

# High-Visibility Enforcement: Assessing Change and Identifying Opportunities



A Study  
Conducted  
Under NCREP —  
The National  
Cooperative  
Research and  
Evaluation  
Program



U.S. Department of Transportation  
**National Highway Traffic Safety  
Administration**



## DISCLAIMER

This publication is distributed by the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in the interest of information exchange. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department of Transportation or the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof. If trade or manufacturers' names or products are mentioned, it is because they are considered essential to the object of the publication and should not be construed as an endorsement. The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers.

Suggested APA Format Citation:

Byrne, A., Petrella, M., & Masucci, C. (2021, May). *High-visibility enforcement: Assessing change and identifying opportunities* (Report No. DOT HS 813 066) National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

## Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. DOT HS 813 066	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle High-Visibility Enforcement: Assessing Change and Identifying Opportunities		5. Report Date May 2021	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Authors Angie Byrne, Margaret Petrella, and Clare Masucci Volpe National Transportation Systems Center		8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center 55 Broadway Cambridge, MA 02142		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH2215V00014	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, DC 20590		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code NPD-320	
15. Supplementary Notes The authors acknowledge the NHTSA Regional Offices and State Highway Safety Offices from Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New York, Oklahoma, and Rhode Island, as well as the Iowa State Patrol and Loveland, Colorado, Police Department for their participation in the interviews.  Dr. Christine E. Watson was the NHTSA project manager.  This study is being conducted under the National Cooperative Research and Evaluation Program (NCREP), which is administered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and jointly managed by NHTSA and the Governors Highway Safety Association.			
16. Abstract In this study the research team interviewed nine officials from State Highway Safety Offices (SHSOs) to determine if they perceived a change in participation in or support for high-visibility enforcement (HVE) over the past decade. The research team also interviewed six SHSO or local law enforcement agency (LEA) officials to profile innovative strategies that States or LEAs are using to increase law enforcement participation in HVE. Most of the nine SHSO officials believed there has been a decrease in law enforcement participation in and support for grant-funded HVE activities over the last 10 years, and the SHSO officials identified several common challenges to participation in HVE. However, interviews with SHSO and LEA officials regarding innovative strategies being used to increase participation in HVE revealed possible solutions for these challenges.			
17. Key Word high-visibility enforcement, law enforcement, traffic safety		18. Distribution Statement This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, <a href="http://www.ntis.gov">www.ntis.gov</a> .	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 45	22. Price

**Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)**

Reproduction of completed page authorized

## Table of Contents

1. Acknowledgements.....	1
2. Executive Summary.....	2
3. Introduction .....	3
3.1 Purpose and Background.....	3
3.2 Methodology .....	3
3.2.1 Perception Interview Selection.....	3
3.2.2 Case Study Interview Selection.....	4
3.2.3 Interview Process and Format .....	5
3.3 Results of the Perception Interviews.....	7
3.4 Results from Case Study Interviews .....	9
4. Matching Challenges to Solutions: Findings From Case Studies.....	11
4.1 Challenge: Lack of Manpower/Staffing Shortages .....	11
4.1.1 Strategy: Delaware SHSO Paperwork Reduction and Pay Equity .....	11
4.1.2 Strategy: Flex Scheduling .....	13
4.2 Challenge: Lack of Training to Properly Conduct Details .....	13
4.2.1 Strategy: Maryland SHSO Training Programs .....	14
4.3 Challenge: Concerns About Perception of Law Enforcement by the Community .....	15
4.3.1 Strategy: Aurora Police Highway Enforcement of Aggressive Traffic Unit .....	15
4.3.2 Strategy: Iowa High Five Program.....	16
4.4 Challenges: Generational Differences Among Law Enforcement .....	17
4.4.1 Strategy: Illinois Compensatory (“Comp”) Time Model.....	17
4.5 Challenges: Leadership Buy-In.....	18
4.5.1 Strategy: Loveland, Colorado Pro-Traffic LEA Model.....	19
4.6 Challenges: Maintaining Traffic Safety as a Priority and/or Maintaining HVE Energy .....	20
4.6.1 Strategy: Iowa Operational Plans.....	20
4.6.2 Strategy: Maryland Operations Spreadsheets .....	21
4.6.3 Additional Resources: Law Enforcement/SHSO Interactions and HVE Toolkits .....	21
4.7 Summary of Key Attributes .....	22
5. Common Themes and Additional Opportunities .....	25
5.1 Make Data-Informed Decisions and/or Understand Available Data.....	25
5.2 Capitalize on Technology.....	25
5.3 Use Law Enforcement Liaisons.....	26

5.4	Employ Officer Recognition .....	26
5.5	Summary of Common Themes and Additional Opportunities in Addressing Challenges .....	27
6.	Outstanding Challenges .....	28
6.1	Multiple and/or Easier Overtime Details Available .....	28
6.2	Working with NHTSA and 2 CFR 200 Requirements.....	28
6.3	Funding Decreases.....	29
6.4	HVE Penalties.....	29
7.	Conclusion.....	30
	Appendix A: Perception Interview Guide.....	A-1
	Appendix B: Case Study Interview Guide.....	B-1

## List of Tables

Table 1: Information about States participating in perception interviews. ....	4
Table 2: States and strategies selected for case study interviews. ....	5
Table 3: Most common HVE challenges for SHSO Interviewees (N = 9).....	8
Table 4: HVE challenges and key attributes of case examples that may address them.....	22
Table 5: Common themes/additional opportunities and key attributes to address challenges. ....	27

## 1. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank those who participated in the interviews. The information they provided was critical to the implementation of the project and informed many steps throughout. The team hopes that this report will be a useful resource to the State Highway Safety Offices (SHSOs) and their law enforcement partners.

## 2. Executive Summary

The purpose of this research was two-fold:

1. To assess whether officials from State Highway Safety Offices perceive a change in participation in or support for high-visibility enforcement (HVE) over the past decade, and
2. To identify any innovative strategies that States or law enforcement agencies (LEAs) are using to increase law enforcement participation in HVE.

To address the two research needs above, the research team conducted nine “perception interviews” and six “case study interviews” of officials from SHSOs and LEAs across the United States. These interviews identified rich information about HVE participation among law enforcement and innovative efforts to improve participation in grant-funded HVE activities. The research team worked with National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Regional Administrators to recruit candidates for both the perception and the case study interviews, with the goal of selecting interviewees from States that were diverse with respect to geography, population, and traffic safety challenges. Interviewees included both SHSO officials and representatives from LEAs. The research team developed separate interview guides for each interview type. Each interview was approximately one hour in length. The research team conducted 10 interviews by telephone and 5 interviews in person at the 2019 Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) Annual Meeting.

The perception interviews indicated a general belief that there has been a decrease in law enforcement participation in and support for grant-funded HVE activities over the last 10 years. Challenges frequently mentioned as reasons for the decrease in HVE participation included:

- Lack of manpower and/or staffing shortages,
- Lack of training to properly conduct details (specialized types of enforcement),
- Concerns about public perception of law enforcement,
- Generational differences among officers,
- Leadership buy-in (within law enforcement), and
- Maintaining traffic safety as a priority and/or maintaining “HVE energy.”

Many of the strategies identified in the case study interviews offered solutions for addressing these challenges. Many of the interviewees identified a consistent set of approaches to increase participation in HVE. While not all identified challenges were addressed by the case study strategies, many of the common features of approaches may be useful in guiding the future development of strategies to address them. Furthermore, it may take multiple strategies to fully address challenges to HVE participation and support.



## 3. Introduction

### 3.1 Purpose and Background

HVE is enforcement conducted in a highly visible manner, that is, enforcement that also includes earned media (press events, news reports, and articles) or paid media (advertising purchased on television, radio, or in print) activities to publicize the enforcement efforts. HVE is an effective strategy for reducing risky traffic safety behaviors,<sup>1 2</sup> and, like all traffic safety enforcement, HVE should be applied even-handedly. However, there are indications that HVE is not used by all law enforcement agencies. For example, in the States in which they are permitted by law, only 73% of State patrol agencies and 55% of local LEAs conduct sobriety checkpoints.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, NHTSA has anecdotal evidence that some SHSOs believe support for HVE among LEAs and officers has declined in recent years. To determine if there has been a change in the use of the HVE model, the research team conducted nine interviews of State officials in August 2019 to assess each official’s perception of any change in support for HVE over the past 10 years.

Law enforcement officers are often offered overtime pay to conduct HVE programs, but this strategy for encouraging participation cannot be used if overtime funds are not available or if officers are unwilling to work overtime hours. In response, some State and local LEAs have developed other tactics for promoting HVE participation among law enforcement. Thus, another objective of the current project was to identify innovative strategies that SHSOs and local LEAs are using to increase HVE participation. The research team conducted six case study interviews to document the details of these strategies, including the benefits and challenges of each.

### 3.2 Methodology

#### 3.2.1 Perception Interview Selection

The research team conducted nine interviews of SHSO staff to understand whether these officials perceived a change in the level of participation in and support for HVE over the past 10 years. While the identification of States for these “perception interviews” was guided by recommendations from the NHTSA Regional Offices, the final selections incorporated additional information to ensure diversity in the selected States’ geography, population, and traffic safety challenges. The research team used fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (fatality rate), alcohol-impaired fatalities per 100 million VMT (alcohol-impaired fatality rate), and daytime front seat observed seat belt use to gauge the magnitude of States’ traffic safety

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard, C. M., Magee, K., Bacon-Abdelmoteleb, P., & Brown, J. L. (2018, April). *Countermeasures that work: A highway safety countermeasures guide for State Highway Safety Offices, 9th edition* (Report No. DOT HS 812 478). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

<sup>2</sup> Shults, R. A., Elder, R. W., Sleet, D. A., Nichols, J. L., Alao, M. O., Carande-Kulis, V. G., Zaza, S., Sosin, D. M., & Thompson, R. S. (2001). Reviews of evidence regarding interventions to reduce alcohol-impaired driving. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 21* (Suppl. 4), 66-88.

