic problem was reported in Indiana. Concerned that their county had the highest traffic crash rate of the seven counties surrounding Indianapolis, the Hamilton County prosecutor and the sheriff spearheaded the establishment of a Traffic Safety Task Force. Headed by a full-time executive director, the task force developed measures to address the County's traffic problems. Since its formation two years ago, safety belt use has risen from 28 percent to 68 percent, hazardous road sites have been identified and redesigned, thereby reducing or eliminating serious crashes at those sites.

STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH STATE ASSOCIATIONS OR LOCAL OFFICIALS

The following strategies highlight the actions a law enforcement official could take to work with state associations or elected officials when trying to generate interest and support for traffic safety initiatives:

- o Find out who the leaders are (lists are available through , state associations).
- o Make arrangements to meet with them.
- o Provide them with accurate, up-to-date data (emphasize the costs of these crashes both in human and economic terms). Include personal accounts of the costs of these tragedies, if available.
- o Compile as much information as possible about the program or policy options you are suggesting (detail the benefits).
- o Ask the elected official or state association for support for specific action. Begin on a small scale, support will broaden as public interest grows.
- o Attend meetings. These officials or associations are always looking for speakers for workshops or committee meetings. You could also volunteer to be a speaker. If

speaking is not an alternative, your presence offers the opportunity for informal discussions.

It may appear from these recommendations that it will take a great deal of effort for law enforcement officials to work with state and local officials. However, if you choose to work through state associations of local elected officials, you can easily and directly maximize their political support for your efforts. Through these contacts you can build the support needed at the local and state level to create, expand, or strengthen the development, implementation and enforcement of traffic safety policies and programs in your area.

PROMOTING BROAD BASED TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS: THE SHERIFF AS THE CATALYST FOR ACTION.

The traffic safety programs or actions recommended here are those which are more generic in nature and are such that the sheriff can not act alone. Rather, they require the sheriff to take a leadership position and to work in concert with others so as to articulate and/or facilitate the development of specific traffic safety programs.

In promoting broad based traffic safety programs, sheriffs are uniquely qualified:

- o They are elected officials acutely attuned to the needs of their constituents, so they must be concerned with highway safety.

- o They are often the most prominent elected official in the county, thus giving them a special status of office and unique leadership opportunities for making traffic enforcement an integral part of their portfolio.

Sheriffs have, at a minimum, two fundamental roles as it relates to traffic safety:

- (1) As elected officials they are enforcers of laws and codes of conduct and in many cases, first responders;

- (2) Also, by virtue of their election, they are in the position to encourage citizens and other officials and institutions to take positive actions in matters of concern, i.e., highway safety.

The programs outlined in this section go beyond the traditional mode of strict enforcement and those strategies designed to stop or curtail unsafe driving actions deemed unacceptable by constituents. These programs are more general and attempt to encourage action and public support. It is recommended, for maximum effectiveness, that they be implemented in conjunction with a neighboring sheriff, or better yet, through the state sheriff association. Implementation of any of these programs is an opportunity for a sheriff to mount a "campaign" of coalition building. In this light, the

programs are politically attractive and can generate positive citizen feedback. Taking the lead in the implementation of any one of these programs allows the sheriff to convene coalitions, thus becoming the catalyst of local traffic safety efforts and the coordinator of an important campaign which is in the public interest.

Railroad Grade Crossing Safety Program.

In 1991, 608 occupants of motor vehicles were killed in crashes with trains at rail-crossings. This is a particularly acute problem in rural areas. Accordingly, sheriffs in these areas should promote safety programs that use state-of-the-art materials on cross-bucks and track advance warning signs; use the latest advancement in pavement markings on approaches to these grade crossings, etc. This type of program can be accomplished in conjunction with federal, state and/or municipal departments of transportation or public works. In 1992, the National Sheriffs' Association adopted a resolution in this regard.

Vehicle Registration Systems.

