Evaluation of MAP (Mini-Grant Alcohol Program) Projects in Illinois in 2004

Compiled and Prepared by
Illinois Department of Transportation
Division of Traffic Safety
Evaluation Unit
3215 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9245
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 of 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 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 enforcement component (e.g., Traffic Law Enforcement Program, Local Alcohol Program, IMaGE 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 in 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 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.

This report provides descriptive evaluations of the Traffic Law Enforcement Program (TLEP) and the Local Alcohol Program (LAP) projects using the Fiscal Year 2004 monthly enforcement data obtained from the local grantees.

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.
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Executive Summary of MAP Program

During FY04, the Division of Traffic Safety funded 22 MAP projects. A MAP grantee is usually a local police agency with an adequate number of police officers who are familiar with traffic safety related issues. The main goal of the MAP program is to reduce the number of individuals involved in fatal and serious injury impaired driving crashes by focusing on impaired driving violations at selected locations and selected time slots. The enforcement activities were scheduled seven times a year (two-week period per campaign).

Summary data and information on these 22 projects are provided in Table 1. Table 1 shows total traffic enforcement data for the eight enforcement campaigns. In addition, summary statistics, such as average campaign patrol hours, motorist contact rate, percent occupant protection violations, percent speed violations, DUI rate and alcohol-related contact rate are reported in this table.

Based on the data provided by the MAP grantees, the following results were obtained:

1. Selected police departments had a total of 6,340 patrol hours, an average of 793 hours per campaign (6,340 divided by 8 campaigns).
2. A total of 7,964 vehicles were stopped during these campaigns, with a vehicle contact rate of one for every 47.8 minutes of patrol.
3. A total of 6,237 citations and written warnings were issued (one for every 61.0 minutes).
4. There were 1,575 speeding citations issued during the seven enforcement campaigns.
5. A total of 557 DUI citations were issued.
6. There were 381 alcohol-related and 90 drug-related citations issued.
7. The projects also issued 64 sworn reports to motorists under the age of 21 with a positive BAC level under .08.

It should be noted that no specific occupant protection objectives were set for the MAP program since occupant protection violations are a secondary emphasis for the MAP projects. A total of 1,132 safety belt and child restraint citations/written warnings were issued during all eight campaigns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Citation</th>
<th>Campaign #1</th>
<th>Campaign #2</th>
<th>Campaign #3</th>
<th>Campaign #4</th>
<th>Campaign #5</th>
<th>Campaign #6</th>
<th>Campaign #7</th>
<th>Campaign #8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Moving Viol.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Belt</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Restraint</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outland Warrants</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended License</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Reports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Belt W/Warning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Rest. W/Warning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Stopped</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>7964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Contact Rate</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average B.A.C.'s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DUI Proc Hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Totals</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>6237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Citation</th>
<th>Regular Non-Overtime Patrol</th>
<th>MAP SUMMARY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Moving Viol.</td>
<td>2354</td>
<td>3283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Belt</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Restraint</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Belt W/Warning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Rest. W/Warning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Enf. Total</td>
<td>4356</td>
<td>4596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Patrol Hours</td>
<td>766.95</td>
<td>847.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total F.T.A.'s</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Average Campaign Patrol Hours: 905.7 hours
- Motorist Contact Rate (citations/written warnings): 61.0 min
- Occupant Protection Violation Percentage: 21.2%
- Speed Violation Percentage: 25.3%
- DUI Rate: 11.4 hours
- Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate: 5.8 hours
In Illinois, during 2003 1,454 persons were killed in fatal crashes (Fatal Analysis Reporting System 2003). In 2003, approximately 136,279 persons were injured in crashes (Statewide Summary of Motor Vehicle Crash Statistics, 2003). The cost per death in Illinois for 2003 was $1,120,000 and the cost per nonfatal disabling injury was $55,500 (National Safety Council, Illinois 2002). Based on Fatal Analysis Reporting System (FARS) data, 640 (44.0 percent) of fatalities occurred in alcohol related crashes.

Many lives could be saved by changing public attitudes regarding risk taking behaviors such as impaired driving, speeding, and the non-use of safety belts and child safety seats. It has been shown that visible enforcement programs focusing on these violations offer the greatest potential for changing these behaviors. To change public attitudes regarding these behaviors, the Division of Traffic Safety (DTS) developed the M.A.P. program (Mini-grant Alcohol enforcement Program). The MAP program provides overtime enforcement officers to enforce impaired driving and occupant protection violations during eight specified enforcement periods throughout the state. These enforcement periods are scheduled around holidays when the highways are the busiest. All agencies participating in the program conduct enforcement within the same two-week period (see Appendix A) to ensure high visibility of enforcement statewide.