<sup>3</sup> Erickson, D. J., Farbakhsh, K., Toomey, T. L., Lenk, K. M., Jones-Webb, R., & Nelson, T. F. (2015). Enforcement of alcohol-impaired driving laws in the United States: A national survey of state and local agencies. *Traffic Injury Prevention, 16*(6), 533–539.

challenges. Table 1 identifies the States selected to participate in the perception interviews, as well as traffic safety statistics associated with each State.

*Table 1: Information about States participating in perception interviews.*

State	NHTSA Region	2016 Population <sup>4</sup>	2016 Fatality Rate <sup>5,6</sup>	2016 Alcohol-Impaired Fatality Rate <sup>5,7</sup>	2016 Observed Seat Belt Use <sup>5,6</sup>
Colorado	8	5,607,154	1.17	0.31	84%
Florida	4	20,984,400	1.47	0.42	90%
Iowa	7	3,145,711	1.21	0.32	91%
Maryland	3	6,052,177	0.88	0.24	92%
Michigan	5	9,962,311	1.07	0.25	94%
Montana	10	1,050,493	1.51	0.67	78%
New York	2	19,849,399	0.85	0.24	93%
Rhode Island	1	1,059,639	0.64	0.24	88%
Texas	6	28,304,596	1.40	0.54	92%
<i>All States</i>	-	<i>324,985,539</i>	<i>1.18</i>	<i>0.33</i>	<i>90%</i>

The SHSO officials who participated in the perception interviews came from highway safety offices of varying sizes, and the interviewees had a nearly even distribution of years of experience. All but one SHSO official interviewed were the director or chief of their offices.

### 3.2.2 Case Study Interview Selection

The case studies were also identified in coordination with the NHTSA Regional Offices, which recommended interviewees knowledgeable about eight different programs being used by LEAs to increase participation in HVE. There were two case study interviews, Iowa and Maryland, that covered two strategies each. Table 2 identifies the organizations participating in the case study interviews and their associated strategies.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *Annual estimates of the resident population for the United States, regions, states, and Puerto Rico: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019*. [www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-national-total.html#par\\_textimage\\_1810472256](http://www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-national-total.html#par_textimage_1810472256).

<sup>5</sup> National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2019). *State Traffic Safety Information*. <https://cdan.nhtsa.gov/STSI.htm>

<sup>6</sup> National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2018, September). *Summary of motor vehicle crashes: 2016 data* (Traffic Safety Facts. Report No. DOT HS 812 580). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812580>

<sup>7</sup> National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2017, October). *Alcohol-impaired driving: 2016 data* (Traffic Safety Facts. Report No. DOT HS 812 450). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812450>

Table 2: States and strategies selected for case study interviews.

State/Agency	Strategy
Colorado/Aurora Police Department	Highway Enforcement of Aggressive Traffic (HEAT) Unit
Colorado/Loveland Police Department	Pro-Traffic Departmental Model
Delaware/SHSO	Paperwork Reduction and Pay Equity
Illinois/SHSO	Comp Time Model
Iowa/SHSO	High Five Program
Iowa/SHSO	Operational Plans
Maryland/SHSO	Operations Spreadsheets
Maryland/SHSO	Training Programs

Two people who participated in the case study interviews are currently SHSO officials, two are law enforcement liaisons (LELs) or LEL coordinators, one is a current law enforcement officer, and one is a NHTSA Regional Office program manager. Of these six interviewees, three indicated they are retired law enforcement officers.

### 3.2.3 Interview Process and Format

The research team conducted the perception and case study interviews using two modes: in-person or telephone. Five interviews (3 perception interviews and 2 case study interviews) occurred in person at the 2019 GHSA Annual Meeting in Anaheim, California, in August 2019, while the remaining 10 interviews (6 perception interviews and 4 case study interviews) took place via conference call before and after the 2019 GHSA Annual Meeting.

The research team developed two separate interview guides (one for the perception interviews and one for the case study interviews) and adhered to the questions in those guides during the interviews, with occasional clarification questions. (See Appendices 1 and 2 for the interview guides.)

The key topics explored in the perception interviews included:

- Types of HVE activities conducted by the SHSO and the traffic safety problems being addressed by HVE;
- Number of SHSO staff devoted to coordinating grant-funded HVE/the use of other resources (if any) for HVE;
- Perceived safety impacts of grant-funded HVE;
- Challenges in carrying out HVE activities;
- Perception of whether there has been a change over the past 10 years in:
  - Number of LEAs participating in HVE,
  - Number of HVE hours billed, and
  - Types of HVE activities;
- Perception of whether (and how) there has been a change over the past 10 years in support for participation in HVE (among leadership and among officers);
- Information collected by SHSOs that might reflect changes in support for HVE; and

- Perception of whether NHTSA/GHSA Core Activity Measures (as reported in States' annual Highway Safety Plans) accurately capture the SHSO's grant-funded HVE activity/participation.

The key topics addressed in the case study interviews included:

- Description of the innovative strategy used to increase participation in HVE;
- Length of time the strategy has been in place;
- Motivation for the development of the strategy;
- Evolution of the strategy (if applicable);
- Methods to encourage HVE participation prior to implementing the strategy;
- Impact of the strategy on HVE participation, and whether the LEA collects data to measure impact;
- Level of support for the strategy within the department;
- Challenges in implementing the strategy;
- Sustainability of the strategy;
- Use of the strategy by other LEAs; and
- Lessons learned from implementing the strategy.

At the start of each interview, the research team requested permission to directly but anonymously quote those interviewed. No interviewee denied permission. One interviewee asked that the research team allow the interviewee to review quotes, but no direct quotes were used from that person.

Immediately after each interview, the research team members conducting the interview completed a form to provide a summarized reflection of what they observed or learned in each interview and why they believed that was important. The information from these forms was used to develop lists of key themes for the formation of this report. Additionally, based on detailed notes taken during interviews, research team members coded interviewees' responses to each question in a spreadsheet. After all responses were coded, the research team synthesized the data by looking for key themes, trends, and relationships among the information in the spreadsheets, such as identifying common responses from multiple interviewees. The interview summary forms completed by the interviewers themselves after each interview were also coded to allow for a similar analysis.

It is important to note that this was a limited sample size of only nine perception interviews and six case study interviews. This sample of SHSOs is not intended to be a representative sample of SHSOs across the United States but rather to achieve diversity in geography, population, and traffic safety challenges faced by States. Additionally, the intent of the perception interviews was to assess the interviewees' subjective beliefs about changes in support for HVE rather than to determine whether support for HVE among law enforcement had objectively changed.

### 3.3 Results of the Perception Interviews

The perception interviews indicated that all nine SHSOs followed the traditional HVE impaired-driving crackdown and occupant protection mobilizations during national campaign time periods, following the NHTSA Communications Calendar.<sup>8</sup> The most prominent traffic safety issue interviewees reported targeting with HVE activities was alcohol-impaired driving. Occupant protection, speed, and distraction were the next three most common safety issues targeted (in that order). Some interviewees also mentioned addressing pupil transportation safety, motorcyclist safety, and child passenger safety.

All perception interviewees indicated that their law enforcement partners engaged in HVE outside of grant-funded HVE, although there was significant variability in the extent of this additional activity. Two perception interviewees noted that funding from non-grant sources within the State was available to conduct HVE efforts. Another interviewee provided an example of a department conducting non-grant-funded sobriety checkpoints as part of a memorial effort for a young member of the community who was killed by an impaired driver. The research team noted that some respondents may have considered additional traffic enforcement to be an HVE activity, as opposed to a true HVE activity that combines the enforcement with a visibility component (e.g., earned and/or paid media).

Five of the perception interviewees noted regional HVE participation differences in their States, while four indicated there were no geographic differences. Specifically, five perception interview respondents noted differences in participation between rural and urban areas, while the other four did not. The respondents who did note differences indicated they perceived rural departments as less likely to participate in HVE activities than urban departments.

All perception interviewees indicated that they believed their offices' HVE efforts have had positive safety impacts in their States, and they provided one or two examples of specific traffic safety issues where the States have experienced positive change. The two most commonly cited successes were reducing the number of unbelted and impaired-driving fatalities. In some instances, the interviewees offered data from their States' Highway Safety Plans to support their views.

The perception interviews identified several common challenges SHSOs face with respect to law enforcement participation and implementation of HVE activities. The two most common challenges identified were lack of manpower and competition with easier overtime details (temporary assignments); both challenges are related to difficulty obtaining consistent participation throughout the duration of the grant award. Table 3 summarizes the challenges identified by at least three perception interviewees. All interviewees identified multiple challenges. If a single interviewee mentioned one challenge more than once, it was only counted once for that interviewee.

---

<sup>8</sup> For example: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2020). *2021 NHTSA Communications Calendar*. [https://one.nhtsa.gov/links/tsm/14791\\_2021CommCalendar\\_061720\\_v8-tag.pdf](https://one.nhtsa.gov/links/tsm/14791_2021CommCalendar_061720_v8-tag.pdf)

Table 3: Most common HVE challenges for SHSO Interviewees (N = 9).

Challenge	# of Interviewees Who Mentioned
Lack of manpower and/or staffing shortages	8
Multiple and/or easier overtime details available	8
Concerns about public perception of law enforcement	6
Making data-informed decisions and/or understanding data available	5
Generational differences among officers	4
Leadership buy-in (within law enforcement)	4
Working within NHTSA and 2 CFR 200 requirements	3
Funding decreases (from both State and Federal sources)	3

All but one interviewee indicated that they believed there has been a decrease in grant-funded HVE participation among law enforcement over the past 10 years; the remaining interviewee was unsure. Furthermore, all but one interviewee noted that the hours billed by their law enforcement partners in grant reimbursement requests for HVE activities has decreased. Explanations for this decrease in participation in HVE included lack of manpower—the most commonly cited HVE challenge—and funding. Three interviewees indicated that their Federal funding has either decreased or has not kept up with increasing personnel and administrative costs.

