



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



DOT HS 811 22(

October 2009

Evaluation of Five Years of GM Funding for Public Information and Education Programs

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.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. DOT HS 811 226	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subject Evaluation of Five Years of GM Funding for Public Information and Education Programs	5. Report Date October 2009		
	6. Performing Organization Code 211.8		
7. Authors Richard D. Blomberg, Kristopher T. Korbelak, Mark D. Lardner and Arlene M. Cleven	8. Performing Organization Report No.		
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Dunlap and Associates, Inc. 110 Lenox Avenue, Stamford, CT 06906	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)		
	11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-05-C-35043 – Task Order 8		
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 8/21/07 – 8/29/08		
	14. Sponsoring Agency Code		
15. Supplementary Notes Ian Reagan served as the NHTSA Task Order Manager for the study.			
16. Abstract On March 7, 1995, an agreement was reached between General Motors (GM) and NHTSA to settle an investigation into alleged fires in GM pickup trucks. The agreement avoided litigation and offered an opportunity for meaningful cooperation between government and industry to enhance the safety of the driving public. It required GM to spend in excess of \$51 million over a five-year period to support highway safety research and programs that would prevent motor vehicle deaths and injuries. Of interest to the current study was the agreement to expend at least \$11,855,000 in certain described areas of public information and education (PI&E) and to expend approximately one-fifth of this amount in each year of the five-year period. The following three types of PI&E activities were covered under the public education section (Section C) of this agreement: support of State safety legislation, support of enforcement of State safety laws and support of safety organizations. Each grantee under this agreement submitted an annual report to GM describing project activities, and GM provided a year-end report to NHTSA of activities and expenditures. The objectives of the current study were: to assess and synthesize the reports submitted by those who received the grants for PI&E activities; determine if the projects funded by the GM grants endured after the grant funding was depleted; and create a database of the information obtained from the various reports that NHTSA can use to perform analyses of interest regarding the five years of GM-sponsored PI&E activities. Six case studies were produced that illustrate the range of activities conducted with the GM grant funds. Tabulations of data extracted from the grantee reports on the 234 projects studied showed that about half of the GM funds (\$6,844,000) were given to the 102 grants in support of the enforcement of State safety laws. The 109 grants focused on the support of State safety legislation totaled \$2,566,000, and the 23 projects supporting safety organizations received a total of \$1,820,000 in GM grant funds. The grantees used the full range of media forms including TV, radio, print and conferences/symposiums. Few projects included formal evaluations, but those that did documented successful outcomes traceable to the availability and use of the GM funds. There was no discernible relationship between project size and success—small and large projects both produced positive results. Follow-up contacts were successful with personnel from 24 of the 44 projects that filed a report in the fifth (last) year of the agreement. Twenty of these 24 projects were still in existence and following substantially the same objectives for which they had received GM grant funds.			
17. Key Words GM Agreement GM Grants Community Projects Seat Belts Alcohol Programs Highway Safety Research		18. Distribution Statement This report is free of charge from the NHTSA Web site at www.nhtsa.dot.gov	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 103	22. Price

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

This page intentionally left blank

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Background

On March 7, 1995, an agreement was reached between General Motors (GM) and NHTSA to settle an investigation into alleged fires in GM pickup trucks. The agreement avoided time-consuming and costly litigation and offered an opportunity for meaningful cooperation between government and industry to enhance the safety of the driving public. It required GM to spend in excess of \$51 million over a five-year period to support highway safety research and programs that would prevent motor vehicle deaths and injuries. Seven different program areas were covered—fire safety research, public education, crash test dummy research and development, burn and trauma research, computer modeling activities, driver impairment research, and the purchase and distribution of child safety seats. In addition, GM agreed to enhance Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 301, the primary purpose of which is to reduce deaths and injuries occurring from fires that result from fuel spillage during and after motor vehicle crashes.

The current study focused on the part of the agreement that required GM to expend at least \$11,855,000 in certain delineated areas of public information and education (PI&E) in approximately even amounts in each of the five years following execution of the agreement. The solicitation and selection of the grantees was a collaborative process between NHTSA and GM targeted to areas and organizations that both thought would provide the greatest safety benefit. Three types or focal areas of PI&E activities were covered under the public education section (Section C) of the GM-NHTSA agreement:

- Support of State safety legislation—donations were made to State-level coalitions working for the enactment, upgrading, or retention of administrative license revocation laws, blood alcohol concentration (BAC) laws (.08 BAC per se and zero-tolerance-for-youth laws), graduated licensing, and enhanced enforcement of seat belt and child safety seat use laws.
- Support of enforcement of State safety laws—donations were made to governmental units undertaking selective traffic law enforcement campaigns or to organizations supporting such campaigns.
- Support of safety organizations—donations were made to selected national organizations involved in programs intended to increase occupant restraint use and/or control impaired driving.

Each grantee under this agreement submitted an annual report to GM describing project activities, and GM provided a year-end report to NHTSA of activities and expenditures. The purpose of the current study was to assess and synthesize the reports submitted by those who received the grants for PI&E activities during the five years of the PI&E program to examine the extent, nature, and effectiveness of the GM grants. In particular, the following questions were addressed:

- How were the project funds used (e.g., seat belt programs, alcohol programs, graduated licensing)?
- What activities were accomplished (e.g., media events, Internet activities, database development or maintenance)?
- What were the results?
- What measurable impact did these programs have on traffic safety as documented by the programs themselves?

A secondary objective of the study was to create a database of the information obtained from the various reports that NHTSA can use to perform analyses of interest regarding the five years of GM-sponsored PI&E activities.

Results

Results consist of six case studies that demonstrate the range of PI&E project types and sizes as well as tabular results of the extent and application of funding. Each case study describes what the project set out to do, how exactly it was done, how the efforts were evaluated and how a positive impact was achieved. Objective reporting of what the project did based on its own reports and follow-up conversations and a subjective view of the project's approach, accomplishments and lessons learned are included. Brief summaries of the case studies are presented here. The complete case studies are included in Sections 3 to 8 of the report.

Case Study—Mississippi MADD (Support of State Safety Legislation)

Mississippi MADD received \$50,000 over a three-year period in which it focused efforts on passage of a zero-tolerance law for drivers under 21, a .08 g/dL BAC per se law for drivers 21 and older, an ignition interlock bill, a statewide open alcohol container within vehicles prohibition and primary seat belt enforcement. It expended considerable effort in expanding its coalition team by making direct contact with various supporting organizations. An intensive mail and media campaign was designed to inform the public and legislators of the program and to solicit support. Establishment of an 800 number provided a cost-free way for the public to obtain information on methods of participating in the legislative program. Publications were developed for legislators and coalition members. A survey was made of legislative candidates on highway safety topics, and the results were made available to the public. Several coalition participants attended the MADD National Impaired Driving Training Institute. Highway safety demonstrations were held for high school students, highway safety leaders and police officers involved in alcohol enforcement. During this training, "Fatal Vision Goggles" were used to let participants experience visual impairment similar to that produced by alcohol. From a legislative point of view, the project managed to help pass five of its primary agenda items into laws. The zero-tolerance bill passed as did laws on graduated driver licensing (GDL) and repeat-offender penalties (including ignition interlock). Also passed was a bill that made it unlawful to manufacture, sell, or distribute false identification cards and a bill that extended the required age at which a child must be properly restrained in a child restraint device to age 8.

**Case Study—Traffic Safety Association of Michigan
(Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws and of State Safety Legislation)**

The Traffic Safety Association of Michigan received \$477,500 over a period of five years during which it focused on reducing impaired driving and on increasing seat belt use. Other goals included reduction of fatal crashes in which alcohol was a factor and an increase in compliance with speed laws. Initial efforts focused on the passage of a primary seat belt law. Meetings were held with legislators and major newspapers, information packets and brochures were developed, and several media events were scheduled. Also developed was a legislative database that, among other things, tracked legislative contacts and positions. Michigan's primary seat belt law was passed in May 1999. Support of enforcement efforts focused on Michigan's *Safe & Sober* campaign and *Operation Nightcap*, whose objectives were to increase seat belt use and compliance with speed laws and to decrease alcohol-involved crashes. The campaigns initiated waves of intensified enforcement that were preceded and followed by publicity. Pre-enforcement publicity consisted of a two-week period of media events and conferences, press articles, television and radio advertisements, speaking engagements, and other activities. During post-enforcement publicity, the results of the wave were reported to the community. The State reported a then record high seat belt use of 69.9% in 1998. In the fall of 1999, seat belt use rose to 70.1%.¹ The project reported that a large reduction in fatal and serious injury alcohol-related crashes was achieved in the months directly following the *Safe & Sober* campaign.

**Case Study—North Carolina Governor's Highway Safety Program
(Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws)**

The North Carolina Governor's Highway Safety Program received \$75,000 for the year 1995 to increase seat belt use. The program tested the effect of posting feedback signs on the State's highways. The signs provided information on percentages of current seat belt use in the city in which the signs were posted as well as the highest recorded previous use for that city. A pilot study in two cities was successful, and the signs were added to the State's *Click It or Ticket* campaign. Nine cities were selected for the project. Observers collected seat belt use data on drivers and front seat passengers, and signs were updated as appropriate. The project got started with GM funding and currently is operational in 12 cities. Although data on the effectiveness of the project were not available, the project reported that seat belt use was increased in each city. It also reported that the public's perception of the signs was positive.

**Case Study—Utah Safety Council
(Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws)**

The Utah Safety Council received \$20,000 from GM for the year 1997 to increase awareness and use of child safety seats and seat belt use among children. Utah's *Buckle Up for Love* program encouraged parents to buckle up all children and place those under 4 in child

¹ In 2007, Michigan's seat belt use rate had climbed to 93.7%, one of the highest in the Nation, based on data reported in NHTSA's, *Traffic Safety Facts*, Seat belt use in 2007 – use rates in the States and Territories, DOT HS 810 949.

safety seats. People observing an unrestrained child were asked to report vehicle-identifying data to the Utah Safety Council that, in turn, agreed to send the vehicle owner information on child vehicle safety. Vehicle owners were not penalized with fines or tickets. Promotional material was developed and media events were scheduled to publicize the program. Although results may not be attributable solely to the program, child restraint use increased from 54.7% in 1996 to 68.7% in 1997.²

Case Study—Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws)

The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute received \$455,000 over a three-year period in which it focused efforts on reducing impaired driving and increasing seat belt use. The Governor's Council on Impaired and Dangerous Driving used the funds to conduct Blitzes 9 through 24 of its *Operation Pull Over* campaign. Each blitz consisted of four weeks of public awareness followed by two weeks of increased enforcement. Each blitz targeted a specific audience including young male drivers, parents of small children, families preparing for summer vacations, young African American males, children under 12 and their families, motorists, middle and high school students, and families of middle school children. Each blitz promoted one of the following highway safety issues—sober driving, the zero-tolerance law for minors, proper protection of children in vehicles, speeding, and seat belt usage for the entire family. The promotions made use of a variety of media material and events including radio and television public service announcements (PSAs), print material, educational videos, posters, billboards, school activities, and press conferences. At the completion of each blitz, a telephone survey was conducted that was designed to provide information on the success of the campaign including the effectiveness of the advertising and the impact each blitz had upon behavior. These surveys revealed a positive effect of the promotional and enforcement campaigns.

Case Study—Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (Support of Safety Organizations)

The Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS) received \$700,000 from GM over the five-year period. The funds provided the necessary support to allow the organization to continue to grow and strive towards financial independence. NETS has grown to include at least 24 corporate organizations and coordinators in 26 States. It created a State partnership program and provided the partners with resources and technical assistance that they needed to prosper. Activities included an annual conference, development of a State program implementation guide, database design and support, and instructor training and implementation workshops. As part of its 1997 program, NETS launched a *BeltAmerica 2000* campaign designed to encourage employer involvement with employee seat belt programs. Funding was provided for holding occupant protection symposiums at the State level. Occupant protection was a major traffic safety effort. The most successful venture of this kind was a Michigan project that emphasized increased usage of seat belts, improvements in the use of child restraints and reductions in drinking and driving. NETS also helped create a comprehensive media list to assist employers in

² Utah's overall belt use in 2007 was 86.8% as reported by NHTSA's, *Traffic Safety Facts*, Seat belt use in 2007.

obtaining media exposure for announcing their support of stepped up enforcement. Seminars presented best practices for traffic safety management.

Results—Use of Funds

The tabular results consist of counts and cross-tabulations of information coded from the 234 reports prepared by the GM grantees. By far, the most detailed information exists with respect to how the project funds were used, i.e., the types of activities that were funded by the GM grants. Many projects did not report the precise amounts they received. Where projects did provide data, however, there was virtually perfect correspondence between the GM report of the dollars granted and the recipients' indication of the amounts received. Also, the nature and extent of PI&E activities reported by the grantees appear fully consistent with the amount of their grants.

Project fund use was categorized in three different ways—by primary focal area, specific topic coverage and specific media used. Projects devoted to the support of State safety legislation tended to be small in size with an average grant of \$23,541. More than half of these projects (55 of 109) were funded at the level of \$20,000 or less, and none received more than \$50,000.

Projects supporting enforcement of State safety laws were funded at relatively high levels and averaged \$67,098. Approximately 53% of these 102 programs received in excess of \$50,000, and only 16.6% were funded at a level of \$30,000 or less.

Slightly more than 39% of the 23 projects in support of safety organizations were funded at a level in excess of \$50,000, while almost 48% received funding of \$30,000 or less. Overall, the average grant in support of safety organizations was \$79,130, but the variability across grants in this category was quite high.

Well over half of the 234 projects (143 or 61.1%) addressed alcohol topics. Seat belt and helmet topics were also very popular with 160 projects (68.4%) of the total addressing these areas. Licensing topics were not as widespread in the PI&E generated by these programs. Only 35 of the 234 efforts (15%) addressed licensing.

Almost 36% of the studied projects covered a variety of other topics including expansion efforts and speed limits. Expansion efforts included various activities and forms of recruitment aimed specifically at increasing the size of a project's member base and/or outreach. A few projects addressed topics such as aggressive driving, pickup trucks, and drowsy driving.

The reports from the grantees generally provided quantitative data on the extent to which the various modes of PI&E were used. The grantees reported that they used 821 different media forms. This represents an overall average use of 3.5 different media per grant and did not vary notably as a function of the size of the GM grant.

Results—Project Persistence

As part of the generation of this report, attempts were made to contact each program that was awarded funding in the fifth year of the GM grant period (1999-2000). The goal of this effort was to determine if these programs were still in existence in 2008, and, if so, whether they were following the same objectives for which they received GM funding. Follow-up contacts were successful with personnel from 24 of the 44 projects that filed a report in the fifth year of the agreement. Twenty of these 24 projects were still in existence and following substantially the same objectives for which they had received GM grant funds.

Results—Project Evaluations

There is little quantitative information on the success of the grants in achieving their stated objectives. Where data or claims were available, most outcomes were positive. There was no discernible relationship between the extent of project funding and the success measures reported by the grantees or developed by this project's analysts on the basis of the information in the reports. Small and large projects both produced positive results.

