

December 2008

**Evaluation of the 2008 Labor Day
You Drink & Drive. You Lose. Campaign
August 1 - September 15, 2008**

For more information please contact:

**Illinois Department of Transportation
Division of Traffic Safety
Evaluation Unit
3215 Executive Park Drive
P.O. Box 19245
Springfield, Illinois 62794**

Illinois Department of Transportation

Division of Traffic Safety

Evaluation Unit

The Evaluation Unit within the Division of Traffic Safety in the Illinois Department of Transportation focuses on evaluation and monitoring of various highway safety projects and programs in Illinois. The Evaluation Unit conducts research and analyses that enhance the safety and efficiency of transportation by understanding the human factors that are important to transportation programs in Illinois. The main functions of the Unit include the following:

1. Develop an in-depth analysis of motor vehicle related fatalities and injuries in Illinois using several crash related databases (Crash data, FARS, Trauma Registry, and Hospital data, state and local police data).
2. Develop measurable long term and short term goals and objectives for the Highway Safety Program in Illinois using historical crash related databases.
3. Evaluate each highway safety project with an enforcement component (e.g., Traffic Law Enforcement Program, Local Alcohol Program, IMaGE and MAP projects) using crash and citation data provided by local and state police departments.
4. Evaluate several highway safety programs (e.g., Occupant Protection and Alcohol). This involves evaluating the effects of public policy and intervention programs that promote safe driving.
5. Design and conduct annual observational safety belt and child safety seat surveys for Illinois. This survey is based on a multi-stage random selection of Interstate Highways, US/IL Highways, and several local and residential streets.
6. Provide results of research and evaluation as well as annual enforcement activities to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) as part of the Federal Requirements of State Highway Safety Program in Illinois.
7. Provide statistical consultation to other Sections at the Division of Traffic Safety and other Divisions at IDOT.
8. Publish results of all research and evaluation at the Division and place them as PDF files at IDOT's Website.

Using statewide public opinion survey of Illinois licensed drivers, this report evaluates the impact the “*You Drink & Drive. You Lose*” (a highly visible, massive enforcement effort designed to detect violators of Illinois traffic laws with special emphasis on alcohol) on drinking and driving issues during the August 2008 mobilization in Illinois. The main alcohol issues include self-reported belt use, motorists’ opinion and awareness of the existing local and state alcohol enforcement programs, such as roadside safety checks, drunken driving laws, and alcohol related media programs and slogans.

The report was compiled and prepared by the Evaluation staff. Comments or questions may be addressed to Mehdi Nassirpour, Ph.D., Chief of Evaluation Unit, Bureau of Administrative Services, Division of Traffic Safety, Illinois Department of Transportation, 3215 Executive Park Drive, Springfield, Illinois 62794-9245.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
<i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Program Model.....	1
Alcohol / Motor Vehicle Related Injuries and Fatalities	2
Report Objectives	4
2008 Labor Day <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Campaign in Illinois: Timeline of Activities	5
Media & Enforcement Results	7
Media	8
Earned Media.....	8
Paid Media	9
Enforcement	10
Illinois State Police.....	10
Local Police Agencies.....	12
Non-Funded Earned Enforcement	12
Cost / Effectiveness Analysis of YDDYL Enforcement Activities	15
Illinois State Police.....	15
Local Enforcement	15
Limitations of Enforcement Data	17
Evaluation	18
Overview of Telephone Survey Findings	19
Statewide Telephone Survey	22

Appendix

Appendix A: <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> 2008 Enforcement Activities and Associated Costs.....	42
--	----

List of Diagrams

Diagram 1: 2008 <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Campaign Timeline	6
---	---

List of Figures

Figure 1: Theoretical Model of <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Campaign.	2
Figure 2: Percent Belted Occupants Among Fatally Injured in Motor Vehicle Crashes by Time of Day in Illinois in 2007	3
Figure 3: Percent Alcohol Related Fatalities and Percent Belted Occupants by Time of Day in Illinois in 2007	3
Figure 4: Total Patrol Hours Per Citation by Citation Type During 2008 <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Campaign in Illinois	10
Figure 5: Map of Roadside Safety Checks and Saturation Patrols During the 2008 <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Campaign	14
Figure 6: Awareness of <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Slogan in Illinois	20

List of Tables

Table 1: Earned Media Items Obtained During the YDDYL Campaign by Media Market	8
Table 2: Labor Day <i>You Drink & Drive. You Lose.</i> Campaign: Cost of Paid Media by Media Market	9
Table 3: Summary Results of Enforcement Activities	11
Table 4: Enforcement Activities and Associated Costs by Type of Grantee	16
Table 5: MINI-Grantees Enforcement and Associated Costs	42
Table 6: Regular Grantees with Single Grants Enforcement and Associated Costs	44
Table 7: Regular Grantees with Multiple Grants Enforcement and Associated Costs	47
Table 8: All Grant Enforcement and Associated Costs	51

Executive Summary

You Drink & Drive. You Lose. (YDDYL) is a highly visible, massive enforcement effort designed to detect violators of Illinois traffic laws with special emphasis on alcohol. An intense public information and education campaign runs concurrently with an enforcement blitz to inform the motoring public of the consequences of drinking and driving. During the campaign the YDDYL message is repeated in the media and enforcement of DUI laws are stepped up. The goal of the campaign is to save lives and reduce injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes by reducing the incidence of drinking and driving in Illinois.

The 2008 Labor Day YDDYL mobilization was conducted from August 1 to September 15, 2008. There were 155 local law enforcement agencies and the Illinois State Police which participated in the statewide campaign. There were an additional 18 agencies which just submitted citation information. Data presented in this report indicate the campaign was successful. Enforcement results and an in-depth evaluation of the campaign are included in this report.

MEDIA

1. The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) / Division of Traffic Safety (DTS) held four press conferences (Chicago, Belleville (Metro East), Springfield, and Rockford) throughout the state on August 18, 2008.
2. Law enforcement agencies participating in the Labor Day campaign reported 118 print stories, 36 radio stories, and 11 TV news stories were generated as a result of the Labor Day campaign enforcement efforts. Furthermore, the following earned media items were generated during the 2008 YDDYL campaign: 399 announcements were made, 49 banners were displayed, 2,673 posters/flyers were distributed, 30 presentations were given, 320 press releases were issued, and 24 public access messages were made.
3. In an effort to help reduce alcohol related crashes and fatalities on roadways, IDOT/DTS created a public service announcements titled "Loser." The public service announcement titled "Loser" portrayed DUI offenders at different stages in their lives. This was done to demonstrate how a DUI can permanently brand a person's image for life.
4. DTS Director Mike Stout participated in a series of radio interviews that played on about 11 stations across the state to remind motorists not to drink and drive.
5. IDOT/DTS spent \$792,357 on broadcast television, cable and radio to promote the National YDDYL campaign beginning August 18 and ending August 30, 2008.

ENFORCEMENT

6. One hundred fifty-eight (158) local law enforcement agencies and all Illinois State Police (ISP) districts participated and provided complete enforcement activities for the 2008 Labor Day alcohol mobilization. A total of 172 roadside safety checks (RSCs) and 774 saturation patrols were conducted during the August 25 to September 7, 2008 enforcement period. An additional 18 non-funded earned enforcement agencies just submitted citation information.

7. Local law enforcement and ISP logged a total of 24,498 patrol hours and issued 31,625 citations during the Labor Day campaign. One citation was written every 46.5 minutes of enforcement.
8. Local law enforcement and ISP issued 616 DUI and alcohol-related citations. One alcohol-related citation was written every 39.8 hours of enforcement. An additional 143 DUI and alcohol-related citations were written by non-funded earned enforcement agencies that did not submit patrol hours.
9. A total of 8,956 citations were issued for safety belt and child passenger safety seat violations during the Labor Day campaign resulting in an average of one occupant restraint violation every 2.7 hours. An additional 469 safety belt and child safety seat citations were written by non-funded earned enforcement agencies that did not submit patrol hours.

COST EFFECTIVENESS OF ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

10. The agencies included in the YDDYL cost / effectiveness analysis conducted a total of 23,767.3 patrol hours and issued 30,633 citations at a total cost of \$1,231,619.37. On average, citations were written every 46.6 minutes of enforcement at a cost of \$40.21 per citation, or \$51.82 per patrol hour. Furthermore, these agencies wrote 571 DUIs during the campaign, which was 1.9 percent of total citations issued.
11. Thirty-two (32) RSC mini-grantees issued one citation every 68.3 minutes. The cost per citation for these agencies was \$38.47 and cost per patrol hour was \$38.47. Sixty-two regular grantees issued one citation every 43.1 minutes. The cost per citation for these agencies was \$36.14 and the cost per patrol hour was \$50.34. Forty-seven grantees with multiple grants issued one citation every 41.8 minutes. The cost per citation for these agencies was \$35.42 and the cost per patrol hour was \$50.80. The Illinois State Police issued one citation every 84.2 minutes. The cost per citation for the ISP was \$101.57 and cost per patrol hour was \$72.37.
12. The enforcement data (such as total number of patrol hours and total citations) provided by the local agencies should be interpreted with caution since the calculated indicators, such as cost per patrol hour or cost per citation, and/or citation written per X minutes vary substantially across selected local agencies.

TELEPHONE SURVEY

Perceptions of DUI Enforcement

13. When asked hypothetically "If you drove after having too much to drink to drive safely, how likely do you think you are to be stopped by a police officer?", 33 percent of recent drinkers indicated the likelihood of being stopped is "almost certain" or "very likely".
14. Three-quarters (73 percent) of those surveyed in September reported seeing "about the same police presence on the roads they normally travel", while 23 percent reported seeing police "more often".
15. When asked "Compared to three months ago, do you think a driver who had been drinking is now more likely to be stopped by police, less likely to be stopped, or is this

about the same?" the percentage of people who said "more likely to be stopped" was 32 percent during the September survey. Results from the June survey were similar.

16. The percentage of respondents in the Chicago suburbs who believed a driver who had been drinking was "more likely to be stopped" decreased from 32.4 percent in June to 29.9 percent in September. On the other hand, in the southern Illinois, this percentage increased from 31.3 percent to 34.9 percent from June to September.

Roadside Safety-Checks

17. In the Chicago suburbs awareness levels of roadside safety checks decreased from 38 percent in June to 30 percent in September. In the southern part of Illinois, this percentage decreased only from 44 percent in June percent to 34 percent in September.
18. Most September respondents aware of roadside safety checks attribute their awareness to television, friends/relatives, and newspapers (awareness for all three of these sources was 26 to 27 percent) and radio (22 percent). Those respondents who heard about roadside safety-checks via television, newspaper, or radio learned most from news stories verses advertisements (97 percent versus 10 percent for newspapers; 71 percent versus 37 percent for television; and 78 percent versus 28 percent for radio).
19. Analysis among those who were aware of roadside safety checks by region. The percent of applicable respondents who had personally seen a check was 52 percent in the Chicago metro regions and about 37 percent for the downstate regions.
20. The percentage of respondents who indicated having personally seen roadside safety checks rose from 23 seven percent in June to a substantially higher 15 percent in the September survey.

Awareness of "DUI" Roadside Safety Check.

21. The percent who indicated that, "in the past (thirty) days," they had "seen or heard anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks that were used primarily to check for alcohol impaired driving," increased from 22 percent in June to nearly 26 percent in September.
22. Telephone surveys found that the percent of people who indicated that in the past (thirty) days, they had "read, seen, or heard anything about alcohol-impaired driving in Illinois," increased statewide from 66 percent in June to 71 percent in September. This change was more evident in downstate Illinois where the percentage increased from 67 percent in June to 76 percent in September. In the Chicago metro areas awareness rose from 65 percent in June to 69 percent in September. Of those telephone respondents who had heard or seen messages about alcohol-impaired driving, by far the greatest exposure source was television (79 percent).

Awareness of the You Drink & Drive. You Lose Slogan

23. In June of 2003, 55 percent of those surveyed were familiar with the YDDYL slogan. The September 2008 survey indicated those familiar with the slogan had risen to 75 percent.

24. September 2008 survey results show awareness levels for the YDDYL slogan were at 78 percent for downstate Illinois and 80 percent for the Chicago Metro region. From May to September, awareness in the Chicago suburbs increased by twelve percentage points from 75 percent in May to 80 percent in September.

Evaluation of the 2008 Labor Day *You Drink & Drive. You Lose.* Campaign August 1 - September 15, 2008

Introduction

You Drink & Drive. You Lose. (YDDYL) is a highly visible, massive enforcement effort designed to detect violators of Illinois traffic laws with special emphasis on alcohol. An intense public information and education campaign runs concurrently with an enforcement blitz to inform the motoring public of the consequences of drinking and driving. During the campaign the YDDYL message is repeated in the media and enforcement of DUI laws are stepped up. The goal of the campaign is to save lives and reduce injuries resulting from motor vehicle crashes by reducing the incidence of drinking and driving in Illinois. The YDDYL mobilization includes the following components:

1. Earned Media¹
2. Paid Media
3. Enforcement
4. Evaluation


The 2008 Labor Day YDDYL mobilization was conducted from August 1 to September 15, 2008 with a special focus on impaired driving.

You Drink & Drive. You Lose. Program Model

YDDYL is a model of the social marketing program that combines enforcement with communication outreach (paid and earned media). The main message regarding the benefits of not drinking and driving is not only to save lives and prevent injuries, but to keep people from getting tickets by the police. Several alcohol-related laws, such graduated licensing and .08 laws were passed by the Illinois legislature in the past that made it possible for police to stop and ticket motorists who did not obey the law. As part of the YDDYL campaign, several road side safety checks and saturation plans are conducted by local and state police departments throughout the state where motorists are stopped and checked for alcohol.

¹ Earned media is coverage by broadcast and published news services. Earned media generally begins one-week before paid media, two weeks before enforcement, and continues throughout other phases of the program. An earned media event, like a press conference and press release, typically is used to announce the ensuing enforcement program.

