



Illinois Department of Transportation

Division of Traffic Safety
3215 Executive Park Drive / P.O. Box 19245 / Springfield, Illinois / 62794-9245

TECHNICAL REPORT

April 2006

Evaluation of FY05 Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement Program (IMaGE) and Mini-Grant Alcohol Program (MAP) Projects in Illinois

Compiled and Prepared by

Illinois Department of Transportation

Division of Traffic Safety

Evaluation Unit

3215 Executive Park Drive

Springfield, Illinois 62794-9245

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 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 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.

This report provides descriptive evaluations of the Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement Program (IMaGE) and the Mini-Alcohol Program (MAP) using the fiscal year 2005 monthly enforcement data obtained from the local grantees. The focus of the enforcement projects included, but was not limited to, occupant protection enforcement, speeding enforcement, and impaired driving enforcement.

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

Table of Contents

IMaGE Projects Section

Analysis of the FY05 IMaGE Projects	1
Summary of IMaGE Program.....	2
Evaluation of IMaGE Program	5
General Objectives of IMaGE Projects	6
Category 1 IMaGE: Population under 2,500	8
Category 2 IMaGE: Population 2,501-10,000	11
Category 3 IMaGE: Population 10,001-25,000	14
Category 4 IMaGE: Population 25,001-50,000	17
Category 5 IMaGE: Population 50,001 and over	20

List of IMaGE Tables

Table 1: IMaGE Data Summary Table	4
Table 2: Selected Objectives by Selected Population Categories	7
Table 3: IMaGE: Population Under 2,500	10
Table 4: IMaGE: Population 2,501-10,000.....	13
Table 5: IMaGE: Population 10,001-25,000.....	16
Table 6: IMaGE: Population 25,001-50,000.....	19
Table 7: IMaGE: Population 50,000 and over	22

MAP Projects Section

Analysis of the FY05 MAP Projects	23
Summary of MAP Program	24
Evaluation of MAP Program.....	26
General Objectives of MAP Projects.....	27
Category 1 MAP: Population 2,501-10,000	29
Category 2 MAP: Population 10,001-25,000	31
Category 3 MAP: Population 25,001-50,000	34
Category 4 MAP: Population 50,001 and over.....	36

List of MAP Tables

Table 8: MAP Data Summary Table	25
Table 9: MAP Selected Objectives by Selected Population Categories	28
Table 10: MAP: Population 2,501-10,000	30
Table 11: MAP: Population 10,001-25,000	33
Table 12: MAP: Population 25,001-50,000	35
Table 13: MAP: Population 50,001 and over	37

Appendix A: Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement FY 2005 Campaign Dates	38
Appendix B: Mini Grant Alcohol Program FY 2005 Campaign Dates	39
Appendix C: Map of FY 2005 IMaGE and MAP Projects by County	40

Analysis of the FY05 Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement Program (IMaGE) Projects

Summary of IMaGE Program

During FY 2005, the Division of Traffic Safety funded 50 Integrated Mini Grant Enforcement (IMaGE) projects in Illinois. An IMaGE grantee is usually a local police agency with adequate number of police officers who are familiar with traffic safety related issues. The main goal of the IMaGE program is to promote safety belt and child safety seat use by focusing on occupant protection and speed violations at selected locations and selected time slots. The enforcement activities were scheduled five times a year (two-week period per campaign).

Data and information on these 50 projects are provided in **Table 1**. **Table 1** shows total traffic enforcement data by five 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 and information provided by the IMaGE grantees, the following results were obtained:

1. Selected police departments had a total of 19,702 patrol hours, an average of 3,940 hours per campaign (19,702 divided by 5 campaigns).
2. A total of 183 out of possible 260 campaigns were conducted.
3. A total of 28,670 vehicles were stopped during these campaigns with a vehicle contact rate of one for every 41.2 minutes.
4. A total of 40,075 citations and written warnings were issued (one for every 29.5 minutes of patrol).
5. There were 8,649 speeding citations issued during the five enforcement periods. More than 21 percent of the total citations and written warnings were issued for speeding violations.
6. During FY05, all the IMaGE projects combined issued 16,640 safety belt citations and 108 safety belt written warnings.
7. A total of 3,062 child safety seat citations and 2 child safety seat written warnings were issued.
8. A total of 1,618 alcohol-related citations, including DUIs, were issued during the 183 enforcement campaigns. It should be noted that no specific alcohol-related objectives were set for the IMaGE projects since alcohol-related violations were a secondary emphasis for the IMaGE projects.

Table 1
FY05 IMAGE CAMPAIGN PROJECT DATA SUMMARY TABLE
TOTALS
ALL IMaGE POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Image "Overtime" Enforcement

Type of Citation	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Total
Speeding	1,470	1,522	1,599	2,089	1,969	8,649
Other Moving Viol.	1,594	1,561	1,887	1,157	1,739	7,938
DUI	324	320	334	156	281	1,415
Alcohol Related	30	30	46	58	39	203
Safety Belt	3,534	2,121	5,319	2,674	2,992	16,640
Child Restraint	619	224	822	673	724	3,062
Drugs	40	32	29	33	56	190
Weapons	2	5	4	1	1	13
Stolen Vehicles	0	2	7	3	4	16
Outstand Warrants	74	45	79	143	92	433
Suspended License	162	157	156	513	195	1,183
Sworn Reports	40	28	17	74	64	223
Safety Belt W/Warn.	20	21	57	2	8	108
Child Rest. W/Warn	0	0	2	0	0	2
Vehicles Stopped	5,703	5,023	8,504	3,739	5,701	28,670
Vehicle Contact Rate	40.2	40.5	28.1	70.5	43.8	41.3
Average B.A.C.'s	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Image Totals	7,909	6,068	10,358	7,576	8,164	40,075

Regular Non-Overtime Patrol

Type of Citation	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Total
Speeding	2,115	273	2,102	1,210	1,708	7,408
Other Moving Viol.	3,052	792	4,798	1,937	3,692	14,271
DUI	604	27	1,125	208	866	2,830
Alcohol Related	109	9	69	66	78	331
Safety Belt	568	149	1,178	480	544	2,919
Child Restraint	234	3	545	180	126	1,088
Safety Belt W/Warn.	33	10	42	12	12	109
Child Rest. W/Warn.	16	2	9	7	13	47
Regular Enf. Total	6,731	1,265	9,868	4,100	7,039	29,003

IMAGE SUMMARY DATA

	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Total
Total Patrol Hours	3,817.5	3,387.8	3,983.3	4,393.0	4,162.0	19,743.5
Total P.I. & E.'s	2,187.5	1,857.8	2,041.5	2,151.0	841.5	9,079.3
Pre Survey %					N/A N/A N/A	
Post Survey %	N/A N/A N/A					
Safety Belt % Change						

Average Campaign Patrol Hours	3,948.7 hours
Motorist Contact Rate (citations/written warnings)	29.6 minutes
Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	49.2 %
Speed Violation Percentage	21.6 %
DUI Rate	14.0 hours
Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate	9.7 hours

Evaluation of the Integrated Mini Grant Enforcement Program (IMaGE)

In Illinois, during 2004, 1,356 persons were killed in fatal crashes (Fatal Analysis Reporting System, 2004) and approximately 122,061 persons were injured in motor vehicle crashes (Statewide Summary of Motor Vehicle Crash Statistics, 2004). The cost per death in Illinois for 2004 was \$1,130,000 and the cost per nonfatal disabling injury was \$49,700 (National Safety Council, 2004).