Five of the nine perception interviewees indicated that engagement and communication with the LEAs working with their SHSOs on HVE was critical to maintaining HVE participation, support, and implementation at current levels (or, in some instances, increasing activity for emerging issues) and overcoming challenges. Of those five, four spoke about engagement and communication with law enforcement in the context of maintaining personal relationships with the departments, and especially with leadership. One interviewee shared that fostering personal relationships with LEAs allows for candid conversations on more sensitive topics, such as if the department is not spending grant funds at the expected rate or if HVE activity levels are lower than expected.

When the perception interviewees were asked if there were any changes to the *types* of grant-funded HVE enforcement activities conducted over the past 10 years, several responded that LEAs are changing the enforcement tactics they use to address safety issues. One interviewee noted their State uses a bucket truck (i.e., a medium- to heavy-duty vehicle equipped with a long arm supporting an aerial platform) to better spot distracted drivers because it allows law enforcement to see into vehicles while drivers are manipulating their phones. Another interviewee noted using spotters for enforcement of laws related to pedestrians. However, in discussing these changes to their enforcement tactics, many interviewees shared that they believed general enforcement changes were due to shifts in the public’s perception of law enforcement—for instance, changes to a community policing model as opposed to the proactive enforcement of the HVE model. Most of the interviewees who noted changes in enforcement tactics also cited changes in grant funding availability and emerging problems in

their community as reasons for the change in enforcement tactics. For example, some LEAs are developing programs targeting problems outside of the traditional HVE areas of speed, occupant protection, and impaired driving, such as distracted driving and pedestrian enforcement.

The perception interviews included a question asking the interviewees if there was any data the interviewee could point to that quantified changes in support or participation in their HVE grants, either positive or negative. The responses varied considerably. Most of the interviewees mentioned multiple types of data that described the changes, but there was no single measure that could quantify support for HVE. Four interviewees mentioned that they had noticed changes in citations issued (broadly), while three interviewees noticed changes in crashes and grant liquidations.

The research team also asked if the NHTSA/GHSA Core Activity Measures (measures reported in States' annual Highway Safety Plans), seat belt and speed citations, and impaired driving arrests, accurately captured the amount of grant-funded HVE activity conducted. Interviewees offered two different perspectives on this question. Some interviewees felt that the reductions in arrests and citations indicated there was more compliance taking place, and, therefore, the department had a successful program. Other interviewees acknowledged this typical interpretation of the success of HVE but also described why this interpretation was inaccurate: they believed the reduction in citations results from grantees submitting fewer reimbursement hours for HVE activities. Interviewees identified possible alternatives to the Core Activity Measures, including individual officer production data, contacts, warnings, and crashes.

### 3.4 Results from Case Study Interviews

The case study interviews explored SHSOs' and LEAs' use of innovative strategies to encourage HVE participation. Of the six case study interviews, four described a single strategy each; however, the Maryland and Iowa interviews covered two strategies each. While the strategies differed, many common themes emerged. These themes were key attributes that many of the strategies shared, including using data-driven decision-making, implementing new technology, drawing upon LELs, and using officer recognition.

All case study interviewees indicated their strategies were developed to increase law enforcement participation in HVE activities. All the strategies described had been in effect for 4 years or less, except for one strategy whose initial concept started 10 years ago. Four of the six case study interviewees indicated their strategies had evolved since inception. Of those who indicated their strategies had evolved, two specifically indicated that they evolved due to regular reviews of fatality, crash, HVE participation, and other sources of data with their partners.

Since implementing their respective strategies (described in detail below), all but one case study interviewee reported noticing an increase in HVE participation by law enforcement officers. Five of the case study interviewees cited data showing their strategies increased HVE participation, including the increased liquidation of grant funds, crash and fatality data, hours

participating in HVE activities, and observed seat belt use. The data points varied. One of the case studies used only a single measure to determine if the strategy had increased participation in HVE, while the other five case studies used broader spectrums of measures. Three interviewees indicated that the implementation of the strategy has changed how law enforcement or the SHSO allocates resources. Only one interviewee said that it was too early to tell if there was a change in HVE participation because of the new strategy, also noting that law enforcement participation in HVE activities was already high in the State. However, he did note that he believed morale among officers had significantly improved because of the implementation of the strategy.

The case study interviewees all noted positive support among the broader law enforcement community in rolling out their respective strategies. However, this positive support did not mean that rollout and implementation came without challenges or hurdles that needed to be addressed. The most common challenge that the interviewees faced when attempting to implement these strategies involved getting buy-in from specific law enforcement leaders and officers, NHTSA, and the community. Two interviewees also noted that concerns about public perceptions of law enforcement from the communities the LEAs serve were also a challenge to overcome. Another challenge that two interviewees cited was the need to restructure and reallocate resources based on the change in strategy to encourage HVE participation.

The case study interviewees were asked what they learned from implementing their strategies to encourage HVE participation (i.e., what worked, what did not work). Five of the interviewees noted the overall importance of communication and collaboration with all parties involved during rollout and implementation of the new strategy. Three interviewees emphasized the importance of communication and collaboration with leadership within LEAs. Three interviewees also stressed the importance of being flexible with implementing the strategies and the need to self-assess and adjust as required.

All but one of the case study interviewees thought their strategies were sustainable over time, and the one interviewee who did not indicated he was not sure because he believed innovation is constantly needed. Four of the case study interviewees shared their strategies with either another department or SHSO. However, of these four, only one was aware of another LEA or SHSO that adopted the strategy.



## 4. Matching Challenges to Solutions: Findings From Case Studies

Analysis of the results of both sets of interviews revealed that the case study interviews addressed many of the challenges to participation in and support for HVE that were identified during the perception interviews. Therefore, the remainder of this report is organized to reflect these relationships, summarized in Table 4, Section 4.7. While not all challenges identified during the perception interviews had possible solutions from the case study interviews, most of the challenges were addressed.

While the primary focus of this project was participation in and support for HVE among law enforcement, interview responses sometimes drifted into perceived barriers to HVE implementation. Interviewed officials often perceived challenges to implementing HVE (i.e., officers' insufficient training to conduct HVE) as also influencing their participation in and support for HVE. While the focus of the challenge areas was HVE participation and support, many of these challenges also pertain to HVE implementation. Similarly, the case study strategies reflect the focus on HVE participation and support but also contain some overlap with HVE implementation.

Many of the case study interviewees also identified a consistent set of approaches that could be part of any strategy to increase participation in HVE. These approaches were identified as critically necessary in implementing strategies with law enforcement partners. Table 5 in Section 5.5 summarizes these common themes/outstanding opportunities and their key attributes to addressing outstanding challenges. (Section 6 describes the challenges that were not able to be addressed.)

While the case studies listed below address many of the challenges identified by interviewees, they may not completely and comprehensively address the challenges. There may be additional countermeasures or innovative methods required to fully address these items. However, these case studies identify innovative and creative opportunities taken by LEAs to address perceived reductions in participation of law enforcement in HVE activities.

### 4.1 Challenge: Lack of Manpower/Staffing Shortages

During the perception interviews, eight of the nine respondents identified the challenge of manpower and staff shortages with law enforcement partners. Multiple explanations were given for these shortages, including local budget cuts (e.g., LEAs were asked to “do more with less”), military deployments, and recruitment difficulties. Many respondents provided examples of specific departmental shortage numbers or spoke of how funding (i.e., flat funding or cuts) did not rebound at the end of the last economic recession.

#### 4.1.1 Strategy: Delaware SHSO Paperwork Reduction and Pay Equity

The Delaware SHSO works with 40 LEAs across the State that support HVE grant efforts. The SHSO learned that LEAs were facing staffing shortages, and the rural LEAs were especially burdened. Because of these shortages, completing all the paperwork for grant applications was challenging and, therefore, affected HVE participation and support. To address this challenge,

the Delaware SHSO changed their operating procedures to do more of the upfront paperwork for the LEAs, including filling in basic LEA information (e.g., contact information) and completing the problem identification on behalf of the LEA. Additionally, instead of the LEAs waiting for request for proposals to come out announcing a grant opportunity, the SHSO contacted the LEAs directly. Due to these updates, the SHSO reduced the LEA's paperwork burden, so the LEA was only required to review and sign-off on the grant application. This change in operating procedures and paperwork reduction also helped the SHSO move to a more data-driven approach because it allowed the SHSO to target different LEAs for different funding priorities based on the LEA's specific traffic safety challenges. Part of this data-driven and uniform approach involved creating an annual events calendar to avoid competing traffic safety priorities between the SHSO and LEAs.

A second strategy the SHSO deployed to increase participation in HVE was implementation of a flat overtime rate for all participating LEAs. The SHSO noticed that there was significant variation between LEAs for overtime pay, and these pay discrepancies created morale issues when multiple LEAs would work together for crackdown and mobilization efforts. To address this, all overtime grant activities now have a flat funding amount of \$65 per hour statewide, no matter the LEA. The State reassesses this amount on a regular basis and adjusts it when appropriate.

The SHSO believes the combination of these two strategies (paperwork reduction and flat overtime rate) has been effective for several reasons. First, it found a very positive response among LEAs, with LEAs returning a higher number of grant applications than before the strategy. The SHSO is also seeing that the LEAs' planned spending and actual spending are closely matched. Closing the gap between planned spending and actual spending ensures that SHSO grant funds are being spent in areas where data suggest there are the most challenges, as opposed to leaving the grant funds unspent or reallocating them to projects where a need for the funding is not as strongly supported by data. Most importantly, the SHSO is finding that many of the LEAs are also meeting the traffic safety goals established in their grant agreements.

The SHSO was candid that their small size affords Delaware some opportunities that may not be available to larger States. The interviewee indicated they are on a first name basis with all law enforcement leadership in the State and visit law enforcement agencies on a regular basis to foster continued support. Additionally, data are of a similar uniformity and quality across the State because all LEAs use the same Computer-Aided Dispatch/Records Management System. When the data are consistent across LEAs, it instills confidence that the SHSO can make consistent, data-informed decisions about grant allocation; in turn, confidence in the data positively affects both HVE participation and support, as well as HVE implementation.

*Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- SHSO goes to law enforcement when the SHSO has an identified traffic safety problem; they don't wait for law enforcement to come to the SHSO.