Overall, definitive, quantitative answers to the four questions the present study addressed could not be derived from the available data. There was a consensus of the involved project staff that GM funds were used productively in support of highway safety efforts, largely focused on alcohol impaired driving and occupant restraint use. The GM funds promoted accomplishments with respect to the awareness of these issues that could not have been achieved in the absence of the GM/NHTSA agreement. During the five-year GM funding period, a broad range of traffic safety initiatives received assistance across the country. Some would not even have existed without the GM funding, and many others were enhanced by the availability of the additional resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Technical Summary	iii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 The GM Agreement	1
1.2 Study Objectives	2
2. Method	3
2.1 Description of the Reports	3
2.2 The Coding Scheme	3
2.3 Fifth Year Program Contacts	6
2.4 Selection of Case Studies	7
3. Case Study—Mississippi Mothers Against Drunk Driving	8
3.1 Grant Particulars	8
3.2 Objective	8
3.3 Method	8
3.4 Specific Use of GM Funds	11
3.5 Other Funds Used	11
3.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding	11
4. Case Study—Traffic Safety Association of Michigan	14
4.1 Grant Particulars	14
4.2 Objective	14
4.3 Method	14
4.4 Specific Use of GM Funds	18
4.5 Other Funds Used	18
4.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding	18
5. Case Study—North Carolina Governor’s Highway Safety Program	20
5.1 Grant Particulars	20
5.2 Objective	20
5.3 Method	20
5.4 Specific Use of GM Funds	21
5.5 Other Funds Used	21
5.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding	21
6. Case Study—Utah Safety Council	23
6.1 Grant Particulars	23
6.2 Objective	23
6.3 Method	23
6.4 Specific Use of GM Funds	24
6.5 Other Funds Used	25
6.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding	25
7. Case Study—Indiana Criminal Justice Institute	27
7.1 Grant Particulars	27
7.2 Objective	27
7.3 Method	27
7.4 Specific Use of GM Funds	32
7.5 Other Funds Used	32
7.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding	33

8.	Case Study—Network of Employers for Traffic Safety	34
8.1	Study Particulars	34
8.2	Objective	34
8.3	Method	34
8.4	Specific Use of GM Funds.....	38
8.5	Other Funds Used	38
8.6	Discussion/Implications of GM Funding.....	39
9.	Results	41
9.1	Use of Grant Funds	41
9.1.1	Funds Use and Primary PI&E Focal Area	41
9.1.2	Funding and Media Type	43
9.1.3	Focal Area and Media Type.....	44
9.2	Subject Area Coverage	51
9.3	Results and Impact.....	54
9.4	Program Continuity.....	56
10.	Discussion	57
10.1	Use of the GM Grant Funds.....	57
10.2	Accomplishments and Outcomes.....	57
	APPENDIX A—Code Sheet and Coding Rules.....	A-1
	APPENDIX B—Project Summary Data by State	B-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Amount of GM Grant.....	42
Table 2.	Total and Mean Expenditure by Primary PI&E Focal Area.....	43
Table 3.	Number of Grants Using Each Media Form by Extent of Project Funding.....	44
Table 4.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Television Use.....	45
Table 5.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Radio Use	46
Table 6.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Newspaper Use.....	46
Table 7.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Other Print Media Use.....	47
Table 8.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Meeting/Symposium/Training	48
Table 9.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Letter-Writing Campaign	49
Table 10.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Press Conference.....	49
Table 11.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Awards Programs	50
Table 12.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Planning.....	51
Table 13.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Alcohol Topic.....	52
Table 14.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Seat Belt Topic	52
Table 15.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Licensing Topic.....	53
Table 16.	Primary PI&E Focal Area by Other Topic	54
Table 17.	Primary PI&E by Project Measured Impact	55

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of a study to analyze annual reports generated by individual grantees who received funding from General Motors as part of an agreement between GM and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

1.1 The GM Agreement

On March 7, 1995, an agreement was reached between GM and NHTSA to settle an investigation into alleged fires in GM pickup trucks. The agreement avoided time-consuming and costly litigation and offered an opportunity for meaningful cooperation between government and industry to enhance the safety of the driving public. It required GM to spend in excess of \$51 million over a five-year period to support highway safety research and programs that would prevent motor vehicle deaths and injuries. Seven different program areas were covered—fire safety research, public education, crash test dummy research and development, burn and trauma research, computer modeling activities, driver impairment research, and the purchase and distribution of child safety seats. In addition, GM agreed to enhance Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 301, the primary purpose of which is to reduce deaths and injuries occurring from fires that result from fuel spillage during and after motor vehicle crashes.

Of interest to the current study was the agreement to expend at least \$11,855,000 in certain delineated areas of public education and to expend approximately one-fifth of this amount in each year of the five-year period. The following three types of PI&E activities were covered under the public education section (Section C) of this agreement:

- Support of State safety legislation—donations were made to State-level coalitions working for the enactment, upgrading and/or retention of administrative license revocation laws, BAC laws (.08 g/dL BAC per se laws, zero-tolerance for youth laws), graduated licensing, and enhanced enforcement of seat belt and child safety seat use laws.
- Support of enforcement of State safety laws—donations were made to governmental units undertaking selective traffic law enforcement campaigns and/or to organizations supporting such campaigns.
- Support of safety organizations—donations were made to selected national organizations involved in programs intended to increase occupant restraint use and/or control impaired driving.

The implementation of the PI&E grants was a joint process involving NHTSA and GM. The solicitation of proposals as well as the selection of recipients was a collaborative effort in which both organizations attempted to maximize the potential safety benefit from the expenditures. Prior experience with the various types of PI&E as well as previous successful performance of the submitting organizations was taken into account when making grant decisions.

1.2 Study Objectives

Each grantee under this agreement submitted an annual report to GM describing project activities, and GM provided a year-end report to NHTSA of activities and expenditures. Given the large dollar amount provided across the Nation, NHTSA perceived the need to collate and summarize information from the hundreds of activities supported by this agreement.

The purpose of the current study was to assess and synthesize the reports submitted by grantees for PI&E activities during the five years of the program. The following specific questions were addressed:

- How were the project funds used (e.g., seat belt programs, alcohol programs, graduated licensing)?
- What activities were accomplished (e.g., media events, Internet activities, database development or maintenance, etc.)?
- What were the results?
- What measurable impact did these programs have on traffic safety as documented by the programs themselves?

A secondary objective of the study was to create a database of the information obtained from the various reports that NHTSA can use to perform additional analyses of interest regarding the five years of GM-sponsored PI&E activities.

2. METHOD

This section describes the methods used to acquire, code and analyze the reports submitted by the GM grantees. GM administered the grants and collected the individual reports. All of the coding, analysis and interpretation of the grantee reports as well as the preparation of this report were performed solely by Dunlap and Associates, Inc., under contract to NHTSA. GM was helpful in acquiring a complete set of the grantee reports and reviewed this document in draft form.

2.1 Description of the Reports

Each grantee submitted an annual report to GM that described project activities. These reports were then categorized by GM as falling under one of the focal areas: support of State safety legislation; support of enforcement of State safety laws; or support of safety organizations. Each report was grouped into its specific funding year and assigned a volume number and a tab number (a subsection of the volume) by GM.

In all, 234 annual project reports for the 1995 through 1999 granting term were examined for this study. The totals by year were:

- Year 1 (1995-1996) = 36 reports
- Year 2 (1996-1997) = 48 reports
- Year 3 (1997-1998) = 54 reports
- Year 4 (1998-1999) = 52 reports
- Year 5 (1999-2000) = 44 reports.

Funding years were evaluated in chronological order. Virtually all reports assigned a tab number were received for analysis (reports for only five tab numbers indicated by GM were unable to be located).

The content and length of each annual report could vary greatly from year to year and, particularly, from project to project. Some reports offered a multitude of information while others contained little pertinent to this study's objectives. When there was a need to clarify information in a report, an attempt was made to contact the grantee for additional insights.

2.2 The Coding Scheme

A coding scheme was created by the project team in collaboration with NHTSA to identify and organize potentially useful information. The initial code sheet was designed to retrieve all information that was potentially of interest from a GM grantee's report. After this superset of information was identified, the code sheet was pretested with a subset of actual

reports and modified to exclude categories that were largely unavailable. Appendix A contains the final code sheet.

The code sheet consisted of descriptive variables, most of which were also assigned multiple levels or class intervals. For example, the variable entitled “Type of Project Evaluation Measure” was coded into one of the following levels: “Survey/Questionnaire,” “Focus Groups,” “Behavioral Observations,” “Crash-Based,” “Anecdotal,” or “None.” The code sheet was also designed to permit hierarchical coding of specific topic and funding variables. For example, “Licensing Topic 1” was intended to indicate a greater project focus than “Licensing Topic 2.” Unfortunately, it was often not possible to determine a focus level from the data provided in the project reports. Consequently, a set of general classification and coding procedures was developed. For instance, in order for a project to be given credit for working on a given topic or using funds for a specific purpose, that project must have included or referenced an example of completed work. Simply mentioning the topic was not considered to be sufficient evidence that the project worked on that topic. Where determinable, all topics were coded from most important to least important according to the project report. When in doubt, the coding defaulted to the hierarchy on the code sheet. Whenever a project’s report did not contain information that was requested on the code sheet, those particular variables were left blank. When critical information was missing, however, the project was contacted in an effort to fill in some of the gaps. Unfortunately, in many cases it was difficult to find a representative who actually worked on the funded project and/or someone who had access to the records and the time to check on the questions at hand. Most project representatives were eager to help and did so as well as they could with the resources available to them.

The volume, tab number and year for each report were recorded along with other descriptive information such as the name of the agency receiving the grant, the type of organization receiving funds, the State in which the agency was located, the year of GM funding, the duration of the project (not the duration of the GM funding) and the level of the program’s application (e.g., State, county, local). When coding the type of organization receiving funds, government organizations that did not have a specific level set aside for them were coded as public agencies, State or local. When a question arose as to whether a public agency or a police department received the grant money (for example, GM awarded grant money to the Florida Highway Patrol), the analyst coded the type of agency receiving the funds as a police department to preserve the police distinction. When coding the duration of the project, the analyst coded “a legislative session” as one year.

The type of PI&E executed by each program was of particular interest. The code sheet contained possible entries for projects that supported State safety legislation, the enforcement of State safety laws, the support of safety organizations, or any combination of these three types of activities. Specific dollar amounts, such as the amount of money granted by GM, the amount actually used by the project, the amount carried over from a previous grant and any excess funds deferred for use in future years, were also recorded. In cases where it was clear that outside (non-GM) funding had contributed to the project’s efforts, the nature of the major dollar or value contributor was recorded (State, Federal, local, private, corporate, or multiple) as well as the total dollar amount granted from all outside sources. Only voluntary contributors of time and/or money were included. If unable to determine the major contributor, the analyst coded the nature of the other sources as “Multiple.”

Special attention was given to the specific topics addressed by each project. Variables were created for each of the following types of topics: “Alcohol (drinking and driving),” “Licensing,” “Seat Belt/Helmet” and “Other.” The code sheet permitted recording variables for up to four different alcohol topics and up to two topics for each of the remaining categories.

Alcohol variables had levels that ranged from specific to more general. Thirteen such levels were created. Some specific alcohol code levels included .08 BAC legislation, zero-tolerance, and administrative license revocation. More general levels included “Alcohol General (non-legislative)” and “Alcohol Other Laws or Multiples.”

The Licensing variable categories included: “General Licensing,” “Graduated Licensing,” and “Older Driver Issues.” The levels in the Seat Belt/Helmet were: “Seat Belt Use,” “Child Passenger Protection,” “Motorcycle Helmets,” “Primary Law,” and “Other Seat Belt Law.” When seat belt legislation was directed at children, it was coded as “Child Passenger Protection” to preserve the distinction. Finally, the categories for the “Other Topic” variable were: “Speed Limits,” “Aggressive Driving,” “Red Light Running,” “Pickup Trucks,” “Drowsy Driving,” or “Expansion.”

Special attention was also given to each project’s specific use of GM funds. Six variables (“Specific Use of Funds 1” through “Specific Use of Funds 6”) were created. Sixteen possible levels for these funding variables were also created to help clarify and quantify what monetary efforts were undertaken by each project. Levels included “Television,” “Radio,” and “Newspaper.” The “Newspaper” level specifically included press releases, magazine articles, and any publicly printed media. An “Other Print Media” level was created for mailings, pamphlets, posters, and the like. Levels were also created to help code funds expended on activities such as meetings, symposiums, training sessions, letter-writing campaigns, press conferences, database development and maintenance, and the purchase of equipment.

When possible, all specific uses of funds were coded from most expensive to least expensive. If no expense breakdown was available and it was impossible to determine what was more costly to the project from the given data, the hierarchy in which each variable was coded was the one on the code sheet. Newsletters issued by individual organizations to their staffs or contributors (e.g., MADD newsletters) were not coded as publicly printed media. Such efforts were coded in a level with other print media such as mailings, pamphlets, and posters. Similarly, news articles (or any other kind of press coverage) must have been generated by the project or “earned” as a result of something the project did. Individual projects were not scored as using project funds for a media item if the coverage would have been there with or without the project’s efforts. For example, when television and radio coverage resulted from a project activity such as holding a press conference, the coverage was coded as the same type of PI&E as the press conference.

Two other areas of interest concerned whether a project was evaluated and what type of evaluation measure projects used to determine if they were successful. The code sheet included the variables “Project Measured Impact (Objective Project Reporting)” and “Type of Project Evaluation Measure” to examine these questions. The measured impact variable contained three levels that covered positive, neutral, and negative or counterproductive results. This variable

was only coded if an actual impact was measured by the project and quantitative data were presented. Simply reporting the number of votes or providing evidence of a specific law being passed did not qualify. The measured impact could have been documented in a project's report or described by a project representative during a follow-up telephone conversation. Two final levels were added to cover cases in which the project had no evaluation or was still conducting the evaluation. "Type of Project Evaluation Measure" was recorded as either "Survey/Questionnaire," "Focus Groups," "Behavioral Observations," "Crash-Based," "Anecdotal," or "None."

In addition to evaluations by the projects themselves, the analysts coded their subjective impression of each project's outcome in four variables—"Judged Impact," "Judged Impact Potential," "Judged Duration of Impact," and "Estimated Extent of Outreach." Coding of the "Judged Impact" variable was derived by a project analyst from each project's subjective reporting efforts. For example, many project reports stated whether or not they were satisfied with the outcome of their efforts and whether such efforts were worthwhile. Such comments were then coded as positive, neutral, or negative. In cases where a project did not subjectively report its level of accomplishment, the analyst assigned a value of "No assessment given" to the "Judged Impact" variable.

The "Judged Impact Potential" permitted the analyst assessing the project's efforts the opportunity to offer his/her own opinion on whether the project as described had the potential to create an impact.

The "Judged Duration of Impact" variable captured the analyst's subjective assessment of the length of time the impact made by each project might last. Analysts recorded whether the effects of the project were "Short-term (likely to extinguish quickly after the project ended)," "Medium-term (might last up to one year after the project ended)," or "Long-term (could last for more than a year after the project ended)." This variable was only coded if the "Judged Impact Potential" variable was positive or negative.

A final subjective variable was created to capture the "Estimated Extent of the Process Outreach." Where determinable, each project was designated as having a "Widespread," "Moderate," or "Limited" process outreach based on the extent of the project's efforts relative to the targeted population.

2.3 Fifth Year Program Contacts

As part of the generation of this report, attempts were made to contact each program that was awarded funding in the fifth year of the GM grant period (1999-2000). The goal of this effort was to determine if these programs were still in existence in 2008, and, if so, whether they were following the same objectives for which they received GM funding. The results of these contacts are included in the State-by-State project summary in Appendix B. Not all programs were reached, and some of those contacted had no remaining personnel with direct knowledge about the GM grant. This is not surprising given the length of time between the grant and the contact. Nevertheless, enough programs were contacted to support meaningful observations on the longevity of the programs.

2.4 Selection of Case Studies

Case studies were prepared to supplement the tabular data. The objective of the case studies was to describe in some depth a cross-section of projects deemed typical or representative by the analysts. The selection of case study candidates began during the data coding. Projects that appeared to have performed exceptionally well or developed something original were noted for later review.