Previous studies have shown that changing public attitudes regarding risk-taking behaviors such as speeding, impaired driving, and not using safety belts and child safety seats will save lives. It has also 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) has developed the IMaGE program. The IMaGE program provides selected police departments with extra funding to place enforcement officers on overtime patrols for speeding violations, impaired driving violations, and occupant protection violations during five 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 IMaGE Program are:

1. Achieve higher use of safety belts and child safety seats.
2. Increase enforcement of occupant restraint, impaired driving and speed laws.
3. Reduce the number of motor vehicle related fatalities and injuries.

In FY05 the Division of Traffic Safety funded 50 IMaGE projects throughout the state. Only 25 of the 51 projects participated in all 5 campaigns. Funding for the IMaGE program, which is administered by DTS, is provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Although a total of \$1,436,795.00 was obligated to fund the 51 IMaGE projects, actual program cost for fiscal year 2005 was \$1,128,982.00. The average cost of one hour of patrol within an IMaGE project was \$57.18 (\$1,128,982 divided by 19,743 patrol hours), while the average cost of a citation/written warning was \$28.17 (\$1,128,982 divided by 40,075 citations/written warnings) during FY03.

The evaluation of the IMaGE program was based on the enforcement data submitted to the Division by the 50 local agencies. Out of 50 projects, 11 met all of their objectives stated in the approved projects. Graphic distribution of all 51 projects is displayed on the Illinois map (see **Appendix C**).

General Objectives of IMaGE Projects

- 1) X number of patrol hours per enforcement campaign
- 2) A minimum of one motorist contact (citations and/or written warnings) for every 60 minutes of patrol.
- 3) Thirty percent of contacts must be for occupant protection violations.
- 4) No more than 50 percent of contacts should be for speeding violations.
- 5) Conduct pre and post observational safety belt surveys.

The above objectives vary from location to location. The patrol hours and contact rates are determined by the population size of a location, the higher the population in a location, the higher the number of patrol hours and contact rates for that location. Location-specific historical data within specific population groups were used to produce selected traffic safety indicators listed in objectives 1 through 4.

Table 2 depicts selected IMaGE grant categories based on population size and their specific objectives.

Table 2: Selected Objectives by Selected Population Categories

Categories based on population (1)	Patrol hours (2)	Contact rate (3)	Occupant protection (4)	Speed (5)	Safety belt surveys (6)
Under 2,500	60-70 per campaign (350 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	Thirty (30) percent of contacts for occupant protection	No more than 50 percent of citations for speed	Conduct pre and post surveys at two (2) sites
2,501-10,000	85-95 per campaign (474 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	Thirty-six (36) percent of contacts for occupant protection	No more than 50 percent of citations for speed	Conduct pre and post surveys at four (4) sites
10,001-25,000	95-105 per campaign (525 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	Thirty-two (32) percent of contacts for occupant protection	No more than 50 percent of citations for speed	Conduct pre and post surveys at six (6) sites
25,001-50,000	125-135 per campaign (675 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	Thirty-three (33) percent of contacts for occupant protection	No more than 50 percent of citations for speed	Conduct pre and post surveys at eight (8) sites
Over 50,000	135-145 per campaign (725 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	Thirty (30) percent of contacts for occupant protection	No more than 50 percent of citations for speed	Conduct pre and post surveys at ten (10) sites

Column 1: Selected population categories

Column 2: Total number of hours assigned to each population category

Column 3: The number of traffic stops every X minutes of patrol

Column 4: The assigned percentage of occupant protection citations

Column 5: No more than 50 percent of citations for speeding

Column 6: The number of pre and post safety belt survey sites

Category 1 IMaGE: Population under 2,500

List of IMaGE Projects with Populations under 2,500:

- | | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 1) Fairmont | 3) Sesser (Withdrew) |
| 2) Roxana | |
-

Category Evaluation

Fairmont and Roxana submitted enforcement data for 4 of 5 campaigns. Sesser only submitted enforcement data for 3 of 5 campaigns and withdrew from the project after submitting the third. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

Objective 1: Conduct 60-70 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (300-350 hours annually).

Accomplishments: *As shown in Table 3, all three police departments met this objective. The average hours of patrol per campaign for Fairmont, Roxana and Sesser were 74.3, 72.5 and 68.0 respectively.*

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

Accomplishments: *Two of the three projects (Roxana and Sesser) met this objective by averaging one contact for every 32.8 minutes of patrol and 54.0 minutes of patrol respectively. On the other hand, Fairmont failed to meet this objective by averaging one contact for every 72.7 minutes of patrol.*

Objective 3: More than 30 percent of all citations must be for written for occupant restraint violations.

Accomplishments: *Three projects in this category met the objective. Roxana issued 30.9% of all citations for occupant restraint violations. Richmond issued 34.7% and East Hazel Crest issued 43.4% of all citations for occupant restraint violations.*

Objective 4: Citations issued for speeding violations must not exceed 50 percent of all citations written.

Accomplishments: *All three projects met this objective with Fairmont issuing 38.6 percent, Roxana issuing 18.6 percent, and Sesser issuing 20.5 percent.*

Objective 5: Agency must conduct pre and post safety belt surveys.

Accomplishments: *East Hazel Crest Police Department, Richmond Police Department and Roxana Police Department conducted pre and post seat belt surveys. East Hazel Crest had an increase in seat*

belt usage of 2.8%, (from 78.5% to 81.3%). Richmond had an increase of 9.9%, (from 73.4% to 83.3%) and Roxana had a decrease in seat belt use of 9.8%, (from 73.0% to 63.2%).

Category Results:

None of the projects in this category met all of the objects. The Roxana and Sesser projects met all of the objectives but did not conduct pre and post observational seat belt surveys. Fairmont met all of the objectives except the motorist contact rate objective by only averaging one contact for every 72.7 minutes of patrol.

Table 3 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 1** projects.

Table 3

FY05 IMAGE Summary Report

Category 1: Population Under 2,500

IMaGE Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12		
	CRITERIA:	Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA:		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA:		Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	CRITERIA:		Speed Violation Percentage	CRITERIA:		Safety Belt Percent Change Between Pre & Post Survey	CRITERIA:	
					60 - 70 Patrol Hours Per Campaign			1 Motorist Contact for each 60 Minutes of Patrol			30% of Contacts for Occupant Protection			Less Than 50% of Contacts for Speeding			Conduct Seat Belt Surveys	
					Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Fairmont	223.0	3	74.3	X		72.7		X	36.4%	X		38.6%	X		0.0%	X		
Roxana	290.0	4	72.5	X		32.8	X		43.9%	X		18.6%	X		N/A		X	
Sesser	272.0	4	68.0	X		54.0	X		53.3%	X		20.5%	X		N/A		X	

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.

Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 7 = Occupant Protection Violation Percentage = ((Seat Belt Violation+Seat Belt Warnings+Child Restraint Violations+Child Restraint Warnings)/ Total Number Citations Written)*100

Column 9 = Speed Violation Percentage =(Number of Speeding Citations / Total Number of Citations) * 100

Category 2 IMaGE: Population 2,501 - 10,000

List of IMaGE Projects with Populations Between 2,501 and 10,000:

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 1) Bradley | 7) Mendota |
| 2) Burnham | 8) Oak Brook |
| 3) Columbia | 9) Riverside |
| 4) Flossmoor | 10) Shorewood |
| 5) Madison | 11) Thornton |
| 6) Maryville | 12) Willowbrook |
-

Category Evaluation

Bradley, Burnham, Flossmoor, Maryville, Mendota, Riverside, and Willowbrook submitted enforcement data for all 5 campaigns. Columbia, Oak Brook, and Thornton submitted enforcement data for 4 of 5 campaigns. Shorewood and Madison submitted enforcement data for 3 and 2 of the 5 campaigns respectively. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

Objective 1: Conduct 85-95 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (425-475 hours annually).