The license plate is a critical law enforcement tool for apprehending criminals and for public safety identification purposes. Many states continue to authorize single plates. Sheriffs in those states should advocate, through their state legislatures and departments of motor vehicles, incorporation of two fully reflective license plates which are reissued at regularly scheduled intervals. The National Sheriffs' Association also supports this program.

Positive Guidance Highway Safety Programs.

Sheriffs can be the linchpin with state, county and local highway officials to facilitate the upgrading of signs, signals and road markings and to recommended specifications in order to produce positive guidance systems. It is estimated that 7,000 lives a year might be saved if such systems are adopted and implemented. In addition, positive guidance systems have been shown to be the most cost effective way to improve roadway traffic safety.

Bus Safety Programs.

The safe transportation of school-age children in buses presents unique safety challenges to sheriffs in rural communities. Sheriffs can work with elected school boards and state legislators to fund improved safety markings on buses, signs or in paved school bus loading zones. Passenger loading or discharge educational programs for drivers and students are available to PTA groups for board

of education meetings or school assemblies. Sheriffs can be instrumental in improving school bus safety by taking a strong public stand against violators.

Theme Vehicles.

The sheriff in Carson City County, Nevada was instrumental in obtaining a grant (Section 402 funds - see resources) to purchase a vehicle which displayed a traffic safety theme for specific periods of time depending on the seriousness of the problem. Deputies assigned to the "Theme Car" were tasked with the responsibility of enforcing the traffic regulations associated with the designated theme. This innovative program has been very effective in reducing traffic problems in his county and has attracted strong citizen approval.

RESOURCES

OVERVIEW

Sheriffs and/or other law enforcement officials contemplating a rural initiative traffic safety program should be aware of the many resources, whether in the form of financial assistance, publications or technical assistance, that are available.

FUNDING FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

Funding for highway safety programs is legislated by the Congress and delegated to the U.S. Department of Transportation to be administered by NHTSA and FHWA, through each state's Governor's Highway Safety Representative (GHSR) (see Appendix A-5 for current list). Monies for these program priorities (Section 402 highway safety funds) are distributed to the states according to population and road mileage, on a 60 percent (to state) and 40 percent (to local communities) split. Applications for funds are filed with the GHSR. Funded programs or projects that are approved by the GHSR are then forwarded to and reviewed by each NHTSA Regional Administrator (See Appendix A-4). Highway safety problems depicted in the project applications, must be thoroughly documented, as must be the intended solution to the problem. Some stipulations exist on the use of Section 402 monies. Therefore, if Federal dollars are needed to assist you in conducting one of these traffic enforcement programs, please contact your state's GHSR.

Among the programs available for Federal funding under the latest Congressional authorization are drunk driving enforcement, speed enforcement, occupant protection (including child restraint systems), motorcycle safety, and police traffic services. Including below (as headings under "Publications") are some of the topical program areas to be considered in conducting a rural initiative program. The program summaries include an overview of the problem and recommend enforcement strategies.

PUBLICATIONS

It is impossible to list all the publications that are available through the U.S. Department of Transportation's, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration or the Federal Highway Administration to assist law enforcement agencies develop or implement a traffic safety program. However, some of the more helpful publications are listed below:

1. General Program Topics

- o Building Support for Traffic Safety Programs - a Guide to Working with Local Government Associations, US DOT, NHTSA, no reference number.
- o Community Traffic Safety Programs, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 391, March 1989.
- o Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS), US DOT, NHTSA reference DOT HS 807 794, printed by December each year.
- o Highway Safety Priority Plan - Moving America Into The 21st Century, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 648, Sept. 1990
- o Highway Safety Program Advisories, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 655, December, 1990.
- o Law Enforcement Public Information, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 733, July, 1991.
- o Manual of Model Police Traffic Services - Policies and Procedures, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 806 906, January, 1986.

o Noteworthy State and Community Highway Safety Projects, US DOT, NHTSA, DOT HS 807 762, September, 1991.

o Traffic Safety Materials Catalog - FY 91 (Updated yearly), US DOT NHTSA, DOT HS 807 718, May, 1991.

o Traffic Safety Summit, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 561, April, 1990.