The components of the YDDYL model are paid and earned media paired with local and state enforcement to increase the public's awareness of the consequences of drinking and driving. These variables work together to reduce injuries and fatalities. **Figure 1** shows the components of the YDDYL model.



Alcohol / Motor Vehicle Related Injuries and Fatalities

The relationship between drunk driving and fatalities has been well documented in the literature (FARS, 2007). The severity of a motor vehicle crash increases when the driver is impaired. Individuals who drive while impaired are more likely to drive recklessly and become involved in fatal crashes. Plus, impaired drivers are less likely to use safety belts, thereby increasing their own risk for serious injury in a crash.

Figure 2 shows the percentage of restraint use among occupants of vehicles who were killed by time of day. As shown in this graph, only a small percentage of those who were killed between midnight and 4:00AM, were wearing their safety belts.





Figure 3 depicts the percentage of belted occupants and the percentage of alcohol related fatalities by time of day. According to this graph, there is a negative relationship between the percentage of belted occupants and the percentage of alcohol related deaths, especially during nighttime hours. This indicates that the nighttime safety belt usage rate among those who drink and drive is very low.



Report Objectives

The purpose of this technical report is to provide details of the activities, costs, and available outcomes of the 2008 Labor Day YDDYL campaign. The objectives of this report are:

- To provide a summary of earned and paid media activities prior to and following the Labor Day YDDYL campaign.
- To provide a detailed summary of enforcement activities during the campaign.
- To provide costs and effectiveness of enforcement activities.
- To determine Illinois residents' views and opinions regarding alcohol impaired driving and enforcement.

The evaluation of this campaign includes process and outcome measures. The process measures include documenting the activities associated with the program publicities (earned and paid media) and enforcement activities during the campaign. The only immediate statewide outcome measure that was used in this study was the pre and post telephone surveys of Illinois drivers. The main and ultimate outcome measure of the campaign is based on the actual alcohol related fatalities and injuries before and after the campaign. Unfortunately, the current fatal and injury crash data are not yet available to measure the true impact of the YDDYL campaign on fatalities and injuries. Once fatal and injury data are available to users, a comparison will be made between crash data during this campaign and the data for the same time period in previous years.


2008 Labor Day *You Drink & Drive. You Lose.* Campaign in Illinois: Timeline of Activities

In August 2008, IDOT Division of Traffic Safety launched a statewide YDDYL campaign. In coordination with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and state, county and local law enforcement agencies, the program set out to crack down on drunk drivers across the state by means of a highly publicized enforcement campaign of impaired driving laws. As illustrated in **Diagram 1**, YDDYL activities began August 1 and concluded September 18, 2007.

The following activities took place during the campaign:

- August 8 – September 25, 2008: Earned media was obtained, including four press conferences held August 18 in Belleville, Chicago, Rockford, and Springfield.
- August 17 – September 7, 2008: Paid media advertisements promoting YDDYL ran from August 17 to 31. Highly publicized strict enforcement of the impaired driving laws was conducted from August 25 to September 7.
- September 2 – September 24, 2008: Post statewide telephone public opinion surveys were conducted.

Diagram 1: 2008 *You Drink & Drive. You Lose.* Campaign Timeline



MEDIA & ENFORCEMENT RESULTS

Media

Earned Media

IDOT/DTS held four press conferences (Chicago, Belleville (Metro East), Springfield, and Rockford) throughout the state on August 18, 2008. **Table 1** lists the earned media items obtained during the YDDYL campaign by media markets which conducted press conferences, as well as the articles and stories generated from the publicity.

Table 1: Earned Media Items Obtained During the YDDYL campaign by Media Market

Media Market	Print News Stories	Radio News Stories	TV News Stories	Announcements	Banners	Posters / Flyers	Presentations	Press Release Issued	Public Access Msgs.
Chicago	76	24	2	366	31	517	28	5	17
Metro East	12	3	3	12	3	2	0	18	4
Springfield / Champaign	3	2	2	8	3	123	0	9	0
Rockford	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0
Media Markets which did not conduct a YDDYL Press Conference	27	7	3	13	12	2031	2	31	3
TOTAL	118	36	11	399	49	2673	30	320	24

In addition to the coverage generated by the press conferences, our law enforcement grantees are required to submit articles in their local press regarding enforcement that they are planning. Law enforcement agencies participating in our Labor Day campaign reported 118 print stories, 36 radio stories, and 11 TV news stories were generated as a result of the YDDYL enforcement efforts. Furthermore, the following earned media items were generated during the 2008 YDDYL campaign: 399 announcements were made, 49 banners were displayed, 2,673 posters/flyers were distributed, 30 presentations were given, 320 press releases were issued, and 24 public access messages were made.

In an effort to help reduce alcohol related crashes and fatalities on roadways, IDOT/DTS created a public service announcements titled “Loser.” The public service announcement titled “Loser” portrayed DUI offenders at different stages in their lives. This was done to demonstrate how a DUI can permanently brand a person’s image for life.

Finally, DTS Director Mike Stout participated in a series of radio interviews that played on approximately 11 stations across the state to remind motorists not to drink and drive.

Paid Media

Paid alcohol enforcement messages are aired repeatedly during the YDDYL campaign publicity period. Messages are focused on enforcement, reminding motorists to not drink and drive. YDDYL paid advertisement campaigns usually last two weeks. During this period, television and radio advertisements air extensively. Paid media targeted the YDDYL message in the 23 specified counties in Illinois where about 85 percent of population resides and 70 percent of motor vehicle crashes occur. Top-rated stations and programming were chosen based on Arbitron and Nielson ratings systems focusing on the 18-34 year old African-American, Hispanic and rural male demographic.

IDOT/DTS spent \$792,357 on broadcast television, cable and radio to promote the National YDDYL campaign beginning August 17 and ending August 31, 2008. **Table 2** lists the cost of paid media by media market for the YDDYL campaign.

**Table 2: Labor Day You Drink & Drive. You Lose. Campaign
Cost of Paid Media by Media Market**


Media Market	Dollars Spent – TV	Ads Ran - TV	Dollars Spent – Radio	Ads Ran - Radio	Total Dollars Spent	Total Ads Ran
Chicago	\$ 288,797.40	5,646	\$299,407.50	2,226	\$ 588,204.90	7,872
Davenport	\$ 14,577.30	274	\$ 10,096.20	471	\$ 24,673.50	867
Peoria	\$ 13,274.10	456	\$ 12,499.20	682	\$ 25,773.30	1,138
Springfield	\$ 14,657.05	1,430	\$ 16,843.50	1,331	\$ 31,500.55	2,761
Rockford	\$ 12,423.60	228	\$ 9,558.00	639	\$ 21,981.60	867
Metro East	\$ 16,263.00	260	\$ 15,493.50	305	\$ 31,756.50	565
Total TV & Radio	\$ 359,992.45	8,294	\$ 363,897.90	5,654	\$ 723,890.35	14070
Internet	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 68,466.37	See Note*
Total Dollars Spent	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$792,356.72	N/A

*Note: Internet advertising was done through the following websites: Facebook, My Space, WKSC-Webpage, WFLD-Webpage, and Comcast.net. It was estimated that more than 15 million ad impressions (website hits with the CIOT banner) occurred during the CIOT campaign.

Enforcement

The *You Drink & Drive. You Lose. (YDDYL)* Labor Day campaign lasted two weeks. During this period, zero-tolerance enforcement focusing on alcohol violations was carried out statewide. A summary of the enforcement activities over the two week campaign appears in **Table 3**. One hundred fifty-eight (158) local law enforcement agencies and all Illinois State Police (ISP) districts participated in the 2008 Labor Day alcohol mobilization. There were an additional 18 non-funded earned enforcement agencies which just submitted citation information. A total of 172 roadside safety checks and 774 saturation patrols were conducted during the August 25 to September 7, 2008 enforcement period.

Local law enforcement and ISP logged a total of 24,497 patrol hours and issued 31,625 citations during the campaign. One citation was written every 46.5 minutes of enforcement. Local law enforcement and ISP issued a combined total of 616 DUI citations, an average of one DUI citation written every 39.8 patrol hours. A total of 8,956 citations were issued for safety belt and child passenger safety seat violations resulting in an average of one occupant restraint violation written every 2.7 patrol hours. **Figure 4** depicts the number of hours of Labor Day YDDYL patrol per citation by citation type.



Illinois State Police Enforcement

All Illinois State Police Districts participated in statewide CIOT enforcement, covering 98 of Illinois' 102 counties. ISP conducted 2,603 hours of enforcement including 42 roadside safety checks and 44 saturation patrols. Of the total 1,855 citations issued by the ISP, one hundred

Table 3: Summary Results of Enforcement Activities

Selected Enforcement Activities	Agencies that Participated and Submitted Complete Enforcement Data					Non-Funded Agencies that Participated and Submitted Only Alcohol, Safety Belt and Child Safety Seat Citations (n=18)	GRAND TOTAL
	Local Police Agencies (n=142)	Non-Funded Earned Enforcement Agencies (n=16)	Local Agencies Total	ISP	Statewide Total		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Number of Enforcement Hours	21,165	729	21,894	2,604	24,498	NA	NA
Number of Roadside Safety Checks	117	13	130	42	172	NA	NA
Number of Saturation Patrols	625	105	730	44	774	NA	NA
Total Citations	28,784	986	29,770	1,855	31,625	3,847	35,472
One Citation Written Every X Minutes of Enforcement	44.1	44.4	44.1	84.2	46.5	NA	NA
Number of DUI & Alcohol Related Citations	456	35	491	125	616	143	759
DUI / Alcohol Related Citation Written Every X Hours	46.4	20.8	44.6	20.8	39.8	NA	NA
Safety Belt / Child Safety Seat Citations	8,332	315	8,647	430	8,956	469	9,425
Safety Belt / Child Safety Seat Citations Every X Hours	2.5	2.3	2.5	6.1	2.7	NA	NA

Column 1: Lists the types of enforcement activities conducted during the YDDYL campaign.

Column 2: The Local Police Agencies includes all DTS grantees (mini and year-long) that participated in the YDDYL campaign.

Column 3: Non-Funded Earned Enforcement Agencies includes all agencies which did not receive funding from DTS, but submitted both enforcement hours and citation information to DTS.

Column 4: The Local Agencies Total combines the information from the Local Police Agencies (column 2) and the Non-Funded Earned Enforcement Agencies (column 3).

Column 5: The ISP includes all enforcement conducted by the Illinois State Police during the YDDYL campaign.

Column 6: The Statewide Total combines the information from the Local Agencies Total (column 4) and the ISP (column 5).

Column 7: Includes citation information from those agencies which participated on their own, did not receive any funding from DTS, and only submitted citation information.

Column 8: The Grand Total is the sum of enforcement activities from the Local Agencies Total (column 4), the ISP (column 5), and the Non-Funded Earned Enforcement Agencies (column 7). The Grand Total was only calculated for Total Citations, Number of DUI & Alcohol-Related Citations, and Safety Belt / Child Safety Seat Citations.

twenty-five (125) were DUI and alcohol-related citations and 430 were safety belt and child safety seat citations. On average ISP wrote one DUI citation for every 20.8 patrol hours and one safety belt / child safety seat citation for every 8.4 patrol hours.

Local Enforcement

Local police agencies worked 21,894 hours on Labor Day alcohol enforcement, conducting 130 roadside safety checks and 730 saturation patrols. **Figure 5** features a map identifying the number of agencies that conducted enforcement during the You Drink & Drive. You Lose. campaign by county. A total of 29,770 citations were written by local law enforcement agencies, or one citation was written every 44.6 minutes of enforcement. Four hundred ninety-two (491) DUI citations were issued, or one DUI citation was written every 44.6 patrol hours. In addition, 8,647 occupant restraint violations were issued for failure to wear a safety belt or failure to properly restrain a child in a safety seat, an average of one occupant protection citation every 2.5 patrol hours. Total estimated enforcement cost was **\$1,324,349**.

One hundred forty-two (142) local police agencies which had a grant with DTS participated in the YDDYL enforcement. These agencies conducted a total of 117 roadside safety checks and 625 saturation patrols logging a total of 21,165 patrol hours and issuing 28,784 citations. One citation was written for every 44.1 minutes of patrol by local officers during statewide enforcement. These agencies issued 456 DUI and alcohol-related citations and 8,332 safety belt and child safety seat citations. One DUI / alcohol-related citation was issued for every 46.4 patrol hours and one safety belt / child safety seat citation was written for every 2.5 patrol hours.

There were 16 local police agencies which participated on their own and did not receive funding from DTS. Although they were not required to submit all of this information, these agencies submitted both enforcement hours and citation information. They conducted a total of 35 roadside safety checks and 105 saturation patrols logging 729 patrol hours and issuing 986 citations. They issued 35 DUI and alcohol-related citations and 315 safety belt and child safety seat citations. They averaged one DUI / alcohol-related citation for every 20.8 patrol hours and one safety belt / child safety seat citation for every 2.3 patrol hours.

Non-Funded Earned Enforcement

There were 18 additional agencies which participated in the YDDYL mobilization without receiving any funding from IDOT. Since these agencies participated in the campaign using their own money, they were not required to submit detailed enforcement data to IDOT, except total

number of DUI and alcohol-related citations and total number of safety belt and child safety seat citations. These agencies issued 3,847 total citations. Of the total 3,847 citations, one hundred forty-three (143) DUI and alcohol-related citations and 469 safety belt and child safety seat citations were issued by these agencies.

Cost / Effectiveness Analysis of *You Drink & Drive. You Lose.* Enforcement Activities

In an effort to assess the costs and effectiveness of enforcement activities, actual reimbursement claims paid out for local and state agencies were used to calculate cost per hour of enforcement and cost per citation during the YDDYL campaign.

A cost / effectiveness analysis was performed for those agencies participating in YDDYL.

Table 4 summarizes enforcement activities (patrol hours, citations, total DUIs, percentage of total citations that were DUIs, citation written every X minutes of patrol, cost per citation, cost per patrol hour, and cost of project) by grant type.