Accomplishments: *Ten of the twelve projects met this objective. The average campaign patrol hours for those projects which met this objective ranged from 88.6 average hours per campaign (Willowbrook Police Department) to 108.6 average hours per campaign (Burnham Police Department). Flossmoor and Shorewood were the two projects which failed to meet this objective by only averaging 81.9 patrol hours per campaign and 71.5 patrol hours per campaign respectively.*

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 45-60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishments: *Nine of the twelve projects in this category met this objective. Those projects included Bradley, Burnham, Flossmoor, Madison, Oak Brook, Riverside, Shorewood, Thornton, and Willowbrook. Of these projects, Madison and Flossmoor had the best contact rates by making one motorist contact for more than every 25 minutes of patrol. The three projects which failed to meet this objective included Columbia (one motorist contact for every 62.0 minutes of patrol), Maryville (one motorist contact for every 66.3 minutes of patrol), and Mendota (one motorist contact for every 61.4 minutes of patrol).*

Objective 3: Thirty six percent of all contacts must be for occupant protection.

Accomplishments: *Nine out of the twelve projects met this objective. For those projects which met this objective, the percentage of occupant restraint violations issued ranged from 38.5 percent (Burnham) to more than 65.0 percent (Thornton). The three projects which failed to meet this objective included Bradley (30.1 percent), Columbia (27.8 percent), and Madison (30.5 percent).*

Objective 4: Speeding contacts must be less than 50 percent.

Accomplishments: *All of the projects within this category met this objective. The percentage of speeding citations issued ranged from 5.8 percent (Flossmoor) to 42.0 percent (Willowbrook).*

Objective 5: Agency must conduct pre and post safety belt surveys.

Accomplishments: *Eight out of twelve departments in this category conducted both pre and post observational seat belt surveys. The following list shows the projects which met this objective with the percentage point change of seat belt use in parentheses: Bradley (11.3), Burnham (6.0), Columbia (2.2), Flossmoor (22.5), Madison (17.8), Maryville (1.2), Mendota (11.2), and Willowbrook (5.5). The four projects which did not conduct both pre and post observational surveys included Oak Brook, Riverside, Shorewood, Thornton.*

Category Results:

Overall two out of the twelve projects (Burnham and Willowbrook) met all five objectives, eight of the twelve projects met four of the five objectives, and Columbia and Shorewood only met three of the five objectives. All of the projects which conducted seat belt surveys noticed increases in seat belt use in their respective areas ranging from increases of 1.2 percentage points (Maryville) to 22.5 percentage points (Flossmoor). The one exception was Columbia which noticed a slight decrease in belt use by 2.2 percentage points.

Table 4 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 2**.

Table 4
FY05 IMAGE Summary Report
Category 2: Population 2,501 - 10,000

IMaGE Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 85-95 Patrol Hours Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate	CRITERIA: 1 Motorist Contact for each 45-60 Minutes of Patrol		Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: 36% of Contacts for Occupant Protection		Speed Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: Less Than 50% of Contacts for Speeding		Safety Belt Percent Change Between Pre & Post Survey	CRITERIA: Conduct Seat Belt Surveys	
				Criteria Met?		(In Minutes)	Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?	
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Bradley	462.3	5	92.5	X		26.1	X		30.1%		X	24.2%	X		11.3%	X	
Burnham	543.0	5	108.6	X		32.7	X		38.5%	X		26.5%	X		6.0%	X	
Columbia	409.0	5	81.8		X	62.0		X	27.8%		X	41.4%	X		-2.2%	X	
Flossmoor	409.5	5	81.9		X	24.8	X		50.1%	X		5.8%	X		22.5%	X	
Madison	190.0	2	95.0	X		24.0	X		30.5%		X	25.5%	X		17.8%	X	
Maryville	440.0	5	88.0	X		66.3		X	47.5%	X		37.2%	X		1.2%	X	
Mendota	473.0	5	94.6	X		61.4		X	50.4%	X		21.2%	X		11.2%	X	
Oak Brook	395.8	4	98.9	X		51.5	X		40.8%	X		37.1%	X		N/A		X
Riverside	458.0	5	91.6	X		46.2	X		40.0%	X		27.9%	X		N/A		X
Shorewood	214.5	3	71.5		X	43.9	X		51.5%	X		24.2%	X		N/A		X
Thornton	370.0	4	92.5	X		52.9	X		65.7%	X		11.0%	X		N/A		X
Willowbrook	443.0	5	88.6	X		26.8	X		45.3%	X		42.0%	X		5.5%	X	

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.
Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.
Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.
Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)
Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60
Column 7 = Occupant Protection Violation Percentage = ((Seat Belt Violation+Seat Belt Warnings+Child Restraint Violations+Child Restraint Warnings)/ Total Number Citations Written)*100
Column 9 = Speed Violation Percentage = (Number of Speeding Citations / Total Number of Citations) * 100

Category 3 IMaGE: Population 10,001 - 25,000

List of IMaGE Projects with Populations Between 10,001 and 25,000:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1) Bellwood | 12) Lemont |
| 2) Blue Island | 13) Lincolnwood |
| 3) Cahokia | 14) Marion |
| 4) Centralia | 15) Melrose Park |
| 5) Collinsville | 16) Midlothian |
| 6) East Moline | 17) Northlake |
| 7) East Peoria | 18) Palos Hills |
| 8) Glen Carbon | 19) Prospect Heights |
| 9) Herrin | 20) West Chicago |
| 10) Homewood | 21) Winnetka |
| 11) Lake in the Hills | |

Category Evaluation

Blue Island, Collinsville, East Moline, East Peoria, Lemont, Marion, Northlake, and West Chicago submitted enforcement data for all 5 campaigns. Cahokia, Centralia, Glen Carbon, Midlothian, Melrose Park, Prospect Heights, and Winnetka submitted enforcement data for 4 of 5 campaigns. Homewood, Lake in the Hills, and Lincolnwood submitted data for 3 of 5 campaigns. Bellwood only submitted enforcement data for 2 campaigns, while Herrin and Palos Hills only submitted enforcement data for 1 campaign each. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

Objective 1: Conduct 95-105 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (475-525 hours annually).

Accomplishment: *Fourteen out of twenty projects in this category met the average enforcement hour objective. Of the projects which met this objective, the average enforcement hours per campaign ranged from 97.1 (Cahokia) to 140.1 (Prospect Heights). The six projects which failed to meet this objective included Blue Island (average of 74.4 patrol hours per campaign), Centralia (average of 87.9 patrol hours per campaign), Collinsville (average of 6.4 patrol hours per campaign), Glen Carbon (average of 62.9 patrol hours per campaign), Marion (average of 88.9 patrol hours per campaign), and Northlake (average of 88.0 patrol hours per campaign)..*

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 45-60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishment: *All of the projects in this category, excluding Herrin, met this objective. For those projects which met this objective, the motorist contact rate ranged from 23.6 (Lemont) to 51.6 (Marion). On the*

other hand, the Glen Carbon Police Department only made one motorist contact for every 65.9 minutes of patrol.

Objective 3: Thirty two percent of all contacts must be for occupant protection.

Accomplishment: *All of the projects in this category met this objective. The percentage of occupant restraint violations issued ranged from 32.2 (Prospect Heights) to 77.0 (Lake in the Hills).*

Objective 4: Speeding contacts must be less than fifty percent.