2. Traffic Safety Topic - Speed

o Beyond the Limits - A Guide to Speed Enforcement, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 802, February, 1992.

o Drone Radar Operational Guidelines - Final Report, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 753, August, 1991.

o Update of Enforcement Technology and Speed Measurement Devices, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 584, December, 1989.

3. Traffic Safety Topic - Impaired Driving

o Drunk Driving Laws and Enforcement - An Assessment of Effectiveness, American Bar Association, Criminal Justice Section, 1800 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. February, 1986.

o Drunk Driving Public Information Program Strategies and Planning Guide, developed by Professional Management Associates, 8830 Cameron Street, Silver Springs, MD 20910, for NHTSA, Office of Alcohol Countermeasures, Contract number 81-C-05093.

o Drug Evaluation and Classification Program - Briefing Paper, US DOT, NHTSA, May 1990, no reference number.

o DWI Detection and Standardized Field Sobriety Tests Training Program - Administrators Guide, US DOT, NHTSA, no reference number, available through the Office of Enforcement and

Emergency Services, Police Traffic Services
Division.

o Model Community Service Program for DWI Offenders,
US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 806 983, June,
1986.

o Safer Streets Ahead - A Community Handbook to
Prevent Impaired
Driving, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 651,
September,
1990.

o The Use of Sobriety Check Points For Impaired
Driving
Enforcement US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807
656, November, 1990.

4. Traffic Safety Topic - Occupant Protection

- o Model Enforcement Program for Occupant Protection - A 7-point Program for Increasing Safety Belt and Child Seat Usage, US DOT, NHTSA, no reference number, available through the Office of Occupant Protection.
- o Seat Belts and the Law: Mandatory Use Laws and the Legal Consequences of Non-Use, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 576, May, 1990.
- o Buckle Up For Love!, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 650, published yearly for Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week, (February).
- o Child Passenger Safety Resource Manual, US DOT, NHTSA, no reference number, 1992.

5. Miscellaneous Topics

- o Commercial Vehicle Enforcement: A Guide for Law Enforcement Managers, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 274, May 1988.
- o Highway Statistics (yearly), US DOT, FHWA, reference FHWA PL-91 003, published each year.
- o Police Personnel Allocation Manual and User's Guide, Sheriff's Departments, US DOT, NHTSA, reference DOT HS 807 788 and DOT HS 807 787, December, 1991.
- o Law Enforcement Public Information, A guide for law enforcement administrators for successful media relations, US DOT, HS 807 733, July 1991.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance in almost any topical area can be provided by the NHTSA's Office of Enforcement and Emergency Services, Police Traffic Services Division (NTS-41), 400 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., 20590, (202) 366 9837. Additional assistance can be provided by the NHTSA Regional Offices. NHTSA Regional Administrators are located in the following offices:

NHTSA Regional Offices:

- o Region I (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI and VT),
Transportation Systems
Center, Kendal Square Code 903, Cambridge, MA
02142, (617) 494
3427.

NHTSA Regional Offices (con't)