ISP, sixty-two (62) year-round DTS grantees, 47 DTS grantees with multiple grants, and 32 YDDYL grantees were included in this cost / effectiveness analysis. Together, these agencies conducted a total of 23,767.3 patrol hours and issued 30,633 citations during enforcement at a total cost of \$1,231,619. On average, one citation was written every 46.6 minutes during enforcement at an average cost of \$51.82 per citation, or \$40.21 per patrol hour. Furthermore, the emphasis of the *You Drink & Drive. You Lose.* was to reduce the drunk driving. A total of 571 DUIs were written by these agencies, which was 1.9 percent of all citations issued during the campaign. This was See **Appendix A** for a detailed listing of enforcement activities and costs by agency.

Illinois State Police

ISP conducted 2,603.5 patrol hours during YDDYL enforcement and issued 1,855 citations at cost of \$188,656, or \$72.50 per patrol hour. One citation was written every 84.2 minutes, an average cost of \$101.70 per citation. ISP issued 125 DUIs, which was 6.7 percent of all their citations issued during the campaign.

Local Police Agencies

As of December 23, a total of 141 agencies participating in the statewide mobilization have submitted their claims and have been reimbursed by the Division of Traffic Safety. A total of 32 agencies were solely Roadside Safety Check grantees, 62 agencies had only one regular grant with DTS, and 47 agencies had multiple grants with DTS. As of these 47, they had 110 grants with DTS. Refer to **Appendix A (Tables 5 through 7)** to see each agency's enforcement activities and associated costs by grant type. **Table 8** shows the aggregate enforcement activities and their associated costs by grant type.

The 32 mini-grantees included in this analysis worked a total of 2,337 patrol hours and wrote 2,054 citations at a cost of \$89,895.47, or \$38.47 per patrol hour. On average, one citation was written every 68.3 minutes during statewide enforcement at a cost of \$43.77 per citation. These MINI grantees issued 52 DUIs, which was 2.5 percent of all their citations issued during the campaign.

Sixty-two (62) regular grantees contributed 6,768.0 patrol hours to the campaign, issuing 9,427 citations. Regular grantees issued one citation every 43.1 minutes of patrol at a cost of \$36.14 per citation or \$50.34 per patrol hour. These regular grantees issued 170 DUIs, which was 1.8 percent of all their citations issued during the campaign.

The remaining 47 agencies with multiple grants conducted 12,059.3 patrol hours and they issued 17,297 citations during the YDDYL mobilization. These agencies issued one citation every 41.8 minutes of patrol at a cost of \$35.42 per citation or \$50.80 per patrol hour. These agencies with multiple grants issued 224 DUIs, which was 1.3 percent of all their citations issued during the campaign.

Table 4: Enforcement Activities and Associated Costs by Type of Grantee

Agency / Grant Type	Patrol Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citations Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Cost
IL State Police	2,603.5	1,855	125	6.7%	84.2	\$101.57	\$72.37	\$188,417.72
Mini-Grantees (n=32) ¹	2,336.5	2,054	52	2.5%	68.3	\$43.77	\$38.47	\$89,895.47
Regular Grantees with Single Grants (n=62) ²	6,768.0	9,427	170	1.8%	43.1	\$36.14	\$50.34	\$340,686.16
Regular Grantees with Multiple Grants (n=47) ³	12,059.3	17,297	224	1.3%	41.8	\$35.42	\$50.80	\$612,620.02
Total	23,767.3	30,633	571	1.9%	46.6	\$40.21	\$51.82	\$1,231,619.37

NOTES:

¹ The Mini-Grantees category includes only those agencies which received funding to conduct roadside safety checks during the YDDYL mobilization.

² The Regular Grantees with Single Grants category includes those agencies which received funding for only one regular year-long grant from DTS. The total number for each grant is as follows: 1 CMV-SEP, 32 IMAGE, 3 LAP, 15 MAP, 2 RSC, 5 SEP, 4 TLEP.

³ Regular Grantees with Multiple Grants includes those agencies which received funding for multiple grants from DTS. Please refer to **Appendix A - Table 7** for the types of grants each agency had.

Limitations of Enforcement Data

The enforcement data (such as total number of patrol hours and total citations) provided by local agencies should be interpreted with caution since the calculated indicators, such as cost per patrol hour or cost per citation, and / or a citation written per X minutes vary substantially across selected local agencies.

For example, based on the cost per patrol hour, DTS reimbursed the Braidwood Police Department \$966 for conducting 44.0 patrol hours resulting in \$21.97 per patrol hour. On the other hand, Lemont Police Department was reimbursed \$4,176 for conducting 42.00 patrol hours resulting in \$99.42 per patrol hour. Similarly, when looking at cost per citation, DTS reimbursed Western Springs \$1,345 for writing 120 citations resulting in a cost of \$11.21 per citation issued. On the other hand, Mattoon Police Department was reimbursed \$1,144 for only issuing 2 citations resulting in a cost of \$571.75 per citation issued. Finally, there were great discrepancies for total citations written per minutes of patrol conducted. In one case, Western Springs Police Department issued 120 citations over 30.0 patrol hours resulting in one citation written for every 15.0 minutes of patrol. On the other hand, Mattoon Police Department issued only two citations over 30.0 patrol hours resulting in one citation issued for every 900.0 minutes of patrol (see **Table 5**).

Future Plan

In an effort to address the concerns raised in this cost / effectiveness analysis, the Evaluation Unit is proposing to address these issues by taking the following course of action:

1. Conduct an in-depth analysis of the current data to identify those agencies considered as outliers. Since there are several different reasons for the presence of outliers, ranking and identifying outliers among local agencies will be performed separately by taking into account different indicators, such as total patrol hours, number of minutes it took to write a citation, and cost per citation.
2. Provide the list outliers to the local police agencies and ask them to verify their figures and provide reasons for high or low values. There is a possibility that the figures local agencies provided for IDOT are incorrect.
3. Conduct an unannounced audit of the local police agencies to be sure the data are correctly compiled and submitted to IDOT.
4. Based on the findings from the local agencies, develop a proactive plan to improve the timeliness, completeness, accuracy of the data.

EVALUATION

Evaluation

As indicated earlier in this report, an evaluation of the *You Drink & Drive. You Lose.* (YDDYL) campaign includes process measures (e.g., documenting the activities associated with campaign media and enforcement activities) and outcome measures, such as pre and post telephone surveys of Illinois drivers. The pre and post telephone surveys were conducted in order to measure the impact of paid/earned media and enforcement activities on the public's knowledge and attitude toward the mobilization. The surveys were conducted through the Survey Research Office at the University of Illinois at Springfield. In addition to the evaluation of public perception on the campaign, we will conduct an outcome evaluation of the campaign on motor vehicle related injuries and fatalities when the actual crash data become available in the near future.

Overview of Telephone Survey Findings

Telephone surveys showed that the percent of people who indicated that "in the past (thirty) days, they had read, seen, or heard anything about alcohol-impaired driving in Illinois," increased statewide from 66 percent in June to 71 percent in September. This change was evident among those surveyed in the downstate areas where awareness rose from 67 percent in June to 76 percent in September. Of those telephone respondents who had heard or seen messages about alcohol-impaired driving, by far the greatest exposure source was television (79 percent).


Telephone survey respondents were asked about their awareness of fifteen selected traffic safety slogans, asked in a random order. Nine slogans related to drinking and driving. The largest percentage point increase from May to September occurred for the Drunk Driving. Over the Limit. Under Arrest. slogan, experiencing an increase of nearly nine percentage points in awareness from 26 percent in May 2008 to 35 percent in September 2008. The You Drink and Drive. You Lose. slogan increased from 77 percent in May 2008 to 80 percent in September 2008.

Awareness of the *You Drink & Drive. You Lose.* Slogan: 2003 - 2008

In June of 2003, 55 percent of those surveyed were familiar with the YDDYL slogan. This awareness level rose to 81 percent in the September 2007 survey. During the 2008 You Drink and Drive. You Lose. campaign, awareness of the message was at 80 percent.

Figure 6 displays the awareness of the YDDYL slogan from 2003 to 2008.

Detailed results of the pre / post telephone survey will be presented in the next section.



STATEWIDE TELEPHONE SURVEY

**The Illinois Statewide Labor Day 2008
Alcohol Impaired Driving Enforcement Campaign Surveys**

Conducted for



Division of Traffic Safety

Conducted by



**Survey Research Office
Center for State Policy and Leadership
University of Illinois at Springfield**

Summary Report

Field Interviewing: June and September, 2008
(Supplemented with Selected Findings from May 2008 Survey)

Preliminary Tables Presented: October, 2008

Draft Report: October, 2008

Written by

Richard Schuldt, Director, UIS/SRO

With assistance from

Mark Winland, Interviewing Lab Manager

Introduction

The Illinois Department of Transportation, Division of Traffic Safety, contracted with the Survey Research Office, located in the Center for State Policy and Leadership, at the University of Illinois at Springfield to conduct three statewide telephone surveys from May through September, 2008 relating to either seat belt or DUI-related enforcement and media campaigns. The first survey was conducted in May prior to the Memorial Day weekend; the second was conducted in June, after the Memorial Day weekend; and the third survey was conducted in September, after the Labor Day weekend.

The May survey focused on questions regarding seat belt-related opinions and behaviors and took place prior to a seat belt enforcement and media campaign that took place in a time period surrounding the Memorial Day weekend. The June survey included a full set of both seat belt and DUI-related questions as did the September survey. The September survey took place after a DUI enforcement campaign that took place in a time period surrounding Labor Day weekend. Thus, the May survey served as a “pre-test” for the Memorial Day seat belt enforcement and media campaign, with the June survey serving as a “post-test” for this campaign. Similarly, the June survey serves as a “pre-test” for the Labor Day DUI enforcement campaign, with the September survey serving as a “post-test” for this campaign.²

Methodology

The sampling methodology for the three surveys was similar to that of other recent telephone surveys on seat belt and DUI initiative topics conducted for IDOT’s Division of Traffic Safety. The state was first stratified into the Chicago metro area and the remaining Illinois counties, known as “downstate.” The Chicago metro area was further stratified into the City of Chicago and the Chicago area suburbs, which included the Cook County suburbs and the suburbs in the five “collar” counties. The downstate area was further subdivided into north/central Illinois and southern Illinois. Thus, the statewide surveys had four stratified geographic regions: City of Chicago, Chicago suburban counties, and the downstate counties, subdivided into north/central Illinois and southern Illinois. Random samples of telephone numbers were purchased for each of the four stratification areas (City of Chicago, Chicago suburban counties, north/central Illinois, and southern Illinois).

Field interviewing for the latest September survey was conducted from September 2 – September 24, 2008, with over 500 licensed drivers (510-542). Actual field interviewing for the June survey was conducted from June 2 – July 1, 2008, with over 600 licensed drivers (602-637). And, actual field interviewing for the May survey was conducted from April 12 – May 12, 2008, with over 500 licensed drivers (524-540).³

The numbers of completions for each stratification group are presented below for the three surveys. It should be noted that statewide results reported in this summary have been weighted to correct for the intentional over/under-representation of the respective regions.

² In addition to the statewide surveys, a rural county component was added to both the May and June surveys. This component was not part of the September survey.

³ These numbers represent those interviewed for the statewide stratified sample for May and June. It should be noted that there was some attrition during the interviewing. The higher number in each range is the number responding to the first substantive question, and the lower number is the number responding to the last question.

	2008 Seat Belt Pre-Test May 2008	2008 Seat Belt Post-Test / DUI Pre-Test June 2008	2008 DUI Post-Test Sept. 2008
<i>TOTAL</i>	532*	620*	526*
Chicago metro area	307	348	315
<i>City of Chicago</i>	148	187	142
<i>Chicago suburban counties</i>	159	161	172
Downstate counties**	225	272	212
<i>North/central Illinois</i>	96	149	107
<i>Southern Illinois</i>	129	123	104

*These are mid-point numbers between the number who began the interview and the number who completed a full interview.

**Our goal was to divide the downstate counties sample roughly in half so that, if necessary, we could also analyze by north/central and by southern Illinois.

The sampling error for the September and May statewide results is +/- 4.3 percent, while the sampling error for the June statewide results are +/- 4.0 (at the 95th confidence level).⁴ The error for subgroups in all surveys is, of course, larger.

Each telephone number in the samples was called a maximum of six times, at differing times of the week and day. Within households, interviewers asked for the youngest licensed driver 75 percent of the time, because earlier experience showed that we under-represent younger drivers. In the other 25 percent of the time, interviewers asked for a licensed driver who was male/female (varying at random) and who had the next birthday. Replacements were accepted if that designated household member was not available. The average (median) length of completed interviews was 14 minutes for the September and June surveys and 11 minutes for the May survey.

In the following summary, the statewide results for each of the surveys have been weighted to arrive at a proper distribution by region, gender, age category and education level.⁵ No other weighting has been applied.

Comments on Results

In the results that follow, **we focus on those questions most pertinent to the DUI initiative surrounding the 2008 Labor Day weekend.** We also focus on the statewide and regional results -- and on selected results by whether respondents had an alcoholic drink in the past 30 days, specifically highlighting the results and changes that occurred in and between the June and September surveys (the DUI initiative “pre-test” and “post-test” surveys). However, we at times comment on the May results when they appear to add understanding to the later

⁴ The sampling errors (and completion numbers) presented here are based on the average between partial and full completion numbers.

⁵ The age categories used for weighting purposes are: up to 29 years old; 30s and 40s; and 50 and older. The statewide proportions for each age category were derived from data on the age distribution of Illinois licensed drivers provided by IDOT’s Division of Traffic Safety. This is the third year that age has been used in the weighting of the results, and its usage was driven by the fact that we consistently under-represent the youngest drivers despite the fact that the interviewing protocol directs interviewers to ask to speak to the youngest licensed driver three-quarters of the time. This is the first year that education level has been used in the weighting of responses.

results/changes.⁶ In this summary report, percentages have sometimes been rounded to integers, and percentage changes (i.e., +/- % within parentheses) refer to percentage point changes unless specifically noted.⁷

The Excel file. The full results are presented in the **IDOT 2008 Labor Day DUI Survey Tables** file (an Excel file) compiled for the project. Separate worksheets are included for:

- the statewide results;
- the results for statewide respondents who indicated having had an alcoholic drink in the past 30 days (“drinkers”)
- regional results, for the two regions of Chicago metro area and “downstate”;
- statewide results by gender;
- statewide results by age group (three categories: up to 29; 30s/40s; 50 and over);
- statewide results by race (white/non-white).