- SHSO simplifies the grant application process by completing the problem identification process for law enforcement and by limiting the amount of information that LEAs need to enter on their applications.
- SHSO pays a uniform dollar amount for all overtime activities across the State and reassesses this amount on a regular basis.
- SHSO maintains communication with law enforcement partners; uses direct, real-time communication (i.e., videoconferences or, if public health conditions permit, in-person meetings) as much as possible.
- SHSO identifies opportunities for data to be consistently reported from LEA to LEA for uniformity in analysis and reporting.

#### **4.1.2 Strategy: Flex Scheduling**

The Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) found LEAs were experiencing difficulties in filling HVE shifts during the limited time periods of mobilization and crackdowns and, because of this challenge, LEAs were requesting more flexibility in scheduling shifts for HVE patrols.<sup>9</sup> In response, the State introduced “flex patrols.” These are periods outside of the statewide enforcement periods for crackdowns and mobilizations during which participating LEAs can schedule patrols to address a specific traffic safety problem (e.g., distracted driving). Statewide crackdown and mobilization enforcement periods are targeted, short-time-frame periods of enforcement, while the flex patrols allow LEAs to address the same issues during additional time frames with greater flexibility of scheduling, including shift start and end times. The WTSC recommended creating a written policy permitting these types of “flex patrols” and the guidelines for their scheduling.

#### *Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- SHSO creates a written policy that allows for flexible scheduling of HVE patrols outside of the statewide enforcement periods for crackdowns and mobilizations.

## **4.2 Challenge: Lack of Training to Properly Conduct Details**

When the perception interview respondents discussed their manpower and staffing shortages, a sub-issue related to this challenge was the lack of available officers with the advanced skills needed to conduct certain types of patrols, especially for impaired driving. The LEAs lack of available officers with appropriate skills affected participation and support for HVE, as well as the LEAs’ ability to implement HVE, more generally. One interviewee noted that demand for officers is so high in their State that the Standardized Field Sobriety Test (SFST) is not always covered in Academy by the time the new officer starts working. Dahl & Thompson<sup>9</sup> also noted that “many officers avoid DUI investigations due to the complexity of the investigation process.” Other perception and case study interviewees noted observations of marijuana and opioid use increasing over the past 10 years, putting LEAs in situations where they do not have

---

<sup>9</sup> Dahl, D. & Thompson, B. (2017). *Proactive traffic enforcement survey and assessment*. Washington Traffic Safety Commission. <https://waspc.memberclicks.net/assets/docs/2017%20final%20traffic%20enforcement%20assessment%20report%20-%20final.pdf>

enough officers who are trained through Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE) and/or drug recognition expert (DRE) programs.

#### **4.2.1 Strategy: Maryland SHSO Training Programs**

The Maryland SHSO runs a variety of traffic safety training programs for its law enforcement partners, the most notable of these trainings being its DUI Institute. This DUI Institute, conducted in coordination with the University of Maryland, is a one-week, intensive, college-level instructional program for law enforcement officers who want a comprehensive understanding of impaired driving issues and leadership roles in DUI enforcement. The DUI Institute is specifically designed for law enforcement officers currently or soon to be assigned to patrol, traffic, or traffic training duties that have an emphasis on DUI enforcement. The SHSO found that many officers were not confident in their skills making DUI arrests. As a result, the SHSO worked with the University of Maryland to develop this training to build officer skills and increase their confidence. Officers rotate through different kinds of training, which includes courtroom skills, training on current law, and other DUI enforcement skills.

Another training program the SHSO conducts is a front-line supervisors' conference. The focus of this training conference is to explain to supervisors why conducting HVE enforcement is valuable and to mobilize leadership to emphasize this importance through the ranks. During these conferences, data are discussed, and high performance is recognized. The SHSO found it is critical to get the buy-in from these leaders to maintain their LEAs' HVE participation. Like the Delaware case study, the SHSO found the "in-person" element of these conferences critical to maintaining its relationship with these partners and developing a collaborative approach to safety.

#### *Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- SHSO builds advanced skills among officers for DUI enforcement (see NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*<sup>1</sup> for more information).
- SHSO conducts trainings in real-time, virtually (e.g., using videoconferencing) or, if public health conditions permit, in-person.
- SHSO trains front-line supervisors to encourage buy-in and mobilization of patrol officers within their LEAs.

Additional research supports Maryland's position that training for both leadership and patrol-level officers increased HVE support and participation. Otto and colleagues found that officers who participated in at least one training per year were two times more likely to engage in frequent traffic safety enforcement compared to officers who did not participate in annual trainings.<sup>10</sup> Their study was conducted in coordination with 14 State Departments of

---

<sup>10</sup> Otto, J., Finley, K., Green, K., & Ward, N. (2019). *Understanding law enforcement attitudes and beliefs about traffic safety* (Report No. FHWA/MT-19-003/8882-309-08). Montana Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration.  
[www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/research/docs/research\\_proj/tsc/LAW\\_ENFORCEMENT\\_ATTIT/UES/TSC-TPF\\_LE\\_FINAL\\_REPORT.pdf](http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/research/docs/research_proj/tsc/LAW_ENFORCEMENT_ATTIT/UES/TSC-TPF_LE_FINAL_REPORT.pdf)

Transportation to understand law enforcement attitudes and beliefs about traffic safety within the internal culture of LEAs. Furthermore, they also noted that leadership found additional training valuable in increasing support for traffic enforcement activities.

#### 4.3 Challenge: Concerns About Perception of Law Enforcement by the Community

Five perception interviewees used the term “Ferguson effect” to describe the interviewees’ concerns about the public’s perception of law enforcement. This term was first used by Chief Doyle Sam Dotson III in 2014 to describe the belief that police are using less vigorous enforcement in situations that might lead to public backlash. In describing this effect, those interviewed in the current study discussed their belief that police are not as proactive as in the past about enforcing traffic laws. The interviewees described their view that many in law enforcement believe that the public holds negative attitudes towards law enforcement, and this belief discourages law enforcement from participating in and supporting HVE activities. Two interviewees said that law enforcement officers were afraid of “ending up on the news” or “on YouTube.” However, while the Ferguson effect was the most commonly cited term, it was not the only perception shift interviewees discussed. One interviewee noted the rise in suicides among law enforcement, and another noted how changes in mental health funding have placed a greater burden on law enforcement to handle more mental health issues in their communities. The interviewees believed that because of these additional challenges faced by officers, prioritization of participating in and supporting HVE efforts diminished.

One of the case study interviewees offered an observation that although the Ferguson effect may be creating concerns about public views of law enforcement, the interviewee believed the bigger issue was the shift away from law enforcement officer engagement in their communities. This interviewee noted that during the Great Recession that took place from 2007-2009, many community police officers were redirected to more crime-focused activities, and relationships with their community partners were neglected. The interviewee believed these relationships were damaged because there were no more community engagement officers to explain to members of the community why the LEA was conducting certain types of enforcement, and damage from these neglected relationships built over time.

##### 4.3.1 Strategy: Aurora Police Highway Enforcement of Aggressive Traffic Unit

In 2015 Aurora, Colorado, experienced a steep increase in fatalities on both their highways and city streets. In response to this increase, the local law enforcement agency analyzed traffic safety data and reassigned six highly trained officers (including officers trained in crash reconstruction and incident management) to a dedicated Highway Enforcement of Aggressive Traffic (HEAT) unit. Officers were dedicated to specific road segments, which became “their road[s]” where the officers focused all their HVE enforcement efforts. Officers took ownership of these road segments and worked with community members, the media, and engineers for safety efforts on these roads. After implementation of the program, Aurora experienced a significant decline in crashes and fatalities in the targeted areas.

There has been positive media coverage of the HEAT unit. The officers in the unit communicate effectively to the public that they are focused on safety and not revenue generation. For

example, when the LEA posted on its Facebook page about issuing a speeding ticket to a violator driving over 100 mph, the comments were generally positive about stopping this dangerous driver. Moreover, the positive results of the HEAT program (clearing crashes faster and reducing traffic jams) have also helped with public perception of the unit.

The HEAT unit was structured out of the existing traffic unit. HEAT unit weekday shifts are funded by the city, and weekend shifts are funded with overtime grant funds. Four officers operate during daytime hours and two during the night. This operational structure has existed since the HEAT unit's inception. The only modification to the way in which the HEAT unit operates has been the addition of monthly team operations, since the members of this unit enjoyed teaming up for some enforcement and community events.

HEAT unit members were hand-selected by the leadership of the traffic unit because of the officers' support and engagement with HVE and traffic safety operations. The LEA justified the change in operating structure of the traffic unit because the HEAT unit was grant-funded; therefore, a different level of accountability for performance and reporting was required for these overtime hours. While this restructuring initially caused some friction in the LEA, it was soon well-accepted. Officers who did not like participating in traffic details did not have to participate in traffic enforcement and HVE as frequently due to HEAT officers now focusing exclusively on traffic operations during their shifts. Furthermore, regular patrols were given back their time to be proactive on other types of enforcement or handle calls for service.

#### *Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- The local LEA uses highly trained officers with an interest in traffic enforcement to conduct HVE (see NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*<sup>1</sup> for more information).
- The local LEA creates "ownership" of road segments by law enforcement.
- The local LEA uses partnerships within the community, including the media, so they, too, take ownership in safety efforts (see also *Countermeasures That Work*<sup>1</sup> for more information).
- The local LEA builds in team operational times to continue to motivate participating officers.

#### **4.3.2 Strategy: Iowa High Five Program**

The Iowa SHSO found that 72% of all fatal crashes in the State in 2012 occurred on secondary rural roads.<sup>11</sup> Many of these fatalities were unbelted. A collaborative approach to address this predominantly rural safety issue was coordinated among enforcement, engineers, and the education community. These three parties worked together to conduct data analysis and create crash maps to focus their enforcement efforts. Once the SHSO identified the "problem spots," engineers conducted Road Safety Audits; enforcement conducted additional enforcement patrols and coordinated with one another to conduct extensive public outreach.

---

<sup>11</sup> Hoyer, P. (2018, April 22-24). High Five Rural Traffic Safety Project [PowerPoint presentation]. Lifesavers Conference, San Antonio, TX.