After coding all of the projects, the analysts selected a subset of projects they considered representative of the range of activities, project objectives and project sizes in the total group. This was a subjective process that resulted in a convenience sample from all 234 projects. Follow-up telephone calls were then made to each of the projects in this sample to obtain more details about the project's activities. If project representatives were able to assist by providing missing information and relevant details, the project was retained as a possible case study. The six case studies presented in Sections 3-8 of this report were then selected from this final group by a consensus of the analysts. If projects were largely identical, the one for which the most detailed information was available was retained as a case study and the others in the group were not included in the case studies.

Each case study describes what the project set out to do, how exactly it was done, how the efforts were evaluated and how a positive impact was achieved. Objective reporting of what the project did based on its own reports and follow-up conversations and a subjective view of the project's approach, accomplishments, and lessons learned are included. The studies also contain a description of the GM funds and their use. In many projects, the GM grant money was paired with contributions of some kind from outside agencies. When this was the situation, the case study describes the additional tasks or activities that the project was able to accomplish as a result of the GM support.

3. CASE STUDY—MISSISSIPPI MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING ³

3.1 Grant Particulars

Agency Receiving Grant:

MADD - Mississippi State Office

Years and Amounts of Funding:

1997 (\$15,000), 1998 (\$15,000), 1999 (\$20,000)

Type of PI&E:

Support of State Safety Legislation

3.2 Objective

The Mississippi MADD project focused on the passage of specific legislation in the 1998, 1999, and 2000 Mississippi legislative sessions. Topics for the 1998 session included zero-tolerance (.02 g/dL BAC) for drivers under 21 and modifications to Mississippi's Implied Consent Law. Topics for the 1999 and 2000 sessions included an ignition interlock bill. Topics that were addressed in all three sessions included an .08 BAC per se law for drivers 21 and older, a statewide open alcohol container prohibition in vehicles, and primary seat belt enforcement.

3.3 Method

In order to highlight its goals, MADD Mississippi focused on creating a “grassroots awareness” of the issues, developing a sustaining base and recruiting legislative support.

Working in conjunction with the Mississippi Association of Highway Safety Leaders, MADD has served as the primary group in Mississippi promoting highway safety legislation. Recognizing the need to expand, the organization decided to broaden its coalition and encourage several existing members to become more active in legislative issues. MADD contacted the existing coalition members as well as 104 possible members. For the 1998 session, direct contact was made with 17 organizations to either recruit or ensure their continued support. Each of the contacted agencies either became part of or remained part of the coalition team. Allstate Insurance Company and State Farm Insurance agreed to encourage their Mississippi agents to contact local legislators regarding the project's legislative initiatives. The Christian Action Commission of the Mississippi Southern Baptist Convention activated its local community

³ Based on: MADD Mississippi Project Update 1997; MADD Mississippi Project Update 1998; MADD Mississippi Project Update 1999; MADD Mississippi Project Update 2000; Phone conversation(s) with MADD Mississippi representatives; e-mail correspondence with MADD Mississippi representatives.

network. The Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety recruited five other groups as additions to the coalition team. MADD has continued to maintain and increase this broad-based group.

MADD developed a mail campaign for the 1998 session. Three primary mail programs were conceived to generate grassroots knowledge and legislative support. A total of 11,251 pieces were mailed in attempts to recruit the support of a “general population list and affiliated associations.” The mailing included 286 pieces that were sent to legislators notifying them of the project’s agenda and recruiting their support.

MADD Mississippi contacted media representatives requesting their editorial support. The media representatives responded, but not all of the resulting newspaper articles and editorials were tracked. The articles and editorials received were in favor of MADD’s proposed legislation and against the legislature’s attempts to “weaken” the proposed bills.

The project developed a radio campaign through which the public was informed of an issue and how to take action on that issue. The Mississippi Radio Network helped the project develop three 30-second radio announcements targeting zero-tolerance, open alcohol container, and .08 BAC laws. The radio spots were played statewide, but were limited to the 1998 and 1999 campaigns. Copies of these announcements were delivered to coalition members for the purpose of recruiting donated air time.

An 800 number was established to provide a cost-free way for people to determine how they might participate in the legislative activity. This number was maintained through the 2000 legislative term, during which it also provided information on how to contact legislators or other key players, additional material related to the issues at hand, the current status of the legislation and a list of scheduled committee meetings.

In the 1998 session, two bills were introduced. The first dealt with open alcohol container issues. The second was a combination of zero-tolerance and an .08 BAC per se law. The open alcohol container was introduced in the Senate, assigned to the Judiciary Committee and then to subcommittee. The subcommittee chair regarded the bill as “too controversial.” Consequently, it was denied without any consideration. The second bill was introduced only in the House, where the subcommittee removed the .08 BAC per se from the proposal. A motion to return .08 BAC per se to the bill in the full committee was defeated by a vote of 12 to 8. An additional motion was made to add .08 BAC per se on the floor of the House, but was also defeated by a vote of 63 to 55. The zero-tolerance proposal passed and was sent for consideration to the Senate. Working effort was given to support several other bills that dealt with false identification, primary enforcement of seat belts, and child restraints.

For the 1999 session, an orientation meeting was held on December 17, 1998, that focused on reviewing legislative emphasis, extending requests to join the coalition and the creation of an activity planning group. A second meeting was held on January 9, 1999. The activity planning group was formed and in its first meeting (December 21, 1998) shaped the project’s legislative agenda for the rest of the term—emphasize coalition building and activities leading to the year 2000 session. With 1999 having been an election year, and because the House and Senate had already warned the committee chairs about introducing anything “controversial,” it was believed that nothing was going to happen with highway safety

legislation. As a result, the project emphasized a personal contact basis with legislators and created a one-page summary sheet and accompanying support documents for .08 BAC per se, open alcohol container, and ignition interlock bills. The project provided coalition members with more support documents that illustrated the need for the specific highway legislation. Print items were developed to provide basic information on key topics. Materials were developed for each legislative session; they included legislative packets with summary positions on each agenda item, lists, pictures, and contact information of appropriate committee members and the presidential initiative for making .08 BAC the national limit. Other similar print materials, such as national and specific Mississippi statistical information, the MADD Mississippi 2000 legislative agenda, a letter to all legislators detailing the agenda and requesting support, and an alert letter to coalition members that contained draft communications for use with legislators were also developed.

In an effort to train a group of coalition participants to be advocates in highway safety issues, MADD Mississippi paid the portion of expenses not covered by MADD National for 24 individuals to attend a MADD National Impaired Driving Training Institute event. The training was held in New Orleans on May 17-19, 1999. The project originally sent out 175 invitations to recruit up to 20 participants, but the response was so positive they were able to increase the number of slots allocated to Mississippi to 24. In order to attend, participants were required to work with the legislative initiative for the year 2000 session. Participants developed an overall strategy that included interactive demonstrations and a candidate survey leading up to the 2000 session.

MADD Mississippi noted significant progress on three bills during the 1999 legislative session. A bill on .08 BAC was introduced and was supported in the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee chairperson. The House Subcommittee chairperson agreed to cosponsor the open alcohol container bill in the 2000 session. The re-introduction of an ignition interlock bill was planned for the 2000 session with the support of the House Subcommittee chairperson. In addition to these gains, support was given to bills on responsible server training for alcohol vendors, the authorized use of radar, and the creation of a felony offense for fleeing or eluding a law enforcement officer.

Because 1999 was a State election year, the project decided to conduct a highway safety survey of the legislative candidates. Two sets of the same survey were conducted. The first was sent to all candidates running for governor, lieutenant governor and attorney general; the second consisted of the runoff candidates for legislative seats in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Surveys were mailed certified/return signature and then followed up with telephone calls when they were not returned. Each survey was mailed to the candidates with an explanation letter and a deadline by which the survey had to be returned. In July 1999, the project hosted a news conference and released the first round results to the public. All candidates were invited to participate. Because the project did not receive a good return from the runoff candidates, information was made available to the public, but no separate news conference was held. The results of the second round of the survey were released at the end of October 1999. No endorsement of any candidate was made or inferred at any time.

From September 1999 through January 2000, the project held 11 interactive highway safety demonstrations on high school campuses in seven cities that were considered to be

primary media centers. MADD developed an interactive approach for participants that emphasized the use of “Fatal Vision Goggles” (used to depict the effects of alcohol impairment in lieu of actually consuming alcohol). Both students and adults were involved in the demonstrations. Fatal Vision Goggle activities included walking a straight line, walking on an elevated 2 x 4, a football toss, a basketball free throw, and driving a golf cart through a pre-designed track. Information on each of the identified issues was made available to the public at each demonstration. Following the demonstrations, a loan-out program was established to enable further use of the goggles. The goggles were distributed at no cost to the receiving agencies.

In conjunction with the Mississippi Association of Highway Safety Leaders (MAHSL), the Sobriety Trained Officers Representing Mississippi (STORM) and MADD, a legislative reception was held at the Meadowbrook Church of Christ on January 13, 2000. Designed to provide information on the project’s legislative focus, the attendees were given an opportunity to have interactive experiences with the Fatal Vision Goggles. The activities arranged included: Safety Convincer, a basketball shoot, the operation of a remote control car, field sobriety testing, operating a golf cart on a designated track, and a display of child restraint seats. Guests were encouraged to participate in each activity as well as review and pick up literature on relevant highway safety issues. Attendees were also encouraged to co-sponsor related bills.

3.4 Specific Use of GM Funds

Due to the limited grant money, MADD Mississippi did not expense personnel or consultant fees to GM. Monies were used to pay for radio air time, purchase stamps and supplies for legislative mailings, print coalition notices and support materials, and maintain the 800 line. Funds were also allocated for the Impaired Driving Training Institute participants, interactive highway safety demonstrations and Fatal Vision Goggles, coalition training, the candidate survey, a legislative reception, and event related travel.

3.5 Other Funds Used

Most personnel and consulting fees were paid for by MADD Mississippi or contributed by participating coalition members. MAHSL and STORM were contributors for the legislative reception. MADD National contributed to the costs of their National Impaired Driving Training Institute event.

3.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding

The project aim was to pass specific traffic safety legislation. MADD Mississippi took advantage of the situation and turned limited funding into positive results.

The project garnered support through print and radio advertising in the 1998 and 1999 sessions. Through the mail campaign, significant portions of the general population, State legislators, and media representatives were contacted. Media representatives responded to project requests for support with positive editorials. The radio announcements, developed in conjunction with the Mississippi Radio Network, transmitted a statewide message targeting zero-tolerance, open alcohol containers, and .08 BAC.

The establishment of an 800 number helped the project promote more active legislative efforts among coalition members and individuals alike. Maintained through the 2000 term, this number provided an effective way for people to determine how they might participate in the campaigns. It also provided information on how to contact legislators, additional material related to the issues at hand, the current status of the legislation, and scheduled committee meetings.

The decision to emphasize coalition building and planning activities for the year 2000 legislative session was a perceptive one. Given the unstable situation in the 1999 session, it was probable that none of the proposed highway safety bills would have passed. In the end, the decision to steer clear of controversial legislation efforts proved wise. No items were passed during the 1999 legislative term—nothing was even considered in committee. The project responded well, budgeting the majority of the grant funds for the 2000 session and creating support documents for their legislative agenda. MADD continued its preparation for the 2000 session by providing coalition members with a contact list for all House and Senate members, the preliminary results from a Mississippi Traffic Safety Study (phone survey in which most participants were in favor of anti-drunk driving policies and preventive programs), and President Clinton's radio address, promoting a .08 BAC standard.

MADD recognized the continuing need for expansion and active participation. The project successfully recruited new participating agencies and succeeded in increasing the activity of several existing coalition members. Consistent with this effort to create more active coalition members, the organization paid the portion of expenses not covered by MADD National for 24 individuals to attend a MADD National Impaired Driving Training Institute event. The effort was made to train a group of coalition participants to be active advocates in highway safety issues. The response was overwhelmingly positive. Participants in the training developed a strategy that included the interactive demonstrations and the candidate survey as preparation for the 2000 legislative term.

Perhaps one of their most effective efforts was MADD's interactive highway safety demonstrations. The project was able to target major media markets with events designed to be enjoyable and informative. The acquired Fatal Vision Goggles made it possible for both adults and minors to participate in the clever demonstrations that appealed to all attendees. Demonstration events were also held on high school campuses with entire student bodies participating. Activities included such things as shooting basketball free throws, a dart toss, transferring water from one cup to another, putting on make-up and driving a golf cart through a pre-designed track. There was even a basketball game between a semi-pro team and law enforcement officers while the team members were wearing the impairment-simulating goggles. Guests were able to participate in the activities as well as pick up literature on relevant highway safety issues. The events became so popular that they were continued and became the basis for demonstrations across the State. The demonstration in Natchez, Mississippi even prompted the development of additional alcohol programs.

A similar special legislative reception demonstration was held that gave the attending legislators information on the project's legislative focus as well as opportunities to interact with

the Fatal Vision Goggles. Following the demonstrations, MADD established a loan-out program that expanded use of the goggles, which were loaned at no cost to the receiving agencies.

The project proved capable and able to make a difference with the grant monies received. MADD Mississippi noted that some of the basic coalition building could have been accomplished without GM funding, but that most of the activities that were conducted would certainly not have been possible if it were not for the GM grants and other funding that was received. At the time of reporting, MADD Mississippi did not have the necessary funds to pursue the type of activities required to be effective with the media, legislators and the general public.

From a legislative standpoint, MADD Mississippi managed to help pass five of their primary agenda items into laws. In the 1998 session, zero-alcohol tolerance (.02 BAC) for drivers under 21 passed. Laws concerning graduated driver licensing and repeat offender minimum penalties with ignition interlock passed in 2000. Throughout the campaign, MADD Mississippi notes having given “working effort” to several other traffic safety related bills. In the 1998 session several of them passed, including a bill that made it unlawful to manufacture, sell or distribute false identification cards, and another that increased the required age for which a child must be properly restrained in a child restraint device to age 8.

4. CASE STUDY—TRAFFIC SAFETY ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN⁴

4.1 Grant Particulars

Agency Receiving Grant:

Traffic Safety Association of Michigan

Year and Amounts of Funding:

1995 (\$177,500), 1996 (\$100,000), 1997 (\$100,000), 1998 (\$50,000), 1999 (\$50,000)

Type of PI&E:

Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws
Support of State Safety Legislation

4.2 Objective

This project had as its primary goals reducing impaired driving and increasing seat belt use in the State of Michigan. Other goals included the reduction of fatal crashes in which alcohol was a factor and an increase in compliance with speed laws.

4.3 Method

The Traffic Safety Association of Michigan (TSAM) received GM grant funding on behalf of the Michigan Seat belt Coalition (MSBC) and the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP). The funded project focused on the passage of safety legislation and the support of State safety laws. Efforts in support of legislation included expansion of the coalition and contracting for a media consultant, legislative consultant and lobbyist who provided guidance in the development of the project's strategy. In addition, various organizational meetings and promotional events were held.

The MSBC decided it would be best to refer to "primary enforcement" as "standard enforcement." It was believed this terminology would better frame the proposed seat belt legislation as being on a par with all other traffic laws. For the 1996 legislative session, a meeting was held at which information on the importance of passing primary seat belt legislation was presented to approximately 40 legislators and their aides. Following this meeting, editorial board meetings were conducted with six major newspapers. These efforts generated positive press in the southern portion of the State.