- o Region II (NY, NJ, PR and VI), 222 Mamaroneck Avenue, Room 204, White Plains, NY 10605, (914) 682-6162.
- o Region III (DE, DC, MD, PA, VA and WV), BWI Commerce Park, 7526 Connelley Drive, Suite L, Hanover, MD 21076-1699, (410) 768 7111.
- o Region IV (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, and TN), Suite 501, 1720 Peachtree Road, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30309, (404) 347 4537.
- o Region V (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH and WI), 18209 Dixie Highway, Suite A, Homewood, IL 60430, (708) 206 3300.
- o Region VI (AR, LA, NM, OK and TX), 819 Taylor Street, Room 8A38 Fort Worth, TX 76102-6177, (817) 334 4300.
- o Region VII (IA, KS, MO and NE), P.O. Box 412515, Kansas City, MO 64141, (816) 926 7887.
- o Region VIII (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT and WY), 555 Zang Street, 4th Floor, Denver, CO 80228, (303) 969 6917.
- o Region IX (American Samoa, AZ, CA, GU, HI, Northern Mariana Islands and NV), Suite 1000, 211 Main Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 774 3089.
- o Region X (AK, ID, OR and WA) 3140 Jackson Federal Building, 915 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98174, (206) 553 5934.

Governor's Highway Safety Representatives:

Requests for funding assistance for noteworthy traffic safety related enforcement projects should be directed to your State's Governor's Highway Safety Representative

(GHSR). Monies for these projects must be applied for in accordance with existing law and/or regulation. Congress appropriates monies under the stewardship of NHTSA for Section 402 of the Highway Safety Act. The Act details program emphasis areas. These monies are then apportioned to the states according to population and road mileage, on a 60 (state), 40 (local community) split. When applying for funding under this Section the applicant must address specific problems and the corrective action. Program(s) must thoroughly document goals and objectives in order to qualify for assistance. There is a filing due date for the application.

Listed below are the addresses and phone numbers for each state's GHSR:

Alabama - P.O. Box 5690, 401 Adams Avenue, Montgomery,
36103-5690,
(205) 242 8672.

Alaska - P.O. Box N, 450 Whittier Street, Juneau,
99811,
(907) 465 4322.

Arizona - 3010 N. Second Street, Suite 105, Phoenix,
85012,
(602) 223 2359.

Arkansas - 10324 Interstate 30, Little Rock 72203, (501)
569 2211

California - 700 Franklin Blvd., Suite 440, Sacramento,
95823,
(916) 445 0527

Colorado - 4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Denver 80222,
(303) 757 9201.

Connecticut - P.O. Box Drawer A, 24 Wolcott Hill Road,
Wethersfield
06109-0801, (203) 666 4343.

Delaware - P.O. Box 430, Dover 19901, (302) 739 5911.

District of Columbia - Frank D. Reeves Center, 2000 14th
Street, NW, 6th Floor, Washington 20009, (202) 939 8000.

Florida - 605 Suwannee Street, MS 57, Tallahassee
32399-0405,
(904) 922 5820.

Georgia - Equitable Building, 100 Peachtree Street,
Suite 2000,
Atlanta, 30303, (404) 656 6996.

Hawaii - 869 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu 96813, (808)
587 2150.

Idaho - State House Mail, Boise, 83720, (208) 344 2100

Illinois - P.O. Box 19245, 3215 Executive Drive,
Springfield

62794-9245, (217) 782 4972.

Indiana - Room 206, State House, Indianapolis 46204,
(317) 232 2588.

Iowa - Wallace State Office Building, Des Moines, 50319,
(515) 281 5104.

Kansas - Docking State Office Building, 7th Floor,
Topeka 66612,
(913) 296 3461.

Kentucky - KSP Headquarters, 919 Versailles Road,
Frankfort 40601-9980, (502) 695 6300.

Louisiana - P.O. Box 66336, Baton Rouge 70896, (504) 925
6991.

Maine - 36 Hospital Street, State House Station #42,
Augusta 04333,
(207) 582 8776.

Maryland - P.O. Box 8755, BWI Airport, Baltimore
21240-0755,
(410) 859 7397.

Massachusetts - 100 Cambridge Street, Room 2104,
Saltonstall State
Office Building, Boston 02202, (617) 727

5073.

Michigan - 300 South Washington Square, Knapps Center,
Suite 300,
Lansing, 48913, (517) 334 5210.

Minnesota - 211 Transportation Building, St Paul 55155,
(612) 296 6642.