The SHSO's messages focused on positive reinforcement instead of a punitive approach (e.g., "seat belts save lives" as opposed to "click it or ticket"). This approach included handing out informational cards, writing letters to the editors of local newspapers, messaging using social media, as well as a close monitoring and sharing of data with the community and collaborating organizations. This positive reinforcement approach yielded significant media coverage and had a positive impact on safety. Within the 18-month pilot phase, there was a 7% reduction in overall crashes and an upward trend in seat belt use. In addition, the Road Safety Audits identified low-cost engineering improvements for immediate and future implementation.

Like the Aurora, Colorado, HEAT program, the Iowa SHSO found that working with partners was a critical piece in building the public trust in its High Five program. The Iowa SHSO kept the messages safety-focused and worked diligently to share the success of its safety efforts with the public. It found that the favorable reporting in the media also helped. Based on the pilot success, the SHSO has since expanded the program beyond the original pilot communities and continues to operate it.

#### *Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- SHSO builds partnerships in the community to demonstrate traffic safety goes beyond law enforcement (see also *Countermeasures That Work*<sup>1</sup> for more information).
- SHSO uses traffic safety data to focus on problem areas.
- SHSO selects messaging in a strategic and careful way.
- SHSO reinforces messages by participating in community events and maintaining consistent contact with the media (e.g., letters to the editor) (see also *Countermeasures That Work*<sup>1</sup> for more information).
- SHSO starts with a small program, and builds it over time.

#### 4.4 Challenges: Generational Differences Among Law Enforcement

Four of the perception interviewees mentioned that generational differences among law enforcement are contributing to changes in participation in HVE. For example, these four interviewees believed that younger officers place a stronger emphasis on work/life balance and do not want to take overtime details because they would rather spend time with their families. One interviewee noted that officers do not need to work as much overtime because it has become more common for both adults in a family to work outside of the home, resulting in less financial stress on officers to support their families. One interviewee candidly noted, "you can't just throw money at the problem."

##### **4.4.1 Strategy: Illinois Compensatory ("Comp") Time Model**

The Illinois SHSO spent a lot of time listening to its law enforcement about how to increase participation in HVE campaigns. The SHSO found that time off is a more valuable commodity among the younger generation of officers than overtime pay, and it explored a model that allowed for comp time as a reimbursement for overtime HVE grant activity. Officers can still collect traditional overtime pay, but, now, the officers also have the option of comp time, or a combination of comp time and overtime pay. The amount of comp time officers receive is equivalent to the amount of overtime, e.g., if the overtime rate is time-and-a-half, the amount



of comp time received is 1.5 times the hours worked. This model has sparked interest among younger officers to participate in HVE activity, but it also has increased participation by older officers.

Illinois now has more departments participating in the grant programs, as well. In one year, the number of LEAs applying for grants increased from 169 to 218. Although it is too early to have extensive data since implementing this new model in 2017, anecdotally, the SHSO is hearing from local LEAs that the program is increasing the number of officers participating in grant-funded HVE programs. To foster this new interest in HVE participation due to the comp time model, the SHSO has created talking points for leadership to discuss with younger officers about the importance of conducting HVE activities so that these officers better understand their important role in affecting traffic safety outcomes.

Moving to this type of model has had some challenges. Some LEAs have limitations on how much comp time can be accrued by each officer, while other LEAs needed to update collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) to formally approve the addition of comp time in these agreements and the associated policies (e.g., how many comp times hours can be accrued). The State also worked with the NHTSA Region 5 Office to gain its support for this type of strategy. Positive perceptions about the comp time model from law enforcement helped garner support for it, although the case study interviewee noted it did take time to shift how LEAs compensate for overtime details. This delay was due to getting LEAs on board with the idea, updating LEAs policies and procedures (and CBAs when applicable), as well as timekeeping systems. However, once an LEA agreed to offer a comp time option (including updating the CBA), the update in the timekeeping systems was complete by the next pay period. This was a matter of days for the larger/urban LEAs and within a week for rural LEAs.

#### *Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- SHSO listens to law enforcement partners about ideas they have for increasing HVE participation.
- SHSO offers non-traditional compensation methods such as comp time.
- SHSO capitalizes on the energy associated with trying something new by creating talking points and messaging to expand implementation.
- SHSO works with NHTSA when making a significant change to grant reimbursements.
- SHSO is patient and persistent when making major shifts.

#### 4.5 Challenges: Leadership Buy-In

Four perception interviewees discussed the challenge of engaging law enforcement leadership to support HVE. They indicated that if the leadership at an LEA does not support HVE, then it is unlikely to happen since the leadership “sets the tone” for the rest of the LEA. A study by Dahl and Thompson<sup>7</sup> also supports this assessment, finding that “the value that an administration placed on traffic enforcement tended to align with the priority that patrol officers held” (p. 16). Another study found that when officers perceived that their supervisors supported traffic



enforcement and issued citations on their own, officers modeled this behavior and increased their own issuance of citations.<sup>12</sup>

Two interviewees specifically pointed to the challenge of working with Sheriffs because Sheriffs are elected officials and often focus on maintaining their elected positions of leadership. The interviewees felt that Sheriffs are concerned that if they encourage their officers to write citations, it might lead to public backlash. However, contrary to elected Sheriffs' fears, the voting public has consistently identified traffic as a primary concern.<sup>13</sup>

#### **4.5.1 Strategy: Loveland, Colorado Pro-Traffic LEA Model**

In the Loveland, Colorado, Police Department, the chief of police has a major focus on traffic safety. He builds relationships in the community around this issue and cements this expectation with new officers when they are hired. He makes sure his officers do more than just write citations; officers are also engaged in community events to share their traffic safety messaging. The emphasis on traffic safety is agency-wide and not just limited to the traffic unit. This top-down involvement with traffic safety has also motivated other chiefs in the State to focus on HVE and traffic safety.

The Loveland Police Department's emphasis on safety has three main components: data-driven enforcement, training for officers, and officer recognition. They use the Data-Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS) model to identify traffic safety hot spots, and the police department uses a scheduling software that helps the officers target these locations during their enforcement details. Every officer is ARIDE-trained, and the police department is working to increase the number of DRE trained officers. Each month, officers are recognized at monthly DDACTS meetings, and those who are exceptional throughout the year are nominated for Colorado DOT Safety Champion awards.

The primary emphasis of Loveland Police Department's traffic safety focus is impaired driving. The department schedules details around community events where impairment is likely, as well as at other times of the year that data indicate are problematic. In addition to what is taking place in their own community, the department participates in a county-wide DUI task force that is not funded with grants. The task force also expands its efforts into other transportation modes such as impaired boating. This emphasis on impairment has created a dedicated workforce that has become passionate about getting alcohol- or drug-impaired drivers off the roads. There is little challenge in getting shifts filled.

---

<sup>12</sup> Johnson, R. R. (2011). Officer attitudes and management influences on police work productivity. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, 293-306.

<sup>13</sup> Wiliszowski, C. H., Lacey, J. H., Cyr, E., & Jones, R. K. (2001). *A trend analysis of traffic law enforcement in the United States* (Report No. DOT HS 809 269). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. [https://rosap.nhtsa.gov/view/dot/14635/dot\\_14635\\_DS1.pdf](https://rosap.nhtsa.gov/view/dot/14635/dot_14635_DS1.pdf)

#### *Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- The local LEA champions traffic safety to community, officers, and other law enforcement leadership.
- The local LEA uses a data-driven enforcement model that capitalizes on both the data available and technology to maximize implementation.
- The local LEA sets the expectation that HVE is a focus for an LEA and recognizes those who lead.
- The local LEA trains officers to be able to address HVE areas of concern.
- The local LEA partners with other law enforcement organizations.

#### 4.6 Challenges: Maintaining Traffic Safety as a Priority and/or Maintaining HVE Energy

Perception interviewees voiced various concerns relating to maintaining traffic safety as a priority and/or maintaining “HVE energy.” Perception and Case Study interviewees described “HVE energy” as the enthusiasm officers have for HVE participation, support, and implementation. Some interviewees indicated the only time that HVE is a priority with law enforcement is when it is fully funded by grants. Other interviewees indicated that law enforcement partners believe some traffic safety challenges have been addressed, so officers no longer need to focus time and resources on it. This was most commonly mentioned with respect to seat belt usage.

##### **4.6.1 Strategy: Iowa Operational Plans**

Each year, the Iowa SHSO creates a “vision wall” displayed in its office. It is created through an annual strategic planning process that identifies projects for the upcoming year. Once the SHSO identifies these projects and priorities, the SHSO works with law enforcement partners to create traffic safety plans for addressing impaired driving, speeding, occupant protection, and distracted driving. These plans outline previous years’ work, and the expectation is that the law enforcement partners will continue to maintain a baseline level of effort. Otherwise, law enforcement must explain to the SHSO why the LEA was not able to continue their level of production. The SHSO views the creation of these plans as a self-assessment process to help LEAs evaluate what is underway and see if the LEA can set the bar a little higher each year. Law enforcement partners are presented with four areas of focus (occupant protection, speed, impaired driving, and distracted driving) for which LEAs need to establish both strategies and goals. LEAs report back to the SHSO on progress toward executing strategies and meeting goals monthly.

Law enforcement partners have been supportive of this strategy because it creates more accountability than in the past but does not take a punitive approach if LEAs are not meeting their goals. Leadership within enforcement has been especially supportive because it gives them a better sense of how they are doing in comparison to their peer LEAs. It also creates competition among LEAs to see who is achieving the greatest impacts; this competition creates more participation. The SHSO reinforces the successes of individual LEAs by sending the leadership emails congratulating the individual LEAs if they have had an especially successful

month. The SHSO will also write letters to the editor thanking local Sheriffs for their promotion of safety in their communities.

Part of the rollout of these plans also included the opportunity to participate in more multi-jurisdiction efforts, which has also helped with HVE participation. These collaborations have included more corridor projects focusing on high crash areas around the State. The collaborative aspect of these plans also helps energize LEAs because the LEAs enjoy working with fellow law enforcement peers on projects.

*Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- SHSO approaches relationship with law enforcement as a partnership.
- SHSO creates operational plans in a self-assessment format that outlines priority areas and sets goals.
- SHSO monitors production and highlights success by sharing results and avoids taking a punitive approach for not meeting goals.
- SHSO creates more collaborative and multi-jurisdictional opportunities.
- SHSO encourages competition between participating LEAs.

#### **4.6.2 Strategy: Maryland Operations Spreadsheets**

Each week, the Maryland Highway Safety Office collects information about what activities LEAs have planned in the local communities. Then, the SHSO shares this information in a spreadsheet around the State. This allows law enforcement partners to coordinate on enforcement efforts. It also allows the SHSO to build relationships with law enforcement partners due to the regular communication about activities.

In addition to coordination and building relationships, this sharing of information has also helped the SHSO monitor the activity of law enforcement partners. If the SHSO notices that an agency is not participating at its usual level, it can follow-up to discuss the reasons why and to identify any tools or resources that may help address a decline. The SHSO aims for a 90% liquidation rate with law enforcement partners; therefore, these reports also help the SHSO reallocate funds to other entities if an LEA is not able to keep up.

*Key Attributes of This Case Example:*

- SHSO communicates constantly with law enforcement partners.
- SHSO encourages coordinated law enforcement efforts.
- SHSO establishes liquidation expectations and adjusts grant allocations, if needed.

#### **4.6.3 Additional Resources: Law Enforcement/SHSO Interactions and HVE Toolkits**

Another tool available to assist SHSOs with maintaining traffic safety as a priority and/or maintaining “HVE energy” is the *Law Enforcement/SHSO Interactions Toolkit*<sup>14</sup> available from GHSA. This toolkit contains a self-assessment tool for SHSOs to review law enforcement

---

<sup>14</sup> Governors Highway Safety Association (2019). *Law Enforcement/SHSO Interactions Toolkit*. [www.ghsa.org/resources/law-enforcement](http://www.ghsa.org/resources/law-enforcement)

outreach and engagement activities and develop plans to strengthen relationships, a directory of State law enforcement associations (available only to GHSA members), a customizable PowerPoint presentation to use with law enforcement audiences, and case studies of effective law enforcement liaison (LEL) programs. NHTSA has also developed a *High-Visibility Enforcement Toolkit*<sup>15</sup> that contains information to assist LEAs with coordination, leadership and community buy-in, and implementation of HVE activities.

#### 4.7 Summary of Key Attributes

Table 4 below summarizes the HVE challenges and key ideas to address challenges that appeared throughout the case studies.

*Table 4: HVE challenges and key attributes of case examples that may address them.*

HVE Challenge Area	Ideas From Case Study Interviews to Address Challenge Area
Lack of Manpower/Staffing Shortages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSO goes to law enforcement when the SHSO has an identified traffic safety problem; they don't wait for law enforcement to come to the SHSO.</li> <li>• SHSO simplifies the grant application process by completing the problem identification process for law enforcement and by limiting the amount of information that LEAs need to enter on their applications.</li> <li>• SHSO pays a uniform dollar amount for all overtime activities across the State and reassesses this amount on a regular basis.</li> <li>• SHSO maintains communication with law enforcement partners; uses direct, real-time communication as much as possible.</li> <li>• SHSO identifies opportunities for data to be consistently reported from LEA to LEA for uniformity in analysis and reporting.</li> <li>• SHSO creates a written policy that allows for flexible scheduling of HVE patrols outside of the statewide enforcement periods for crackdowns and mobilizations.</li> </ul>
Lack of Training to Properly Conduct Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSO builds advanced skills among officers for DUI enforcement.</li> <li>• SHSO conducts trainings in real-time, virtually or, if public health conditions permit, in-person.</li> <li>• SHSO trains front-line supervisors to encourage buy-in and mobilization of patrol officers within their LEA.</li> </ul>

<sup>15</sup> National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (n.d.). *High-Visibility Enforcement Toolkit*. [www.nhtsa.gov/enforcement-justice-services/high-visibility-enforcement-hve-toolkit](http://www.nhtsa.gov/enforcement-justice-services/high-visibility-enforcement-hve-toolkit)

Table 4: HVE challenges and key attributes of case examples that may address them.

HVE Challenge Area	Ideas From Case Study Interviews to Address Challenge Area
Concerns About Perception of Law Enforcement by the Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local LEA uses highly trained officers with an interest in traffic enforcement to conduct HVE.</li> <li>• Local LEA creates “ownership” of road segments by law enforcement.</li> <li>• Local LEA uses partnerships within the community, including the media, so they, too, take ownership in safety efforts.</li> <li>• Local LEA builds in team operational times to continue to motivate participating officers.</li> <li>• SHSO builds partnerships in the community to demonstrate traffic safety goes beyond law enforcement.</li> <li>• SHSO uses traffic safety data to focus on problem areas.</li> <li>• SHSO selects messaging in a strategic and careful way.</li> <li>• SHSO reinforces messages by participating in community events and maintaining consistent contact with the media.</li> <li>• SHSO starts with a small program, and builds it over time.</li> </ul>
Generational Differences in HVE Interest Among Officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSO listens to law enforcement partners about ideas they have for increasing HVE participation.</li> <li>• SHSO offers non-traditional compensation methods such as comp time.</li> <li>• SHSO capitalizes on the energy associated with trying something new by creating talking points and messaging to expand implementation.</li> <li>• SHSO works with NHTSA when making a significant change to grant reimbursements.</li> <li>• SHSO is patient and persistent when making major shifts.</li> </ul>
Leadership Buy-In (Within Law Enforcement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local LEA champions traffic safety to community, officers, and other law enforcement leadership.</li> <li>• Local LEA uses a data-driven enforcement model that capitalizes on both the data available and technology to maximize implementation.</li> <li>• Local LEA sets the expectation that HVE is a focus for an LEA and recognizes those who lead.</li> <li>• Local LEA trains officers to be able to address HVE areas of concern.</li> <li>• Local LEA partners with other law enforcement organizations.</li> </ul>

Table 4: HVE challenges and key attributes of case examples that may address them.

HVE Challenge Area	Ideas From Case Study Interviews to Address Challenge Area
<p>Maintaining Traffic Safety as a Priority and/or Maintaining “HVE Energy”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSO approaches relationship with law enforcement as a partnership.</li> <li>• SHSO creates operational plans in a self-assessment format that outlines priority areas and sets goals.</li> <li>• SHSO monitors production and highlights success by sharing results and avoids taking a punitive approach for not meeting goals.</li> <li>• SHSO creates more collaborative and multi-jurisdictional opportunities.</li> <li>• SHSO encourages competition between participating LEAs.</li> <li>• SHSO communicates constantly with law enforcement partners.</li> <li>• SHSO encourages coordinated law enforcement efforts.</li> <li>• SHSO establishes liquidation expectations and adjusts grant allocations, if needed.</li> </ul>

## 5. Common Themes and Additional Opportunities

Many of the strategies outlined above have common themes that are critical for implementing innovative strategies to increase participation and support for HVE. In addition, the interviews identified additional opportunities for improving HVE participation and support, such as tools or process changes that have also helped.

### 5.1 Make Data-Informed Decisions and/or Understand Available Data

Every perception interviewee made comments about State data. These comments all recognized the importance of making data-informed decisions, but some interviewees also acknowledged the challenges related to available data. Specifically, five interviewees expressed the challenge of making data-informed decisions or understanding available State data. Many of these interviewees noted that the ability to access timely data is improving because of electronic reporting. Therefore, they are currently working on identifying how to best use this new data to be more effective and strategic with HVE efforts. Although data are more readily available, it can create a challenge for the SHSOs because they are not always sure how to best use the information or make changes to operating procedures to reflect a better understanding. Regardless of the challenges, SHSOs are attempting to use data to better inform how to award grant funds and how to communicate changes to SHSO grant processes with law enforcement partners.

A prior study found that when officers indicated a higher level of understanding about safety outcome data, the officers were 2.1 times more likely to engage in frequent traffic safety enforcement than officers who indicated lower levels of knowledge about data.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, it is not only important for the SHSOs to have a better understanding of State data, it is also critically important that the SHSOs communicate this data knowledge to their law enforcement partners. The Delaware SHSO paperwork reduction effort, Aurora Police HEAT Unit, and Iowa operational plans are all examples of how the SHSOs and LEAs are more strategically using and communicating data.

#### *Key Attributes of Organization Practices for Making Data-Informed Decisions:*

- SHSOs take advantage of State data analysis capabilities.
- SHSOs and local LEAs change processes to reflect information learned from data.
- SHSOs communicate State data to law enforcement partners, with a focus on the role law enforcement plays in impacting those numbers.

### 5.2 Capitalize on Technology

When interviewees discussed making data-informed decisions or understanding available data, many interviewees moved into discussions about how the LEA or SHSO is using technology as part of this process. Electronic reporting is critical in providing access to more timely and accurate data to inform their decision-making process. Along with updating their processes due to better data availability, some SHSOs are also updating their grants processing. Some are now using electronic grant reporting systems that manage the entire grant process—application, implementation, and conclusion—through an electronic system to provide more timely and

accurate information to both SHSOs and their law enforcement partners about grant-related activities. It can also simplify reporting and help SHSOs identify high-performing departments.

*Key Attributes of Organization Practices for Capitalizing on Technology:*

- SHSOs implement electronic reporting for law enforcement for more accurate and timely data.
- SHSOs improve electronic reporting capabilities between SHSOs and law enforcement partners.

### 5.3 Use Law Enforcement Liaisons

There was no specific question in either the perception interviews or case study interviews about LELs; however, comments collected noted how LELs can be leveraged to increase HVE participation by law enforcement partners. The most common suggestion was that LELs not have grant management responsibilities. Instead, participants suggested LELs should focus entirely on fostering and coordinating relationships with law enforcement partners. Many interviewees, particularly in the case study interviews, indicated that their LEL's personal communication efforts, with a focus on positive reinforcement, contributed to the success of the LEA's strategy to increase HVE participation.

