

**National Highway Traffic Safety  
Administration,  
Regions 1 and 2  
Law Enforcement Partnership Forum Pilots**

*Working Together*



## **Executive Summary**

A recent review of national motor vehicle fatality data discloses a concerning increase of 7.2% during 2015 compared to 2014. Although there appears to be a variety of contributing circumstances, a certain amount of concern is focused on the apparent endemic disengagement by the nation's law enforcement agencies. Information gathered in an informal manner indicates a variety of causation factors related to this reduction in traffic enforcement.

During May 2016 the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration began the development of a listening session format presented as a series of Law Enforcement Partnership Summits. NHTSA Regional 1 and 2 Administrators constituted a team to plan and design four such partnership listening and learning sessions. Two states from each Region was selected to pilot one of these forums. The states, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Maine were selected for a variety of operational considerations but primarily for their ability to produce effective, efficient data, drilled down to the most local level. Following preliminary planning sessions, it was decided the forums would have one goal:

***To identify common challenges to, and potential solutions for consistent, efficient and effective Traffic Safety Services.***

The combined Regions 1&2 team developed a forum format which was compressed into a three-hour time frame. The first forum took place in Freehold, New Jersey on July 22, 2016. Similar forums took place in early August in Connecticut and Rhode Island. One additional forum is scheduled for September 28<sup>th</sup> in yet to be determined location in Maine. The following report provides a description of the summits and an overview of the cumulative information obtained from these summits.

### **Forums' Format**

- In each of the pilot states, a specific geographical area of the state was selected to be used as an area of focus. The selection was based on crash data, specifically serious injury crashes.
- The state highway safety office staff sent letters of invitation to those law enforcement agencies located within the specific area of focus.
- Attending agencies were provided with state, county and local data as well as a list of topics to be discussed relating to the data. Also included in this informational package was an agenda. (A copy of a sample agenda is included with this document as an attachment).
- Typically, the forums started at either 9:00 or 10:00 and one ten-minute networking break was included.

- Following welcoming remarks and opening comments a presentation of data was delivered by a data analyst as part of a comprehensive power point presentation.
- Following a short break, a roundtable discussion was initiated. (the content of the forum roundtables are included later in this document). The primary emphasis of discussion was the identification of challenges to sustained traffic safety services. This included the identification of strategies to address and overcome these identified obstacles. During each of the forums a series of questions was asked by the Forum team. More or less the same questions were asked in each forum. They are as follows:
  1. What is your crash data capacity at the local level?
    - Does your agency currently have a dedicated crash data analyst? If not how do you collect data?
    - Describe your agency's mapping capabilities?
    - If your agency has effective mapping, how do you use it? How is the information transmitted to the traffic enforcement officers and other patrol personnel?
    - How do you fund your data collection system?
  2. Currently, what are the specific manpower deployment challenges within your agency?
  3. Within your agency, who conducts traffic enforcement? Are all uniformed personnel expected to perform regular, data driven enforcement? Or is this responsibly conducted only by dedicated personnel/units?
  4. When enforcement is conducted is it only during enforcement campaigns or sustained throughout the year? Are these activities conducted on an overtime basis or during patrol discretionary time?
  5. What is your ideal design for an effective and efficient traffic safety deployment model?
  6. What steps can be taken to assist your agency to participate in a consistent level of traffic safety engagement?

A summation was delivered and input requested from the attendees. Following this open floor discussion, closing remarks by hosting state and NHTSA attendees, closed the forums.

## Lessons Learned

Obstacles to sustained engagement in traffic safety enforcement may be segmented into three general categories:

1. *Resources*
  - a. Personnel
  - b. Training
  - c. Equipment
2. *Operational Deployment*
3. *Administrative Leadership*

These obstacles have been placed in the selected category that seems to be the most appropriate for the topic. It should be noted that some obstacles have components that may fit two or more of the categories.