⁴ Based on: Traffic Safety Association of Michigan Project Update 1995; Traffic Safety Association of Michigan Project Update 1996; Traffic Safety Association of Michigan Project Update 1997; Traffic Safety Association of Michigan Project Update 1998; Traffic Safety Association of Michigan Project Update 1999; phone conversation(s) with Traffic Safety Association of Michigan representatives; phone conversations with Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning representatives.

The work plan developed by the media consultant involved motivating people to support the proposed legislation with positive messages. In response, the MSBC created an information packet that included: fact sheets, graphs, news clippings, and lists of State representatives and contact people. These packets were mailed to over 2,500 organizations and individuals in an effort to get traffic safety advocates to encourage their legislators to support the primary belt legislation. A database of coalition members was developed in conjunction with this effort that helped track distribution and responses.

To generate additional mail support, the project purchased a variety of stationery so that organizations and individuals who were unable to mass mail their own letters of support might be represented. Organizations either provided the coalition with one master letter or approved a letter that was already written by the coalition. The project then personally addressed the approved letter to each legislator.

A promotional brochure was developed and mailed to individuals in targeted districts, distributed at conferences and meetings and provided in quantity to organizations for distribution to their membership. Two printings totaling 40,000 brochures were made. The first batch (25,000) was printed with fatality and injury reduction projections provided by the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI). The second mailing was revised to reflect data provided by NHTSA that more accurately showed the benefits of the proposed legislation based on expected increases in seat belt use as a result of the primary enforcement.

The project created a "legislative position database" that tracked all legislative contacts, the position of each legislator on the issue at hand, the rationale for his or her position and any future action that may have been required or suggested. The database proved successful and was used to derive strategies that indicated where the project's energies would be most effective. Lobbying activities were coordinated through a legislative consultant contracted by the coalition.

The project assembled legislative packets consisting of general seat belt use information and information that was specific to each legislative district. The packets included news clippings, editorials and lists of local organizations and supporters of the primary belt initiative. The project's media consultant designed a graphic that was placed on the front of each packet. These legislative packets were personally delivered to each representative.

Three media events were conducted. Local community members, enforcement and members of the medical community were represented at these events. Red, heart-shaped balloons were purchased and used to draw attention to the event location and enhance photo opportunities for the media.

In all, 100 speaker kits containing speech ideas, possible questions and answers, fact sheets, listings of State representatives, postcard handouts, and an 11" x 17" poster were created to assist local supporters in making presentations to civic and service organizations. The kits were designed to motivate people to contact Senate members and support the passage of primary seat belt legislation in the State of Michigan.

For the 1997 legislative session, the project decided not to pursue the legislation that was introduced in the 1996 session. Instead, a major reorganization occurred. Numerous

organizational and informational meetings took place, and considerable work was done within the subcommittee structure. After combining with the National Air Bag Safety Campaign, the coalition appointed new chairs to its subcommittees. A lobbyist and public relations firm were hired. The coalition identified co-chairs, organized strategies for health, medical, and public safety communities, developed a new theme (*Take a Look*) and logo, created new talking points, and developed a new informational brochure. This brochure included an explanation of primary enforcement, various related fact sheets, answers to commonly asked questions regarding primary enforcement of seat belts and several positively related news clippings. All expenses and fees were paid for by the funds provided by the National Air Bag Safety Campaign.

For the new campaign, the originally proposed legislation was amended to include mandatory use of seat belts for all passengers in the vehicle and mandatory use of child safety seats for all children under the age of four in addition to permitting primary enforcement.

On March 5, 1997, the coalition introduced the *Take a Look* campaign at the State capitol with a successful press conference and media event. Following the conference, the coalition's lobbying subcommittee began soliciting support.

The project developed and aired radio advertisements in four cities. In addition, a vendor was contracted to set up phone calls from constituents patched directly through to their legislator. In this way, constituents were able to voice their support of the legislation in targeted districts.

On May 26, 1999, the Michigan primary seat belt bill became a law.

Support of enforcement efforts for the project was focused on Michigan's *Safe & Sober Campaign* and *Operation Nightcap*. *Safe & Sober* follows a STEP (Selective Traffic Enforcement Program) model of traffic safety designed to combine statewide enforcement efforts with public information and education. *Operation Nightcap* is a statewide alcohol enforcement program that is supported by the OHSP. Topics for the campaigns included impaired driving, seat belt use, and speeding.

The *Safe & Sober* campaign involved identification and analysis of existing traffic problems and also ensured that personnel, equipment, communities and the media were identified and prepared to address the problems effectively. The objectives were to increase the statewide seat belt use rate and compliance with Michigan speed laws, and to decrease the percentage of alcohol-involved crashes. To accomplish these tasks, the campaign began waves of enforcement that consisted of a period of pre-enforcement publicity followed by a period of increased enforcement and finally a period of post-enforcement publicity.

Pre-enforcement publicity included a two-week period of media events including conferences, press articles, television and radio advertisements and speaking engagements. The police were then given a "primary focus" for which the particular wave of enforcement was designed. Following two weeks of intensified traffic law enforcement, the project spent an additional week reporting the results of the wave's activities to the community. The reported results consisted of traffic arrests and citations, criminal arrests, recovered stolen property, fugitive arrests, and any other noteworthy activity that occurred as a result of the *Safe & Sober* effort.

Advertising and promotional items were a large portion of the campaign. The project created numerous advertisements in the form of radio and television announcements, banners, movie screen advertisements, posters and billboards.

In the first year of GM funding, most efforts were focused on planning future enforcement and publicity activities. To assist in the planning efforts, a local public relations organization, Creative Media, Inc., was retained as a consultant. Creative Media put together an extensive work plan for Michigan's *Safe & Sober* Campaign. The plan incorporated a media strategy, message development, print development and production and radio broadcast production and placement.

Year two of GM funding involved further development. The project created numerous promotional items including a *Safe & Sober* video logo, campaign letterhead, pens, banners, key chains, billboard art, and the production and placement of movie theater slide screens.

For the third and fourth years of GM funding, the project focused exclusively on high visibility events that attracted young adults. These included activities at popular beaches, concerts, car races and special events such as fairs. With specific types of events in mind, special advertising materials were used to make *Safe & Sober* a strong and visible presence. The project decided to create promotional items that were more a part of the events they were targeting than just plain handouts. Some of these items included prepaid phone cards, beach towels and banners.

Safe and Sober banners were created and distributed with suggestions that they be hung at places and events that attracted young adults (e.g., baseball tournaments, beaches, marinas). In the Detroit area, prepaid phone cards were distributed to young adults who were observed entering fast food restaurants and other popular spots wearing their seat belts. Recipients were grateful to receive the cards. The promotion was covered by the media who reported on the increased enforcement effort. A limited number of beach towels were sponsored and distributed by radio station promotion directors, event coordinators, and others who were considered important in gaining access to young adults.

A final awards luncheon was held to honor individual law enforcement officers and thank them for their contributions to the campaign. Eighteen officers, deputies, and troopers were recognized and received plaques for their efforts.

Campbell-Ewald, Michigan's largest advertising agency, accepted a request to help spread the buckle up message to young males. In turn, the company researched the issue, held focus group interviews and developed campaign strategies. Campbell-Ewald refined the print and radio campaign pieces and conducted individual interviews (supported by GM) with target groups of young men. Based on the results of their efforts, particularly the belief that these advertisements would encourage the target group to buckle up, the company produced billboards, radio advertisements, and banners.

In the fifth year of funding, TSAM focused almost all of its GM-funded efforts on creating and airing radio public service announcements in support of Michigan's *Operation*

Nightcap activities. TSAM leveraged approximately 30% more than the GM grant award from participating radio networks. The additional air value resulted in a doubling of *Operation Nightcap* airtime compared to the previous year.

4.4 Specific Use of GM Funds

The project indicated that the funding supplied by GM played a critical role in increasing public awareness and education regarding the benefits of complying with the traffic laws targeted and also allowed for the purchase of advertising and awareness materials that otherwise would not have been available. Most of the GM funds were used for paid advertising, particularly in the form of radio and television spots. Funds were also used for many promotional items such as banners, phone cards, beach towels, and posters. GM funding helped pay for a *Safe & Sober* video logo, logo sheet and a newsletter to campaign participants. This newsletter contained promotional and informational material that produced earned media opportunities and engaged media advocates across the State. Professional studio fees, production of billboard art, production and placement of movie theater slide screens and promotional item art and production were also some of the products that were paid for with the GM grants. In the latter portion of the granting period, GM funds were allocated for a final awards luncheon and a photographer for the awards luncheon. GM funds also supported an interview project conducted by Campbell-Ewald.

4.5 Other Funds Used

The project received Federal funding that provided for overtime hours for enforcement personnel, public relations contractual assistance and administrative support, and production of promotional materials including radio and television spots.

Funding for the enforcement campaign came from several sources, including The Outdoor Advertisers Association of Michigan, which donated space for 120 billboards throughout the State. The Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning sent three honorees from the awards luncheon to the 1999 Lifesavers Conference in Seattle, Washington. Campbell-Ewald, a major Detroit advertising company, donated its time and expertise to develop a unique seat belt campaign for young adults. This organization also leveraged its continuous relationship with billboard companies and radio stations and gained free advertisement placement. All agency services were provided at Campbell-Ewald's expense, including billboard costs, radio advertisement costs and banners used in the Campbell-Ewald campaign.

Funds for legislative efforts were contributed by several sources, including the National Air Bag Safety Campaign, which paid for numerous organizational and informational meetings and some expenses associated with the services of a lobbyist and public relations firm.

4.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding

This project set out to reduce impaired driving and increase seat belt use. Legislative and enforcement efforts were carefully designed and executed to accomplish these goals. The project created a successful blend of educational advertisement and legislative campaigning that eventually helped pass Michigan's primary seat belt law. A similar combination of intelligent

promotional advertisements and leveraging of funds led to the attainment of a highly visible enforcement campaign. It is important to note that the documented success of this program comes from positively affecting seat belt use and impaired driving over the course of several years. UMTRI reported seat belt use at a then record high in 1998 with a 69.9% overall use rate. Michigan's use rate in 2007 was 93.7%.⁵ The project further stated that there was a large reduction in fatal and serious injury alcohol-related crashes in the months directly following the Michigan *Safe & Sober* campaign.

⁵ Source: NHTSA, Seat belt use in 2007.

5. CASE STUDY—NORTH CAROLINA GOVERNOR’S HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM⁶

5.1 Grant Particulars

Agency Receiving Grant:

North Carolina Governor’s Highway Safety Program

Year and Amount of Funding:

1995 (\$75,000)

Type of PI&E:

Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws

5.2 Objective

In November 1995, General Motors gave the North Carolina Governor’s Highway Safety Program (NCGHSP) \$75,000 to support highway safety efforts. The objective was to save lives and reduce injuries in motor vehicle crashes by increasing seat belt use.

5.3 Method

A pilot “feedback sign” program, modeled after similar efforts in Canada, was held in Asheboro and Greensboro, North Carolina, in the summer of 1995. It was designed to test the effectiveness of posting seat belt use percentages on signs visible to the public before adding such a program to the State’s *Click it or Ticket* campaign (a statewide effort to promote seat belt use via advertisement, incentives and enforcement).

The pilot program was successful and increased seat belt usage in both cities. Consequently, the NCGHSP decided to use the GM funds to expand the “feedback sign” project to complement the *Click It or Ticket* campaign. Nine cities within North Carolina were chosen based on the interaction of several factors including size, location, commitment to highway safety and geographic/demographic representativeness of the State. Participating cities included Asheboro, Asheville, Charlotte, Fayetteville, Greenville, Greensboro, Hickory, Wilmington, and Winston-Salem.

Large and small feedback signs were installed along roadways throughout each city. The signs showed the current seat belt use rate for the city as well as the highest recorded previous rate for that city. Each sign was updated weekly or monthly. Statistics were obtained by individuals who performed observational seat belt use surveys at selected locations in each city.

⁶ Based on: North Carolina Governor’s Highway Safety Program Project Update 1995; phone conversations with North Carolina Governor’s Highway Safety Program representatives.

Observations were taken on or about the same time and at or near the same locations each week or month. Only drivers and front seat passengers were counted. After new results were obtained, the observers updated the signs to reflect the new survey percentages.

5.4 Specific Use of GM Funds

GM funding was spent on the manufacturing, installation, and upkeep of the signs. At the time of the report, \$53,081 had been spent. The balance of the \$75,000 grant was to be committed to expand the project in at least eight more cities that had expressed interest. Ultimately, all original program funding was expended.

5.5 Other Funds Used

It is unknown whether outside sources contributed funding to the feedback sign campaign. The final report submitted to GM did not specify any such funding. Although phone conversations were held with the Governor's Highway Safety Program, no personnel involved with the funding of the program were available to provide further information.

5.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding

Without the GM funding, this project would not have been conducted. This sign project is the first of its kind in the United States. A similar program conducted in Canada increased seat belt usage to more than 90%. The feedback signs in North Carolina were intended to inform motorists of their compliance with the seat belt law and to prompt individuals traveling in a motor vehicle (passengers and drivers alike) to buckle up for safety. The signs were also intended to enhance the effectiveness of educational programs that targeted seat belt use, and to maintain the habit of buckling up as a model and example for youth. Theoretically, the more people buckle up, the more they will continue to wear their seat belts.

The project approach shows promise. The NCGHSP was able to take a limited amount of funding and apply a simple, effective design that produced positive results. Seat belt use rates in each participating city increased as a result of the project's efforts, and the public's perception of these efforts was positive as documented in newspaper media. As a result of the overwhelming support from participating communities, the NCGHSP continued the project. At the present time, it is operational in approximately 12 cities and is wholly funded from within. Positive feedback and positive results continue.

The largest current problem is fundraising. The project has moved away from occasionally using police officers to collect the observational data. Observers were acquired from the police department "Explorers Program," student traffic organizations and non-profit organizations. They now mostly come from *Safe Communities*. Sign maintenance is a cooperative effort between the State Department of Transportation and the *Safe Communities* members.

Despite the lack of funding, the feedback program continues to get positive results. The NCGHSP has decided to keep it running, and would have four or more participating locations if

more funding were available. As it stands, participants in the feedback sign project are required to find local funding.

6. CASE STUDY—UTAH SAFETY COUNCIL⁷

6.1 Grant Particulars

Agency Receiving Grant:

Utah Safety Council

Year and Amount of Funding:

1997 (\$20,000)

Type of PI&E:

Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws

6.2 Objective

The objective of this project was to increase the awareness and use of child safety seats and seat belts among the children of Utah. Parents were encouraged to go beyond the State requirements, which dictated only that children under two years old be in safety seats and that children through age 10 be buckled in seat belts. *Buckle Up For Love* encourages parents to buckle up all children and place those under age four in a child safety seat.

6.3 Method

Buckle Up For Love is a “neighbor to neighbor” program. A person who observed an unrestrained child in a moving vehicle called a toll-free number and reported the Utah license plate number, date, time, location and any other information that may have been useful and related to the observation. In return for this information, the Utah Safety Council pledged to send the owner of the observed vehicle safety information regarding his or her child. Individuals had the option of reporting an unrestrained child by mailing in a *Buckle Up For Love* reporting card. AT&T Wireless customers also had the option of dialing a pre-programmed toll free number, “#KIDS.” The program was designed to aid enforcement efforts by educating the public and making the public aware of the safety issues involved. Vehicle owners who were reported were not penalized with fines or tickets.

In an effort to publicize the program and increase awareness, *Buckle Up For Love* hosted two events—a media breakfast and a “traffic safety rest stop fair.” The media breakfast focused on occupant protection. *Buckle Up For Love* information was distributed to the attendees. The safety fair was held for the public in Spanish Fork Canyon and also focused on occupant protection.