Additionally, GHSA's *Law Enforcement/SHSO Interactions Toolkit*<sup>14</sup> includes two case studies from Idaho and Washington that examine effective State LEL programs and their relationships with SHSOs. Idaho, for example, employs six LELs who participate in bi-monthly calls with the SHSO, proactively schedule visits with LEAs, take part in training opportunities, participate in community events, and keep an active social media presence. Since these positions have been added, the fatality rate and the total number of traffic-related fatalities in the State have declined. Washington uses a team approach where each LEL is teamed with an SHSO employee. The SHSO employee focuses on the coordination of grant activities, data analysis, and media events, while the LEL focuses on outreach and coordination with law enforcement.

*Key Attributes of Organization Practices for Use of LELs:*

- SHSOs focus the LEL role on outreach and coordination efforts with law enforcement, not grant management.
- SHSOs have LELs engage in positive reinforcement in communication with law enforcement partners.
- SHSOs have LELs proactively communicate with the law enforcement community with direct, real-time meetings (e.g., videoconferences) or, if public health conditions permit, in-person visits.

### 5.4 Employ Officer Recognition

Every case study interviewee mentioned the importance of recognizing high-performers for HVE participation and traffic safety outcomes. The methods of recognition included individual officer recognition through detail selection priority, recognition from the chief of their department, increased training opportunities (especially for enhanced enforcement techniques such as DREs), and formalized law enforcement recognition programs. Interviewees also



mentioned the importance of recognizing agencies with equipment, additional grant funds for enforcement, and formalized law enforcement recognition programs. Wiliszowski and colleagues<sup>13</sup> noted several other recognition methods, including special uniforms or patches designating traffic officers and offering extra time off for high performing individuals.

*Key Attributes of Organization Practices for Employing Officer Recognition:*

- SHSOs and local LEAs recognize both individual officers and LEAs for high performance.
- SHSOs and local LEAs provide incentives, such as training and/or equipment, for high performers.

### 5.5 Summary of Common Themes and Additional Opportunities in Addressing Challenges

Table 5 below summarizes the common themes/additional opportunities and key attributes to address challenges that are outlined throughout section 5.

*Table 5: Common themes/additional opportunities and key attributes to address challenges.*

<b>Approach</b>	<b>Key Attributes</b>
Make Data-Informed Decisions and/or Understanding Available Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSOs take advantage of State data analysis capabilities.</li> <li>• SHSOs and local LEAs change processes to reflect information learned from data.</li> <li>• SHSOs communicate State data to law enforcement partners, with a focus on the role law enforcement plays in impacting those numbers.</li> </ul>
Capitalize on Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSOs implement electronic reporting for law enforcement for more accurate and timely data.</li> <li>• SHSOs improve electronic reporting capabilities between SHSOs and law enforcement partners.</li> </ul>
Use Law Enforcement Liaisons (LELs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSOs focus the LEL role on outreach and coordination efforts with law enforcement, not grant management.</li> <li>• SHSOs have LELs engage in positive reinforcement in communication with law enforcement partners.</li> <li>• SHSOs have LELs proactively communicate with the law enforcement community with direct, real-time meetings (e.g., videoconferences) or, if public health conditions permit, in-person visits.</li> </ul>
Employ Officer Recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSOs and local LEAs recognize both individual officers and LEAs for high performance.</li> <li>• SHSOs and local LEAs provide incentives, such as training and/or equipment, for high performers.</li> </ul>

## 6. Outstanding Challenges

The perception interviews identified eight frequently mentioned challenges for HVE participation and support. The case study examples above addressed five of the eight challenges mentioned by interviewees. There were three additional challenges from the perception interviews that did not have a clear possible solution from the case study interviews. Additionally, two perception interviews and one case study interview identified an additional challenge regarding how the penalties associated with HVE enforcement affect HVE participation.

### 6.1 Multiple and/or Easier Overtime Details Available

Eight of the nine perception interviews noted there are many overtime details available but not enough personnel to fill them all. The nature of the different overtime details, including difficulty with extensive paperwork or time of deployment, also contributes to fewer law enforcement participating in the HVE opportunities. The interviewees noted that HVE details, particularly for impaired driving, are on nights and weekends—not the time that most people want to be working overtime. Additionally, the HVE details that occur during the day (speed and occupant protection, for example) compete primarily with construction details. One interviewee commented, “it is a lot easier to sit in a car and watch a hole being dug” than to work an HVE detail. At times, interviewees also linked the discussion of the difficulty in finding officers to staff overtime HVE details to concerns about public perceptions of law enforcement outlined in Section 4.3. Interviewees asserted that officers preferred working other kinds of details, particularly construction, because they rarely had to take enforcement action on these types of details and, thus, didn’t have to worry about potential public response.

Other research also identifies competing overtime opportunities as a challenge. Dahl and Thompson<sup>9</sup> found in 19 of 25 LEAs interviewed that there was an “abundance of overtime opportunities” available and that LEAs could not always consistently meet demand for staffing their details. They also found that overtime HVE patrols have higher paperwork and reporting expectations than most other overtime opportunities, so officers choose to sign up for other overtime shifts instead of HVE. (See Section 6.2 for an elaboration on the challenges associated with paperwork and reporting.)

### 6.2 Working with NHTSA and 2 CFR 200 Requirements

Higher expectations for paperwork and reporting for HVE overtime shifts by SHSO staff (who then had to pass this expectation down to law enforcement) was noted in three of the perception interviews. Specifically, interviewees described higher reporting expectations for HVE overtime patrols due to requirements from their NHTSA Regional Offices and 2 CFR § 200 (“Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards”), which lists financial administration rules for all Federal grants. These three interviewees expressed frustration with the increasing amount of new data they are now being asked to collect from their law enforcement partners across several citation and arrest types.

SHSO staff believed the increased reporting expectations hampered support for HVE participation and implementation because it was creating too much of a reporting burden for law enforcement. Many LEAs do not have easy ways to collect this additional data in a manner that differentiates grant-funded HVE overtime details from regular, non-grant funded enforcement (HVE and/or non-HVE), so it is often collected by requiring officers to fill out a piece of paper. The participating agency then must review these individual pieces of paper to aggregate the LEA's totals, and the SHSO must then aggregate this data for all participating LEAs to provide NHTSA with the specific grant-funded HVE data requested. Many interviewees were exploring ways to better employ technology to make this data collection process simpler and easier for the officers.

There were also three perception interviewees who noted how changes from NHTSA and 2 CFR 200 impacted how SHSOs could use their funds. SHSOs specifically identified changes that restricted equipment purchases for law enforcement partners or promotional items for public outreach and engagement events. The interviewees believed these items had helped the SHSO encourage HVE participation in the past.

### 6.3 Funding Decreases

Some perception interviewees discussed how funding issues affect participation, support, and implementation of HVE activities, and vice versa. Two of the perception interviewees described how their State funding has been decreasing over the years as a direct result of fewer citations being written and/or arrests being made. The interviewees stated that declining support and participation in HVE and other traffic safety enforcement contributed to this decrease in citations written and/or arrests made. A portion of the fine amount from either the arrest or citation would go into a State fund, and the SHSO allocated a portion of those funds to use for overtime enforcement. The interviewees described how this is a circular process that continues to get worse: since fewer arrests and citations are being made, less money goes into overtime enforcement. As a result, there are fewer resources to devote to LEAs who are supportive of HVE efforts, and the numbers of arrests and citations continue to decrease.

### 6.4 HVE Penalties

Three interviewees (two perception and one case study) stated that they believed that recent increases in fines for HVE associated activities, particularly not wearing a seat belt, have contributed to a decline in support and participation in HVE efforts, as well as decreased HVE implementation. The interviewees offered two reasons for this connection. First, the interviewees believed the officers thought that HVE enforcement had shifted from improving safety to being a revenue-generating mechanism. Second, the interviewees felt that the officers believed the increased fines were overly punitive and so were more hesitant in writing citations. Additionally, the penalties for some of these citations are associated with automatic insurance increases (known as "surchargeable" penalties); therefore, the person receiving the fine is penalized twice. One perception interviewee shared that the seat belt citation fine in the interviewee's State was now over \$150; previously, it was \$60.

## 7. Conclusion

The perception interviews indicated that most of the nine interviewees believe that there has been a decrease in law enforcement participation in grant-funded HVE activities over the last 10 years. Most interviewees noted one or more of the following challenges as reasons for the decrease:

- Lack of manpower and/or staffing shortages,
- Lack of training to properly conduct details,
- Concerns about public perception of law enforcement,
- Generational differences among officers,
- Leadership buy-in (within law enforcement),
- Maintaining traffic safety as a priority and/or maintaining “HVE energy,”
- Multiple and/or easier overtime details available,
- Making data-informed decisions and/or understanding data available,
- Working within NHTSA and 2 CFR 200 requirements, and
- Funding decreases at the State level.

Although the perception interviews indicate that the interviewees believed there has been a decline in participation in HVE activities by law enforcement, the case study interviewees identified innovative strategies to slow or reverse this trend. Most of these innovative strategies were developed in response to challenges identified by LEA or SHSO staff. Several central themes ran through the strategy case studies:

- Making data-informed decisions and/or understand available data,
- Capitalizing on technology,
- Using LELs, and
- Using officer recognition.

While this report connects specific challenges to specific solutions, it might take a combination of several strategies or further innovation to fully address the challenges identified in this report. There are also outstanding challenges that the case studies were not able to address. Nevertheless, common themes from the case studies offer a basis for developing and testing potential countermeasures to address these remaining challenges.

It should be emphasized that the research team only interviewed SHSO officials from nine States and that, because of the small sample, the team’s analysis of interviewees’ responses was qualitative in nature. Given the small number of officials interviewed, the findings from this study are not intended to be representative of all SHSOs or SHSO officials throughout the country. Alternatively, this question could be answered using objective measures of the amount of participation in or implementation of HVE, for example, by tracking the amount of grant funds or number of officer hours spent on HVE activities throughout the country over time. However, as noted by perception interviewees, there is ambiguity in the interpretation of these measures: declines in objective measures may either reflect declines in HVE participation *or*

improvements in safety resulting from effective HVE. Additionally, differences in the amount and type of information about HVE activities collected across States, and even across LEAs within a State, make analyses with objective measures difficult and labor-intensive.