These worksheets contain relevant results for each of the three surveys, with focus on the June pre-test and September post-test surveys, and include the percentage point changes from the June to the September surveys. They also include a demographic portrait of the group(s) being analyzed.

Time frame in recall question wording. The time frame in the recall questions in all of these surveys (September, June and May) is that of “the past 30 days.”⁸

Demographic characteristics of the June and September samples. Before reporting the DUI-related results, it is worth noting that the weighted June and September 2008 demographic portraits of the two samples are, overall, very similar with regard to most of the characteristics asked about.

The largest differences are found for: number of people 16 and over in the household; race/ethnicity; self-identified type of community; and, to a lesser degree, employment status and household income. A description of these differences follows. All other differences between the two samples are less sizeable.

- The September sample has fewer respondents than the June sample who reported that their household has three members who are 16 years of age or older (13.2% vs. 20%).
- The September sample has somewhat more white respondents than does the June sample (76% vs. 71%), and has somewhat fewer Hispanics (4.7% vs. 8.2%).
- The September sample has somewhat more respondents than the June sample who say they live in “a rural area” (13.4% vs. 8.5%), with the June sample being closer to the May sample in this regard (7.4%). At the same time, the September sample has slightly fewer who say they live in “a bit city” (21.3% vs. 24.2%).

⁶ Relevant comparison questions in the May 2008 survey were those which asked about awareness and experience with roadside checks in general and the one specific DUI-related question, which inquired about whether respondents had read/seen/heard anything about alcoholic impaired driving in Illinois.

⁷ When the decimal is .5, we round to the even integer. Decimals are sometimes reported when percentage numbers are small and they add to understanding of changes/differences.

⁸ This is noted because in some of the past “June” surveys after Memorial Day, which extended into July, the time period wording included an explicit mention that the time period included Memorial Day.

- The September sample has somewhat fewer respondents than the June sample who are full-time workers (45.1% vs. 49.4%) and who are retired (16.3% vs. 20%). The September sample has somewhat more respondents who are students (7.6% vs. 4.3%).
- The September sample has somewhat more respondents than the June sample who are in the highest income bracket of more than \$100,000 (24% vs. 20%), but at the same time also has slightly more in the lowest income bracket (6.3% vs. 3.6%). The September sample has somewhat fewer respondents in the middle income categories.

THE RESULTS

In the following summary of results for each question, we comment first upon the statewide results, including changes that occurred from June to September. Where applicable, we then summarize the results for those statewide respondents who reported having had an alcoholic drink in the past thirty days. We then summarize the regional findings, focusing on the dichotomous regional breakdown of the Chicago metro area vs. “downstate.”⁹ At times, portions of these summaries are omitted either because they lack relevance or because the sub-sample numbers are too small to warrant comment.

Behaviors relating to drinking and driving

Frequency of drinking. *“How often did you drink alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days?”* Statewide, substantially more September than June respondents reported having had any alcoholic drink in the past thirty days (57% vs. 46%). *During the remaining portions of this report, we sometimes refer to those who indicated ever having an alcoholic drink in the past thirty days as “drinkers” or “recent drinkers” and their counterparts as “non-drinkers.”*

Examining the more specific responses, less than one in twenty September respondents reported drinking every day (4.5%) while over one in ten (13%) reported drinking *at least* several days a week. About one-quarter (25%) reported drinking either “once a week or less” or “only on weekends.” Almost one-fifth (19%) reported drinking only on celebrations or special occasions, and nearly four of ten (39%) reported not having had a drink in the past thirty days.

As noted above, substantially more September than June respondents reported having had an alcoholic drink in the past month (57% vs. 46%). This increase is spread across all of the frequency-of-drinking categories.

Regional results. In both the September and June surveys, more Chicago metro area than downstate respondents reported having an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days (52% vs. 35% for June; 62% vs. 49% for September). And, for both areas, more September than June respondents reported doing so (62% vs. 52% for the Chicago metro area; and 49% vs. 35% for downstate).

Focusing on the most recent September results *for the Chicago metro area*, we find about one in seven (14%) reporting drinking *at least* several days a week, one-quarter (25%) saying

⁹ For this report, the Chicago metro area includes the City of Chicago, the rest of Cook County, and the “collar counties” of Lake, McHenry, Kane, DuPage and Will.

once a week or less or only on weekends, and over one-fifth (22%) saying only on special occasions, with over one-third (36%) saying they never had a drink in this time period. *For downstate*, we find a bit more than one in ten (12%) saying *at least* once a week, nearly one-quarter (24%) saying once a week or less or only on weekends, and 14 percent saying only on special occasions, with a plurality of 46 percent saying they never drank in this time period.

For Chicago metro area respondents, we find an increase from June to September in the percent who reported drinking at least several days a week (9% to 14%). Downstate shows a much smaller increase here (10% to 12%).

Drinking and driving. *“Have you ever driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking alcoholic beverages?” [For the 46 (June) to 57 (September) percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* Nearly one-quarter (23%) of the 57 percent of September respondents who reported drinking alcoholic beverages in the recent past reported they had driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking during this time period. This is lower than the respective proportion of such drivers who said so in June (27%), but it should be noted that the June proportion is from a somewhat smaller pool of relevant respondents (recent drinkers). *For the entire samples*, these results translate into 12 percent who did so in June and 15 percent who did so in September.

In September, the percent of *drinkers* who reported having recently driven within two hours after drinking an alcoholic beverage is somewhat more in the Chicago metro area (24%) than in downstate (19%). In June, this percentage was quite similar (27% in the Chicago area vs. 25% downstate). Responding drinkers in both areas show a decline from June to September, with the downstate percentage-point decline twice that found in the Chicago area (27% to 24% for the Chicago area; 25% to 19% for downstate).

When these regional results are translated into proportions of all sample members, we find that the percent who reported that, in the past thirty days, they had driven within two hours after drinking is 14 to 15 percent in the Chicago metro area (14.0% in June; 15.0% in September) and about 9 percent in downstate (8.8% in June; 9.4% in September).

Number of times. *“About how many times [in this time period] did you drive within two hours after drinking?” [For the approximate 12 to 15% of total sample members who had an alcoholic beverage in the recent past and who indicated they had driven a motor vehicle after drinking during this time.]*

For those who had driven a motor vehicle within two hours of drinking in the recent past, 46 percent of the September respondents reported doing so once, and nearly half (49%) reported doing so two to four times. Nearly one in twenty (almost 5%) reported doing so five times or more.

The statewide comparison for September and June shows no consistent trend. For example, more September than June respondents indicated doing so once (46% vs. 37%), and more September respondents also indicated doing so 3 or 4 times (28% vs. 15%). Yet, fewer September respondents reported doing so twice (21% vs. 34%) and doing so 5 to 9 times (3% vs. 10%). Very few in either survey reported doing so 10 or more times (2-3%).

Number of drinks on last occasion. *“On the most recent occasion (driving within two hours of drinking), about how many drinks did you have?” [For the approximate 12 to 15% of total sample members who indicated they had driven within two hours of drinking in the past month.]*

About one-third (33%) of the relevant respondents in the September survey reported having had one drink, about 40 percent reported having had two drinks, just over one in five

(21%) reported having had three or four drinks, and 6 percent reported having had five or more drinks.

Compared to June, we find fewer September respondents reporting one or two drinks (73% vs. 81%) and more of them reporting three or four drinks (21% vs. 9%). Just slightly fewer September respondents reported having had five or more drinks (6.2% vs. 9.7%).

Frequency drive when too much to drink. *“About how many times [in this time period] did you drive when you thought you had too much to drink?” [For those who indicated they have driven within two hours of drinking an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days – 12 percent of total sample in June; 15 percent of total sample in September.]*

In both the September and June surveys, over 95 percent of those asked the question (those who indicated they had driven within two hours after having an alcoholic drink in the past thirty days) reported never having had too much to drink when they drove in the past thirty days (96% in June and 98% in September). While small in both surveys, the proportion who said they had done so is twice as much in June as it is in September (4% vs. 1.9%).

Reports of *never* having done so in the past thirty days are quite similar between Chicago area drinkers and downstate drinkers in September (97% and 100%, respectively). In June, reports of never having done so is 95 percent in Chicago and 98 percent downstate.

For the Chicago metro region, the proportion who indicated doing so *at least once* dropped by virtually half from June to September (4.9% to 2.5%). It dropped from hardly any (1.5%) to none for downstate respondents.

Assessed trend in personal drinking and driving. *“Compared to three months ago, are you now driving after drinking: more often, less often, or about the same?” [For those who indicated they have driven within two hours of drinking an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days – 12 percent of total sample in June; 15 percent of total sample in September.]*

Overall, the results for *relevant* respondents are very similar for the September and June surveys. The percent who said they “never drive after drinking” is somewhat more than 60 percent (64% in September, 62% in June), and just over one-quarter (26-27%) in both surveys say they are now drinking “about the same.” The proportion saying they are drinking “less often” is just slightly higher in June than in September (9.3% vs. 6.6%), and hardly any or none said they are now drinking “more often.”

In September, the percent of relevant respondents who said they “never drive after drinking” is higher downstate than it is in the Chicago metro area (78% vs. 59%). But in June, this percentage was similar in both areas (62% for the Chicago area; 61% for downstate).

Chicago area results in June and September are quite similar, with the largest change being an increase in the proportion who reported “about the same” (26.4% to 30.6%). Downstate results show a large increase in the proportion who said they never drive after drinking (61% to 78%) but also declines in the proportions who said “less often” (12.5% to 2.4%) and “about the same” (23.6% to 17.1%).

Perceptions of and attitudes about police presence and enforcement

Perceptions of DUI enforcement. Three questions in the interview solicited respondents’ perceptions about general police presence on roads and police enforcement of DUI laws. In the first question, respondents were asked how likely it is they would be stopped if they drove after having too much to drink. In the second question, respondents were asked about the relative frequency they see police on the roads they drive (compared to three months ago). And, in the third question, respondents were asked another relative question, this time regarding how

likely it is that a driver who had been drinking will be stopped, compared to three months ago.¹⁰ (Also see the next section for questions specifically relating to roadside checks.)

Police enforcement of drinking laws -- a hypothetical, personalized-wording question. *“If you drove after having too much to drink to drive safely, how likely do you think you are to be stopped by a police officer?”* For the results of this question, *we will focus on the results for those respondents who gave a substantive answer to the question.*¹¹

Of relevant September respondents statewide, just over one-tenth (11.5%) said that being stopped by police would be “almost certain,” and nearly three in ten (29%) said it would be “very likely.” Four in ten (40%) said it would be “somewhat likely,” while nearly one in five (19%) said it would be either “somewhat unlikely” (11%) or “very unlikely” (8%).

The results in September are similar to those found in June.

*Among recent drinkers who gave a substantive response,*¹² the percent who indicated that their likelihood of being stopped is either “almost certain” or “very likely” is very similar in June and September (35% and 33%, respectively). The percent who said “somewhat likely” decreased some from June to September (48% to 42%). And, an increase is found in the percent who said either “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” (17% to 24%).

In terms of regions, about 80 percent of the respondents in both the Chicago area and the downstate area gave a substantive response in each of the two surveys. *Among those giving substantive responses,* the combined percent who said “almost certain” or “very likely” is very similar in both the Chicago area and downstate in September (42% and 39%, respectively). In June, the Chicago area proportion is similar to that found in September, but the downstate proportion was larger (41% and 47%, respectively). So, for downstate respondents, there is a decline in the combined percent who said “almost certain” or “very likely” from 47 percent in June to 39 percent in September.

Police presence on roads. *“Compared with three months ago, do you see police on the roads you normally drive more often, less often, or about the same?”*

Nearly three-quarters (73%) of the September respondents reported seeing police “about the same” on the roads they normally drive compared with three months ago, while over one in five (23%) said they police “more often” and just 3 percent said “less often.”

Slightly more June than September respondents reported seeing police on the roads they normally drive “more often” (26% vs. 23%) compared with three months ago while slightly more September respondents reported seeing them “about the same” (73% vs. 69%).

¹⁰ Because of possible question order effects here, we kept the order of these questions the same as in the national survey template.

¹¹ In each surveys, about 3% said “don’t know” or refused to answer, and another approximate 14% were coded as “not drinking so they cannot relate to the question.” For future surveys of this sort, it might be better not to personalize the question. That is, instead of asking, “if you drove after having too much to drink ...,” it might be better to ask respondents how likely police are to stop drivers who do this behavior. This is in line with the wording of the third question in this section.

¹² Interestingly, a few respondents who indicated having had a drink in the past 30 days responded that they do not drink so cannot answer the question (4% in June; 6% in September). These respondents are omitted from the results reported in this section.

Among recent drinkers, we find a great deal of similarity in the June and September responses – with the largest change being a slight increase in the percent who said “less often” (1.5% to 4.4%). Just over one-fifth (22%-23%) in both surveys said “more often” and nearly three-quarters (74%) in both surveys said “about the same.”

By region, the percent who said they see police “more often” compared to three months ago is about one-quarter in the Chicago area for both the June (25%) and September (24%) surveys. For downstate, this percentage is just over one-quarter (26%) in June and drops to about one-fifth (21%) in September.

Further analysis shows that the June and September results across the board here are very similar in the Chicago area. But for downstate, in addition to the decline in “more often” noted above, there is also a decline in the proportion who indicated “less often” (6.2% to 1.2%) and a sizeable increase in the proportion who indicated “about the same” (65% to 77%).

Police enforcement of drinking laws -- comparative, general evaluation. “Compared to three months ago, do you think a driver who had been drinking is now more likely to be stopped by police, less likely to be stopped, or is this about the same?”