### Resources

#### ➤ *Personnel*

- **Manpower:** Critical shortages in the workforce, continuing calls for service
- **Responsibility:** No full-time traffic unit or personnel responsible for traffic specific duties
- **Reluctance:** No full-time traffic unit or personnel responsible for traffic specific duties
- **Officer Safety & Public Safety:** National, high profile events. Requests to increase deployment to two person patrols for certain national high visibility enforcement events
- **Additional needs:** DRE's, Data-analysts, court clerks, prosecutors

#### • *Training*

- **Academy and In - service:** Traffic enforcement training at the Police Academy recruit level, Post Academy and in-service levels not prioritized
- **Supervisory/Management:** Lack of traffic specific training, such as traffic program management for first line supervisors
- **ARIDE/DRE:** Limited access to Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (*ARIDE*) and *DRE* training
- **Localized Problem ID:** The need for additional training for Distracted Driving, Aggressive Driving, Pedestrian Safety education/enforcement and other various trainings relating to local traffic safety priorities

- *Equipment*
  - **Advanced Speed and Measurement Devices:** Upgraded and updated equipment and related training increases enforcement activity, accuracy and credibility in judicial proceedings
  - **Speed Monitoring Trailers and Variable Message Boards:** Offers a level deterrence, real-time public information and provides timely and accurate data
  - **Automated Enforcement Systems:** Recognizing lack of manpower and location-based impediments, automation is a desired option

### Operational Deployment

- Competing operational priorities
- Other opportunities for overtime instead of traffic details
- Dictated rate of overtime (such as New Jersey)
- Little or no access to timely local crash data, right place, right time, right reason
- National campaigns are viewed as a substitute for sustained enforcement conducted as a standard countermeasure
- Agencies are restricted to time frames when they can perform certain categories of enforcement (i.e. CIOT in late May), instead of when they're most capable of effectively conducting seat belt enforcement etc.

### Administrative Leadership

- Lack of agency leadership guidance and direction specific to traffic services
- Shortage of political and community support for traffic enforcement
- Rationalization of fines

### Takeaways and Recommendations

- Identify/select a key person in the LE agency who will be responsible for traffic safety services. This individual must be the agency's traffic safety champion. This is a critical position that we must help cultivate, mentor and train
- Create a national public information and outreach message/campaign supporting law enforcement traffic safety efforts and emphasizing the value of traffic enforcement and education at the LOCAL level. Highlight the importance of traffic safety quality of life benefits
- Cost/benefit/return on investment analysis, overtime versus traffic safety champion, equipment, training, etc.
- Promote multi-agency sharing of Crash Data Analysts (county, region wide)
- Promote the continued development of Predictive Analytics, DDACTS model etc.
- Promote/support Regional Traffic Officers Associations (New Jersey model)

- Create/expand Regional Traffic Crash Reduction Task Forces
- Enhance collaborative efforts with FHWA, State/local DOT's/Highway Safety Alliances (Vermont model)
- Encourage/support statewide electronic traffic violation data-based warning systems
- Work with GHSA to survey state Highway Safety Offices to determine what categories of equipment would produce the best return on investment and improve evidence based enforcement countermeasures
- Collaborate with GHSA to review and evaluate the current allocation of funding for specific enforcement campaigns, such as Speed and Distracted Driving
- Research how private sector and the U.S. military services motivate and train their Millennial employees
- Increase efforts to promote on-line ARIDE training as a feeder system into state DRE programs (many are not aware of its existence), (Not widely supported by State DRE Coordinators)
- Utilize Regional and State Judicial Outreach Liaisons and State Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutors to assist local court staff regarding successful prosecution of Impaired Driving cases and promote effective countermeasure efforts, 24/7 etc.

### **Future Law Enforcement Partnership Forums**

- Continue follow-up actions with the four host states
- Convene a minimum of one forum in each of the remaining eight Regions
- Review post-summit participants' surveys
- Work on the evolution of forum format, participants, material and data
- Maintain a continues historical accounting of information realized from these forums
- Evaluate the level of law enforcement engagement, pre and post forum in each state
- Maintain a continuous historical accounting of information realized from these forums
- Evaluate the level of law enforcement engagement, pre and post forum in each state

### **Forum Materials**

The NHTSA Law Enforcement Partnership Forum internal team, has developed an electronic package which will be available to each of the other eight Regions. The package will include the following *sample* documents:

- A power point presentation
- A forum agenda (for a three - hour session)
- A letter of invitation to participating agencies
- An agency profile form, to be prepared by the participating agencies prior to the forum
- A follow-up participant's survey relating to issues raised at the forum
- A "thank you for attending" letter

### **Report Preparation**

This report is the result of a collaborative effort between the states of New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maine, the staffs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Regions 1,2,5 &7 and NHTSA Headquarters staff.