⁷ Based on: Buckle Up For Love Project Update 1997; Buckle Up For Love 1997-98 Project Update; phone conversation with Buckle Up For Love representatives.

In order to achieve their objective, the project set several specific goals: to increase the Utah child restraint usage rate three percentage points (from 54% to 57%); to increase observation reports in areas outside the Salt Lake Metropolitan Area 20%; to send information packets to 80% of reported individuals.

The *Buckle Up For Love* program distributed press releases that garnered print media coverage (mostly in local newspapers). Many of these articles were printed outside the Salt Lake Metropolitan Area, where the lack of child restraint use is notably higher. Two major press releases were distributed during the campaign generating a total of 30 print articles.

The project scheduled three promotional media interviews: two on television and one on radio. The first interview took place on KUTV, a CBS affiliate. Noon News interviewed the *Buckle Up For Love* marketing coordinator about child passenger safety and the *Buckle Up For Love* program. One month later, another local television station aired a similar interview with the *Buckle Up For Love* program coordinator. The interview was publicized on two news “spots.” During the same month, The Utah Safety Council president was part of a radio interview concerning *Buckle Up For Love*.

6.4 Specific Use of GM Funds

In cooperation with KUTV, a 30-second *Buckle Up For Love* public service announcement (PSA) was developed that conveyed the importance of properly restraining children and infants. It also encouraged individuals to report children they observed as unrestrained. The announcement was broadcast to cover National Safe Kids Week, National Buckle Up America Week, and Mother’s Day. GM funds were used to purchase half of the air time — 96 spots. KUTV paid for the development of the PSA and for the air time for an additional 96 spots. The broadcasts resulted in over three million impressions.

The *Buckle Up For Love* campaign also developed and distributed a new poster and brochure. The colorful posters consisted of a photograph of a smiling little girl properly restrained in a child safety seat. “BUCKLE ↑ 4 ♥.” appeared above the photograph and “We Trust You!” appeared on the picture, below the little girl. Below the photograph were directions to phone the Utah Safety Council if an unrestrained child was observed. The proper contact information was given, as well as the message: “The Utah Safety Council will remind them 2 BUCKLE ↑ 4 ♥.” The brochures were miniature versions of the posters with important occupant protection safety tips printed on the back.

The remaining funds were used in cooperation with the Welti and Call Advertising Firm. Like the PSA, the poster and brochure conveyed the importance of restraining children and offered the means to report individuals who did not restrain them. In all, 15,000 posters and 20,000 brochures were sent statewide to doctors’ offices, libraries, day care centers, health departments, businesses, and other interested organizations.

Overall, \$2,500 was spent on the creation of brochures and \$4,500 was spent on the creation of posters. The remaining \$13,000 was spent on media time, including the PSAs.

6.5 Other Funds Used

The Utah Safety Council, the Utah Highway Safety Office and KUTV all contributed to the *Buckle Up For Love* campaign. The Utah Safety Council contributed a total of \$11,132. Of this total, \$7,500 was spent to support the program coordinator, \$1,152 was used to pay postage costs, \$480 was expended for phone costs, \$1,000 was used to produce 30,000 cards and \$1,000 was used to create 20,000 brochures. The Utah Highway Safety Office contributed a total of \$1,014, all of which was expended on postage. KUTV contributed \$15,000 of media time. These matching funds included the costs of creating the PSA.

6.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding

The *Buckle Up For Love* program had a successful year in 1997. Its main goal was to increase the awareness and use of child safety seats and seat belts among children. Both of these objectives were met. The project received approximately 3,800 reports of unrestrained children and 200 other requests for *Buckle Up For Love* information.

A very positive aspect of the *Buckle Up For Love* program was its motivational strategy. Citizens who reported unrestrained children were comforted by the fact that life-saving information was to be forwarded to the owner of the vehicle. Those who reported unrestrained children may also have been encouraged by the fact that no citations were issued to the owner of the vehicle as a result of the program. The project offered several, hassle-free ways to report observations (toll free phone call, mail-in reporting card), making the reporting process easy and not very time consuming.

Buckle Up For Love apparently secured the attention of its two desired audiences: the media and the public. Observation cards and brochures were distributed to interested organizations, including preschools, libraries, hospitals and doctors' offices. The project successfully hosted events for the media (media breakfast) and for the public (traffic safety fair) that conveyed occupant protection messages and promotional materials to the attendees. Press releases announcing Child Passenger Safety Week and describing the *Buckle Up For Love* program garnered positive newspaper coverage in areas where compliance with State child safety restraint requirements was low. The resulting print articles stressed Child Passenger Safety Week and the importance of making sure all children and adults are properly restrained in motor vehicles at all times. These articles drew attention to the fact that the number of properly restrained Utah children under age eight had increased 15% since the inception of *Buckle Up For Love* in October of 1995. The articles also noted there was still a significant proportion (almost one-third) of Utah's children who were not restrained, and suggested Child Passenger Safety Week be used as the starting point for increased child restraint use with the *Buckle Up For Love* program as a tool towards that goal.

The Utah child restraint rate increased from 54.7% in 1996 to 68.7% in 1997. Although it cannot be definitively attributed totally to the program, it appears reasonable to conclude that *Buckle Up for Love* accounted for a significant part of the improvement. It is also apparent that the GM funding played a substantial role in the apparent success of the *Buckle Up For Love* effort. GM funds paid for the PSA media time, an amount that was, in turn, matched by the

television station and resulted in an estimated three million impressions. GM money was also used to create the campaign's new posters and brochures.

Buckle Up For Love program used an effective array of advertising to increase the awareness and use of child safety seats and seat belts in the State of Utah. The increased awareness of the program resulting from posters and media coverage was made possible by the assistance from GM that allowed the Utah Safety Council to create and distribute materials that furthered their cause and positively affected their goal.

7. CASE STUDY—INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE⁸

7.1 Grant Particulars

Agency Receiving Grant:

Indiana Criminal Justice Institute

Years and Amounts of Funding:

1996 (\$140,000), 1997 (\$140,000), 1998 (\$100,000), 1999 (\$75,000)

Type of PI&E:

Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws

7.2 Objective

The objective of this project was to reduce impaired driving and increase seat belt use in Indiana. The project also addressed graduated licensing, child passenger protection, zero-tolerance, and speed limits.

7.3 Method

Operation Pull Over used public information and police enforcement efforts in four quarterly “blitzes.” Each blitz consisted of four weeks of public awareness followed by two weeks of increased enforcement. Public awareness was obtained through planners and printed education information distributed to law enforcement agencies, regional and local media events and statewide advertisements. These blitzes were conducted by the Governor’s Council on Impaired and Dangerous Driving. While the grant money was slotted for the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, the agency ultimately receiving the funding through the Institute was the Governor’s Council on Impaired and Dangerous Driving. The Council was then responsible for reporting back to GM with the explanation of how the grant money was spent and what the findings were. The plan was to use the funds to conduct Blitzes 9 through 24 of its *Operation Pull Over* campaign.

Each blitz targeted a specific audience. For example, Blitz 9 targeted young male drivers 16 to 24. This blitz was split into two phases, the first running from October 13 to the end of November, 1995, and the second phase running from December 1, 1995, to January 6, 1996. The first part attempted to promote sober driving through a radio advertisement depicting a scenario in which a young male had to explain the death of his girlfriend in a drunk driving accident to the girl’s father. This sober driving message was also brought to four Indiana high schools in conjunction with the Dodge Neon Drunk Driving Simulator. The second part of

⁸ Based on: Reports to GM from Operation Pull Over, Indiana’s Safe and Sober Effort, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, and discussions with project personnel.

Blitz 9 focused more on promoting awareness of the new zero-tolerance law for minors. The same radio spot was used and specific information about the new law was sent to radio stations and TV and newspaper outlets throughout the State.

Blitz 10 targeted parents and promoted child safety. Three advertisements were used to get across the message that children should always be placed in the back seat of vehicles. The first advertisement was a radio spot using the cartoon character Garfield. The second advertisement was a 10-second TV PSA that was a companion to the radio advertisement. The third advertisement was a 30-second TV PSA featuring David Letterman's mother. In addition, events were held at six schools in Indiana to promote the use of seat belts, booster seats, and riding in the back seat for kindergartners. Blitz 10 ran from January 26 through March 22, 1997.

Blitz 11 targeted young males 21 to 34. This blitz had five media events planned throughout the month of May to discourage driving under the influence. At these events, Fatal Vision Goggles were used to simulate impairment. Advertisements were also run in these areas. To coincide with the season in which the blitz was scheduled, a spring theme was used in the advertising. Along with this theme, law enforcement agencies issued "thank you" tickets to drivers who were wearing their seat belts and driving safely. Recipients of the "tickets" were then entered in a raffle to win a CD player for their car from a local appliance store.

Blitz 12, which ran from July 20 through September 13, 1997, targeted families in Indiana as they prepared for their summer vacations. Emphasis was placed on seat belt usage, speeding and driving under the influence. To go along with the radio spots, sobriety checkpoints were set up and were part of the media focus. The council advertised that the checkpoints were to take place in certain areas on a Friday night. The statistics from these checkpoints were collected and faxed to media outlets across the State on the following Monday. These checkpoints led to 68 DUI and 128 seat belt citations.

Blitz 13 concentrated on getting young, African American males in Indiana to wear their seat belts. This advertisement campaign was a joint venture with NHTSA that also was conducted in five other Midwestern States. For the blitz, a movie trailer, poster, billboard, educational video, and a radio and TV PSA were created. A basketball theme titled "Stay in the Game" was used to make the point that wearing seat belts can help avoid the family tragedy that was depicted in the advertisement. The council also sponsored free movie passes to get people to show up at the movie theater on nights when the ads were being run. They also ran demonstrations of Fatal Vision Goggles at some of the theaters.

Blitz 14 used the three part slogan "Belts and Boosters in the Back Seat" to target children under 12 and their families. The NHTSA radio and TV ad "Back Seat Baby" starring Ray Charles and the crash test dummies Larry and Vince was used to promote putting babies in the back seat. A "Safety Sketch" game was also developed to be used at media events. The media events were held at five after-school programs. At each of these events children were shown a skit starring Vince and Larry, and the children participated in the "Safety Sketch" game.

Blitz 15 targeted young male drivers 21 to 34 and emphasized impaired driving. Blitz 15 used the tag-line "Drinking and driving—It's not a sport" to try to reach young male drivers 21 to 34. Promotional material included posters, coasters, napkins, print ads, and banners. These

were developed for use in golf, softball, racing, bowling, restaurant, and bar venues. To aid promotion, interviews were conducted on television and radio public affairs programs. Media throughout the State were also notified of businesses that were combating impaired driving through the use of these materials.

After the enactment of a new primary seat belt law and new child passenger safety provisions, Blitz 16 was begun. It targeted families and emphasized seat belts and speed. Blitz 16 used the tag-line “your family and yourself” to grab the attention of Indiana families, emphasizing the importance of buckling up every member of the family. Printed materials were developed depicting three white crosses on the side of a road and the message “These people were stopped for not wearing their seat belts.” A wipe-on/off refrigerator board was also created and distributed to the public. This board promoted the new seat belt and child passenger laws. A radio announcement was created. It attempted to link the white crosses with “loved ones” killed in traffic crashes. The announcement stressed enforcement and briefly explained the new seat belt and child passenger laws. Blitz 16 focused on creating press via radio and television public affairs programs throughout the State.

Blitz 17, targeting high school-age drivers, addressed the dangers of “risky driving” and the need to buckle up for safety. It used a “tombstone” campaign. Focus groups with middle school and high school students were conducted. After viewing posters from previous campaigns, almost all the students felt that “consequence and guilt-type posters” would be startling and attention-getting. The participants also indicated that billboard and movie theater advertisements would be appealing, especially if the message was short and to the point. These findings helped develop the campaign and the campaign’s key poster design. The poster used the following message, “Ryan and his best friend had some beers, didn’t wear their seat belts, and were speeding—say hello to Ryan’s best friend.” The visual consisted of Ryan’s friend’s tombstone. Message pens containing safe driving messages were developed and distributed to the general public as promotional items for this blitz period. A traveling game show became the media focus for the blitz. Originally used in the State Fair, the game show traveled to high schools in Indianapolis, Terre Haute, Evansville, South Bend, and Fort Wayne.

Blitz 18 targeted families with middle school-aged children and emphasized seat belt use. Blitz 18 used a wrestling theme and the tag-line “Buckle up or get busted up” to reach families with middle school-aged children. “Rick the Wrecker,” a fictitious wrestler, was created and used in the poster. A supporting radio advertisement was also developed. Promotional notebooks were developed using the poster as the outside cover and “hard-hitting facts” on the inside cover. A game show designed for middle school-aged students was created that presented traffic safety facts and information in an entertaining format. “R.U.N. (Are You in) JEOPARDY” featured students competing with their teachers, presided over by Indiana State Police troopers. The game show traveled to middle schools in Indianapolis, Evansville, Terre Haute, Fort Wayne, and Mishawaka (South Bend).

Blitz 19, conducted in June 1999, focused on drinking and driving. The target audience for this blitz was males 16 to 30. In efforts to reach this population, some of the blitz work was conducted at college campuses across the State and featured the victim of a drunk driving accident describing the experience. Blitz 19 featured the theme, “Don’t drink & drive. Do we

have to spell it out for you?” This slogan was advertised as part of a radio and television campaign that was supplemented with posters.

Blitz 20 was designed to promote safe family driving and featured a statewide partnership with Dairy Queen as an effective means of promoting safe driving. Project teams toured various Dairy Queen locations with a crash car as a visual tool to prompt discussion with families about the importance of safe family driving and seat belt use. Blitz 20 featured the theme, “Mommy/Daddy, where do orphans come from?” A statewide billboard campaign pictured this slogan with an unbuckled seat belt and a large buckle. Printed materials, including static clings that mirrored this slogan, were distributed at Dairy Queens across the State. There were also static clings with the slogan, “Everyone Buckled. Kids in Back.” Other give-a-ways included memo boards, yo-yos and T-shirts. Radio PSAs were used to repeat this particular safe and sober message in 20 media markets.

Blitz 21 was designed to reach young drivers in high school. It involved touring several high schools, posters and radio announcements depicting a young couple in love that were tragically killed in a car crash because they were not wearing their seatbelts. Sun visor organizers were also given out to students at specific high school events as promotional materials for the blitz. Posters depicted hospital personnel transporting two dead bodies, with the tagline, “Everyone at school thought that Ryan and Sarah would be together forever. They were right. Drive safely and always buckle up.” Radio announcements depicted a similar scene.

Blitz 22 targeted child passenger safety and child car seat installation. The blitz focused on educating parents about child passenger safety and teaching them how to properly install car seats. A variety of promotional materials designed to catch the eye of parents were used. Posters, bumper stickers, bill stuffers were among the items created for the blitz. A partnership with T.G.I. Friday’s helped sponsor the effort. A plentiful mix of printed materials used themes such as, “Put Yourself in Their Seat,” and “Everyone Buckled, Kids in Back” were distributed with instructional materials on child passenger and car seat safety. Radio promotions helped get the word out statewide. Blitz 22 also featured a partnership with GM dealerships throughout Indiana at which car seat clinics were conducted.