In September, the statewide percent who said “more likely to be stopped” is nearly one-third (32%) while the proportion who said “about the same” is about six in ten (62%). Few said “less likely” (2%). The June results here are very similar to the September results.

Among drinkers, we find a decrease from June to September in the percent who said “more likely to be stopped by police” (34% to 28%) and an increase in the percent who said that this likelihood “is about the same” (62% to 67%). Very few in either survey said “less likely to be stopped.”

By region, the percent who said that a driver who had been drinking is “more likely” to be stopped by policy compared to three months ago declined slightly in the Chicago metro area from June to September (32.4% to 29.9%). The opposite trend of a small increase is found for downstate (31.3% to 34.9%).

Evaluations of penalties given to DUI offenders

Two questions in the interview solicited respondents’ evaluations of the penalties given to DUI offenders. One dealt with first offenders, and the other dealt with repeat offenders.¹³

Evaluations of penalties for first offenders. “Do you think the penalties given to drivers your area who are guilty of their first offense for alcohol-impaired driving are: too lenient, too harsh, or about right?”

By a margin of 45 percent to 26 percent, a plurality of the September statewide respondents reported the penalties for first offenders are “about right” as opposed to “too lenient.” Only 6 percent said they were “too harsh,” and nearly one-quarter (23%) did not express an opinion.

Overall, these results are very close to the June results.

Among drinkers, percentages surrounding one-quarter in both the June and September surveys said that these penalties are “too lenient” (23% in June; 26% in September) while hefty

¹³ These questions were asked for the first time in the 2004 surveys.

pluralities in both surveys said the penalties are “about right” (48% in June; 45% in September). Only 6 percent in both surveys said the penalties are “too harsh,” and nearly one-quarter (23%-24%) did not express an opinion.

Analysis by region. Results in the Chicago metro area are quite similar in both the June and September surveys – with just under one-quarter (23-24%) saying the penalty is “too lenient,” about 43 to 47 percent saying “about right,” about one in twenty (6 to 7%) saying “too harsh,” and about one-quarter (23%-27%) saying they do not know.

The results in the downstate area also do not depart much from June to September. Here, the largest changes are a small decrease in the percent saying “about right” (45% to 40%) and a small increase in the percent saying they do not know (17% to 22%). In each survey, about one-third (32%-34%) of the downstate respondents said “too lenient” while about one in twenty (3.8% to 5.8%) said “too harsh.”

Evaluations of penalties for repeat offenders. “Do you think the penalties given to repeat offenders of alcohol-impaired driving are: too lenient, too harsh, or about right?”

The results are virtually reversed when we move from the question about penalties given for first offenders to this question about repeat offenders. Here, by a margin of 43 percent to 34 percent, a plurality of the September respondents is found to believe that penalties are “too lenient” as opposed to “about right.” Hardly any (1%) said “too harsh” while over one in five (22%) did not express an opinion. These results are close to the results found in the June survey.

Among recent drinkers, the percent who said that these penalties are “too lenient” is a plurality in both the June and September surveys – and increased some from June to September (41% to 47%). Meanwhile, the percent who said the penalties are “about right” is very stable, at just under one-third (32% in June; 31% in September). And, very few indicated that these penalties are “too harsh” (2.2% in June; 0.7% in September).

Analysis by region. Again, we see similar results that are quite similar in the Chicago area for the June and September surveys – with 35 to 38 percent saying the penalties are “too lenient,” 35 to 37 percent saying the penalties are “about right,” only a few (1%-2%) saying “too harsh,” and about one-quarter (27.6% and 23%) saying they do not know.

Among downstate respondents, we see a small increase from June to September in the percent saying they do not know (15% to 20%). Other results are very similar in the two surveys – with just over half saying “too lenient” (53%-54%), over one-quarter saying “about right” (27%-29%) and only a few saying “too harsh” (0.6%-1.9%).

Roadside safety checks

Respondents were asked about their awareness and experience with roadside safety checks in general. Later in the survey instrument, they were asked about their awareness and experience with safety checks whose primary purpose was to check for alcohol-impaired driving.

It should be noted that this departs a bit from the national survey template. This was done intentionally for reasons of obtaining comparable Illinois trend data and because Illinois roadside checks are somewhat different than those in many other states.¹⁴

¹⁴ In terms of obtaining comparable data, we had asked the general roadside check question in surveys for the past several years. The wording itself is a bit different from the national template because of the nature of Illinois roadchecks, checking vehicles which pass through a roadcheck for all possible traffic violations. To make the Illinois data comparable, we added a later question which asked about road safety checks which appeared to be

General roadside safety-check questions

In interpreting June-to-September change here, it should be noted that there was a sizeable increase from *May* to June in the percent who had seen/heard about roadside checks in the past thirty days (21% in May to 41% in June).¹⁵

Awareness of roadside safety checks. The percent who indicated that, “*in the past thirty days,*” they had “*seen or heard of anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks where they stop to check drivers and vehicles*” declined from about 40 percent in June to just over 30 percent (41% to 31%). This is still substantially higher than the 21 percent who indicated such in May.¹⁶

Among recent drinkers, awareness of roadside safety checks declined from 44 percent in the June survey to 34 percent in the September survey. (No comparable data is available for the May survey because the frequency-of-drinking question was not asked in that survey.)

Analysis by region. Reported awareness of roadside safety checks decreased in the Chicago area from almost four in ten (38%) in June to about 30 percent in September. However, the September proportion is a 7 percentage-point increase from that found in May (23%).

In the downstate region, reported awareness of these checks decreased from more than four in ten (44%) in June to about one-third (34%) in September. However, the September proportion is nearly 16 percentage points higher than that found in May (18%).

Sources of awareness. *Of those who had seen or heard anything about roadside safety checks,* the September percentages for those who had seen/heard about them through the various sources is about the same for newspapers, friends/relatives, and television (26-27%), followed very closely by radio (22%). One in five also identified an other source (20%). In the June survey, the sources of television and newspaper (31-33%) were virtually on par, ahead of those for friends/relatives and radio (21-23%).

Among all relevant 2008 statewide respondents, *those who mentioned newspapers* were far more likely to say they had heard of the safety checks from news stories than from advertisements (97% vs. 10% in September; 83% vs. 15% in June). *For those who mentioned television,* exposure through news stories is about twice that as exposure through advertisements for both the September and June surveys (71% vs. 37% for September; 68% vs. 33% for June). *For those who mentioned radio,* we find the vast majority were exposed through news stories in September (78% vs. 28% for advertisements) while exposure through advertisements in June surpassed that found for news stores (65% vs. 41%).

Among recent drinkers who reported awareness of the roadside checks in the September survey, exposure through friends and relatives was reported by 32 percent, somewhat more than

primarily targeted for alcohol-impaired driving. We believe these questions reflect the actual situation in Illinois while also giving us comparable data.

¹⁵ The May 2008 survey was the “pre-test” survey for the Memorial Day seat belt initiative. For these results, see the Memorial Day 2008 Seat Belt Initiative Survey Report.

¹⁶ For awareness of roadside safety checks, we used the final percentages after a follow-up question that confirmed the meaning of “roadside safety checks.”

reported exposure through television (25%), newspapers (24%), or radio (21%). Nearly one-fifth reported an other source.

An analysis of the *regional source-of-exposure results for September respondents who were aware of these roadside checks* finds that about fairly similar percentages of Chicago area respondents exposure through each of the sources asked about: friends and relatives (28%); radio (24%); television (23%); and newspapers (20%) – with another one-fifth mentioning some other source.

For downstate respondents in September, nearly four in ten reported being exposed through newspapers (38%) followed by almost one-third for television (32%). Somewhat fewer indicated exposure through friends and relatives (27%) followed by radio (19%). Nearly one-fifth mentioned some other source.

Personally seeing roadside checks. *Of those who had seen or heard anything about roadside safety checks*, the statewide percent who indicated they had personally seen such checks is somewhat more in June (56%) than in September (47%). The May proportion is equivalent to that found in June, higher than that found in September.

Among those recent drinkers who were aware of roadside safety checks, the incidence of personally seeing a check decreases from 57 percent in June to 48 percent in September.

Analysis among those who were aware of roadside safety checks by region. The percent of applicable respondents who had personally seen a check dropped from 60 percent in June to 52 percent in September in the metro Chicago area. This percentage also dropped from 50 percent to 37 percent in the downstate area. In both the Chicago area and downstate, the May result is very close to the June result.

When these results are based on all sample members (and not just those aware), we find the percent who have seen a roadside safety check increased from just over one in ten in May (12%) to over one in five in June (23%) and then dropped to about 15 percent in September.

Among all recent drinkers, the percent who said they had personally seen a roadside safety check declines from about one-quarter in June to about one in six in September (25% to 16.5%).

Analysis by region. Again, when the percent is based on all sample members (and not just those who were aware), the percent of Chicago metro area respondents who reported personally seeing a roadside check decreased from 23 percent in June to about one in six (16%) in September, only slightly more than the 13 percent found in May.

The same trend is seen downstate. Here, this percentage decreased from 22 percent in June to 12 percent in September, only somewhat more than the 9 percent found in May.

Personally going through a roadside check. *When those who had personally seen a roadside check* were asked whether they have “personally been through a roadside check in the past (thirty) days, either as a driver or as a passenger,” somewhat less than one-half (47%) of relevant September respondents answered in the affirmative, about the same as the 45 percent who said so in May and somewhat higher than the 52 percent for relevant June respondents.

Calculated on the basis of all sample members, this translates into slightly over one in twenty who said they have recently been through a roadside check in the May and September surveys (6.7% and 6.8%, respectively) and twice this proportion in the June survey (12.8%).

Among recent drinkers who had personally seen a roadside check, the percent who said they had actually gone through a check decreased somewhat from just over half in June to just

under half in September (53% to 47%). *Based on all recent drinkers*, the percent who indicated having gone through a check decreased almost in half from June to September, from 14.4 percent to 7.9 percent.

By region. When the percentage of *all sample members* who indicated having gone through a safety check in the past thirty days is examined, we find that – for the Chicago metro area -- this incidence decreased from June to September (13.9% to 8.1%), a level about on par with that found in May (7.7%).

The same trend is found downstate. Here, this incidence decreased from June to September (11.3% to 4.6%), a level on par with that found in May (4.8%).

Drinking-related roadside check questions (later in the interview)

Awareness of “DUI” roadside safety checks. The percent who indicated that, “*in the past (thirty) days,*” they had “*seen or heard anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks that were used primarily to check for alcohol impaired driving,*” increased slightly from just over 22 percent in June to 26 percent in September.

Among recent drinkers, the results show a small increase in awareness from June to September (25% to 29%).

By region. Nearly one-quarter (~23%) of the Chicago area respondents indicated having heard about these roadside safety checks in both the June and September surveys. Awareness of them downstate increased from 22 percent in June to 31 percent in September.

Personally going through these roadside checks. *Of those who had seen/heard of such roadside checks*, the percent of those who indicated “*having personally gone through [these] checks*” decreased by half, going from 20 percent in the June survey to 9 percent in the September survey. This translates into nearly 5 percent of all sample members for the June survey and just over 2 percent for the September survey (4.6% and 2.4%, respectively).

Among recent drinkers who had seen/heard of these checks, the proportion who indicated they personally had gone through them declined from about one in five in June (21%) to under one in ten in September (7%). *Translated into percentages for the entire recent drinker group*, we find the percent who indicated they had personally gone through a check declined from about one in twenty in June to about 2 percent in September (5.2% to 1.9%).

By region -- for those who have heard of the roadside checks, we see a decrease from June to September in the percent who indicated they personally went through such checks in both the Chicago area (22% to 9%) and downstate (17% to 11%). *When translated into an incidence based on all sample members*, we find a small decrease in the Chicago area from June to September (5.0% to 2.1%) and stability in the downstate incidence (3.8% and 3.4%).

Messages about alcohol-impaired driving

Awareness of messages about alcohol-impaired driving. The percent who indicated that, “*in the past thirty days,*” they had “*read, seen or heard anything about alcohol impaired driving in Illinois,*” increased somewhat, from 66 percent in June to 71 percent in September. In May, it stood at just over 50 percent (51%).

Among recent drinkers, awareness also increased somewhat from June to September, by an amount just a bit smaller than for all respondents (68% to 72%).

By region. The increase from June to September in reported exposure to these messages is smaller in the Chicago metro area (65% to 69%) than it is in downstate Illinois (67% to 76%). But, the increase from May to September is about the same in both areas – about 20 percentage points: 49% to 69% in the Chicago area; and 54% to 76% downstate.

Sources of messages. *Of those who had seen or heard such messages,* by far the greatest exposure source in both September and June is found for television (79% in September and 70% in June).

In September, television was followed by billboards/bus signs (52%), then newspapers and radio (43% each), and then posters/bumper stickers (almost 40%). Friends/relatives (21%) followed and then came brochures/pamphlets (17%).

In June, television was followed by newspapers and billboards/bus signs (51% each), then radio (44%) and posters/bumper stickers (42%). As above, friends/relatives (25%) followed and then came brochures/pamphlets (16%).

Respondents who said they were exposed through television, radio, or newspapers were asked whether this was through a commercial/advertisement, through a news program or story, or something else. For newspapers, relevant respondents were primarily exposed through news stories rather than commercials (87% vs. 27% in September and 87% vs. 22% in June). For radio, relevant respondents more frequently identified advertisements rather than news stories in both surveys, but there is more balance in June (74% for ads vs. 41% for news in September; 66% for ads vs. 54% for news in June). For television, relevant September respondents more frequently identified advertisements rather than news stories (73% vs. 49%), but relevant June respondents, by a very small margin, identified news over ads (67% for news stories vs. 60% for advertisements).¹⁷

For recent drinkers who indicated awareness of these messages in the September survey, we also find television, by far, to be the most frequent source of exposure (77%). TV is followed by billboards/bus signs (57%) and then radio (45%), newspapers (41%), and posters/bumper stickers (36%). Friends/relatives (18%) as a source are next and finally brochures/pamphlets (13%). Just over one in ten of these respondents mentioned an other source.