Following Maine's Law Enforcement Partnership Forum, their contributed information will be added to this report. Additionally, all other state forums, linked to this project will continue to be added to this report.

Date Prepared:

Submitted by: The staffs of Regions 1 and 2

The following narratives describe the three forums that have been completed. Additional individual forum descriptions will be added as they are completed.



## New Jersey

### Forum overview

The first of the four The Law Enforcement Partnership Forum series was held as a three-hour, one-day workshop in Freehold, New Jersey. Hosted by the Monmouth County Sheriff's Office and coordinated by NHTSA Regions 1 and 2, the forum focused on identifying common challenges to and potential solutions for consistent, efficient and effective traffic safety services. The Forum was attended by executives and line personnel from 16 New Jersey law enforcement agencies, as well as NHTSA headquarters and regional staff, the Governor's Representative for highway safety in New Jersey, and the Executive Director of the New Jersey Chiefs Association.

### Opening session

NHTSA Regional Law Enforcement Liaisons Mike Morris and Ted Minall moderated the forum (agenda attached). After brief introductions and welcoming remarks from NHTSA senior leadership, and the Director of the New Jersey Division of Highway Traffic Safety, Chief Morris outlined a brief set of objectives for participants, emphasizing the need for active discussion throughout the event. Joseph Weiss, a data analyst with Rutgers University, provided context to New Jersey's traffic safety issues by presenting statewide crash data, and an overview of Monmouth County crash trends. Monmouth and Atlantic counties were selected based on data, revealing these counties experienced the highest fatal and injury crash numbers in the state.

### Roundtable Discussion

**The Forum Team moderator opened the group discussion by presenting some commonly cited challenges to sustaining traffic safety enforcement services:**

- Lack of personnel - agencies are under staffed
- Too busy with calls for service, and related administrative reporting processes, not enough time for traffic enforcement

- Competing demand for time such as community meetings, local events etc.
- Other, easier, opportunities for overtime (e.g., road construction)
- Lack of community support and a shortage of political support for local traffic enforcement
- Low level of interest in traffic enforcement or other overtime opportunities (millennials, culture)
- Lack of consistent effective prosecution, cases routinely dismissed or plea bargained to a lesser violation or offense
- High profile negative media coverage which discourages some offers from engaging the public during traffic events

**In addition, the following questions were posed to forum participants by the Forum Team:**

1. What is your crash data capacity at the local level?
  - Does your agency currently have a dedicated crash data analyst? If not how do you collect data?
  - Describe your agency's mapping capabilities?
  - If your agency has effective mapping, how do you use it? How is the information transmitted to the traffic enforcement officers and other patrol personnel?
  - How do you fund your data collection system?
2. Currently, what are the specific manpower deployment challenges within your agency?
3. Within your agency, who conducts traffic enforcement? Are all uniformed personnel expected to perform regular, data driven enforcement? Or is this responsibly conducted only by dedicated personnel/units?
4. When enforcement is conducted is it only during enforcement campaigns or sustained throughout the year? Are these activities conducted on an overtime basis or during patrol discretionary time?
5. What is your ideal design for an effective and efficient traffic safety deployment model?
6. What steps can be taken to assist your agency to participate in a consistent level of traffic safety engagement?