Blitz 23 was designed to reach males under 30. Using media characterized as a beer commercial, this blitz used the theme, “One Part Person. One Part Alcohol. Mix irresponsibly in an automobile and you have a recipe for disaster.” This theme was extrapolated to a 30-second radio spot and posters featuring drinks named “Dirt Nap,” “The Innocent Victim,” and “The Jail Sentence.” The statewide effort kicked off with a CD case give-a-ways and a remote controlled car race in which participants wore Fatal Vision Goggles to emphasize the effect of alcohol on driving control. Radio efforts and graphic posters, depicting different types of drinks stacked in a pile with names associated with the negative consequences of drinking and driving (e.g., “The Twisted Metal,” “The Remorse”).

At the time of the final report update, Blitz 24 was being planned. The goal was to promote safe family driving over the summer travel season. Special attention was to be paid to child passenger safety.

Several campaigns were held over the course of the year that coincided with the goals of the project. Two seat belt law campaigns targeting all motorists were run. The first came after Indiana's governor signed a law making seat belt enforcement primary and strengthening several child passenger safety provisions. The second came two months later. A *Lights on for Life* campaign was used to draw attention to NHTSA's National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Month. Traffic reports for the Indianapolis area were sponsored by *Operation Pull Over*. People were asked to drive the entire day with their car's headlights on. Finally, a graduated driver's license campaign was initiated to explain the details of Indiana's new graduated driver's license program to young drivers.

The first phase of the seat belt law campaign began as a result of the joint effort of several groups to promote awareness of the new primary seat belt law and child passenger safety provisions. The campaign used the tag-line, "Indiana's seat belt law...It's a Snap!" Cards featuring the new law were distributed through each organization's channels, banners were created for use at events, and print ads were created for use in newspapers. Designed to encourage traffic safety advocates to write to their newspapers, a letter-to-the-editor campaign was created. A radio spot was also produced. It used a game show format asking "contestant number one" questions about the new seat belt law and the new child passenger laws. The State police produced a television PSA that was sent with a letter from the superintendent to all the television stations in Indiana. Members of the Governor's Council, Automotive Safety Program and the State police joined together for the "It's a Snap" road trip. At each stop along the promotional tour, banners were hung and information cards were distributed to attendees by staff members.

The second phase of the Seat Belt Law campaign involved the creation of another radio spot. It was designed to "introduce" the seat belt law. A woman announcer introduced "Someone who is dedicated to saving the lives of fellow Hoosiers...Indiana's new seat belt law." The applause of the audience was simulated by the sound of seat belts clicking. Activities also included six press conferences held in seven media markets throughout the State. A simple radio PSA was produced, in which the State police superintendent stated that the new seat belt law was about saving lives, not about handing out tickets. The PSA was sent to all radio stations in Indiana and was accompanied by a letter from the superintendent.

The *Lights on for Life* campaign was one event during National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Month. In an effort to draw attention to the month and awareness of drunk and drugged driving during the holiday season, traffic reports for the Indianapolis area were sponsored by *Operation Pull Over*. People were asked to drive the entire day with their headlights on.

A graduated driver's license (GDL) campaign was created to explain the details of Indiana's new GDL regulations. A radio announcement was developed in which a fortune-teller reveals to a potential driver what he sees in the future and ends up explaining the details of the law. Many organizations involved in traffic safety joined together to help promote the new program. They came up with the tag-line, "You've Waited 16 Years for This... Don't Blow It." Informational cards were developed and distributed. A packet of material was also developed and mailed to all Indiana high schools. The packet contained such things as posters, a letter to the editor, a speaker request form, an offer for a GDL video, and a letter from the two senators

who wrote the new legislation. To further the promotion, press conferences were held in Evansville, Terre Haute, Fort Wayne, South Bend, Gary, and Indianapolis.

At the end of each blitz period, a telephone survey was conducted by Strategic Marketing & Research, Inc. The surveys were designed to provide a quick, inexpensive look at the results of the campaign. In particular, these telephone interviews measured the effectiveness of the advertising and the impact each blitz had on self-reported behavior. The interviews typically surveyed approximately 100 people from the target population, collecting data on whether they had seen or heard the advertisements and how well they were able to recall the message and the content of the ads. They also collected data on the reported effect that the ads had on the driving behavior of the targeted population.

7.4 Specific Use of GM Funds

The vast majority of GM funding was spent on radio ads. In Blitz 9, \$23,400 was spent on radio advertising in the first half of the blitz, and \$21,950 was spent on advertising during the second half of the blitz. Through donations, the Governor's Council was able to get \$1.51 of advertising for every \$1 spent in the first part of the blitz and \$2.39 of advertising for every \$1 spent in the second part of the blitz. During Blitz 10, \$98,651 was spent on radio and TV promotions. This resulted in a ratio of \$1.97 of air time for every \$1 spent. Blitz 11 spent \$27,018 on radio air time and received an additional \$29,597 worth of radio play gratis. The Council spent \$18,579 on radio air time during Blitz 12 and received an additional \$20,990 worth of radio advertising. Blitz 13 spent \$19,849 on radio air time and an additional \$9,962 on billboard advertising. The earned media coverage of Blitz 14 was worth more than \$22,000. In addition during this blitz the Council purchased \$25,834 of air time. Blitzes 17 through 20 spent an average of just over \$16,000 and received an average of \$11,000 in additional ad values.

Two other paid advertisements are noteworthy: Deer Creek and Law Enforcement Publications. The project expended \$6,500 to purchase display advertising at the Deer Creek Music Center, an outdoor concert facility just north of Indianapolis. A lighted sign at the music center displayed an anti-drinking and driving and pro-seat belt message. The project expended \$4,000 for advertisements in various law enforcement publications throughout the State of Indiana. These ads were designed to thank the participants of *Operation Pull Over* with the hope of obtaining their continued support of the program.

7.5 Other Funds Used

This project was given funding from multiple sources, most of which came in the form of extra advertisements from participating radio stations. Other sponsors included the Deer Creek Music Center, whose sponsorship was given an estimated value of \$211,250. In cooperation with Blitz 17, the Center signed on with an offer for "buy one/get one" tickets for their outdoor concerts. Similarly, Finish Line's sponsorship was given an estimated value of \$565,000. This company signed on with an offer for "\$10 off any \$50 purchase." The coupon was featured inside the notebooks created for Blitz 18. Perhaps the most influential donation came from the Air Bag Safety Campaign. Their funds were combined with the remaining \$8,000 from GM to help create an effective seat belt law campaign, the second phase of which could not have been done without their generous contribution of \$17,000. There is even the suggestion that

significantly more funding or in-kind contributions were generated by the program, but the existence and extent of these additional resources could not be verified.

7.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding

The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute made highly effective use of the GM grant funds. The Governor's Council on Impaired and Dangerous Driving used the grant money and maximized its public education and awareness campaigns. The Council was able to use the funds as leverage and gain further funding from participating organizations. The positive effect of their efforts was recorded and documented by a quantitative evaluation using survey data.

It is important to note that the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute and the Governor's Council on Impaired and Dangerous Driving worked in a similar fashion for what appears to be five or more years. Over this period, *Operation Pull Over* remained the central focus. Funding for such initiatives appears well worthwhile given all of the additional support they can generate. These organizations demonstrated their ability to produce positive safety benefits and to establish themselves in a network of affiliates that have also proved to be effective.

8. CASE STUDY—NETWORK OF EMPLOYERS FOR TRAFFIC SAFETY⁹

8.1 Study Particulars

Agency Receiving Grant:

Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS)

Years and Amounts of Funding:

1995 (\$150,000), 1996 (\$200,000), 1997 (\$200,000), 1998 (\$150,000)

Type of PI&E:

Support of Safety Organizations

8.2 Objective

The objective of this project was to improve safe driving behavior through the development and implementation of programs that targeted workplace settings. Throughout the funding, NETS also focused on self-growth and strove to become financially independent. In the 1998-99 funding year, the GM-NETS partnership focused on promoting the consistent use of occupant protection devices for all drivers and passengers.

8.3 Method

The funding received in the 1995 fiscal year was designated toward providing assistance to NETS State partners and toward operational support for NETS National. It was believed that State partners and programs would be more effective in increasing awareness among employers about the need to address traffic safety. Consequently, NETS created a State partnership program and provided these partners with the resources and technical assistance they needed to prosper. GM funding subsidized several of these activities, including the annual State partners Conference, the development of a State program implementation guide, database design and support, and NETS instructor training and implementation workshops.

The conference created an opportunity for State partners to provide assistance and advice to each other, strengthening their network of communications. Over the course of the 1997-98 fiscal year, the NETS State partners meeting became an annual event, providing the partners with opportunities to plan and acquire technical knowledge and assistance toward implementing traffic safety programs. Information was shared between the NETS State partners, NETS National, and the NETS Liaison Committee. New elements were added, including orientation

⁹ Based on: Network of Employers for Traffic Safety Project Update 1995; Network of Employers for Traffic Safety Project Update 1997; Network of Employers for Traffic Safety Project Update 1998; phone conversations with Network of Employers for Traffic Safety representatives.

sessions for new members, focus groups for current members, and liaison committee meetings to encourage more interaction between NETS board members and State partners.

The State partners believed the development of a “how to” guide would assist current and prospective members in the area of training and technical assistance with their start-up activities. Organizations had been requesting such a document since the State partnership concept began in 1993.

With the development of the State partner program, the NETS National database became dependent on input from the States. The updated database was designed to characterize the NETS organization from basic information obtained from surveys that the States conducted with their employer members and contacts, and to help local programs target the training needs of their local employers by offering them essential descriptive data about their local employer base. As the project years passed, the database became more and more comprehensive and included all the employers NETS had worked with on activities such as National Drive Safely at Work Week, Traffic Safety Management Seminars, and *BeltAmerica 2000*. This database also included various press publication contacts and government contractors who were implementing the President’s executive order on seat belts (requires government contractors to participate in the *Buckle Up America* campaign; NETS acted as the information and technical assistance contact point).

As an additional benefit, NETS Instructor Training and Implementation Workshops taught the State partners to target and recruit potential member companies, to market traffic safety in the workplace, and to develop, manage and conduct a training program. These workshops also served as opportunities for the State partners to meet NETS management staff and provide the management staff with their technical assistance and resource needs.

Three NETS State coordinators (Michigan, Ohio, and Tennessee) were given grants to form partnerships with GM units in their States and implement safe driving programs. All three programs followed a similar model focused on three basic objectives. The first involved enhancing employee awareness within the GM units of the risks associated with operating motor vehicles and methods for reducing such risks. Emphasis was placed on seat belt use, impaired driving and child car seats. The second objective was to develop and implement incentive-based programs that encouraged employees to operate motor vehicles safely. Finally, the grant recipients focused on the development of implementation manuals based on the GM programs that had widespread applications for industry, businesses, government and other community and State entities.

The 1996 program involved evaluation efforts and computer-based training. Several States conducted customer surveys and interviews, the purpose of which was to understand the traffic safety needs of private sector operations. NETS planned to tie those efforts in with efforts made by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) in order to develop a more complete view of the effectiveness of the NETS operations. The project worked with Tennessee and developed software to track contacts, training, technical assistance and other activities in the States. Training was conducted at the annual meeting, after which NETS began encouraging all States to use the software. The project also worked in conjunction with Management Systems and Training Technology to produce computer-based training software

that lays out elements of a comprehensive work site traffic safety program and offers several options for employee training and awareness programs.

In support of the President's initiative to increase seat belt use, NETS National launched a *BeltAmerica 2000* campaign as part of its 1997 program. Designed to encourage employer involvement with employee seat belt programs, NETS provided the employers with technical assistance in the implementation of their programs. Participants were asked to complete the *BeltAmerica 2000* survey and request free materials to implement a seat belt campaign. These materials included information on traffic crash costs, a sample seat belt policy, guidelines on conducting a seat belt survey, incentives to increase seat belt use, a sample employee pledge card and fact sheets on seat belts, air bags and child passenger safety. In addition to this toolkit, NETS developed a *BeltAmerica 2000* multi-media presentation that received positive feedback.

As the project progressed, thousands of *BeltAmerica* toolkits were requested and distributed to organizations. The focus turned away from the implementation of workplace programs and toward appeals to employers to publicly announce their support for the ABC (*America Buckles Up Children*) Mobilization Campaign in the 1998 fiscal year. NETS extended itself and refined the *BeltAmerica* toolkit to ensure that it provided a message that was consistent with the broader campaigns of *ABC Mobilization* and *Buckle Up America*. The organization continued to develop an employer toolkit to support the implementation of workplace seat belt programs, and also provided speakers to promote *ABC Mobilization*. NETS continued to distribute "salute" certificates, signed by the Secretary of Transportation, to various companies that achieved an 85% seat belt use rate. To further congratulate these companies, their achievements were promoted in *NETSWork*, the NETS newsletter, and on the NETS Web site. More than 100 work sites applied for a *BeltAmerica 2000* certificate, documenting that the goal of 85% belt use among the participants was reached. As a personal goal, the NETS Leadership Council members agreed to attain an 85% belt use rate within their own organizations. Many achieved their goal. Others at least increased their belt use with assistance from NETS.

NETS offered funding to its State partners for the purpose of holding occupant protection symposiums at the State level. Florida, New Mexico, New Hampshire, and California implemented their own symposiums. Each meeting featured speakers from the State and national levels. *BeltAmerica 2000* was promoted at the New Mexico conference. At the time of reporting, a Wisconsin symposium was scheduled to take place. Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Virginia were in the planning stages of their own symposiums.

NETS held focus groups with its coordinators that were directed toward becoming self-sufficient and improving credibility and effectiveness within the business community. These sessions led to several key findings, among which was the belief that NETS should operate with common logos, colors, and program structure from State to State. It was also believed that the organization should garner more national recognition by way of its well-known nationally participating businesses. The focus groups also pointed to the need for more training on business and marketing techniques and types of performance measures that could ascertain the success of the program. All of these observations were made with the goal of more effectively marketing the NETS organization.

In response to requests from NHTSA and other organizations, the NETS members agreed to join the national effort to enforce seat belt and child safety seat laws. Through the effort of GM and other partners, the 1998-99 NETS campaign was able to fulfill its commitment to enlist public and media support to help create support for law enforcement mobilizations and other events that encouraged the use of seat belts and child safety seats. The organization recruited public and private sector employers and encouraged them to support *Operation ABC Mobilizations* at the community level.

NETS attended weekly meetings to plan and implement the national *Operation ABC Mobilization* effort. In order to gain support in the communities of its 26 State partners, the organization presented the guidelines, processes and details of its action plan in an easy to use format. It customized Organizational Action Kits (OAKs) to appeal to the employer community. Consistent with the short time typically available to employers to devote to highway safety, the OAKs were designed to be as user friendly as possible. They included a press release, opinion editorial, letter to the editor, fact sheets, and suggested activities for the workplace.

To further assist employers in garnering media exposure for announcing their support of stepped-up enforcement, NETS helped create a comprehensive media list. This media list included every media market in each State, the name of all newspapers for a given market, and the name, phone, fax numbers, and addresses of the newspaper editors. The same information was provided for all radio stations for each market with the station director listed as the contact person. As further motivation, NETS provided support for meetings, mailings, and printing.

NETS National held training workshops at the annual stakeholders meeting in January, 1999. These workshops provided training and tools for working with local media and for creating an effective business and marketing plan for a NETS program. The organization provided a business plan template to State partners that included a section on support for *ABC Mobilization* waves and action steps.

Traffic Safety Management Seminars (TSMS) are the cornerstone of the NETS organization. NETS staff and State coordinators presented seminars on “best practices” for workplace transportation safety management systems to human resource, safety, loss/risk control managers, and sometimes *Safe Communities* coordinators. The central feature of these seminars was the development, implementation and evaluation of various occupant protection policies and education campaigns. In 1998, the training seminar was validated by a group of safety experts. Nets developed support materials and tools for the TSMS, including a software tool that supports the efforts of management to identify the cost of traffic crashes in a work site. This tool also helps management develop a plan, a budget, and estimated cost savings that may result from implementing the program.