Accomplishments: *All of the projects in this category met this objective. The percentage of speeding violations issued ranged from 9.5 (East Peoria) to 49.1 (Homewood).*

Objective 5: Agencies must conduct pre and post observational safety belt surveys.

Accomplishments: *Nine of the twenty projects conducted pre and post observational surveys. The following list shows the projects which met this objective with the percentage point change of seat belt use in parentheses: Blue Island (3.8), Cahokia (12.8), Centralia (0.8), East Moline (-1.1), East Peoria (19.9), Glen Carbon (0.4), Homewood (8.7), Lemont (21.2), Lincolnwood (0.0), and Melrose Park (8.0). The remaining 11 projects in this category failed to conduct pre and post observational seat belt surveys.*

Category Results:

For this category, six of the twenty-one projects (Cahokia, East Moline, East Peoria, Homewood, Lemont, Lincolnwood, and Melrose Park) met all five objectives, ten of the twenty projects met four of the five objectives, and four of the twenty projects (Collinsville, Glen Carbon, Marion, and Northlake) met three of the five objectives. Only nine projects conducted both pre and post observational seat belt surveys. Of those that conducted both surveys, the projects which had increases in belt use ranged from 0.4 percentage point (Glen Carbon) to 21.2 percentage points (Lemont). Lincolnwood, Centralia, and East Moline had changes in seat belt use of 0.0 percentage point, -0.8 percentage point, and -1.1 percentage point respectively.

Table 5 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 3**.

Table 5
FY05 IMAGE Summary Report
Category 3: Population 10,001 - 25,000

IMaGE Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 95-105 Patrol Hours Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate	CRITERIA: 1 Motorist Contact for each 45-60 Minutes of Patrol		Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: 32% of Contacts for Occupant Protection		Speed Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: Less Than 50% of Contacts for Speeding		Safety Belt Percent Change Between Pre & Post Survey	CRITERIA: Conduct Seat Belt Surveys	
				Criteria Met?		(In Minutes)	Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?	
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Bellwood	205.3	2	102.6	X		49.9	X		61.5%	X		20.6%	X		N/A		X
Blue Island	372.0	5	74.4		X	27.4	X		37.3%	X		19.4%	X		3.8%	X	
Cahokia	388.3	4	97.1	X		40.4	X		46.5%	X		31.3%	X		12.8%	X	
Centralia	351.5	4	87.9		X	37.3	X		54.0%	X		12.6%	X		-0.8%	X	
Collinsville	316.8	5	63.4		X	49.0	X		38.1%	X		19.6%	X		N/A		X
East Moline	643.0	5	128.6	X		45.9	X		62.7%	X		16.2%	X		-1.1%	X	
East Peoria	501.0	5	100.2	X		42.6	X		73.6%	X		9.5%	X		19.9%	X	
Glen Carbon	251.5	4	62.9		X	65.9		X	52.8%	X		38.9%	X		0.4%	X	
Herrin	105.0	1	105.0	X		48.5	X		40.8%	X		30.8%	X		N/A		X
Homewood	337.3	3	112.4	X		22.5	X		45.2%	X		49.1%	X		8.7%	X	
Lake in the Hills	305.3	3	101.8	X		34.8	X		77.0%	X		6.7%	X		N/A		X
Lemont	596.0	5	119.2	X		23.6	X		54.8%	X		28.8%	X		21.2%	X	
Lincolnwood	311.0	3	103.7	X		35.3	X		32.5%	X		24.4%	X		0.0%	X	
Marion	444.3	5	88.9		X	51.6	X		69.6%	X		22.2%	X		N/A		X
Melrose Park	528.5	4	132.1	X		22.2	X		69.6%	X		19.8%	X		8.0%	X	
Midlothian	411.0	4	102.8	X		35.9	X		62.5%	X		31.6%	X		N/A		X
Northlake	440.0	5	88.0		X	25.5	X		39.0%	X		26.0%	X		N/A		X
Palos Hills	105.0	1	105.0	X		48.5	X		40.8%	X		30.8%	X		N/A		X
Prospect Heights	560.5	4	140.1	X		37.1	X		32.2%	X		27.0%	X		N/A		X
West Chicago	526.0	5	105.2	X		28.8	X		68.0%	X		3.2%	X		N/A		X
Winnetka	502.0	5	100.4	X		49.1	X		35.5%	X		41.2%	X		N/A		X

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.

Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 7 = Occupant Protection Violation Percentage = ((Seat Belt Violation+Seat Belt Warnings+Child Restraint Violations+Child Restraint Warnings)/ Total Number Citations Written)*100

Column 9 = Speed Violation Percentage = (Number of Speeding Citations / Total Number of Citations) * 100

Category 4 IMAgE: Population 25,001 - 50,000

List of IMAgE Projects with Populations Between 25,001 and 50,000:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| 1) Carol Stream | 5) Pekin |
| 2) Elk Grove Village | 6) Rock Island |
| 3) Maywood | 7) Wilmette |
| 4) Moline | |
-

Category Evaluation

Carol Stream, Elk Grove Village, Pekin, Rock Island, and Wilmette submitted enforcement data for all 5 campaigns. Maywood and Moline submitted enforcement data for 4 of the 5 campaigns. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

Objective 1: Conduct 125-135 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (625-675 hours annually).

Accomplishments: *Only three of the seven projects (Carol Stream, Pekin, and Wilmette) met this objective. The other four projects patrol hours ranged from 79.3 per campaign (Moline) to 123.3 per campaign (Rock Island).*

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 45-60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishments: *For those five projects which met this objective, their motorist contact rate ranged from one for every 17.4 minutes of patrol (Moline) to one for every 39.9 minutes of patrol (Elk Grove Village). Wilmette and Maywood, which failed to meet this objective, had motorist contact rates of one for every 67.4 minutes of patrol and 73.0 minutes of patrol respectively.*

Objective 3: Thirty three percent of all contacts must be for occupant protection.

Accomplishments: *All of the projects met this objective with the percentage of occupant restraint violations ranging from 38.9 (Wilmette) to 75.4 (Moline).*

Objective 4: Speeding contacts must be less than fifty percent.

Accomplishments: *All of the projects met this objective with the percentage of speeding violations ranging from 9.4 (Elk Grove Village) to 44.3 (Rock Island).*

Objective 5: Agency must conduct pre and post safety belt surveys.

Accomplishments: *Only two projects (Elk Grove Village and Pekin) conducted pre and post observational seat belt surveys. They had decreases in seat belt use of 0.2 percentage point and 2.7 percentage points respectively.*

Category Results:

Only Carol Stream and Pekin met all five objectives. The remaining five projects only met three of the five objectives. Several of the projects failed to meet the average patrol hours objective and failed to conduct pre and post observational seat belt surveys.

Table 6 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 4** projects.

Table 6
FY05 IMAGE Summary Report
Category 4: Population 25,001 - 50,000

IMaGE Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 125-135 Patrol Hours Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Motorist Contact for each 60 Minutes of Patrol		Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: 33% of Contacts for Occupant Protection		Speed Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: Less Than 50% of Contacts for Speeding		Safety Belt Percent Change Between Pre & Post Survey	CRITERIA: Conduct Seat Belt Surveys	
				Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?	
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Carol Stream	796.5	5	159.3	X		21.1	X		52.0%	X		30.1%	X		-0.2%	X	
Elk Grove Village	581.0	5	116.2		X	39.9	X		58.0%	X		9.4%	X		N/A		X
Maywood	393.0	4	98.3		X	73.0		X	62.8%	X		15.5%	X		N/A		X
Moline	317.0	4	79.3		X	17.4	X		75.4%	X		9.7%	X		N/A		X
Pekin	629.0	5	125.8	X		37.8	X		49.2%	X		14.6%	X		-2.7%	X	
Rock Island	616.3	5	123.3		X	36.9	X		43.4%	X		44.3%	X		N/A		X
Wilmette	660.8	5	132.2	X		67.4		X	38.9%	X		42.2%	X		N/A		X

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.

Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 7 = Occupant Protection Violation Percentage = ((Seat Belt Violation+Seat Belt Warnings+Child Restraint Violations+Child Restraint Warnings)/ Total Number Citations Written)*100

Column 9 = Speed Violation Percentage = (Number of Speeding Citations / Total Number of Citations) * 100

Category 5 IMaGE: Population 50,001 and Above

List of IMaGE Projects with Populations 50,001 and Above:

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Arlington Heights | 5) Macon County |
| 2) Berwyn | 6) Oak Lawn |
| 3) Cicero | 7) Schaumburg |
| 4) Joliet | 8) Winnebago County |
-

Category Evaluation

Arlington Heights, Berwyn, Macon County, Oak Lawn, and Schaumburg submitted enforcement data for all 5 campaigns. Cicero, Joliet, and Winnebago County submitted enforcement data for 3 of the 5 campaigns. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

Objective 1: Conduct 135-145 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (675-725 hours annually).

Accomplishments: *Four of these eight projects (Arlington Heights, Berwyn, Joliet, Oak Lawn) met this objective. Cicero, Macon County and Schaumburg were relatively close to meeting this objective. On the other hand, Winnebago County failed to come close to meeting the objective.*

Objective 2: Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 45-60 minutes of patrol.

Accomplishments: *All of the projects in this category met this objective. The motorists contact rate for these eight projects ranged from one contact made for every 13.7 minutes of patrol (Berwyn) to one contact made for every 55.2 minutes of patrol (Macon County).*

Objective 3: Thirty percent of all contacts must be for occupant protection.

Accomplishments: *The six projects which met the occupant restraint objective had a range from 34.8 percent (Schaumburg) to 81.1 percent (Oak Lawn). Arlington Heights only issued 19.4 percent of all its citations for occupant restraint violations and Joliet only issued 1.3 percent for occupant restraint violations.*

Objective 4: Speeding contacts must be less than fifty percent.

Accomplishments: *All of the projects, except Arlington Heights, met this objective. The percentage of speeding citations ranged from 8.6 (Oak Lawn) to 45.6 (Schaumburg). On the other hand, Arlington Heights failed to meet this objective by issuing more than 53 percent of all citations for speeding violations.*

Objective 5: Agency must conduct pre and post safety belt surveys.

Accomplishments: *Only three of the projects in this category (Arlington Heights, Berwyn, and Macon County) conducted both pre and post observational surveys. The percentage point change in seat belt use for each project were 7.0 (Arlington Heights), 6.7 (Macon County), and no change (Berwyn).*

Category Results:

The only project in this category to meet all five objectives was Berwyn, Macon County and Oak Lawn met four of the five objectives, and the remaining projects only met three of the five objectives. All of the projects in this category met the motorist contact rate objective. Six of eight projects met the occupant restraint violations objective ensuring that the departments were active in the pursuit of occupant restraint violations. Only half of the projects met the patrol hours objective. More than half of the projects in this category failed to conduct pre and post observational surveys.

Table 7 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 5** projects.

Table 7
FY05 IMAGE Summary Report
Category 5: Population 50,001 and Over

IMaGE Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 135-145 Patrol Hours Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Motorist Contact for each 45-60 Minutes of Patrol		Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: 30% of Contacts for Occupant Protection		Speed Violation Percentage	CRITERIA: Less Than 50% of Contacts for Speeding		Safety Belt Percent Change Between Pre & Post Survey	CRITERIA: Conduct Seat Belt Surveys	
				Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?	
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Arlington Heights	779.0	5	155.8	X		35.3	X		19.4%	X	X	53.3%	X	X	7.0%	X	
Berwyn	726.5	5	145.3	X		13.7	X		39.9%	X		18.3%	X		0.0%	X	
Cicero	395.0	3	131.7		X	45.0	X		57.3%	X		15.9%	X		N/A		X
Joliet	423.0	3	141.0	X		38.5	X		1.3%		X	16.2%	X		N/A		X
Macon County	615.0	5	123.0		X	55.2	X		43.0%	X		16.5%	X		6.7%	X	
Oak Lawn	680.0	5	136.0	X		29.4	X		81.1%	X		8.6%	X		N/A		X
Schaumburg	669.0	5	133.8		X	26.1	X		34.8%	X		45.6%	X		N/A		X
Winnebago Count	319.0	3	106.3		X	34.5	X		41.3%	X		22.7%	X		N/A		X

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.

Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 7 = Occupant Protection Violation Percentage = ((Seat Belt Violation+Seat Belt Warnings+Child Restraint Violations+Child Restraint Warnings)/ Total Number Citations Written)*100

Column 9 = Speed Violation Percentage = (Number of Speeding Citations / Total Number of Citations) * 100

**Analysis of the FY05 Mini-Grant Alcohol Program
(MAP) Projects**

Summary of MAP Program

During FY05, the Division of Traffic Safety funded 25 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 25 projects are provided in **Table 8**. **Table 8** 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 5,950 patrol hours, an average of 743 hours per campaign (5,950 divided by 8 campaigns).
2. A total of 7,063 vehicles were stopped during these campaigns resulting in a vehicle contact rate of one for every 50.5 minutes of patrol (5,950 patrol hours divided by 7,063 vehicles multiplied by 60 minutes).
3. A total of 6,319 citations and written warnings were issued resulting in a citation/written warning rate of one for every 56.5 minutes of patrol (5,950 patrol hours divided by 6,319 citations/written warnings multiplied by 60 minutes).
4. There were 1,865 speeding citations issued during the eight enforcement campaigns.
5. During FY05, these 25 projects made 448 DUI arrests.
6. During FY05, these projects issued 371 alcohol-related citations and 104 drug-related citations.
7. The projects issued 67 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 972 safety belt and child restraint citations were issued and 115 seat belt and child restraint warnings were issued during all eight campaigns.

Table 8

FY05 MAP CAMPAIGN PROJECT DATA SUMMARY TABLE Totals ALL MAP POLICE DEPARTMENTS

MAP "Overtime" Enforcement

Type of Citation	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Campaign #6	Campaign #7	Campaign #8	Total
Speeding	291	257	233	323	260	224	157	120	1,865
Other Moving Viol.	367	238	235	294	214	243	244	105	1,940
DUI	80	66	43	74	46	60	52	27	448
Alcohol Related	73	98	36	41	33	40	29	21	371
Safety Belt	108	140	113	190	168	102	83	33	937
Child Restraint	3	11	7	3	3	2	3	3	35
Drugs	25	13	5	12	18	17	11	3	104
Weapons	0	0	1	5	0	2	1	2	11
Stolen Vehicles	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	6
Outstand Warrants	20	26	21	19	7	25	13	1	132
Suspended License	40	40	43	45	24	43	47	6	288
Sworn Reports	8	11	6	14	5	8	5	10	67
Safety Belt W/Warn.	19	29	7	18	10	8	12	6	109
Child Rest. W/Warn	0	0	0	3	0	1	2	0	6
Vehicles Stopped	1,357	1,026	776	1,108	754	1,007	721	314	7,063
Vehicle Contact Rate	46.2	52.0	59.1	52.5	49.5	44.9	44.1	72.0	50.5
Average B.A.C.'s									
Total DUI Procs Hrs	122.4	102.5	60.6	121.3	39.3	88.0	75.1	50.3	659.3
Map Totals	1,034	929	750	1,041	790	779	659	337	6,319