**Participants identified the following additional challenges, unique to their agencies, to provide traffic safety enforcement services in New Jersey:**

- The lack of effective data collection capabilities. Concise identification of specific locations, including times of occurrence and days of the week

- Inability to accurately compare and correlate systematic crash with the availability of EMT crash injury data
- The lack of accuracy and completion of the New Jersey statewide crash reporting form
- Agencies have concerns relating to the cost of funding in-house Drug Recognition Experts. Specifically, who'll pay for the training and maintenance of an agency's DRE program?
- Lack of Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE) training opportunities for many officers
- Increased speed enforcement requires training and equipment funding. Smaller agencies cannot afford new equipment and maintenance of aging units
- Overall need for increased specialized training – such as the need for more DRE. Specific training for officers to distinguish alcohol from other drugs (ARIDE and other versions of impaired driving training)
- Conflict relating to the deployment of available resources, traffic vs. quality of life issues
- Reduction of police personnel. Many times traffic units are the first resources to be reduced or eliminated
- Lack of support/public permission for technology-based traffic enforcement (e.g., red light or speeding cameras)
- Grant Funding Detail Rate: standard \$50.00 an hour from the highway safety office grants needs to be increased. (note: as a result of the forum, NJ has agreed to raise this rate to \$65.00)
- DRE call-out procedures – county and Statewide (New Jersey State Police maintains Statewide through Regional Operations Intelligence Center)
- The lack of DRE training for judges, prosecutors and other members of the judiciary to increase understanding of the science and standard protocols involved
- Some officers feel that the speeding fines are too costly and officers are hesitant to write tickets for that particular violation
- Lack of consistent and complete prosecution of traffic cases. Traffic related charges are routinely reduced to less stringent offences and violations
- A lack of a Statewide (readily retrievable) warning system data base for motor vehicle stops.
- The scarcity of dedicated traffic/crash analyst for smaller agencies
- The need for increased transparency relating to public education regarding local crash, enforcement and other traffic specific information

- More detailed information needed in crash data reporting forms to assist with the development of evidence based enforcement strategies and countermeasures
- Explore the implement photo radar – based on data and information
- Local police contract negotiations negatively impact enforcement activity
- Officers not assigned to a traffic unit are unwilling to conduct traffic enforcement
- An Immediate need for better communication and coordination with local roadway engineers regarding issues with infrastructure. This includes signage, pavement markings and roadway modifications
- A lack of data driven relocatable automated enforcement
- Limiting certain enforcement to specific calendar time frames (i.e. CIOT in late May) reduces the ability to conduct such enforcement to flexible time frames, allowing agencies to conduct more effective enforcement

**Continuing, the participants were provided time to discuss some immediate strategies and possible future solutions that may be utilized to overcome the stated obstacles:**

- Create and fund regional crash analyst positions (county-level?) as a shared resource for enforcement agencies
- Fund equipment purchases through highway safety grants, and identify alternate funding sources
- Promote the complete automation of the crash data collection process. Eliminate current inconsistent, error prone paper based reporting systems
- Increase the availability of funds derived from the state's Impaired Driving Enforcement Fund penalties
- Fund centralized and uniform Traffic Safety Officer Training
- Encourage state TSRP and Regional JOL to promote implied consent for drugged driving offenses
- Create and fund regional crash reduction tasks forces
- Fund Traffic Safety Officer positions in local police departments
- Increases the overtime detail rate similar to current contractual overtime rate (note: previously mentioned, the rate has been adjusted upward)
- Traffic Safety Program Management Training for first line supervisors
- National media campaign explaining why traffic enforcement is important and its role in reducing crashes and how it benefits the community

### Closing Comments

Representatives from the hosting state and members of the NHTSA Forum Team closed the forum by acknowledging the hard work performed by each of the participating agencies.



### Connecticut

#### Forum Overview

The second of a series of Law Enforcement Partnership Forums was kicked off with a three-hour forum in Hartford, Connecticut. Hosted by the Connecticut Department of Transportation and coordinated by the Connecticut Office of Highway Safety as well as NHTSA Regions 1 and 2. The forum provided a platform to identify common challenges to and potential solutions for consistent, efficient and effective traffic safety services. The Forum was attended by executives and line personnel from 16 Connecticut law enforcement agencies, as well as NHTSA Headquarters and regional staff, the Governor's Representative for highway safety in Connecticut, and the current President of the Connecticut Chiefs Association.