The challenges to participation and support for HVE identified here may resonate with other SHSOs and LEAs. The current report links many of these challenges to solutions identified in the case study interviews. These innovative strategies being used by individual States or agencies to promote HVE among law enforcement also offer future opportunities for formal evaluation, which would provide additional data and information about whether and how these strategies could be translated for use in other jurisdictions. Critically, any HVE efforts, like all traffic safety enforcement, should be conducted in a consistent way and applied even-handedly.

## Appendix A: Perception Interview Guide

We are gathering information about High-visibility Enforcement activities undertaken by State Highway Safety Offices or law enforcement. By “HVE,” we mean the combination of highly visible and proactive law enforcement strategies that target specific traffic safety issues. During HVE activities, law enforcement efforts are combined with a communication strategy to educate the public and promote voluntary compliance with the law. For example, HVE might involve sobriety checkpoints targeting alcohol-impaired driving or saturation patrols targeting speeding.

1. Can you tell us a little bit about your role and your responsibilities within the Highway Safety Office?
  - a. How long have you been with the Highway Safety Office?

2. Can you describe the different grant-funded HVE activities that are used in [INSERT STATE]?
  - a. What kinds of traffic safety problems do you target with HVE in [INSERT STATE]?

**PROBE<sup>16</sup>:** Is there a State or Department policy mandating a seniority requirement for overtime activities (whereby senior officers get priority on overtime details)?

3. Does your State Highway Safety Office have any staff devoted to coordinating grant-funded HVE activities?

**IF YES:**

- a. How many staff?
- b. Are they full- or part-time?

**IF NO:**

- a. What role or position is usually responsible for coordinating grant-funded HVE activities?

4. In addition to the grants, are you aware of law enforcement agencies in [INSERT STATE] devoting other resources to HVE?

**IF YES:** Please describe.

5. Thinking about current grant-funded HVE activities, have you noticed any differences in participation across [INSERT STATE]?

**PROBE:** Have you noticed any differences between urban and rural areas?

---

<sup>16</sup> This new probe was added on July 11, 2019, because generational issues were raised in the first two interviews. A follow-up email was sent to the first two interviewees (Rhode Island and Colorado) asking this question.

6. Has HVE had any impacts in your State??

**IF YES:** Please describe.

**PROBE:** What impacts have grant-funded HVE activities had on traffic crashes, fatalities, or injuries?

**PROBE:** What impacts have grant-funded HVE activities had on driver behaviors?

7. Have you or your office encountered any challenges to carrying out grant-funded HVE activities?

**IF YES:** Please describe.

8. Are you aware of any challenges that law enforcement agencies in the State have encountered when trying to carry out grant-funded HVE activities?

**IF YES:** Please describe.

9. Do you think there have been any changes in support for participating in grant-funded HVE among leadership over the past 10 years?

**(IF NECESSARY: Would you say support has increased, decreased, or stayed the same?)**

**IF INCREASED OR DECREASED SUPPORT:**

a. Would you say this [increase/decrease] is primarily among leadership within the department, State leadership, or somewhere else?

**PROBE:** In what ways has leadership's support [increased/decreased]?

**PROBE:** Has there been an [increase/decrease] in the extent to which leadership encourages participation in grant-funded HVE?

b. Why do you think there has been an [increase/decrease] in support among leadership?

**PROBE:** Have changes in funding affected levels of support?

**IF YES:** Please describe.

**PROBE:** Has there been a change in attitudes or philosophy about grant-funded HVE activities?

**IF YES:** Please describe.

10. Do you think there have been any changes in support for grant funded HVE activities among officers?

(IF NECESSARY: Would you say support has increased, decreased, or stayed the same?)

**IF INCREASED OR DECREASED SUPPORT:**

a. In what ways has officers' support [increased/decreased]?

**PROBE:** Has there been a change in their willingness or interest in carrying out grant-funded HVE activities?

b. Why do you think there has been an [increase/decrease] in support among officers?

**PROBE:** Do you think that changes in funding have affected levels of support?

**IF YES:** Please explain.

**PROBE:** Do you think there has been a change in officers' attitudes or philosophies about grant-funded HVE activities?

11. Thinking about the past 10 years or so, have you seen a change in the number of law enforcement agencies participating in HVE grant-funded activities?

**IF YES:** Please describe the change.

12. Thinking about the past 10 years or so, have you seen a change in in the number of grant-funded HVE hours billed by participating agencies?

**IF YES:** Please describe the change.

13. Thinking about the past 10 years or so, do you think there have been any changes in the types of grant-funded HVE activities that are used in your State?

**IF YES:** Please describe the change.

14. Do you know of any information collected by your State Highway Safety Office that might allow you to assess if there was a change in support for or participation in grant-funded HVE?

(IF NECESSARY: For instance, your office might record information about the number of hours devoted towards HVE each year.)

**IF YES:**

a. Would you be able to share this information?

**IF NO:**

a. Why do you think that type of information isn't collected?

b. Do you think collecting that kind of information regularly is feasible?



15. Do you think the three NHTSA/GHSA Core Activity Measures in the Highway Safety Plans and Annual Reports (number of seat belt citations, impaired driving arrests, and speeding citations) accurately captures your State's grant-funded HVE activity?

**[INSERT MEASURES FROM LATEST HSP]**

a. Do you think there is a better way to capture grant-funded HVE activities?

**IF YES:** Please explain.

16. Is there anything else you would like to add? Do you think we've missed anything important about grant-funded HVE activities with in [INSERT STATE]?

## Appendix B: Case Study Interview Guide

The purpose of our research is to learn more about noteworthy or innovative strategies being used by State Highway Safety Offices or law enforcement agencies to increase participation in High-visibility Enforcement. Your State Highway Safety Office's (SHSO) strategy, [INSERT NAME/BRIEF STRATEGY DESCRIPTION], was recommended for being innovative, and we'd like to ask you a few questions about it.

1. Before we start, can you tell me a little bit about your role in the SHSO and your responsibilities?
  - a. How long have you been with your SHSO?
2. Can you describe the details of the strategy your SHSO is using to increase participation in High-visibility Enforcement among law enforcement?
  - a. What are the ways in which this strategy encourages law enforcement officers to participate in HVE, relative to the traditional methods like offering overtime hours?

**PROBE<sup>17</sup>:** Is there a State or Department policy mandating a seniority requirement for overtime activities (whereby senior officers get priority on overtime details)?

3. How long has this strategy been in place in your SHSO?
4. What motivated the initial development of the strategy?
5. Has the strategy evolved over time, or changed at all since you first started implementing it?

**IF YES:** Please discuss how it has evolved.

**PROBE:** What do you think were the reasons for the changes?

**IF NO:** Confirm with interviewee that strategy has remained the same since it was first implemented—**GO TO Q.6**

6. Before you started using this strategy, how did your SHSO encourage law enforcement officers to participate in HVE?

*[NOTE: If respondent is not aware of what was done previously, continue to next question]*

---

<sup>17</sup> This new probe was added on July 23, 2019, because generational issues were raised in the first two Perception interviews. A follow-up email was sent to the first two interviewees (Rhode Island and Colorado) asking this question.

7. Since your SHSO started using this strategy, have you seen a change in HVE participation by law enforcement officers in your State?

**PROBE:** Have you seen changes in the number of officers participating in HVE activities?

**PROBE:** Have you seen changes in the amount of time officers are spending doing HVE?

**IF YES:** Please describe the change, if any (e.g., increased, decreased, no change).

**IF DECREASED OR NO CHANGE:**

- a. Why do you think there has been [a decrease/no change] in HVE participation?—**GO TO Q.8**

**IF INCREASED:**

- b. To what extent do you think the strategy accounts for the increase in participation in HVE?
- c. Aside from the strategy, have there been other factors that may have contributed to the increased participation in HVE? If yes, please describe.

8. How would you describe the level of support for the strategy within law enforcement agencies?

**PROBE:** Have you noticed differences in support for the strategy by seniority or by some other factor?

**PROBE:** What is the level of support for the strategy among department leadership?

**PROBE:** What is the level of support for the strategy among officers themselves?

9. Does your SHSO collect any information that enables it to measure or somehow capture the impacts of the strategy on law enforcement officers' participation in HVE?

**IF YES:**

- a. Please describe.
- b. Can you provide any information (e.g., agency reports, past evaluations) documenting the impacts of the strategy?

10. Has your SHSO faced any challenges in implementing this strategy to increase HVE participation?

**IF YES:**

- a. Please describe.
- b. Have you been able to overcome challenge [X], and if so, how?

*[NOTE: If more than one challenge mentioned, ask question a. separately for the top 2 to 3 challenges].*

11. Do you know if this strategy to increase HVE participation has been adopted by other SHSOs?

**IF AWARE OF OTHER SHSOs USING STRATEGY:**

- a. About how many SHSOs have adopted this strategy?
- b. Do you know if there are differences in adoption or support among the States?

**PROBE:** For example, by urban vs. rural geographies?

**IF NO OTHER SHSOs USING STRATEGY OR DON'T KNOW—GO TO Q.12**

12. Has this strategy for encouraging participation in HVE affected how your SHSO allocates its internal SHSO resources, such as staff, priorities, etc.?

**IF YES:**

- a. Please describe.
- b. What are the benefits of allocating resources in this way?

13. Has this strategy for encouraging participation in HVE affected how your SHSO allocates its grant resources to law enforcement?

**IF YES:**

- a. Please describe.
- b. What are the benefits of allocating resources in this way?

14. Do you believe that your SHSO's strategy is sustainable over time?

- a. Do you plan to continue using this strategy for the foreseeable future?

15. Do you have any "lessons learned" to share with other States that may seek to use the same strategy?

16. Do you have any final thoughts or comments on this strategy to increase law enforcement participation in HVE?

DOT HS 813 066  
May 2021



U.S. Department of Transportation  
**National Highway Traffic Safety  
Administration**