The following presents September *results by region* and based on those who are aware of any messages.

For the Chicago area, exposure through television is most frequent (76%) followed by exposure through billboards or bus signs (54%). Next are three sources of exposure: posters or bumper stickers (41%); radio (41%); and newspapers (38%). Following are friends and relatives (19%) and brochures or pamphlets (14%). Just over one in ten (13%) mentioned an other source.

For the downstate area, exposure through television is most frequent (85%) followed by exposure through newspapers (52%), billboards or bus signs (48%), and radio (46%). Next is posters and bumper stickers (37%) followed by friends and relatives (25%) and brochures or pamphlets (22%). Under one in ten (8%) mentioned an other source.

Reported trend in number of messages. *Those who said they were exposed to messages about alcohol impaired driving (66% of the June respondents and 71% of the September respondents) were asked whether "the number of messages that [they] have seen or*

¹⁷ Note that percentage results for commercials and news stories can add to more than 100 percent because respondents could indicate they were exposed through both types.

heard about alcohol impaired driving in the past (thirty) days is more than usual, fewer than usual, or about the same as usual.”

In September, the statewide percent saying “about the same as usual” is nearly three-quarters (73%). Of the remaining respondents, those who said “more than usual” outdistances those who said “less than usual” by more than a five-to-one margin (22% vs. 4%).

The June results are very similar to the September results here.

Among recent drinkers who had seen/heard of these messages, the proportion saying “more than usual” increased from June to September (21% to 27%) while the proportion saying “about the same as usual” declined (75% to 69%). Few said “less than usual” in either survey (4%-5%).

By region. Again, among respondents who had seen/heard of these messages, just over seven in ten (71%-72%) Chicago area respondents reported the number of messages they had seen or heard is “about the same as usual,” while there is a small decline in the percent who said this number is “more than usual” (26% to 21%).

For applicable downstate respondents, about three-quarters said “about the same” in both June and September (74%-75%) while the percent who said “more than usual” increased a bit from June to September (20% to 25%).

Awareness of selected traffic safety slogans

The question. Respondents were asked about their awareness of sixteen selected traffic safety “slogans,” asked in a random order. Ten are related to drinking and driving, with nine explicitly related.

The September results. The following Table S-1 presents the most recent September results, ordered by level of awareness. The DUI-related slogans are in italics, except for the most recent slogan which is in non-italic bold, **“You drink and drive. You lose.”**¹⁸

This table shows that the *“You drink and drive. You lose”* slogan ranks third in awareness level, at nearly 80 percent. The only two slogans above this in awareness are “Click It or Ticket” (at 92%) and “Friends don’t let friends drive drunk” (at 83%). And, the *“You drink and drive. You lose”* slogan is far ahead of the slogan which ranks fourth in awareness. It should be noted that the more recent slogan, “Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest” is eighth in awareness, at 35 percent.

Further analyses for two DUI-related slogans: “You Drink and Drive. You Lose” and “Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest.” We focus on the major slogan in recent years for the holiday media and enforcement initiatives, “You drink and drive. You lose,” and on the one of the more recent slogans, “Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest.”

May to June to September trends. Statewide, reported awareness of the major DUI campaign slogan, “You drink and drive. You lose,” is about the same in both May and June, with

¹⁸ It appears that the wording of this slogan has alternated over the years and over varying formats and communication modes between “You drink and drive, you lose” and “You drink. You drive. You lose.” Currently, both variants of this slogan can be seen in Illinois. We have used the first wording for the 2007 and 2008 telephone surveys.

only a slight decrease from 77 percent to 75 percent. Awareness then increased to 79.5 percent in the most recent September survey. This June-to-September increase of just over 4 percent points is second only to that for the more recent DUI-related slogan of “Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest,” which shows an increase in awareness from 26 percent in June to 35 percent in September, an increase of 9 percentage points. In May, awareness of this slogan was also at 26 percent, the June awareness level.

Among recent drinkers, reported recognition of the “You drink and drive. You lose” slogan increased from 78 percent to nearly 83 percent. Meanwhile, reported recognition of the “Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest” slogan increased from just under one-quarter in June (23.5%) to nearly four in ten in September (39%).

By region. (See Table S-2.) Awareness levels of the “You drink and drive. You lose” slogan across the May, June and September surveys are quite similar for downstate respondents (81% in May; 77% in June; and 78% in September) – although it is seen there is a very small decrease from the May awareness level to those in June and September. In the Chicago metro area, we see a small increase from the May and June awareness levels of about three-quarters (75% in May; 74% in June) to 80 percent in September.

For the slogan, “Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest,” we find awareness in the Chicago area increased from about one-quarter in both May and June (26% and 24%) to over one-third in September (35%). Nearly the same trend is apparent for downstate respondents, where awareness increased from one-quarter in May (25%) to 29 percent in June, and then to more than one-third in September (34%).

The 2002 through 2008 trends. Because there were media/enforcement campaigns going back to calendar year 2002 for which we have awareness information for numerous selected traffic safety slogans and for both seat belt-related and DUI-related campaigns, it is worth presenting the full cross-sectional trend results. These are presented in Tables S-3A and S-3B, according to level of awareness in the September 2008 survey. The two DUI-related slogans focused upon above are in bold.

Table S-1: Awareness Levels in September 2008

Order	Slogan	Sept level
1	Click It or Ticket	92.2%
2	<i>Friends don't let friends drive drunk</i>	82.8%
3	You drink and drive. You lose.	79.5%
4	<i>Drive smart. Drive sober.</i>	57.4%
5	<i>Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers</i>	50.1%
6	Buckle Up America	44.2%
7	<i>Drive hammered, get nailed.</i>	37.0%
8	<i>Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest</i>	34.8%
9	<i>Cells phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunken driver</i>	29.8%
10	<i>Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number</i>	19.6%
11	<i>Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars</i>	16.2%
12	<i>Step away from your vehicle</i>	14.5%
13	Children in back	12.9%
14	Smart motorists always respect trucks	6.2%
15	Checkpoint Strikeforce	6.1%
16	Operation A-B-C	3.8%

**Table S-2
Awareness of Two DUI-Related Slogans***

Region	May 2008- Survey	June Pre- test	May to June diff.*	Sept Post-Test 2008	June to Sept. diff.*	Total Diff.
Slogan: You drink and drive. You lose.						
STATEWIDE	77%	75%	-2%	80%	+4%	+2%
Chicago Metro	75%	74%	-1%	80%	+6%	+5%
Downstate	81%	77%	-4%	78%	+1%	-3%
Slogan: Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest.						
STATEWIDE	26%	26%	0%	35%	+9%	+9%
Chicago Metro	26%	24%	-2%	35%	+11%	+9%
Downstate	25%	29%	+3%	34%	+6%	+9%

*Differences are based on actual differences, not the rounded integer results presented. These are percentage point increases/decreases.

Table S – 3A
Awareness of Selected Traffic Safety Slogans, April 2002 through September 2008
(April 2002 through September 2005 Portion)

Slogan	Apr '02	Jun '02	Nov '02	Dec '02	May '03	Jun '03	July '03	Jan '04	May '04	July '04	Sep t '04	Apr '05	Jun '05	Sep t '05
Click It or Ticket	41%	71%	67%	71%	67%	85%	83%	87%	84%	90%	88%	81%	91%	87%
Friends don't let friends drive drunk	na	na	na	na	na	89%	89%	86%	85%	90%	85%	86%	82%	80%
You drink and drive. You lose	na	na	na	na	na	55 %	62 %	78 %	68 %	73 %	78 %	70 %	65 %	77 %
Drive smart, drive sober	61%	62%	58%	62%	65%	67%	66%	68%	65%	67%	63%	60%	57%	57%
Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers*	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	48%	50%	54%	51%	55%	54%	53%	47%	51%
Buckle Up America	60%	60%	53%	54%	48%	53%	55%	53%	52%	64%	51%	52%	45%	45%
Drive hammered, get nailed	na	na	na	na	na	30%	52%	46%	45%	46%	41%	37%	32%	38%
Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest.	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na						
Cell phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunk driver.	36%	41%	45%	44%	39%	46%	42%	40%	43%	46%	36%	35%	40%	37%
Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number	na	na	na	na	na	22%	24%	26%	24%	24%	22%	22%	19%	18%
Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars*	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	24%	30%	30%	27%	30%	28%	29%	21%	25%
Step away from your vehicle	na	na	na	na	na	na	16%	na	13%	14%	16%	14%	13%	16%
Children in back	20%	25%	19%	21%	22%	24%	25%	24%	20%	26%	20%	20%	22%	18%
Smart motorists always respect trucks	6%	12%	8%	11%	11%	11%	12%	9%	12%	10%	9%	10%	8%	7%
Checkpoint Strikeforce	na	na	na	na	na	na	9%	na	10%	9%	8%	12%	8%	10%
Operation A-B-C	4%	6%	4%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	4%	5%	3%

*Prior to the June 2003 Post-test survey, this was one slogan.

Table S-3B
Awareness of Selected Traffic Safety Slogans, April 2002 through September 2008
(April 2005 through September 2008 Portion)

Slogan	Apr '05	Jun '05	Sept '05	Apr '06	Jun '06	Sept '06	May '07	Jun '07	Sept '07	May '08	Jun '08	Sept '08
Click It or Ticket	81%	91%	87%	84%	91%	88%	89%	94%	90%	89%	91%	92%
Friends don't let friends drive drunk	86%	82%	80%	86%	82%	80%	84%	84%	83%	80%	83%	83%
You drink and drive. You lose	70%	65%	77%	74%	70%	76%	76%	82%	81%	77%	75%	80%
Drive smart, drive sober	60%	57%	57%	54%	60%	56%	60%	64%	57%	59%	55%	57%
Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers*	53%	47%	51%	49%	45%	49%	50%	52%	53%	52%	49%	50%
Buckle Up America	52%	45%	45%	50%	50%	46%	48%	47%	44%	38%	46%	44%
Drive hammered, get nailed	37%	32%	38%	37%	39%	41%	38%	41%	39%	30%	35%	37%
Drunk driving. Over the limit. Under arrest.	na	na	na	na	na	na	29%	24%	27%	26%	26%	35%
Cell phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunk driver.	35%	40%	37%	37%	34%	39%	31%	37%	34%	35%	31%	30%
Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number	22%	19%	18%	20%	19%	21%	20%	20%	19%	22%	20%	20%
Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars*	29%	21%	25%	23%	24%	22%	23%	26%	20%	23%	22%	16%
Step away from your vehicle	14%	13%	16%	17%	12%	14%	12%	12%	14%	10%	15%	14%
Children in back	20%	22%	18%	22%	19%	19%	20%	17%	19%	18%	18%	13%
Smart motorists always respect trucks	10%	8%	7%	12%	10%	6%	9%	10%	12%	10%	11%	6%
Checkpoint Strikeforce	12%	8%	10%	10%	10%	7%	8%	5%	8%	10%	7%	6%
Operation A-B-C	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%	3%	3%	6%	5%	2%	4%	4%

*Prior to the June 2003 Post-test survey, this was one slogan.

APPENDIX

**Appendix A: You Drink & Drive. You Lose.
2008 Enforcement Activities and Associated Costs**

TABLE 5: MINI-GRANTEES ENFORCEMENT AND ASSOCIATED COSTS

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
Addison	18.0	20	5	25.0%	54.0	\$39.00	\$43.34	\$780.09
Alexander County	42.0	79	0	0.0%	31.9	\$28.65	\$53.89	\$2,263.48
Braidwood	44.0	60	0	0.0%	44.0	\$16.11	\$21.97	\$966.48
Crystal Lake	30.0	23	3	13.0%	78.3	\$58.95	\$45.20	\$1,355.95
Crystal Lake Park District	41.0	34	3	8.8%	72.4	\$34.40	\$28.53	\$1,169.70
Decatur	91.0	59	5	8.5%	92.5	\$69.62	\$45.14	\$4,107.68
East Dundee	65.0	55	2	3.6%	70.9	\$66.33	\$56.12	\$3,648.00
East Hazel Crest	36.0	38	2	5.3%	56.8	\$37.19	\$39.26	\$1,413.31
Flora	105.0	29	1	3.4%	217.2	\$132.24	\$36.52	\$3,834.90
Franklin Park	48.0	165	0	0.0%	17.5	\$14.46	\$49.70	\$2,385.60
Freeport	50.0	15	0	0.0%	200.0	\$84.47	\$25.34	\$1,267.05
Harwood Heights	105.0	91	0	0.0%	69.2	\$53.97	\$46.77	\$4,911.23
Jerome	124.0	126	0	0.0%	59.0	\$28.41	\$28.86	\$3,579.10
Leland Grove	165.0	301	0	0.0%	32.9	\$14.05	\$25.63	\$4,228.67
Lemont	42.0	36	0	0.0%	70.0	\$116.00	\$99.42	\$4,175.83
Lisle	100.5	26	0	0.0%	231.9	\$150.61	\$38.96	\$3,915.87
Marseilles	120.0	49	2	4.1%	146.9	\$85.91	\$35.08	\$4,209.60
Mattoon	30.0	2	0	0.0%	900.0	\$571.75	\$38.12	\$1,143.50
McLean County	25.0	14	3	21.4%	107.1	\$60.39	\$33.82	\$845.50
Mendota	30.0	10	0	0.0%	180.0	\$89.62	\$29.87	\$896.20
Mercer County	224.0	237	6	2.5%	56.7	\$24.95	\$26.40	\$5,913.00
Morton Grove	279.0	134	9	6.7%	124.9	\$112.51	\$54.04	\$15,076.27
Murphysboro	61.0	46	0	0.0%	79.6	\$45.86	\$34.58	\$2,109.66
North Aurora	46.0	66	0	0.0%	41.8	\$33.77	\$48.45	\$2,228.72
North Chicago	35.0	57	0	0.0%	36.8	\$27.63	\$45.00	\$1,575.00
Park City	12.0	21	0	0.0%	34.3	\$18.00	\$31.50	\$378.00