The Specific Goals of the M.A.P. Program are:

1. To reduce the number of fatal and alcohol-related traffic crashes.
2. To increase enforcement of impaired driving laws. (Secondary emphasis to speed and occupant restraint violations).

In FY04 the Division of Traffic Safety’s Local Projects Section funded 22 M.A.P. projects throughout the state. Funding for the MAP program, which is administered by DTS, is provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Although a total of $413,422.00 was obligated to fund the 22 MAP projects, actual program cost for FY04 was $297,025. The average cost of one hour of patrol within a MAP project was $46.85 ($297,025 divided by 6,340 patrol hours), while the average cost of a citation/written warnings was $47.62 ($297,025 divided by 6,237 citations/written warnings) during FY04.

The evaluations of the MAP projects were based on the enforcement data submitted to the Division by the 22 local agencies. A graphic distribution of 22 MAP projects is displayed in Illinois map (see Appendix B).
General objectives of the MAP projects:

X number of patrol hours per enforcement campaign.
A minimum of one (1) motorist contact (written warnings and citations) for every 60 minutes of patrol.
A minimum of one DUI arrest for every ten (10) hours of patrol.
An alcohol-related contact of one for every six (6) hours of patrol.
A DUI processing rate of no more than two (2) hours.

The above objectives vary from location to location. The number of patrol hours and contact rates are determined by the population in that location, the higher the population size in that location, the higher the hours of patrol for that location. This procedure has been determined using historical data available at the Division. Table A depicts selected MAP grant categories based on population size and their specific objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories based on population (1)</th>
<th>Patrol hours (2)</th>
<th>Contact rate (3)</th>
<th>DUI Rate (4)</th>
<th>Alcohol-Related rate (5)</th>
<th>DUI processing (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2501-10,000</td>
<td>24-30 per campaign (210 annually)</td>
<td>One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes</td>
<td>One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol</td>
<td>One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol</td>
<td>A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-25,000</td>
<td>36-42 per campaign (294 annually)</td>
<td>One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes</td>
<td>One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol</td>
<td>One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol</td>
<td>A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001-50,000</td>
<td>40-46 per campaign (322 annually)</td>
<td>One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes</td>
<td>One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol</td>
<td>One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol</td>
<td>A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50,000</td>
<td>48-54 per campaign (378 annually)</td>
<td>One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes</td>
<td>One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol</td>
<td>One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol</td>
<td>A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote
Column 1: Selected population categories
Column 2: Total number of hours assigned to each population category
Column 3: The number of traffic stops every 60 minutes of patrol.
Column 4: The assigned number of DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.
Column 5: The assigned number of alcohol-related citations for every six hours of patrol.
Column 6: The number of hours to process a DUI.
Category 1: Population 2,501-10,000

Participating Police Departments (6)

1) Caseyville Police Dept  
2) East Hazel Crest Police Dept.  
3) Centreville Police Dept  
4) Lebanon Police Dept.  
5) Creve Couer Police Dept.  
6) New Athens Police Dept.

Objective 1: Conduct 24-30 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (192-240 hours annually).

Accomplishments:
Five of the six projects met this objective. The category had a range of 23.4 hours of patrol per campaign in New Athens to 40.7 hours of patrol per campaign in Centreville.

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Three departments met this objective. They were Caseyville, Centreville, and New Athens. The category as a whole had a range of one motorist contact for every 24.1 minutes of patrol to one motorist contact for every 136.8 minutes of patrol.

Objective 3: Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Two of the six departments met this objective. The category had a range of one DUI citation for every 6.1 hours of patrol for the Centreville Police Department to one DUI citation for every 26.7 hours of patrol for the New Athens Police Department.

Objective 4: Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Four of the six departments met this objective. The category had a range of one alcohol-related citation every 3.4 hours of patrol to one alcohol-related citation every 8.5 hours of patrol.
Objective 5: Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

Accomplishments:
All six departments met this objective. The category had a range of a DUI processing time of 0.9 of an hour to 1.8 hours to process a DUI.