Mississippi - 301 West Pearl Street, Jackson 39203-3085,
(601) 949 2225.

Missouri - 311 Ellis Blvd., P.O. Box 104808, Jefferson
City,
65101-4808, (314) 751 7643.

Montana - 1310 East Lockey, Helena, 59620, (406) 444
3412.

Nebraska - P.O. Box 94612, Lincoln, 68509, (402) 471
3900.

Nevada - 555 Wright Way, Carson City, 89711-0090, (702)
687 5375.

New Hampshire - Pine Inn Plaza, 117 Manchester Street,
Concord, 03301, (603) 271 2131.

New Jersey - Department of Law and Public Safety, CN 048,
Trenton,
08625, (609) 588 3750.

New Mexico - P.O. Box 1149, Santa Fe, 87504-01149, (505)
827 5109.

New York - Swan Street Building, Empire State Plaza,
Albany, 12228,
(518) 474 0841.

North Carolina - 215 East Lane Street, Raleigh, 27601,
(919) 733 3083.

North Dakota - 608 East Boulevard Avenue, Bismarck,
58505-0700,
(701) 224 2581.

Ohio - P.O. Box 7167, 240 Parsons Avenue, Columbus,
43266-0563,
(614) 466 3383 or 2550.

Oklahoma - Ward Transportation Building, 3A6, 200 N.E.
21st Street
Oklahoma City, 73105, (405) 521 3314.

Oregon - 135 Transportation Building, Salem, 97310,
(503) 378 6388.

Pennsylvania - 1200 Transportation and Safety Building,
Harrisburg
17120, (717) 787 3928.

Rhode Island - State Office Building, Smith Street,
Providence, 02903, (401) 277 2481.

South Carolina - Division of Public Safety, 1205 Pendelton
Street,
Room 412, Columbia, 29201, (803) 734

0421.

South Dakota - 910 East Sioux, State Capitol Building,
Pierre, 57501, (605) 773 3178.

Tennessee - 505 Deaderick Street, Suite 700, James K.
Polk State
Office Building, Nashville, 37243-0341,
(615) 741 2848.

Texas - 125 East 11th Street, Austin, 78701-2483, (512)
465 6751.

Utah - 4501 South 2700 West, Salt Lake City, 84119,
(801) 965 4463.

Vermont - 120 State Street, Montpelier, 05603-001, (802)
828 2011.

Virginia - P.O. Box 27412, 2300 West Broad Street,
Richmond, 23269,
(804) 367 6602.

Washington - 1000 South Cherry Street, MS/PD-11, Olympia,
98504,
(206) 753 6197.

West Virginia - 1204 Kanawha Boulevard, East, Charleston,
25301,
(304) 348 8814.

Wisconsin - 4802 Sheboygan Avenus, Suite 120B, Madison,
53707-7910,
(608) 266 1113.

Wyoming - P.O. Box 1708, Cheyenne, 82002-9019, (307)

777 4450

Puerto Rico - P.O. Box 41269, Minillas Station, Santurce,
00940,

(809) 726 6670.

APPENDIX B

THE SOUTH CAROLINA EXPERIENCE

Enclosed for reader information are data compiled by the South Carolina Office of Highway Safety from the counties which participated in this two-year project. Although this data shows diminishing trends in crash, injury and fatality incidents (in most of the counties) caution is advised in any interpretation of this information since it does not meet statistically acceptable guidelines and is inconclusive at this time.

These data are separated into "PHASE I" (data from the 12 agencies involved in the pilot project) pages B-1 through B-20, and "PHASE II" (expanded effort involving 21 agencies) pages B-21 through B-42.

APPENDIX B

THE SOUTH CAROLINA EXPERIENCE - PHASE II

APPENDIX C

SUPPORT MATERIALS - CITATION FLIER

APPENDIX D

CADRE AND THE CRASH OUTCOME DATA EVALUATION SYSTEM (CODES)
PROGRAM