Regular Non-Overtime Patrol

Type of Citation	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Campaign #6	Campaign #7	Campaign #8	Total
Speeding	997	966	737	1,194	918	899	627	355	6,693
Other Moving Viol.	1,829	1,785	1,485	2,042	1,339	1,642	1,290	300	11,712
DUI	118	118	105	141	91	100	64	20	757
Alcohol Related	76	130	68	70	46	44	36	20	490
Safety Belt	194	159	149	274	527	341	102	41	1,787
Child Restraint	14	10	4	19	16	9	12	2	86
Safety Belt W/Warn.	15	40	2	25	33	22	12	17	166
Child Rest. W/Warn.	5	4	0	3	5	5	1	5	28
Regular Enf. Total	3,248	3,212	2,550	3,768	2,975	3,062	2,144	760	21,719

MAP SUMMARY DATA

	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Campaign #6	Campaign #7	Campaign #8	Total
Total Patrol Hours	1,044.5	888.7	764.8	969.8	622.5	753.5	529.7	376.8	5,950.1
Total P.I. & E.'s	93	107	74	85	69	68	48	22	566

Average Campaign Patrol Hours	743.8 hours
Motorist Contact Rate (citations/written warnings)	56.5 minutes
Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	17.2 %
Speed Violation Percentage	29.5 %
DUI Rate	13.3 hours
Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate	6.0 hours

Evaluation of the Mini-grant Alcohol Program (MAP)

In Illinois, during 2004, 1,356 persons were killed in fatal crashes (Fatal Analysis Reporting System, 2004) and approximately 122,061 persons were injured in motor vehicle crashes (Statewide Summary of Motor Vehicle Crash Statistics, 2004). The cost per death in Illinois for 2004 was \$1,130,000 and the cost per nonfatal disabling injury was \$49,700 (National Safety Council, 2004). Based on Fatal Analysis Reporting System (FARS) data, 604 (44.5 percent) of all 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 MAP program (Mini-grant Alcohol enforcement Program). The MAP program provides selected police departments with extra funding to place enforcement officers on overtime patrols for 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 B**) to ensure high visibility of enforcement statewide.

The Specific Goals of the MAP 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 FY05 the Division of Traffic Safety's Local Projects Section funded 25 MAP 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 \$631,893.00 was obligated to fund the 25 MAP projects, actual program cost for FY05 was \$476,734. The average cost of one hour of patrol within a MAP project was \$80.12 (\$476,734 divided by 5,950 patrol hours), while the average cost of a citation/written warnings was \$75.44 (\$476,734 divided by 6,319 citations/written warnings) during FY05.

The evaluations of the MAP projects were based on the enforcement data submitted to the Division by the 25 local agencies. A graphic distribution of 25 MAP projects is displayed on the Illinois map (see **Appendix C**).

General Objectives of the MAP projects:

- 1) X number of patrol hours per enforcement campaign
- 2) A minimum of one (1) motorist contact (written warnings and citations) for every 60 minutes of patrol.
- 3) A minimum of one DUI arrest for every ten (10) hours of patrol.
- 4) An alcohol-related contact of one for every six (6) hours of patrol.
- 5) 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 larger 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 9** depicts selected MAP grant categories based on population size and their specific objectives.

Table 9: Selected Objectives by Selected Population Categories

Categories based on population (1)	Patrol Hours (2)	Contact Rate (3)	DUI Rate (4)	Alcohol-Related Rate (5)	DUI Processing (6)
2,501-10,000	24-30 per campaign (210 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 minutes of patrol	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alcohol related citation for every 6 hours of patrol	DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less
10,001-25,000	36-42 per campaign (294 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 minutes of patrol	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alcohol related citation for every 6 hours of patrol	DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less
25,001-50,000	40-46 per campaign (322 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 minutes of patrol	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alcohol related citation for every 6 hours of patrol	DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less
Over 50,000	48-54 per campaign (378 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 minutes of minutes	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alcohol related citation for every 6 hours of patrol	DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less

Column 1: Selected population categories

Column 2: Total number of patrol hours assigned to each population category

Column 3: The number of traffic stops for every 60 minutes of patrol.

Column 4: The assigned number of DUI citations 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 one DUI arrest.

Category 2 MAP: Population 2,501- 10,000

List of MAP Projects with Populations Between 2,501 and 10,000:

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------|
| 1) Caseyville | 4) East Hazel Crest |
| 2) Centreville | 5) Johnsborg |
| 3) Creve Coeur | 6) New Athens |
-

Category Evaluation

None of the projects in this category participated in all eight campaigns. Johnsborg participated in six campaigns, Creve Coeur and East Hazel Crest participated in five campaigns, and Caseyville participated in four campaigns. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

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

Accomplishments: *Three of the four projects met this objective. These three projects averaged 27.7 patrol hours (Creve Coeur), 29.6 patrol hours (East Hazel Crest), and 28.9 patrol hours (Johnsborg) per campaign respectively. On the other hand, Caseyville failed to meet this objective by averaging 20.9 patrol hours per campaign.*

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

Accomplishments: *Caseyville (a motorist contact rate of one for every 34.6 minutes of patrol) and East Hazel Crest (a motorist contact rate of one for every 58.8 minutes of patrol) were the only two projects in this category to meet this objective. Creve Coeur just failed to meet this objective by averaging one motorist contact for every 65.4 minutes of patrol. On the other hand, Johnsborg failed to even come close to meeting this objective by averaging one motorist contact for every 297 minutes of patrol.*

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

Accomplishments: *Only two of the projects (Caseyville and Creve Coeur) met this objective. Caseyville averaged one DUI arrest for every 7.6 patrol hours and Creve Coeur averaged one DUI arrest for every 7.7 patrol hours. On the other hand, East Hazel Crest only averaged one DUI arrest for every 14.8 patrol hours and Johnsborg only averaged one DUI arrest for every 19.3 patrol hours.*

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

Accomplishments: *Caseyville and Creve Coeur met this objective by issuing one alcohol-related for every 2.5 patrol hours and 4.5 patrol hours respectively. On the other hand, East Hazel Crest and Johnsborg*

failed to meet this objective by issuing one alcohol-related citation for every 6.7 patrol hours and 9.6 patrol hours respectively.

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

Accomplishments: *Caseyville and East Hazel Crest met this objective by averaging 1.5 hours and 0.7 hour to process one DUI arrest respectively. Johnsborg almost met this objective by averaging 2.1 hours to process one DUI arrest. Creve Coeur did not provide enough information detailing their DUI processing time.*

Category Results:

None of the projects in this category met all five objectives. Caseyville met four objectives and Creve Coeur and East Hazel Crest met four objectives, while Johnsborg only met one of the five objectives. Although they did not meet all of the objectives, Caseyville, Creve Coeur, and East Hazel Crest have been actively pursuing DUI and alcohol-related violations. Aside from meeting the patrol hours objective, Johnsborg has failed to meet any of the alcohol-related objectives, including DUI arrests.

Table 10 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 1** projects.