Category Results:

Centreville had the best DUI arrest rate in this category writing a DUI citation for every 6.1 hours of patrol; however, they have only submitted reports for the first three campaigns. In this category there were 256 speeding, 95 DUI, 102 alcohol related, 254 seat belt and 15 child restraint citations issued. Table 2 provides data and information pertaining to Category 1 projects.
## Table 2
### Category 1: Population 2,501 - 10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA: 210 Hrs/Yr Total Campaign Patrol Hours</th>
<th>Number of Campaigns Entered</th>
<th>Average Campaign Patrol Hours</th>
<th>Motorist Contact Rate</th>
<th>DUI Rate</th>
<th>Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate</th>
<th>DUI Processing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caseyville</td>
<td>232.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centreville</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creve Coeur</td>
<td>203.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>187.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>136.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory

Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports) / Total Number of Campaign Hours

Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)
Category 2: Population 10,001-25,000

Participating Police Departments (6)
1) Bradley Police Department
2) O'Fallon Police Department
3) Palos Heights Police Department
4) Southern Illinois University Police Department (SIU)
5) Western Illinois University Police Department (WIU)
6) Wood Dale Police Department

Objective 1: Conduct 36-42 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (288-336 hours annually).

Accomplishments:
Five of the six departments met this objective. The other department marginally met this objective. The category had a range of 35.1 hours of patrol per campaign to 53.8 hours of patrol per campaign.

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Three of the six departments met this objective. Palos Heights, Western Illinois University, and Wood Dale Police Departments met the objective with contact rate of one contact for every 31.3, 43.4 and 46.3 minutes of patrol respectively. The category had a range of one contact every 31.3 minutes of patrol to one contact every 86.1 minutes of patrol.

Objective 3: Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
One of the six departments met this objective (Southern Illinois University Police Department). The Western Illinois University, Palos Heights and Wood Dale Police Departments marginally met this objective with a DUI citation for every 10.4, 11.3 and 11.7 hours of patrol respectively. The category had a range of one DUI citation for every 8.5 hours of patrol to one DUI citation for every 29.0 hours of patrol.

Objective 4: Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Three of the six departments met this objective. Wood Dale Police Department marginally met the objective with an alcohol-related citation for every 6.5 hours of patrol. The category had a range of one alcohol-related citation for every 4.5 hours of patrol to one alcohol-related citation for every 7.7 hours of patrol.
Objective 5: Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

Accomplishments:
All six of the departments met this objective. The category had a range of processing a DUI in 1.2 hours to processing a DUI in 1.8 hours.

Category Results:
The six departments in this category wrote 396 speeding, 146 DUI, 114 alcohol related, 529 seat belt and 15 child restraint citations. Table 3 provides data and information pertaining to Category 2 projects.
Table 3
Category 2: Population 10,001-25,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA: 294 Hrs/Year Campaign</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CRITERIA: 36-42 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign
| Criteria Met? | Yes | No |
| Motorist Contact Rate (in Minutes) | 5.2 |
| DUI Rate | X | X | X | X | X |
| Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate (in Minutes) | 5.2 |
| DUI Processing Rate | X | X | X | X | X |
| Criteria Met? | Yes | No |
| Yes No |
| Yes No |
| Yes No |
| Yes No |

Bradley 245.5 6 40.9 X 86.1 X 14.4 X 7.7 X 1.6 X
O'Fallon 376.8 7 53.8 X 84.0 X 29.0 X 7.5 X 1.3 X
Palos Heights 294.5 8 36.8 X 31.3 X 11.3 X 4.8 X 1.6 X
SIU 330.4 8 41.3 X 78.7 X 8.5 X 5.7 X 1.2 X
WIU 280.8 8 35.1 X 43.4 X 10.4 X 4.5 X 1.5 X
Wood Dale 280.0 7 40.0 X 46.3 X 11.7 X 6.5 X 1.8 X

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory
Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)
Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60
Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)
Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports) )
Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)
Category 3: Population 25,001-50,000

Participating Police Departments (5)

1) Alton Police Dept.
2) Elmhurst Police Dept.
3) Kankakee Police Dept.
4) Moline Police Dept.
5) Rock Island Police Dept.

Objective 1: Conduct 40-46 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (320-368 hours annually).

Accomplishments:
All five departments met this objective. The category had a range of 40.4 hours of patrol per campaign to 46.3 hours of patrol per campaign.