Each year occupant protection played a major role in the NETS campaign. Consequently, campaign kits featuring seat belt, air bag, and child safety seat awareness information, artwork, incentives and idea samplers were produced and disseminated in conjunction with National Drive Safely at Work Week.

8.4 Specific Use of GM Funds

Most of the GM funds were expended on print materials. NETS helped develop support materials and tools for the TSMS consisting of a PowerPoint presentation on CD-ROM and a “management tool” CD-ROM. Quarterly campaign documents on occupant protection (totaling 6,500) were also produced and distributed. Funds were expended to create the *National Drive Safely @ Work Week* campaign kits (at least 2,100 produced), which featured information on seat belts, air bags, and child safety seats. Artwork, incentives, and idea samplers were also included with the kits. As an incentive to participate in the campaign, NETS redesigned and distributed 2,000 customized OAKs. The OAKs featured a press release, opinion editorial, letter to the editor, fact sheets, and suggested activities for the workplace. In conjunction with their appeal to employers across the Nation to sign *Endorsements for Enforcement* and engage in media efforts to announce their support for the law enforcement campaign, NETS used grant funds to produce a *BeltAmerica 2000* toolkit. It contained a variety of tools and incentives to support the implementation of workplace seat belt programs and was distributed to “thousands of employers.” Grant funds also helped produce the “salute” certificates that were distributed to congratulate organizations that reached the goal of 85% seat belt use.

Funds were used to support weekly meetings with Greer, Margolis, Mitchell, Burns, and Associates (GMMB&A). These meetings were essential in creating an understanding of the goals and processes of the campaign and finalizing the design and production of the OAKs. NETS provided support for meetings, mailings, printing, and other motivational activities designed to encourage efforts by their State coordinators. The organization also continued the outreach and assistance program associated with *BeltAmerica 2000* by providing speakers from the Network staff who promoted the campaign. Funds were used to support NETS National workshops that were held at the stakeholders meeting in January, 1999. The workshops provided training and tools for working with local media and creating an effective NETS program.

Funds were also used to design a database that enabled NETS to easily locate employers in any given community. It gave the organization access to an additional 6,500 employers via its 26 State partners.

8.5 Other Funds Used

NETS has grown to include at least 24 corporate and government organizations and coordinators in 26 States. Throughout the GM funding years, many organizations contributed in various ways to the operations associated with the NETS programs. For example, in the 1995 report, NETS proclaimed that “most of the member organizations now provide some level of annual funding for NETS operations.” In the evaluation section of the 1996 program update, the project noted that NIOSH had implemented an evaluation survey “as an in-kind contribution.” External partners mentioned in the *1998-99 Activities Report* included NHTSA, NAGHSR, IACP, the Airbag & Seat Belt Safety Campaign, GMMB&A and others. NHTSA is specifically mentioned as helping with the campaign documents on occupant protection. GMMB&A is specifically noted as having met weekly with NETS in an effort to create the OAKs.

8.6 Discussion/Implications of GM Funding

NETS efforts to improve the safe driving behavior of Americans through the development and implementation of programs targeting workplace settings proved to be largely successful. Several important accomplishments resulted from the State grants awarded to the NETS State partners in 1995. The most successful of these ventures proved to be the Michigan project, which emphasized increased usage of seat belts, improvements in the use of child restraints and the reduction of drinking and driving behaviors. *Create the Habit* resulted in increased seat belt use at the GM Lansing Car Assembly Plant. As a result of this pilot project, other GM plants began to rely on the “expertise” of Lansing car assembly employees in the establishment of workplace traffic safety programs at their respective work sites. All of the State grant recipients, however, showed positive expansion efforts towards other car companies and the communities in which they resided.

The goal of the 1998-99 GM-NETS partnership was to “promote the consistent use of occupant protection devices for all drivers and passengers through partnership initiatives,” specifically, *ABC Mobilization* in the general context of *Buckle up America*. Through effective use of its network, NETS accomplished this goal.

In preparation for the *ABC Mobilization* campaign, NETS created a database to track all the employers they had worked with in the past, press publication contacts and government contractors committed to the President’s executive order. The database allowed NETS to easily locate employers and consequently was very effective in their *ABC Mobilization* efforts.

Regularly scheduled meetings with GMMB&A became a productive step to understanding the goals of the campaign and in eventually producing the OAKs. Together with a comprehensive media list, the press releases, editorials, and fact sheets included in the OAKs gave employers everything they needed to publicly announce their *Endorsement for Enforcement* and support of the *ABC Mobilization* effort within their communities.

The *BeltAmerica 2000* toolkit continued the organization’s efforts to support the implementation of workplace seat belt programs. The toolkit was distributed to thousands of employers and continued to bring employers to NETS for assistance in implementing such programs. The NETS staff responded by providing motivational speakers who also promoted the *ABC Mobilization* program and by continuing the distribution of “salute” certificates to organizations that achieved an 85% seat belt use rate. The NETS Leadership Council members provided a good example in their pledge to achieve salute certificates, many having reached that goal. Although all of the organizations did not achieve an 85% use rate, with assistance from other NETS members they did increase their employee seat belt use rate (in one instance, a 22% increase was noted).

In continuation of their successful training efforts, NETS provided a business plan template to State partners with a section on support for *ABC Mobilization* waves at the annual stakeholders meeting in January of 1999. In addition, attendees received workshop training and tools for working with the local media.

The project notes positive feedback from coordinators, members and partners in their campaign efforts. In one particular instance, a United Parcel Service executive was invited to speak at the *Lifesavers 17* conference about the company's success as a non-traditional partner in the Thanksgiving *ABC Mobilization* wave. Through UPS district managers and the OAKs provided by NETS, the organization had implemented a successful media blitz. Another example was noted from Tennessee. The NETS coordinators staged media events across the State. In total there were six successful events that communicated the buckle up message of the *ABC Mobilization* effort.

In conclusion, the GM grant money provided important support to NETS that allowed the organization to continue to grow and strive towards financial independence. This money was essential for the continuing decentralization of the organization and the development of State partners. In return, NETS has demonstrated its ability to grow. The network includes 24 corporate and government organizations and coordinators in 26 States. With member contributions and the sale of their services and products, NETS achieved financial independence. The network distributes to over 8,000 employers nationwide, and operates as the connection among *Buckle Up America*, *ABC Mobilization*, *Safe Communities*, *Partners in Progress* (and similar national campaigns), and the employer community. Their *National Drive Safely @ Work Week* continues to grow year after year. In such ways, NETS has successfully brought more of the employer community into a safety alliance dedicated to getting everyone to buckle up.

9. RESULTS

The tabular results of the data from the reports of the grantees of GM funds presented below are structured around the four questions defined by the statement of work:

1. How were the project funds used (e.g., seat belt programs, alcohol programs, graduated licensing)?
2. What activities were accomplished (e.g., media events, Internet activities, database development or maintenance, etc.)?
3. What were the results?
4. What measurable impact did these programs have on traffic safety as documented by the programs themselves?

There is relatively more quantitative information on the first two questions than on the last two. The grantee reports contained little substantive information on the outcomes of their efforts.

The tabular results consist of counts and cross-tabulations of information coded from the reports of the GM grantees. By far, the most detailed information exists with respect to how the project funds were used, i.e., the types of activities that were funded by the GM grants.

9.1 Use of Grant Funds

Project fund use was categorized in three different ways—by primary focal area, specific topic coverage, and specific media used. Each will be addressed in turn below.

9.1.1 Funds Use and Primary PI&E Focal Area

Table 1 displays the distribution of dollar size of each project by the three primary focal areas—support of State safety legislation, support of enforcement of State safety laws, and support of safety organizations.

The data in Table 1 show that projects devoted to support of State safety legislation tended to be small in size. More than half of these projects (55 of 109) were funded at the level of \$20,000 or less, and none received more than \$50,000.

Table 1. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Amount of GM Grant

			GM Grant Interval						Total	
			\$10,000 or Less	\$10,001 - \$20,000	\$20,001 - \$30,000	\$30,001 - \$40,000	\$40,001 - \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$100,000		More Than \$100,000
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	10	45	33	15	6	0	0	109
		% within Type of PI&E	9.2%	41.3%	30.3%	13.8%	5.5%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within GM Grant Interval	76.9%	84.9%	66.0%	48.4%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	46.6%
		% of Total	4.3%	19.2%	14.1%	6.4%	2.6%	.0%	.0%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	0	8	9	14	17	41	13	102
		% within Type of PI&E	.0%	7.8%	8.8%	13.7%	16.7%	40.2%	12.7%	100.0%
		% within GM Grant Interval	.0%	15.1%	18.0%	45.2%	70.8%	95.3%	65.0%	43.6%
		% of Total	.0%	3.4%	3.8%	6.0%	7.3%	17.5%	5.6%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	3	0	8	2	1	2	7	23
		% within Type of PI&E	13.0%	.0%	34.8%	8.7%	4.3%	8.7%	30.4%	100.0%
		% within GM Grant Interval	23.1%	.0%	16.0%	6.5%	4.2%	4.7%	35.0%	9.8%
		% of Total	1.3%	.0%	3.4%	.9%	.4%	.9%	3.0%	9.8%
Total	Count	13	53	50	31	24	43	20	234	
	% within Type of PI&E	5.6%	22.6%	21.4%	13.2%	10.3%	18.4%	8.5%	100.0%	
	% within GM Grant Interval	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	5.6%	22.6%	21.4%	13.2%	10.3%	18.4%	8.5%	100.0%	

Projects supporting enforcement of State safety laws were funded at relatively high levels. Approximately 53% of these 102 programs received in excess of \$50,000, and only 16.6% were funded at a level of \$30,000 or less. No enforcement projects were funded at \$10,000 or less even though these were all PI&E efforts and were not actually buying police overtime. This funding profile was consistent with the joint planning of GM and NHTSA when soliciting and selecting grantees.

The funding of the 23 projects dealing with the support of safety organizations was more evenly distributed. Slightly greater than 39% of the projects in this focal area were funded at a level in excess of \$50,000, while almost 48% received funding of \$30,000 or less.

A slightly different picture emerges in Table 2 that examines the total, mean, and standard deviation of expenditures in each focal area. Over half of the GM funds were spent on projects in support of the enforcement of State safety laws. This may reflect the nature of applications GM received or recruited.

Table 2 also shows that grants in support of State safety legislation received lower average funding than did projects in either of the other two focal areas. On an average basis, grants in support of safety organizations received the highest per project funding, but there was wide variation across the 23 efforts as indicated by a standard deviation that is almost as large as the mean value of funding.

Table 2. Total and Mean Expenditure by Primary PI&E Focal Area

Primary PI&E Focal Area	N	Total \$	Mean \$	Standard Deviation \$
Support of State safety legislation	109	\$2,566,000	\$23,541	\$9,584
Support of enforcement of State safety laws	102	\$6,844,000	\$67,098	\$36,597
Support of safety organizations	23	\$1,820,000	\$79,130	\$75,338
Total	234	\$11,230,000	\$47,991	\$41,162

9.1.2 Funding and Media Type

The reports from the grantees generally provided quantitative data on the extent to which the various modes of PI&E were used. Thus, a good picture of accomplishments across the 234 projects can be obtained from a tabulation of the media modes actually used. Table 3 shows that 821 different media forms were reported by the grantees. This represents an overall average use of 3.5 different media per grant. Also as shown in Table 3, the average number of media forms used does not vary notably as a function of the size of the GM grant.

Table 3. Number of Grants Using Each Media Form by Extent of Project Funding*

Media Form	\$10,000 or Less	\$10,001-\$20,000	\$20,001-\$30,000	\$30,001-\$40,000	\$40,001-\$50,000	\$50,001-\$100,000	More than \$100,000	Total
Television	2	8	5	6	5	17	9	52
Radio	1	14	10	9	11	22	10	77
Newspaper	4	18	12	13	11	16	10	84
Other Print	7	36	37	19	15	24	15	153
Meeting, Symposium or Training	5	33	33	17	12	14	10	124
Direct Promotion of Legislation	5	28	24	12	4	1	0	74
Letter Writing	1	4	7	7	2	1	1	23
Press Conference	4	9	12	6	4	8	3	46
Internet/ Web Sites	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	8
Database Development	0	2	4	3	1	0	2	12
Awards Programs	2	2	0	1	1	3	4	13
Employee Programs	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
Planning	5	22	18	11	12	21	14	103
Purchase Equipment	2	4	8	6	3	8	1	32
Film/ Movie Theater	0	0	1	2	5	2	1	11
800 Number	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Total Media Forms	38	185	176	113	87	138	84	821
Total Projects	13	53	50	31	24	43	20	234
Forms per Project	2.9	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.2	4.2	3.5

*Each project could use any number of media forms and could therefore enter this table multiple times.

9.1.3 Focal Area and Media Type

Some of the differences in funding levels may be explained by the costs of the different media used for each primary focal area. It is uncertain whether the funding prompted specific media use or whether the perceived need for particular media dictated the amount of funding

applied for and granted by GM. For example, Table 4 shows the use of television as a function of primary focal area. Of the projects focused on support of enforcement of State safety laws, 39.5% used television compared to 14.0% for projects addressed at support of State safety legislation. Only one of 23 grantees in support of safety organizations applied some of its funds to television. The different sizes of the target audience for the PI&E in the three focal areas could also have accounted for some of the difference in expenditures.

Table 4. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Television Use

		Television			Total
		No	Yes		
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	94	15	109
		% within Primary PI&E	86.2%	13.8%	100.0%
		% within Television	51.6%	28.8%	46.6%
		% of Total	40.2%	6.4%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	66	36	102
		% within Primary PI&E	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
		% within Television	36.3%	69.2%	43.6%
		% of Total	28.2%	15.4%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	22	1	23
		% within Primary PI&E	95.7%	4.3%	100.0%
		% within Television	12.1%	1.9%	9.8%
		% of Total	9.4%	.4%	9.8%
Total	Count	182	52	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	
	% within Television	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	

Table 5 shows much the same pattern for broadcast radio. Fifty-two percent of the projects in support of the enforcement of State safety laws used radio as compared with only 19.3% for projects in support of State safety legislation and 13.0% for projects in support of safety organizations. The emphasis on the broadcast media to support enforcement of State safety laws is consistent with the prevailing high visibility enforcement approach typified by NHTSA's *Click It or Ticket* program. Broadcast media are good vehicles for delivering a message on this topic to a large proportion of a State's population.

Table 6 shows the use of newspapers as a function of primary PI&E focal area. The distribution here is far more even. About one third of the grantees in all three primary focal areas believed that newspapers were a viable means to promote their programs.