#### Opening Session

NHTSA Regional Law Enforcement Liaisons Michael Morris and Ted Minall moderated the forum jointly with Connecticut's Law Enforcement Liaison Ed Hedge. Introductions and welcoming remarks were delivered by NHTSA senior leadership, and the Director of Policy and Planning for the Connecticut Department of Transportation. Chief Morris then outlined a brief set of objectives for participants, emphasizing the need for active discussion throughout the event. Dr. Eric Jackson, a data analyst with the University of Connecticut, provided context to Connecticut's traffic safety issues by presenting statewide crash data, as well as local crash information. Dr. Jackson also provided an overview of current crash trends.

#### Roundtable Discussion

**Chief Morris then opened the group discussion by presenting some commonly cited challenges to sustaining traffic safety enforcement services:**

- Lack of personnel - under staffed

- Too busy with calls for service, and related administrative reporting processes
- Competing demand for time such as community meetings, etc.
- Other opportunities for overtime (e.g., road construction)
- Lack of community support and political permission for traffic enforcement
- Low level of interest in traffic enforcement or other overtime opportunities by law enforcement personnel (millennials, culture)
- Lack of consistent effective prosecution
- High profile negative media coverage

**In addition, the following questions were posed to forum participants:**

- 1 What is your crash data capacity at the local level?
  - Does your agency currently have a dedicated crash data analyst? If not how do you collect data?
  - Describe your agency's mapping capabilities?
  - If your agency has effective mapping, how do you use it? How is the information transmitted to the traffic enforcement officers and other patrol personnel?
  - How do you fund your data collection system?
- 2 Currently, what are the specific manpower deployment challenges within your agency?
- 3 Within your agency, who conducts traffic enforcement? Are all uniformed personnel expected to perform regular, data driven enforcement? Or is this responsibly conducted only by dedicated personnel/units?
- 4 When enforcement is conducted is it only during enforcement campaigns or sustained throughout the year? Are these activities conducted on an overtime basis or during patrol discretionary time?
- 5 What is your ideal design for an effective and efficient traffic safety deployment model?
- 6 What steps can be taken to assist your agency to participate in a consistent level of traffic safety engagement?

**Participants identified the following additional challenges, unique to their agencies, to provide traffic safety enforcement services in Connecticut:**

- Continued lack of manpower
- Lack of support for traffic enforcement from state and local government and communities
- Racial profiling requirements stifle traffic enforcement efforts
- LE agencies need further guidance regarding traffic stops. Educate the public why are campaigns being conducted

- Patrol officers expect traffic enforcement officers to handle all traffic issues
- Patrol officers prefer other opportunities to earn overtime rather than traffic details
- Newly hired officers are not properly training for traffic enforcement and others are not interested in traffic related duties
- Solid consistence production from traffic teams, but much lower output from regular patrol officers
- Officers feel there are too many regulations and requirements relating to traffic stops
- Population is increasing in many communities and so is traffic and crashes
- Need engineering solution to high crash areas
- Provide funding for additional TSRP
- Correlate crash data with enforcement data to develop a business case to support enforcement
- Use photo radar to identify traffic violators. Send warning letter to violators
- Training budgets at the police academy have been severely cut and reduction in staffing levels make difficult to provide traffic training
- Problems entering crash data. Cannot enter data into mobile computer units, must return to police facility to enter data
- States Attorney's office manpower has been reduced by 25%, this has a negative impact on full prosecution of cases. Too many plea bargains

**Continuing, the group was encouraged to suggest some immediate strategies and possible future solutions that may address the obstacles:**

- Motivate over time enforcement versus over time for construction
- Improve and strengthen the selection process for Traffic Units. Candidates must be passionate saving lives and working with the community
- Create traffic teams to increase the effectiveness of grant funded enforcement
- Promote effective management/leadership within law enforcement
- Increase effective communication between staff and first line supervisors
- Dedicate grant teams with data requirements (has been working in some agencies)
- Educate and motivate new police officers about traffic unit and create a new culture. Currently, there's a shortage of interest in traffic safety by new employees
- Facilitate regional traffic officer associations and arrange meetings and trainings
- Enhance the interest of Chiefs and executive leadership in developing functional traffic safety programs and working coalitions