TABLE 5: (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
Park Forest	54.0	26	2	7.7%	124.6	\$88.55	\$42.64	\$2,302.42
Plainfield	30.0	26	0	0.0%	69.2	\$62.98	\$54.59	\$1,637.55
Richmond	48.0	36	3	8.3%	80.0	\$37.17	\$27.88	\$1,338.28
Vienna	184.0	45	5	11.1%	245.3	\$88.72	\$21.70	\$3,992.27
West Dundee	22.0	8	0	0.0%	165.0	\$112.67	\$40.97	\$901.36
Western Springs	30.0	120	1	0.8%	15.0	\$11.21	\$44.84	\$1,345.20
MINI GRANTS TOTAL	2,336.5	2,054	52	2.5%	68.3	\$43.77	\$38.47	\$89,895.47

Column 1: Participating law enforcement agency

Column 2: Number of patrol hours conducted during YDDYL enforcement

Column 3: Total number of citations written by law enforcement agency during statewide YDDYL enforcement

Column 4: Total numbers of DUIs written by law enforcement agency during the statewide YDDYL enforcement

Column 5: Percentage of total citations that were DUI citations

Column 6: Number of minutes it took to write a citation = 60 / Number of citations per hour

Column 7: Cost per citation = Total Cost / Number of Citations

Column 8: Cost per patrol hour = Total Cost / Number of Patrol Hours

Column 9: Total Cost = amount of money reimbursed to law enforcement by DTS for statewide enforcement

**TABLE 6: REGULAR GRANTEES WITH SINGLE GRANTS ENFORCEMENT
AND ASSOCIATED COSTS**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grantee Type	Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
CMV-SEP	Summit	21.0	42	0	0.0%	30.0	\$21.02	\$42.05	\$882.96
IMAGE	Blue Island	110.0	247	0	0.0%	26.7	\$20.28	\$45.53	\$5,008.18
IMAGE	Bradley	64.0	88	4	4.5%	43.6	\$28.77	\$39.56	\$2,531.83
IMAGE	Brookfield	100.0	128	0	0.0%	46.9	\$47.17	\$60.38	\$6,037.69
IMAGE	Collinsville	100.0	333	0	0.0%	18.0	\$23.31	\$77.61	\$7,760.65
IMAGE	Columbia	94.0	98	0	0.0%	57.6	\$43.28	\$45.12	\$4,241.44
IMAGE	East Peoria	105.0	182	0	0.0%	34.6	\$30.75	\$53.29	\$5,595.74
IMAGE	Flossmoor	128.0	258	0	0.0%	29.8	\$25.26	\$50.92	\$6,518.12
IMAGE	Grayslake	102.0	104	0	0.0%	58.8	\$45.38	\$46.27	\$4,719.46
IMAGE	Hickory Hills	104.0	159	0	0.0%	39.2	\$33.40	\$51.07	\$5,311.04
IMAGE	Homewood	90.0	142	0	0.0%	38.0	\$35.25	\$55.62	\$5,005.64
IMAGE	Justice	101.0	160	1	0.6%	37.9	\$29.75	\$47.13	\$4,759.65
IMAGE	Kendall County	177.0	261	0	0.0%	40.7	\$32.49	\$47.90	\$8,478.89
IMAGE	Markham	107.0	177	0	0.0%	36.3	\$23.87	\$39.48	\$4,224.21
IMAGE	Matteson	100.0	199	0	0.0%	30.2	\$27.88	\$55.49	\$5,549.09
IMAGE	Metamora	35.0	20	0	0.0%	105.0	\$52.26	\$29.86	\$1,045.22
IMAGE	Midlothian	110.0	244	0	0.0%	27.0	\$19.70	\$43.70	\$4,807.00
IMAGE	Millstadt	36.0	22	0	0.0%	98.2	\$34.20	\$20.90	\$752.45
IMAGE	Minooka	111.0	102	0	0.0%	65.3	\$60.43	\$55.53	\$6,163.41
IMAGE	Oak Forest	69.0	124	0	0.0%	33.4	\$34.80	\$62.55	\$4,315.81
IMAGE	Oak Lawn	170.0	322	0	0.0%	31.7	\$29.65	\$56.16	\$9,547.43
IMAGE	O'Fallon	170.0	224	0	0.0%	45.5	\$35.21	\$46.39	\$7,886.75
IMAGE	Oswego	129.0	276	0	0.0%	28.0	\$26.65	\$57.02	\$7,356.01
IMAGE	Park Ridge	108.0	121	0	0.0%	53.6	\$49.06	\$54.97	\$5,936.38
IMAGE	Peoria County	231.0	193	3	1.6%	71.8	\$47.66	\$39.82	\$9,198.14
IMAGE	Riverdale	101.0	343	0	0.0%	17.7	\$29.08	\$98.76	\$9,975.17
IMAGE	Riverside	162.0	177	1	0.6%	54.9	\$45.34	\$49.54	\$8,024.68
IMAGE	Streator	132.0	147	0	0.0%	53.9	\$36.56	\$40.72	\$5,374.50

TABLE 6: (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grantee Type	Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
IMAGE	Tinley Park	100.0	128	0	0.0%	46.9	\$44.23	\$56.61	\$5,661.12
IMAGE	West Chicago	269.3	479	1	0.2%	33.7	\$15.36	\$27.32	\$7,356.01
IMAGE	Westmont	105.0	166	0	0.0%	38.0	\$44.08	\$69.68	\$7,316.56
IMAGE	Willowbrook	95.0	174	0	0.0%	32.8	\$32.68	\$59.86	\$5,686.88
IMAGE	Winnetka	98.0	106	0	0.0%	55.5	\$52.30	\$56.57	\$5,543.80
LAP	Buffalo Grove	179.5	82	29	35.4%	131.3	\$135.33	\$61.82	\$11,097.15
LAP	Macon County	174.0	146	23	15.8%	71.5	\$40.82	\$34.25	\$5,960.00
LAP	St. Clair County	52.0	15	6	40.0%	208.0	\$150.01	\$43.27	\$2,250.13
MAP	Bartlett	70.0	113	5	4.4%	37.2	\$31.94	\$51.56	\$3,608.88
MAP	Creve Coeur	25.0	19	2	10.5%	78.9	\$38.06	\$28.93	\$723.23
MAP	Downers Grove	49.0	41	1	2.4%	71.7	\$39.98	\$33.45	\$1,639.13
MAP	Edwardsville	53.0	43	8	18.6%	74.0	\$56.70	\$46.00	\$2,437.92
MAP	Elmhurst	33.0	49	7	14.3%	40.4	\$46.47	\$69.00	\$2,277.03
MAP	Glendale Heights	46.0	45	4	8.9%	61.3	\$55.49	\$54.29	\$2,497.17
MAP	Lake in the Hills	38.0	43	4	9.3%	53.0	\$36.15	\$40.91	\$1,554.56
MAP	Lake Zurich	52.0	46	4	8.7%	67.8	\$63.08	\$55.80	\$2,901.56
MAP	Morton	30.0	32	0	0.0%	56.3	\$53.32	\$56.87	\$1,706.12
MAP	Palos Heights	42.0	36	4	11.1%	70.0	\$61.87	\$53.03	\$2,227.26
MAP	Pulaski County	19.0	16	1	6.3%	71.3	\$26.19	\$22.05	\$419.00
MAP	SIU-Carbondale	76.0	75	8	10.7%	60.8	\$40.74	\$40.21	\$3,055.75
MAP	St. Charles	50.0	30	4	13.3%	100.0	\$99.61	\$59.76	\$2,988.24
MAP	Troy	7.0	6	1	16.7%	70.0	\$41.67	\$35.71	\$250.00
MAP	Villa Park	42.8	39	4	10.3%	65.8	\$61.54	\$56.14	\$2,400.00
RSC	Ottawa	30.0	15	2	13.3%	120.0	\$69.87	\$34.93	\$1,048.01
RSC	Rolling Meadows	24.0	10	0	0.0%	144.0	\$125.21	\$52.17	\$1,252.08
SEP	Caseyville	33.5	65	0	0.0%	30.9	\$12.33	\$23.93	\$801.66
SEP	Glen Carbon	51.0	63	1	1.6%	48.6	\$37.75	\$46.64	\$2,378.40
SEP	Moline	217.0	485	0	0.0%	26.8	\$19.98	\$44.65	\$9,688.91
SEP	Niles	117.0	232	0	0.0%	30.3	\$28.40	\$56.31	\$6,587.71

TABLE 6: (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grantee Type	Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
SEP	Tazewell County	209.0	392	0	0.0%	32.0	\$26.40	\$49.52	\$10,349.04
TLEP	DeKalb	235.0	259	1	0.4%	54.4	\$43.37	\$47.79	\$11,231.72
TLEP	Hoffman Estates	105.0	199	0	0.0%	31.7	\$35.31	\$66.92	\$7,026.60
TLEP	Springfield	721.0	741	34	4.6%	58.4	\$45.14	\$46.39	\$33,446.27
TLEP	Winnebago County	253.0	144	7	4.9%	105.4	\$127.16	\$72.37	\$18,310.72
CMV-SEP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		21.0	42	0	0.0%	30.0	\$21.02	\$42.05	\$882.96
IMAGE GRANTS SUBTOTAL		3,713.3	5,904	10	0.2%	37.7	\$31.79	\$50.55	\$187,688.95
LAP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		405.5	243	58	23.9%	100.1	\$79.45	\$47.61	\$19,307.28
MAP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		632.8	633	57	9.0%	60.0	\$48.48	\$48.50	\$30,685.85
RSC GRANTS SUBTOTAL		54.0	25	2	8.0%	129.6	\$92.00	\$42.59	\$2,300.09
SEP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		627.5	1,237	1	0.1%	30.4	\$24.10	\$47.50	\$29,805.72
TLEP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		1,314.0	1,343	42	3.1%	58.7	\$52.13	\$53.28	\$70,015.31
REGULAR GRANTS TOTAL		6,768.0	9,427	170	1.8%	43.1	\$36.14	\$50.34	\$340,686.16

- Column 1: Type of grant that agency had
- Column 2: Participating law enforcement agency
- Column 3: Number of patrol hours conducted during YDDYL enforcement
- Column 4: Total number of citations written by law enforcement agency during statewide YDDYL enforcement
- Column 5: Total numbers of DUIs written by law enforcement agency during the statewide YDDYL enforcement
- Column 6: Percentage of total citations that were DUI citations
- Column 7: Number of minutes it took to write a citation = 60 / Number of citations per hour
- Column 8: Cost per citation = Total Cost / Number of Citations
- Column 9: Cost per patrol hour = Total Cost / Number of Patrol Hours
- Column 10: Total Cost = amount of money reimbursed to law enforcement by DTS for statewide enforcement

Program Descriptions:

- CMV-SEP – Commercial Motor Vehicle Speed Enforcement Program
- IMAGE – Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement Program
- LAP – Local Alcohol Program
- MAP – Mini-Grant Alcohol Program
- RSC – Roadside Safety Check
- SEP – Speed Enforcement Program
- TLEP – Traffic Law Enforcement Program

TABLE 7: REGULAR GRANTEES WITH MULTIPLE GRANTS ENFORCEMENT AND ASSOCIATED COSTS

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grantee Type	Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
MINI	Algonquin	36.0	58	1	1.7%	37.2	\$29.34	\$47.26	\$1,701.51
SEP	Algonquin	128.0	284	0	0.0%	27.0	\$25.93	\$57.54	\$7,365.14
MINI	Alton	77.0	82	8	9.8%	56.3	\$42.23	\$44.98	\$3,463.24
IMAGE	Alton	145.0	389	2	0.5%	22.4	\$19.60	\$52.60	\$7,626.30
MAP	Alton	44.0	34	4	11.8%	77.6	\$53.75	\$41.53	\$1,827.37
MINI	Arlington Heights	140.0	196	3	1.5%	42.9	\$38.06	\$53.28	\$7,459.15
SEP	Arlington Heights	128.0	317	0	0.0%	24.2	\$23.45	\$58.07	\$7,433.50
MINI	Barrington Hills	87.0	117	1	0.9%	44.6	\$37.41	\$50.31	\$4,377.29
SEP	Barrington Hills	27.0	53	0	0.0%	30.6	\$30.09	\$59.06	\$1,594.56
CMV-SEP	Barrington-Inverness	40.0	46	0	0.0%	52.2	\$47.63	\$54.78	\$2,191.20
IMAGE	Barrington-Inverness	184.0	210	0	0.0%	52.6	\$50.95	\$58.15	\$10,700.16
SEP	Bartonville	33.0	56	0	0.0%	35.4	\$20.00	\$33.94	\$1,120.08
IMAGE	Bartonville	110.0	123	0	0.0%	53.7	\$28.48	\$31.84	\$3,502.58
MINI	Bartonville	52.0	63	0	0.0%	49.5	\$26.48	\$32.08	\$1,668.06
MAP	Belleville	45.0	39	5	12.8%	69.2	\$47.38	\$41.06	\$1,847.75
IMAGE	Belleville	135.0	211	0	0.0%	38.4	\$25.04	\$39.13	\$5,282.90
MINI	Berwyn	63.0	102	1	1.0%	37.1	\$32.84	\$53.17	\$3,349.50
IMAGE	Berwyn	187.0	359	0	0.0%	31.3	\$28.37	\$54.46	\$10,183.54
IMAGE	Burnham	96.0	133	0	0.0%	43.3	\$32.69	\$45.29	\$4,347.72
SEP	Burnham	41.0	100	0	0.0%	24.6	\$21.11	\$51.49	\$2,111.11
IMAGE	Calumet City	108.0	311	0	0.0%	20.8	\$7.65	\$22.03	\$2,379.63
MINI	Calumet City	244.0	39	2	5.1%	375.4	\$230.19	\$36.79	\$8,977.51
MINI	Carol Stream	125.0	103	8	7.8%	91.9	\$78.87	\$51.51	\$6,631.52
IMAGE	Carol Stream	133.0	264	3	1.1%	30.2	\$17.88	\$35.48	\$4,719.46
SEP	Carol Stream	76.0	194	0	0.0%	23.5	\$22.52	\$57.49	\$4,369.15
MAP	Carpentersville	64.0	35	6	17.1%	109.7	\$107.79	\$58.95	\$3,772.59
MINI	Carpentersville	70.0	53	5	9.4%	79.2	\$71.98	\$54.50	\$3,815.00
MINI	Champaign	22.0	15	2	13.3%	88.0	\$48.24	\$32.89	\$723.56
SEP	Champaign	129.0	300	0	0.0%	25.8	\$21.03	\$48.91	\$6,309.93
LAP	Chicago	296.0	647	15	2.3%	27.4	\$27.77	\$60.70	\$17,967.20
MINI	Chicago	768.0	270	45	16.7%	170.7	\$157.75	\$55.46	\$42,592.00
SEP	Chicago	696.0	1162	2	0.2%	35.9	\$40.14	\$67.02	\$46,648.00
LAP	Chicago Heights	34.5	21	4	19.0%	98.6	\$80.10	\$48.76	\$1,682.07
SEP	Chicago Heights	32.0	93	0	0.0%	20.6	\$16.02	\$46.55	\$1,489.51