Table 10

FY05 MAP Summary Report

Category 1: Population 2,501-10,000

MAP Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: 210 Hrs/Yr Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 24-30 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 45-60 Patrol Minutes		DUI Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest for Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours		Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related Contact Per Every 6 Patrol Hours		DUI Processing Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours	
				Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?				
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Caseyville	83.5	4	20.9		X	34.6	X		7.6	X		2.5	X		1.5	X	
Creve Coeur	138.5	5	27.7	X		65.4		X	7.7	X		4.5	X		N/A		X
East Hazel Crest	148.0	5	29.6	X		58.8	X		14.8		X	6.7		X	0.7	X	
Johnsburg	173.3	6	28.9	X		297.0		X	19.3		X	9.6		X	2.1		X

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.

Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 7 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 9 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports))

Column 11 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Category 2 MAP: Population 10,001-25,000

List of MAP Projects with Populations Between 10,001 and 25,000:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1) Barrington | 6) Swansea |
| 2) Edwardsville | 7) Villa Park |
| 3) Lake Zurich | 8) Western Illinois University (WIU) |
| 4) Palos Heights | 9) Wood Dale |
| 5) Southern Illinois University (SIU) –
Carbondale | |
-

Category Evaluation

The only project which participated in all eight campaigns was Wood Dale. Barrington submitted enforcement data for seven campaigns. The projects which submitted enforcement data for six campaigns included Lake Zurich and Southern Illinois University – Carbondale. Palos Heights, Swansea, and Villa Park participated in five campaigns. Edwardsville only participated in four campaigns. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

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

Accomplishments: *All of the projects in this category met this objective. The average campaign patrol hours for these projects ranged from 36 (Swansea) to 60.4 (Barrington). Although Edwardsville did not meet this objective, it was relatively close to meeting the objective by averaging 35.5 patrol hours per campaign.*

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

Accomplishments: *All of these projects met this objective with the exception of Barrington. For those projects which met this objective, the motorist contact rate ranged from one for every 38.4 minutes of patrol (Swansea) to one for every 53.8 minutes of patrol (Lake Zurich). On the other hand, Barrington had a motorist contact rate of one for every 82.1 minutes of patrol failing to meet this objective.*

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

Accomplishments: *Only three of the nine projects (Palos Heights, Swansea, and Villa Park) met this objective. Three projects (Edwardsville, Palos Heights, and Western Illinois University) were relatively close to meeting this objective by averaging DUI arrest rate of one for every 11.8 patrol hours, 10.1 patrol hours, and 10.8 patrol hours respectively. Southern Illinois University – Carbondale and Wood Dale had DUI arrest rates of one for every 13.5 patrol hours and*

14.7 patrol hours respectively. On the other hand, Barrington only averaged one DUI arrest for every 47.0 patrol hours.

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

Accomplishments: *Six of the nine departments met this objective. The average alcohol-related contact rate for these six projects ranged from one for every 1.7 patrol hours (Edwardsville) to one for every 5.1 patrol hours (Western Illinois University). Wood Dale and Southern Illinois University – Carbondale averaged more than 8 hours for every alcohol-related contact. On the other hand, Barrington only made one alcohol-related contact for every 17.6 patrol hours.*

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

Accomplishments: *Fix of the nine departments met this objective. The average DUI processing time for these projects ranged from 0.6 hour (Edwardsville) to 1.6 hours (Western Illinois University). Barrington failed to meet this objective by averaging 2.1 hours to process each DUI arrest. Southern Illinois University – Carbondale, Swansea, and Villa Park failed to provide DUI processing time hours and relevant information.*

Category Results:

The only project to meet all five objectives in this category was Lake Zurich, Palos Heights, Swansea, Villa Park, and Western Illinois University met four objectives, Edwardsville and Wood Dale met three objectives, Southern Illinois University – Carbondale met two objectives, and Barrington only met one objective. Aside from meeting the patrol hours objective, Barrington has failed to meet any of the alcohol-related objectives, including DUI arrests.

Table 11 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 2** projects.

Table 11

FY05 MAP Summary Report

Category 2: Population 10,001-25,000

MAP Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: 294 Hrs/Year Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 36-42 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 45-60 Patrol Minutes		DUI Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest For Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours		Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related Contact Per Every 6 Patrol Hours		DUI Processing Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours	
				Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?				
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Barrington	423.0	7	60.4	X		82.1		X	47.0		X	17.6		X	2.4		X
Edwardsville	141.1	4	35.3		X	44.8	X		11.8		X	1.7	X		0.6	X	
Lake Zurich	238.5	6	39.8	X		53.8	X		8.0	X		4.5	X		1.5	X	
Palos Heights	202.0	5	40.4	X		44.1	X		10.1		X	4.1	X		0.4	X	
SIU Carbondale	242.8	6	40.5	X		53.0	X		13.5		X	8.7		X	N/A		X
Swansea	180.0	5	36.0	X		38.4	X		10.0	X		4.9	X		N/A		X
Villa Park	207.5	5	41.5	X		49.0	X		7.4	X		4.1	X		N/A		X
WIU	172.8	4	43.2	X		51.1	X		10.8		X	5.1	X		1.6	X	
Wood Dale	308.0	8	38.5	X		51.3	X		14.7		X	8.3		X	0.9	X	

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.
 Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.
 Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.
 Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)
 Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60
 Column 7 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)
 Column 9 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours / (# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports))
 Column 11 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

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

List of MAP Projects with Populations Between 25,001 and 50,000:

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| 1) Addison | 6) Niles |
| 2) Alton (Withdrew) | 7) Northbrook |
| 3) Carpentersville | 8) St. Charles |
| 4) Downers Grove | |
| 5) Glendale Heights | |
-

Category Evaluation

The only project in this category which participated in all eight campaigns was Downers Grove. Addison, Carpentersville, and Northbrook participated in seven campaigns. St. Charles participated in six campaigns. Glendale Heights and Niles participated in five campaigns and four campaigns respectively. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

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

Accomplishments: *For four of the seven projects which met this objective, the average campaign patrol hours ranged from 40.0 per campaign (Addison) to 46.1 per campaign (Northbrook). The remaining three projects patrol hours per campaign were 36.9 (Carpentersville), 37.0 (Niles), and 39.9 (St. Charles).*

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

Accomplishments: *For four of the seven projects which met this objective, the motorist contact rate ranged from one for every 37.9 minutes of patrol (St. Charles) to one for every 55.1 minutes of patrol (Addison). Those projects which failed to meet this objective had motorist contact rates of one for every 74.9 patrol hours (Carpentersville), one for every 73.8 minutes of patrol (Downers Grove), and one for every 116 minutes of patrol (Northbrook).*

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

Accomplishments: *Only two of the seven projects (Niles and St. Charles) met this objective by averaging a DUI contact rate of one for every 9.3 patrol hours and 9.6 patrol hours respectively. The DUI contact rate for the remaining five projects ranged from one for every 12.6 patrol hours (Glendale Heights) to one for every 46.7 patrol hours (Addison).*

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

Accomplishments: *Only two of the seven projects (Niles and St. Charles) met this objective by averaging one alcohol-related contact for every 4.0 patrol hours and 4.5 patrol hours respectively. The alcohol-related contact rate for the remaining five projects ranged from one for every 6.5 patrol hours (Downers Grove) to one for every 20.0 patrol hours (Addison).*

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

Accomplishments: *The three projects which met this objective had DUI processing times of 1.0 hours (Downers Grove), 2.1 hours (Glendale Heights), and 1.6 hours (St. Charles). Carpentersville failed to provide any information related to their DUI processing times and relevant information.*

Category Results:

None of the projects in this category met all five objectives. Only St. Charles met four objectives. Glendale Heights and Niles met three objectives. Downers Grove and Addison met two objectives. On the other hand, Northbrook only met one objective and Carpentersville met none of the objectives. There was a failure by many of the projects in this category to pursue alcohol-related driving violations.