- Re-create an increased interest and knowledge relating to the traffic culture
- Research new, effective and penetrating media messaging
- Be proactive and educate the media, by promoting the message that traffic enforcement is done to save lives
- Increase Engineering partnership between DOT and law enforcement agencies
- Conduct a non-biased racial profile report for each agency
- Start collecting racial data with crash data and enforcement data
- Having DOT work with the courts regarding the outcomes of the citations written
- Working with courts regarding citations issued/paid/not paid
- Provide funding for training at the Police Academy (lack of funding/limited staff)
- Funding for training for Traffic Units
- Encourage the State Highway Safety Office to provide training grants
- Increase training regarding interaction with drivers during traffic stops
- Advanced traffic related training for officers, supervisors and instructors
- Create Regional Traffic Units with funding
- Implement mutual aid agreements
- Better use of crash data/heat maps. Insure current information is provide to all members of the agency on a timely basis
- Funding assistance for the purchase of automated enforcement equipment such as red light and speed cameras along with other proven equipment
- Work with the State DOT to conduct research regarding traffic circles, roundabouts etc., to reduce speed and traffic
- Provide grants to purchase data equipment



### **Rhode Island**

#### **Forum Overview**

The Rhode Island Forum was held at the Providence Police and Public Safety Facility, located in the city of Providence. The event was hosted and sponsored by the Rhode Island Department of Transportation and presented by the Rhode Island Office on Highway Safety. The geographical area of focus was Providence County and the adjacent Kent County. The rationale for selecting these two counties is based on data indicating 50% of the State's fatalities occur in these two counties. Rhode Island has a total of thirty nine law enforcement agencies and twenty one agencies, from these two counties, were in attendance. Representatives included the Director of the State Police,

eight Colonels (Chiefs) and a mixture of patrol supervisors and officers. In total, eighty two attendees included DOT, Office of Highway Safety staff, Regions 1,2,5 and 7 Regional Administrators, and four Regional LELs. Also in attendance was the president of the Rhode Island Association of Chiefs. The RI Police Academy was also represented. The forum began at 10:00 AM and concluded at 1:00 PM, with one 10 minute networking break included

### Opening Session

The Rhode Island Office on Highway Safety LEL, Colonel Rick Sullivan moderated the opening session assisted by Regional LELs Ted Minall and Mike Morris. Following open statements by Gabrielle Abbate, Chief of the Office on Highway Safety, Region 1 Administrator, Art Kinsman, John Marshall, NHTSA, Director of the Office of Safety Programs, Data was presented. Michael J. Sprague, Supervising Planner, RI DOT delivered an overview of state, county and local, crash and traffic data.

### Roundtable Discussion

**Following a short networking break, Colonel Sullivan facilitated a round table discussion. He opened the group discussion by presenting some commonly cited challenges to sustaining traffic safety enforcement services in Rhode Island:**

- Lack of personnel – agencies are under staffed
- Too busy with calls for service, and related administrative reporting processes
- Competing demand for time such as community meetings, etc.
- Other opportunities for overtime (e.g., road construction)
- Lack of community support and political permission for traffic enforcement
- Low level of interest in traffic enforcement or other overtime opportunities by law enforcement personnel (millennials, culture)
- Lack of consistent effective prosecution
- High profile negative media coverage

**In addition, the following questions were posed to forum participants:**

1. What is your crash data capacity at the local level?
  - Does your agency currently have a dedicated crash data analyst? If not how do you collect data?
  - Describe your agency's mapping capabilities?
  - If your agency has effective mapping, how do you use it? How is the information transmitted to the traffic enforcement officers and other patrol personnel?
  - How do you fund your data collection system?

2. Currently, what are the specific manpower deployment challenges within your agency?
3. Within your agency, who conducts traffic enforcement? Are all uniformed personnel expected to perform regular, data driven enforcement? Or is this responsibly conducted only by dedicated personnel/units?
4. When enforcement is conducted is it only during enforcement campaigns or sustained throughout the year? Are these activities conducted on an overtime basis or during patrol discretionary time?
5. What is your ideal design for an effective and efficient traffic safety deployment model?
6. What steps can be taken to assist your agency to participate in a consistent level of traffic safety engagement?