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Alton and Kankakee Police departments met this objective. Moline and Rock Island marginally met this objective. They had motorist contact rates of one citation for every 62.8 and 64.4 minutes of patrol. Elmhurst Police department failed to meet this objective. The category had a range of one contact every 56.1 minutes of patrol to one contact for every 78.0 minutes of patrol.

Objective 3: Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Two departments met this objective (Rock Island and Kankakee Police Departments). The category had a range of one DUI for every 4.8 hours of patrol to one DUI for every 27.3 hours of patrol.

Objective 4: Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Two of the five departments met this objective. The category had a range of one alcohol-related citation every 3.4 hours of patrol to one alcohol-related citation every 9.6 hours of patrol.

Objective 5: Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

Accomplishments:
All six departments met the objective of processing a DUI in less than 2 hours. The category had a range 0.6 an hour to 1.7 hours to process a DUI.
**Category Results:**

Combined the five departments in this category wrote 232 speeding, 157 DUI, 88 alcohol related, 164 seat belt and 11 child restraint citations. The Kankakee Police Department met all five objectives in their respective project. **Table 4** provides data and information pertaining to **Category 3** projects.
# Table 4

## Category 3: Population 25,001 - 50,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Processing Rate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Rate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist Contact Rate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Campaigns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Campaign Hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Campaigns Entered</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Campaign Patrol Hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory.

Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports) /)

Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)
Category 4: Population over 50,000

Participating Police Departments (5)

1) Madison County Sheriff’s Department
2) McHenry County Sheriff’s Department
3) Naperville Police Department
4) Peoria Police Department
5) Williamson County Sheriff’s Department

Objective 1: Conduct 48-54 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (384-432 hours annually).

Accomplishments:
Two of the five departments met this objective. The category had a range of 51.6 hours of patrol per campaign to 39.0 hours of patrol per campaign.

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Two of the five departments met this objective. The other three departments ranged from one contact for every 63.8 minutes of patrol to one contact for every 68.0 minutes of patrol.

Objective 3: Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Three of the five departments met this objective. Those departments were Naperville, Peoria, and Williamson County Police Departments. The category had a range of one DUI every 6.0 hours of patrol to one DUI for every 47.5 hours of patrol.

Objective 4: Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

Accomplishments:
Naperville, Peoria and Williamson County Police Departments met this objective. The category had a range of one alcohol-related citation for every 3.8 hours of patrol to one alcohol-related citation for every 15.6 hours of patrol.

Objective 5: Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

Accomplishments:
Four of the five departments met this objective. McHenry County marginally met the objective with a DUI processing time of 2.3 hours per DUI.
**Category Results:**

The Naperville Police department met every objective. The five departments in this category wrote 521 speeding, 157 DUI, 76 alcohol related, 126 seat belt and 4 child restraint citations. **Table 5** provides data and information pertaining to **Category 4** projects.
### Table 5
**Category 4: Population Over 50,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Campaign Patrol Hours</th>
<th>Average Campaign Patrol Hours</th>
<th>Number of Campaigns Entered</th>
<th>Campaign To Date Criteria Met?</th>
<th>Number of Campaigns</th>
<th>Average Patrol Hours</th>
<th>Motorist Contact Rate Criteria Met?</th>
<th>DUI Rate Criteria Met?</th>
<th>Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate Criteria Met?</th>
<th>DUI Processing Rate Criteria Met?</th>
<th>Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Per Every 6 Patrol Hours Criteria Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison County</td>
<td>427.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>63.81</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>361.5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>355.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson County</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>68.07</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory

Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports)

Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)
### Appendix A

**MINI-GRANT ALCOHOL PROGRAM**  
**FY 2004 Campaign Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Campaign Dates</th>
<th>PI&amp;E</th>
<th>Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Oct. 13 – 19, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 20 – Nov. 2, 2003</td>
<td>PI&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 3 - 9, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 10, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Nov. 17 - 23, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 24 – Dec. 7, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 8 – Dec 14, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>PI&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 10, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Dec. 15 – 21, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 22 - Jan. 4, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 5 - 11, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>PI&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb. 10, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>March 29 – April 4, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 5 – 18, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 19 – April 25, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>PI&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 10, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>May 17 – 23, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 24 – June 6, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 7 – June 13, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>PI&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>June 14 - 20, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 21 - July 4, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 5 - 11, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>PI&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. 10, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Aug. 23 – 29, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. 30 – Sept. 12, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 13 – 19, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>PI&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 10, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be determined by local agency, i.e., local festival, special event, etc.
The State of Illinois

[number of MAP projects in that county]