TABLE 7: (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grantee Type	Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
MAP	Clarendon Hills	16.0	21	0	0.0%	45.7	\$58.27	\$76.48	\$1,223.70
SEP	Clarendon Hills	28.0	81	0	0.0%	20.7	\$20.30	\$58.71	\$1,643.97
SEP	Cook County	285.0	602	0	0.0%	28.4	\$26.83	\$56.66	\$16,149.07
MINI	Cook County	42.0	17	0	0.0%	148.2	\$125.54	\$50.81	\$2,134.20
MINI	East Moline	81.0	53	2	3.8%	91.7	\$55.27	\$36.17	\$2,929.49
IMAGE	East Moline	22.0	29	0	0.0%	45.5	\$50.75	\$66.89	\$1,471.66
SEP	Elgin	122.0	333	0	0.0%	22.0	\$20.56	\$56.11	\$6,845.59
MINI	Elgin	53.0	73	4	5.5%	43.6	\$20.19	\$27.81	\$1,473.92
LAP	Elgin	75.0	157	18	11.5%	28.7	\$32.20	\$67.40	\$5,054.85
IMAGE	Evanston	148.0	183	0	0.0%	48.5	\$50.19	\$62.06	\$9,184.59
RSC	Evanston	75.0	61	0	0.0%	73.8	\$66.35	\$53.96	\$4,047.37
IMAGE	Fairmont City	56.0	74	0	0.0%	45.4	\$28.10	\$37.14	\$2,079.59
SEP	Fairmont City	60.0	100	0	0.0%	36.0	\$16.45	\$27.42	\$1,645.47
MAP	Hinsdale	40.0	42	2	4.8%	57.1	\$56.75	\$59.59	\$2,383.62
IMAGE	Hinsdale	100.0	100	0	0.0%	60.0	\$61.99	\$61.99	\$6,198.57
IMAGE	Joliet	140.0	373	1	0.3%	22.5	\$23.55	\$62.74	\$8,783.61
MINI	Joliet	71.0	72	1	1.4%	59.2	\$59.10	\$59.94	\$4,255.55
OPEZ	Joliet	64.0	116	0	0.0%	33.1	\$30.17	\$54.69	\$3,499.98
SEP	Joliet	215.0	637	0	0.0%	20.3	\$17.83	\$52.83	\$11,358.39
MINI	Lincolnwood	27.0	29	0	0.0%	55.9	\$54.44	\$58.47	\$1,578.64
TLEP	Lincolnwood	174.0	167	0	0.0%	62.5	\$61.04	\$58.59	\$10,194.08
SEP	Lombard	73.0	87	1	1.1%	50.3	\$44.16	\$52.62	\$3,841.50
MINI	Lombard	67.8	45	1	2.2%	90.3	\$68.64	\$45.59	\$3,088.97
IMAGE	Madison	239.0	333	0	0.0%	43.1	\$23.98	\$33.41	\$7,983.86
SEP	Madison	74.0	179	0	0.0%	24.8	\$14.41	\$34.85	\$2,579.09
MINI	McHenry County	36.0	56	1	1.8%	38.6	\$32.48	\$50.53	\$1,819.02
IMAGE	McHenry County	135.0	169	0	0.0%	47.9	\$47.76	\$59.79	\$8,071.50
SEP	McHenry County	61.0	111	0	0.0%	33.0	\$27.52	\$50.08	\$3,055.01
MAP	Metropolis	30.0	16	0	0.0%	112.5	\$82.77	\$44.15	\$1,324.37
OPEZ	Metropolis	30.0	32	0	0.0%	56.3	\$27.55	\$29.38	\$881.44
IMAGE	Monmouth	105.0	106	2	1.9%	59.4	\$38.64	\$39.01	\$4,096.17
SEP	Monmouth	51.0	116	0	0.0%	26.4	\$15.88	\$36.12	\$1,842.32
MINI	Monmouth	70.0	62	4	6.5%	67.7	\$37.29	\$33.03	\$2,312.16
IMAGE	Orland Park	96.0	302	0	0.0%	19.1	\$20.23	\$63.64	\$6,109.56
RSC	Orland Park	24.0	10	0	0.0%	144.0	\$135.53	\$56.47	\$1,355.31
OPEZ	Orland Park	30.0	89	0	0.0%	20.2	\$19.43	\$57.65	\$1,729.38

TABLE 7: (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grantee Type	Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUJs	Percent DUJs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
IMAGE	Palatine	156.0	175	0	0.0%	53.5	\$54.52	\$61.16	\$9,540.47
MAP	Palatine	194.0	155	4	2.6%	75.1	\$48.46	\$38.72	\$7,511.80
IMAGE	Pekin	228.0	305	1	0.3%	44.9	\$29.24	\$39.12	\$8,919.60
SEP	Pekin	132.0	250	0	0.0%	31.7	\$22.95	\$43.46	\$5,736.75
IMAGE	Peoria	107.0	179	0	0.0%	35.9	\$21.85	\$36.55	\$3,910.38
TLEP	Peoria	108.0	169	0	0.0%	38.3	\$39.51	\$61.83	\$6,677.18
SEP	Peoria Heights	101.0	201	0	0.0%	30.1	\$20.43	\$40.65	\$4,105.57
MINI	Peoria Heights	80.0	22	0	0.0%	218.2	\$117.70	\$32.37	\$2,589.40
IMAGE	Quincy	110.0	254	0	0.0%	26.0	\$32.07	\$74.05	\$8,145.50
MINI	Quincy	36.0	11	0	0.0%	196.4	\$130.79	\$39.96	\$1,438.72
SEP	Rock Island	66.0	206	1	0.5%	19.2	\$14.20	\$44.32	\$2,924.98
MINI	Rock Island	6.0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$41.97	\$251.82
CMV-SEP	Rockford	33.0	35	0	0.0%	56.6	\$62.34	\$66.12	\$2,181.80
RSC	Rockford	55.0	91	1	1.1%	36.3	\$33.32	\$55.13	\$3,032.03
MINI	Roselle	44.0	29	2	6.9%	91.0	\$72.41	\$47.73	\$2,100.00
MAP	Roselle	43.0	66	2	3.0%	39.1	\$36.44	\$55.93	\$2,404.83
LAP	Sangamon County	182.0	85	23	27.1%	128.5	\$95.17	\$44.45	\$8,089.27
MINI	Sangamon County	7.0	7	0	0.0%	60.0	\$32.31	\$32.31	\$226.14
IMAGE	Schaumburg	144.0	155	0	0.0%	55.7	\$55.73	\$59.99	\$8,638.24
SEP	Schaumburg	84.0	177	0	0.0%	28.5	\$26.25	\$55.31	\$4,645.78
MINI	Schaumburg	84.0	62	0	0.0%	81.3	\$76.52	\$56.48	\$4,743.93
LAP	Skokie	137.0	163	4	2.5%	50.4	\$47.53	\$56.55	\$7,746.79
TLEP	Skokie	405.0	577	0	0.0%	42.1	\$32.39	\$46.14	\$18,687.15
IMAGE	Stephenson County	208.0	276	3	1.1%	45.2	\$36.73	\$48.73	\$10,136.52
TLEP	Stephenson County	323.5	145	0	0.0%	133.9	\$80.07	\$35.89	\$11,610.18
MINI	Streamwood	42.0	31	1	3.2%	81.3	\$59.75	\$44.10	\$1,852.20
MAP	Streamwood	45.0	43	0	0.0%	62.8	\$50.82	\$48.56	\$2,185.15
Injury Prevention	Wheaton	70.0	45	0	0.0%	93.3	\$89.96	\$57.83	\$4,048.10
SEP	Wheaton	96.0	150	0	0.0%	38.4	\$38.12	\$59.56	\$5,718.22
IMAGE	Wheaton	180.0	348	1	0.3%	31.0	\$28.50	\$55.10	\$9,918.00
TLEP	Wheeling	318.0	299	10	3.3%	63.8	\$50.60	\$47.57	\$15,128.83
CMV-SEP	Wheeling	50.0	77	0	0.0%	39.0	\$35.89	\$55.27	\$2,763.45

TABLE 7: (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Grantee Type	Agency	Total Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
LAP	Will County	136.0	108	9	8.3%	75.6	\$81.93	\$65.06	\$8,848.16
MINI	Will County	24.0	32	2	6.3%	45.0	\$35.73	\$47.64	\$1,143.24
CMV-SEP	Will County	136.5	332	0	0.0%	24.7	\$20.55	\$49.98	\$6,822.29
SEP	Will County	181.0	443	0	0.0%	24.5	\$21.84	\$53.46	\$9,675.93
MINI	Williamson County	54.0	34	3	8.8%	95.3	\$47.77	\$30.08	\$1,624.32
MAP	Williamson County	42.0	48	3	6.3%	52.5	\$30.04	\$34.33	\$1,441.94
CMV-SEP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		259.5	490	0	0.0%	31.8	\$28.49	\$53.79	\$13,958.74
IMAGE GRANTS SUBTOTAL		3,272.0	5,361	13	0.2%	36.6	\$30.21	\$49.49	\$161,930.11
Injury Prevention GRANTS SUBTOTAL		70.0	45	0	0.0%	93.3	\$89.96	\$57.83	\$4,048.10
LAP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		860.5	1,181	73	6.2%	43.7	\$41.82	\$57.39	\$49,388.34
MAP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		563.0	499	26	5.2%	67.7	\$51.95	\$46.04	\$25,923.12
MINI GRANTS SUBTOTAL		2,508.8	1,733	97	5.6%	86.9	\$69.43	\$47.96	\$120,320.06
OPEZ GRANTS SUBTOTAL		124.0	237	0	0.0%	31.4	\$25.78	\$49.28	\$6,110.80
RSC GRANTS SUBTOTAL		154.0	162	1	0.6%	57.0	\$52.07	\$54.77	\$8,434.71
SEP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		2,919.0	6,232	4	0.1%	28.1	\$25.71	\$54.88	\$160,208.62
TLEP GRANTS SUBTOTAL		1,328.5	1,357	10	0.7%	58.7	\$45.91	\$46.89	\$62,297.42
GRANTEES WITH MULTIPLE GRANTS TOTAL		12,059.3	17,297	224	1.3%	41.8	\$35.42	\$50.80	\$612,620.02

- Column 1: Type of grant that agency had
- Column 2: Participating law enforcement agency
- Column 3: Number of patrol hours conducted during YDDYL enforcement
- Column 4: Total number of citations written by law enforcement agency during statewide YDDYL enforcement
- Column 5: Total numbers of DUIs written by law enforcement agency during the statewide YDDYL enforcement
- Column 6: Percentage of total citations that were DUI citations
- Column 7: Number of minutes it took to write a citation = 60 / Number of citations per hour
- Column 8: Cost per citation = Total Cost / Number of Citations
- Column 9: Cost per patrol hour = Total Cost / Number of Patrol Hours
- Column 10: Total Cost = amount of money reimbursed to law enforcement by DTS for statewide enforcement

Program Descriptions:

- CMV-SEP – Commercial Motor Vehicle Speed Enforcement Program
- IMAGE – Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement Program
- Injury Prevention – Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement Program
- LAP – Local Alcohol Program
- MAP – Mini-Grant Alcohol Program
- MINI – Holiday Mobilization Grant Enforcement Program
- OPEZ – Occupant Protection Enforcement Zone
- RSC – Roadside Safety Check
- SEP – Speed Enforcement Program
- TLEP – Traffic Law Enforcement Program

TABLE 8: ALL GRANT ENFORCEMENT AND ASSOCIATED COSTS

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Grant Type	# Patrol Hours	Total Citations	Total DUIs	Percent DUIs	Citation Written Every X Minutes	Cost Per Citation	Cost Per Patrol Hour	Total Reimbursement
MINI GRANTS TOTAL	4,845.3	3,787	149	3.9%	76.8	\$55.51	\$43.39	\$210,215.53
REGULAR GRANTS TOTAL	16,318.5	24,991	297	1.2%	39.2	\$33.33	\$51.05	\$832,986.12
ILLINOIS STATE POLICE TOTAL	2,603.5	1,855	125	6.7%	84.2	\$101.57	\$72.37	\$188,417.72
GRAND TOTAL	23,767.3	30,633	571	1.9%	46.6	\$40.21	\$51.82	\$1,231,619.37

- Column 1: Type of grant that agency had
- Column 2: Number of patrol hours conducted during CIOT enforcement
- Column 3: Total number of citations written by law enforcement agency during statewide CIOT enforcement
- Column 4: Total numbers of DUIs written by law enforcement agency during the statewide YDDYL enforcement
- Column 5: Percentage of total citations that were DUI citations
- Column 6: Number of minutes it took to write a citation = 60 / Number of citations per hour
- Column 7: Cost per citation = Total Cost / Number of Citations
- Column 8: Cost per patrol hour = Total Cost / Number of Patrol Hours
- Column 9: Total Cost = amount of money reimbursed to law enforcement by DTS for statewide enforcement