**Participants identified the following additional challenges, unique to their agencies, to provide traffic safety enforcement services in Rhode Island:**

- Man-power was the leading challenge brought up during the Forum. A large number of departments cited size as an issue for their department.
- Additional education and training. More specifically, departments requested community-wide education, specialty trainings in each of the traffic safety enforcement areas, specifically Distracted Driving
- Additional training opportunity in crash data mapping.
- A critical need for new or additional traffic safety equipment specifically emphasized was need for new or additional speed detection devices.
- The lack of funding to train DREs for their department.
- The current texting law needs careful review and effective modification.
- Departments conduct only reactive traffic enforcement. Their traffic enforcement depends on community complaints and isn't proactive.
- Roadways in critical need better signage, lights, warnings, or the removal of overgrown foliage.
- Funding to educate the public regarding issues related to distracted pedestrian activities.
- Some Departments rely heavily or completely on State Office on Highway Safety grants for their traffic safety enforcement, with no local funding.
- Departments cited the positive effects of Variable message signs and would like funding for additional units.
- The lack of funding for Speed Enforcement was one of the most commonly mentioned issues.
- The lack of funding and training for Aggressive Driving.

- Departments indicated that CIOT campaigns to be longer. They noted that behavior changes for a couple of weeks and then reverts back when the enforcement stops.
- Dangerous road conditions prevent or reduce traffic enforcement efforts during certain winter months.

**Continuing, the participants were provided time to discuss some immediate strategies and possible future solutions that may be utilized to overcome the stated obstacles:**

- Creating a PSA that explains why officers give out tickets. The message should demonstrate that law enforcement officers don't like to give out tickets, but it's a tested method to change unsafe driving behavior
- A newly enacted suspended license law is counterproductive and it needs modification
- Provide funding training for legislators so they can understand how their legislation affects enforcement. The State TSRP and Regional JOL can assist with this process
- Funding for a statewide RMS system.
- Sustained enforcement for Occupant Protection activities rather than one, two-week period
- Predictive Policing Analysis Module. Identify developing high crash areas before they become significant problems
- The funding and support for Court Staff
- A more effective Motorcycles Training Program that attracts more motorcyclist
- Productivity and officer safety will improve if two person patrols are permitted for state wide Impaired Driving enforcement
- Continue to focus on Drugged (other than alcohol) Driving. A statewide Impaired Driving Summit is scheduled for late August 2016.



### Forum Overview

The Maine Forum was hosted by the Maine Department of Public Safety and held at the Department of Public Safety Headquarters, located in the city of Augusta. The event was hosted by the Maine Bureau of Highway Safety. A total of 24 law enforcement agencies attended including the Maine State Police, 18 Municipal/Local agencies as well as 5 County Sheriffs' Departments. Although the attendees were provided statewide data, special emphasis was placed on the counties of York, Cumberland and Penobscot, due to their rankings of the counties with the three highest total fatalities for 2015. In total ?? attendees ? Chiefs and ? Sheriffs. Also in attendance were the Commissioner of Public Safety, the Director of the Bureau of Highway Safety, The Regional Administrators from Regions 2 and 3, the Deputy Regional Administrator form Region 1, the Director of the Office of Safety Programs and the Regional LELs from Region 1 and 2. The forum began at 10:00 AM and concluded at 1:00 PM with one 10 minute break included.

### Opening Session

The Maine Bureau of Highway Safety, LEL. Thomas Reagan moderated the opening session assisted by Regional LELs, Ted Minall and Mike Morris. Following opening comments by DPS Commissioner, John Morris, R-1, Deputy Administrator Gabriel Cano, and John Marshall, Director of NHTSA, Office of Safety Programs, a Power Point data presentation was delivered by State LEL, Thomas Reagan. That presentation covered a broad range of traffic crash information with an overview of state information and more focused data relating to overall fatalities, impaired fatalities, younger drivers, mature drivers, driver's actions and other assorted traffic crash data statistics. The opening session was closed with a demonstration of the Maine Department of Transportation Crash Query Tool. This website is open to the public and provides a wide variety of crash data, including statistics, mapping and high crash locations.