Table 12 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 3** projects.

Table 12

FY05 MAP Summary Report

Category 3: Population 25,001-50,000

MAP Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: 322 Hrs/Year Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 40-46 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 60 Patrol Minutes		DUI Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest For Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours		Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related Contact Per Every 6 Patrol Hours		DUI Processing Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours	
				Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?				
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Addison	280.0	7	40.0	X		55.1	X		46.7		X	20.0		X	2.7		X
Carpentersville	258.3	7	36.9		X	74.9		X	19.9		X	8.9		X	N/A		X
Downers Grove	343.0	8	42.9	X		73.8		X	14.9		X	6.5		X	1.0		X
Glendale Heights	201.0	5	40.2	X		53.4	X		12.6		X	9.6		X	2.1		X
Niles	148.0	4	37.0		X	49.9	X		9.3	X		4.0	X		2.3		X
Northbrook	323.0	7	46.1	X		116.0		X	19.0		X	7.9		X	2.2		X
St. Charles	239.3	6	39.9		X	37.9	X		9.6	X		4.5	X		1.6		X

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.

Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 7 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 9 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports))

Column 11 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Category 4 MAP: Population 50,001 and Above

List of MAP Projects with Populations 50,001 and Above:

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1) Cook County | 4) Palatine |
| 2) Madison County | 5) Peoria |
| 3) Naperville | 6) Williamson County |
-

Category Evaluation

Madison County was the only project which participated in all eight campaigns. Williamson County participated in seven campaigns. Palatine and Peoria participated in five campaigns each. Cook County only participated in four campaigns. The objectives and accomplishments for these projects are as follows:

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

Accomplishments: *The average patrol hours per campaign for the four projects which met this objective ranged from 51.5 (Peoria) to 63.0 (Cook County). Williamson County only averaged 43.7 patrol hours per campaign.*

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

Accomplishments: *The motorist contact rate for the four projects which met this objective ranged from 39.8 (Palatine) to 56.3 (Madison County). Peoria failed to meet this objective by having a motorist contact rate of 65.2.*

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

Accomplishments: *Only two of the projects within this category met this objective. Peoria averaged one DUI arrest for every 7.0 patrol hours and Williamson County averaged one DUI arrest for every 9.6 patrol hours. The remaining projects had DUI arrest rates of 11.5 (Cook County), 29.9 (Madison County), and 37.7 (Palatine).*

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

Accomplishments: *Only two of the projects within this category met this objective. Peoria averaged one alcohol-related contact for every 4.0 patrol hours and Williamson County averaged one alcohol-related contact for every 3.4 patrol hours. The remaining projects had alcohol-related contact rates of 8.7 (Cook County), 9.3 (Madison County), and 16.5 (Palatine).*

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

Accomplishments: *Three of the five projects met this objective by averaging DUI processing times of 1.8 (Cook County), 1.9 (Palatine), and 1.4 (Williamson County).*

Category Results:

None of the projects in this category met all five objectives. Williamson County did meet four objectives. Cook County, Palatine, and Peoria met three objectives. Madison County only met two objectives. Several of the projects in this category failed to meet or come close to meeting the alcohol-related objectives.

Table 13 provides data and information pertaining to **Category 4** projects.

Table 13

FY05 MAP Summary Report

Category 4: Population 50,001 and Above

MAP Projects	1	2	3	4		5	6		7	8		9	10		11	12	
	CRITERIA: 378 Hrs/Yr. Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 48-54 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 45-60 Patrol Minutes		DUI Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest For Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours		Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related ContactPer Every 6 Patrol Hours		DUI Processing Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours	
				Criteria Met?			Criteria met?			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?				
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Cook Co.	252.0	4	63.0	X		53.4	X		11.5		X	8.7		X	1.8	X	
Madison Co.	419.3	8	52.4	X		56.3	X		29.9		X	9.3		X	2.4		X
Palatine	264.0	5	52.8	X		39.8	X		37.7		X	16.5		X	1.9	X	
Peoria	257.5	5	51.5	X		65.2		X	7.0	X		4.0	X		2.2		X
Williamson Co.	306.0	7	43.7		X	53.5	X		9.6	X		3.4	X		1.4	X	

Column 1 shows the total campaign hours conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Column 2 shows the total campaigns conducted by the selected enforcement agency during FY 2005.

Columns 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the criteria that each project was required to meet.

Column 3 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 5 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) * 60

Column 7 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 9 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports))

Column 11 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

APPENDIX A

Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement FY 2005 Campaign Dates

Campaign Number	Date	Campaign Phase
#1	Nov. 8 - 14, 2004	Safety Belt Pre-Survey
	Nov. 15 - 21, 2004	PI&E - Click It or Ticket
	Nov. 22 – Dec. 12, 2004	Enforcement
	Dec. 6 - 12, 2004	Media Release
	Jan 10, 2005	Report Due
#2	Dec. 13 - 19, 2004	You Drink & Drive. You Lose.
	Dec. 20, 2004 - Jan. 2, 2005	Enforcement
	Jan 3 - 9, 2005	Media Release
	Feb. 10, 2005	Report Due
#3	May 16 - 22, 2005	PI&E - Click It or Ticket
	May 23 - June 5, 2005	Enforcement
	June 6 - 12, 2005	Media Release
	July 10, 2005	Report Due
#4	June 13 - 19, 2005	You Drink & Drive. You Lose.
	June 20 - July 3, 2005	Enforcement
	July 4 - 10, 2005	Media Release
	Aug. 10, 2005	Report Due
#5	Aug. 12 - 18, 2005	PI&E - Click It or Ticket/You Drink & Drive. You Lose
	Aug. 19 - Sept. 5, 2005	Enforcement
	Sept. 12- 18, 2005	Safety Belt Post-Survey
	Sept. 19 - 25, 2005	Media Release
	Nov. 1, 2005	Report Due

APPENDIX B

Mini-Grant Alcohol Program FY 2005 Campaign Dates

Campaign Number	Date	Campaign Phase
#1	Oct. 13 - 17, 2004	PI&E
	Oct. 18 - 31, 2004	Enforcement
	Nov. 1 - 7, 2004	PI&E
	Dec 10, 2004	Report Due
#2	Nov. 15 - 21, 2004	PI&E
	Nov. 22 - Dec. 5, 2004	Enforcement
	Dec. 6 - 12, 2004	PI&E
	Jan 10, 2005	Report Due
#3	Dec. 13 - 19, 2004	PI&E
	Dec. 20, 2004 - Jan. 2, 2005	Enforcement
	Jan. 3 - 9, 2005	PI&E
	Feb. 10, 2005	Report Due
#4	March 28 - April 3, 2005	PI&E
	April 4 - 17, 2005	Enforcement
	April 18 - 24, 2005	PI&E
	June 10, 2005	Report Due
#5	May 16 - 22, 2005	PI&E
	May 23 - June 5, 2005	Enforcement
	June 6 - 12, 2005	PI&E
	July 10, 2005	Report Due
#6	June 13 - 19, 2005	PI&E
	June 20 - July 3, 2005	Enforcement
	July 4 - 10, 2005	PI&E
	Aug. 10, 2005	Report Due
#7	Aug. 12 - 18, 2005	PI&E
	Aug. 19 - Sept. 5, 2005	Enforcement
	Sept. 6 - 11, 2005	PI&E
	October 10, 2005	Report Due
#8	To be determined by local agency, i.e., local festival, special event, etc.	