### Roundtable Discussion

**Following a short networking break, LEL Reagan facilitated a round table discussion. He opened the group discussion by presenting some commonly cited challenges to sustaining traffic safety enforcement services in Maine:**

- Lack of personnel – agencies are under staffed
- Too busy with calls for service, and related administrative reporting processes
- Competing demand for time such as community meetings, etc.
- Other opportunities for overtime (e.g., road construction)
- Lack of community support and political permission for traffic enforcement
- Low level of interest in traffic enforcement or other overtime opportunities by law enforcement personnel (millennials, culture)
- Lack of consistent effective prosecution
- High profile negative media coverage

**In addition, the following questions were posed to forum participants:**

1. What is your crash data capacity at the local level?
  - Does your agency currently have a dedicated crash data analyst? If not how do you collect data?
  - Describe your agency's mapping capabilities?
  - If your agency has effective mapping, how do you use it? How is the information transmitted to the traffic enforcement officers and other patrol personnel?
  - How do you fund your data collection system?
2. Currently, what are the specific manpower deployment challenges within your agency?
3. Within your agency, who conducts traffic enforcement? Are all uniformed personnel expected to perform regular, data driven enforcement? Or is this responsibly conducted only by dedicated personnel/units?
4. When enforcement is conducted is it only during enforcement campaigns or sustained throughout the year? Are these activities conducted on an overtime basis or during patrol discretionary time?
5. What is your ideal design for an effective and efficient traffic safety deployment model?
6. What steps can be taken to assist your agency to participate in a consistent level of traffic safety engagement?

**Participants identified the following additional challenges, unique to their agencies, to provide traffic safety enforcement services in Maine At the same time, those offering the obstacles were asked to provide a possible solution.**

- Law Enforcement Agencies struggling with identifying matching funds for equipment grants and supporting equipment, such as, software for equipment.
- Shortage of personnel willing to perform overtime as well as straight time traffic enforcement opportunities
- Agencies felt they were being punished for not having confirmed crash statistics, high enough to merit grant funding
- Officers are engaged in responding to and staying with calls that eliminate time otherwise spent on traffic enforcement
- The grant process won't pay for an officer attending court on matters related to arrests, tickets effected during grant funded enforcement
- Agencies suggested preferred to use their "best people" to fill traffic enforcement, overtime slots, but are stifled by union rules and requirement for equal distribution of overtime
- Suggested using full time, grant funded officers for traffic enforcement efforts
- Suggested more flexibility using grant funds for locations that violations are high, but crash data doesn't effectively reflect potential safety hazards
- Requests continuation of equipment funding for traffic related equipment, such as: traffic signs, speed bumps, speed trailers, Mobile Data Terminals etc.
- Request more flexibility in grants funding distributions requirements
- Suggested Regional approach to grants funding process
- Provide funding for local problems, such as general driving behavior
- Fund E Citation, and supporting hardware and software
- More traffic training for line officers as well as patrol supervisors. Training relating to court testimony as well as management of an agency's traffic enforcement efforts
- Officers are unwilling to issue high cost tickets to operators who are struggling financially
- Certain traffic infractions, such as distracted driving are very difficult to enforce using current tactics and equipment
- Suggested a system of graduated fines, increasing with each violation in the same category
- Aggressive traffic enforcement and unreasonable ticket penalties can have a negative impact on police - community relationships
- Accelerate the use of technology and science to improve the LEA's ability to identify and prevent crash in high incident locations. Predictable analysis

- When evaluating an agency's traffic enforcement activity for the purpose of funding, traffic warnings (in lieu of a ticket) should also be calculated into the formula to determine funding
- Complete funding for a traffic safety unit, in an agency that does not have such a unit
- Sponsor LEA workshops to assist with granting application and to more thoroughly define conditions such as "supplanting"

INTERIM REPORT