Table 5. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Radio Use

		Radio		Total	
		No	Yes		
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	88	21	109
		% within Primary PI&E	80.7%	19.3%	100.0%
		% within Radio	56.1%	27.3%	46.6%
		% of Total	37.6%	9.0%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	49	53	102
		% within Primary PI&E	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
		% within Radio	31.2%	68.8%	43.6%
		% of Total	20.9%	22.6%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	20	3	23
		% within Primary PI&E	87.0%	13.0%	100.0%
		% within Radio	12.7%	3.9%	9.8%
		% of Total	8.5%	1.3%	9.8%
Total	Count	157	77	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	67.1%	32.9%	100.0%	
	% within Radio	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	67.1%	32.9%	100.0%	

Table 6. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Newspaper Use

		paper		Total	
		No	Yes		
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	67	42	109
		% within Primary PI&E	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
		% within Newspaper	44.7%	50.0%	46.6%
		% of Total	28.6%	17.9%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	66	36	102
		% within Primary PI&E	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
		% within Newspaper	44.0%	42.9%	43.6%
		% of Total	28.2%	15.4%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	17	6	23
		% within Primary PI&E	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%
		% within Newspaper	11.3%	7.1%	9.8%
		% of Total	7.3%	2.6%	9.8%
Total	Count	150	84	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	64.1%	35.9%	100.0%	
	% within Newspaper	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	64.1%	35.9%	100.0%	

Other print media, including pamphlets, posters and similar items, were used widely by projects in all three focal areas as shown in Table 7. More than half of the grantees in each area employed other print media including 77.1% of the projects focused on support of State safety legislation, 55.9% of projects supporting enforcement of State safety laws, and 52.2% of projects supporting of safety organizations. These types of print media are relatively inexpensive, can be distributed easily, and can be developed and implemented quite rapidly in response to a perceived need.

Table 7. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Other Print Media Use

		Other Print Media		Total	
		No	Yes		
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	25	84	109
		% within Primary PI&E	22.9%	77.1%	100.0%
		% within Other Print Media	30.9%	54.9%	46.6%
		% of Total	10.7%	35.9%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	45	57	102
		% within Primary PI&E	44.1%	55.9%	100.0%
		% within Other Print Media	55.6%	37.3%	43.6%
		% of Total	19.2%	24.4%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	11	12	23
		% within Primary PI&E	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
		% within Other Print Media	13.6%	7.8%	9.8%
		% of Total	4.7%	5.1%	9.8%
Total	Count	81	153	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	34.6%	65.4%	100.0%	
	% within Other Print Media	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	34.6%	65.4%	100.0%	

Meetings, symposia, and training sessions were used widely by projects focused on support of State safety legislation (69.7%) and support of safety organizations (60.9%) as shown in Table 8. Grantees addressing support of the enforcement of State safety laws also used these approaches but to a lesser extent (33.3%). The additional funding from GM may have permitted grantees to add these activities to their normal arsenal of approaches.

Table 8. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Meeting/Symposium/Training

		ymposium/ aining		Total	
		No	Yes		
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	33	76	109
		% within Primary PI&E	30.3%	69.7%	100.0%
		% within Meeting/Symposium/ Training	30.0%	61.3%	46.6%
		% of Total	14.1%	32.5%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	68	34	102
		% within Primary PI&E	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Meeting/Symposium/ Training	61.8%	27.4%	43.6%
		% of Total	29.1%	14.5%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	9	14	23
		% within Primary PI&E	39.1%	60.9%	100.0%
		% within Meeting/Symposium/ Training	8.2%	11.3%	9.8%
		% of Total	3.8%	6.0%	9.8%
Total	Count	110	124	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	47.0%	53.0%	100.0%	
	% within Meeting/Symposium/ Training	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	47.0%	53.0%	100.0%	

Table 9 shows that letter writing was much less prevalent than other forms of PI&E. When it was used, it was most often in support of State safety legislation. This is not unexpected as letter writing is a traditional way to promote acceptance of new legislation.

Seventy-four of the 234 projects also used other methods of direct communication such as one-on-one meetings, in support of their efforts. As would be expected, 69 (93.2%) of the 74 grants that employed this approach were in support of State safety legislation. The other five supported enforcement of State safety laws.

Press conferences were used about twice as frequently in programs focused on the support of State safety legislation as in programs in the other two PI&E areas. This is shown in Table 10.

Awards programs were also used with some frequency as shown in Table 11. As would be anticipated, this type of effort was most prevalent in programs focused on the support of safety organizations with more than 17% of these efforts using GM funding for some type of award effort.

Table 9. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Letter Writing Campaign

			Writing Campaign		Total
			No	Yes	
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	89	20	109
		% within Primary PI&E	81.7%	18.3%	100.0%
		% within Letter Writing Campaign	42.2%	87.0%	46.6%
		% of Total	38.0%	8.5%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	101	1	102
		% within Primary PI&E	99.0%	1.0%	100.0%
		% within Letter Writing Campaign	47.9%	4.3%	43.6%
		% of Total	43.2%	.4%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	21	2	23
		% within Primary PI&E	91.3%	8.7%	100.0%
		% within Letter Writing Campaign	10.0%	8.7%	9.8%
		% of Total	9.0%	.9%	9.8%
Total	Count	211	23	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	90.2%	9.8%	100.0%	
	% within Letter Writing Campaign	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	90.2%	9.8%	100.0%	

Table 10. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Press Conference

			Press Conference		Total
			No	Yes	
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	78	31	109
		% within Primary PI&E	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%
		% within Press Conference	41.5%	67.4%	46.6%
		% of Total	33.3%	13.2%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	90	12	102
		% within Primary PI&E	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
		% within Press Conference	47.9%	26.1%	43.6%
		% of Total	38.5%	5.1%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	20	3	23
		% within Primary PI&E	87.0%	13.0%	100.0%
		% within Press Conference	10.6%	6.5%	9.8%
		% of Total	8.5%	1.3%	9.8%
Total	Count	188	46	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	80.3%	19.7%	100.0%	
	% within Press Conference	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	80.3%	19.7%	100.0%	

Table 11. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Awards Programs

			ards Programs		Total
			No	Yes	
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	107	2	109
		% within Primary PI&E	98.2%	1.8%	100.0%
		% within Awards Programs	48.4%	15.4%	46.6%
		% of Total	45.7%	.9%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	95	7	102
		% within Primary PI&E	93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
		% within Awards Programs	43.0%	53.8%	43.6%
		% of Total	40.6%	3.0%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	19	4	23
		% within Primary PI&E	82.6%	17.4%	100.0%
		% within Awards Programs	8.6%	30.8%	9.8%
		% of Total	8.1%	1.7%	9.8%
Total	Count	221	13	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	94.4%	5.6%	100.0%	
	% within Awards Programs	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	94.4%	5.6%	100.0%	

Applying GM funding to planning efforts was popular among grantees in all three focal areas as shown in Table 12. Forty-four percent of all projects used GM-provided support to initiate or continue planning.

Eight projects used GM funding to create or maintain Internet or Web sites. Twelve projects developed databases relevant to their work; eight supported State safety legislation; three supported safety organizations; and one supported enforcement of State safety laws. Four of the programs in support of safety organizations used some of their funding for employee promotion programs.

Overall, 32 projects (13.7% of the total) purchased equipment of some sort with their GM grant funds. Approximately 11% of the projects supporting State safety legislation, 20% of projects supporting enforcement of State safety laws and none of the projects supporting safety organizations purchased equipment with some of their funds. Five (2.1% of the total) projects funded an 800 number with their grant funds.

Table 12. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Planning

		anning		Total	
		No	Yes		
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	71	38	109
		% within Primary PI&E	65.1%	34.9%	100.0%
		% within Planning	54.2%	36.9%	46.6%
		% of Total	30.3%	16.2%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	48	54	102
		% within Primary PI&E	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
		% within Planning	36.6%	52.4%	43.6%
		% of Total	20.5%	23.1%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	12	11	23
		% within Primary PI&E	52.2%	47.8%	100.0%
		% within Planning	9.2%	10.7%	9.8%
		% of Total	5.1%	4.7%	9.8%
Total	Count	131	103	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%	
	% within Planning	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%	

Finally, presentations in movie theaters were used by eight (7.8%) of the projects focused on the support of enforcement of State safety laws and by two (8.7%) of those that addressed the support of safety organizations. Only one (0.9%) of the projects dealing with the support of State safety legislation employed this medium.

9.2 Subject Area Coverage

The foregoing suggests that a wide range of media forms were mounted as a result of the GM funding. This section will examine the subject areas covered by those varied media.

Well over half of the 234 projects (143 or 61.1%) addressed alcohol topics. Table 13 shows that the inclusion of an alcohol topic was largely independent of focal area with a clear majority of projects in all focal areas covering at least one alcohol-related subject.

Overall, seat belt topics were also very popular with 159 projects (67.9%) addressing this area. As with alcohol topics, at least half of the grantees in each focal area used at least some of their funds to disseminate PI&E on seat belts (including child restraints). However, as shown in Table 14, the distribution by focal area was not uniform. More than 84% of the projects supporting enforcement of State safety laws; almost 70% of the grants focused on support of safety organizations; and approximately 52% of support of State safety legislation dealt with seat belts. This is consistent with the fact that some of the States with grant projects already had primary seat belt laws and adequate child restraint regulations. Projects in these locales would not need to promote new or improved legislation.

Table 13. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Alcohol Topic

			Alcohol Topic?		Total
			No	Yes	No
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	37	72	109
		% within Primary PI&E	33.9%	66.1%	100.0%
			40.7%	50.3%	46.6%
		% of Total	15.8%	30.8%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	46	56	102
		% within Primary PI&E	45.1%	54.9%	100.0%
		% within Alcohol 1 Topic?	50.5%	39.2%	43.6%
		% of Total	19.7%	23.9%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	8	15	23
		% within Primary PI&E	34.8%	65.2%	100.0%
		% within Alcohol Topic?	8.8%	10.5%	9.8%
		% of Total	3.4%	6.4%	9.8%
Total	Count	91	143	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	38.9%	61.1%	100.0%	
	% within Alcohol Topic?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	38.9%	61.1%	100.0%	

Table 14. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Seat Belt Topic

			Seat Belt Topic?		Total
			No	Yes	
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	52	57	109
		% within Primary PI&E	47.7%	52.3%	100.0%
		% within Seat Belt Topic?	69.3%	35.8%	46.6%
		% of Total	22.2%	24.4%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	16	86	102
		% within Primary PI&E	15.7%	84.3%	100.0%
		% within Seat Belt Topic?	21.3%	54.1%	43.6%
		% of Total	6.8%	36.8%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	7	16	23
		% within Primary PI&E	30.4%	69.6%	100.0%
		% within Seat Belt Topic?	9.3%	10.1%	9.8%
		% of Total	3.0%	6.8%	9.8%
Total	Count	75	159	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	32.1%	67.9%	100.0%	
	% within Seat Belt Topic?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	32.1%	67.9%	100.0%	

Licensing topics were not as widespread in the PI&E generated by the GM grantees. Only 35 of the 234 efforts (15%) addressed licensing. Moreover, as shown in Table 15, licensing topics, most of which addressed GDL, were concentrated in projects focused on the support of State safety legislation and support of safety organizations. Only four projects supporting enforcement of State safety laws addressed a licensing topic.

Almost 36% of the studied projects covered “other” topics as shown in Table 16. These topics consisted mainly of expansion efforts and speed limits. Expansion efforts included various activities and forms of recruitment aimed specifically at increasing the size of a project’s member base and/or outreach. A few projects addressed topics such as aggressive driving, pickup trucks, motorcycle helmets and drowsy driving. Grants in support of the enforcement of State safety laws were more likely to include these other topics, particularly speed limits. The greatest number of “other” topics (40) was also found in grants that supported the enforcement of State safety laws.

Table 15. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Licensing Topic

			Licensing Topic?		Total
			No	Yes	
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	84	25	109
		% within Primary PI&E	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
		% within Licensing Topic?	42.2%	71.4%	46.6%
		% of Total	35.9%	10.7%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	98	4	102
		% within Primary PI&E	96.1%	3.9%	100.0%
		% within Licensing Topic?	49.2%	11.4%	43.6%
		% of Total	41.9%	1.7%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	17	6	23
		% within Primary PI&E	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%
		% within Licensing Topic?	8.5%	17.1%	9.8%
		% of Total	7.3%	2.6%	9.8%
Total	Count	199	35	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%	
	% within Licensing Topic?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%	

Table 16. Primary PI&E Focal Area by Other Topic

			er Topic?		Total
			No	Yes	
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	77	32	109
		% within Primary PI&E	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
		% within Other Topic?	51.3%	38.1%	46.6%
		% of Total	32.9%	13.7%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	62	40	102
		% within Primary PI&E	60.8%	39.2%	100.0%
		% within Other Topic?	41.3%	47.6%	43.6%
		% of Total	26.5%	17.1%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	11	12	23
		% within Primary PI&E	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
		% within Other Topic?	7.3%	14.3%	9.8%
		% of Total	4.7%	5.1%	9.8%
Total	Count	150	84	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	64.1%	35.9%	100.0%	
	% within Other Topic?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	64.1%	35.9%	100.0%	

9.3 Results and Impact

The available data provide three insights into the results and impact of the various projects. First, as shown in Table 17, only 56 (24.0%) of the 234 projects reported a completed quantitative measurement of impact. An additional nine projects (3.8%) indicated they had a quantitative evaluation in process, but it had yet to be completed. The vast majority of projects that included a measurement of impact were in support of the enforcement of State safety laws. This could be because these efforts are amenable to a quantitative assessment using readily available citation data. The relatively high funding level of these projects also provided them with more resources to support an evaluation.

Among the completed 56 evaluations shown in Table 17, 47 (84%) indicated that the project was partly or totally successful. Three evaluations had a negative outcome indicating the project had not achieved its goals. Six evaluations indicated neither success nor failure. The inability to show conclusively that the project was successful does not necessarily mean, however, that valuable lessons were not learned.

Table 17. Primary PI&E by Project Measured Impact

		Project Measured Impact					Total	
		Negative	Positive	Neutral	No Evaluation	Incomplete/ Pending		
Primary PI&E Focal Area	Support of State Safety Legislation	Count	2	12	6	89	0	109
		% within Primary PI&E	1.8%	11.0%	5.5%	81.7%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Project Measured Impact	66.7%	25.5%	100.0%	52.7%	.0%	46.6%
		% of Total	.9%	5.1%	2.6%	38.0%	.0%	46.6%
	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Count	1	32	0	60	9	102
		% within Primary PI&E	1.0%	31.4%	.0%	58.8%	8.8%	100.0%
		% within Project Measured Impact	33.3%	68.1%	.0%	35.5%	100.0%	43.6%
		% of Total	.4%	13.7%	.0%	25.6%	3.8%	43.6%
	Support of Safety Organizations	Count	0	3	0	20	0	23
		% within Primary PI&E	.0%	13.0%	.0%	87.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Project Measured Impact	.0%	6.4%	.0%	11.8%	.0%	9.8%
		% of Total	.0%	1.3%	.0%	8.5%	.0%	9.8%
Total	Count	3	47	6	169	9	234	
	% within Primary PI&E	1.3%	20.1%	2.6%	72.2%	3.8%	100.0%	
	% within Project Measured Impact	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	1.3%	20.1%	2.6%	72.2%	3.8%	100.0%	

Twenty-two of the 65 projects that reported a quantitative evaluation measure used surveys (five of these were incomplete or pending evaluations). Only a few projects chose to use evaluations that were crash-based, anecdotal, behavioral observations, or focus groups.

The second available assessment of results and impact was the project’s own subjective judgment. Sixty-two percent of all the grant reports included some subjective judgment of success, with over half the projects at all levels of funding making such a report. As would be expected, almost all of these were positive. Only seven grants reported neutral or equivocal outcomes, and none reported negative results.

The third measure of potential impact was the assessment of the Dunlap and Associates, Inc., project staff analyst of the potential of the reported objectives and approaches to produce meaningful results. There was sufficient information to apply this measure to 158 (67.5%) of the

234 projects. Of these, almost all (151 or 95.6% of those for which a judgment was made) were judged to be capable of producing a positive impact. The seven projects not assessed with a positive potential were deemed neutral.

9.4 Program Continuity

Of the 44 projects in the fifth year of funding, 20 were unable to be contacted and, therefore, their existence and current activity are unknown. Of the 24 where contacts with someone knowledgeable about the program were made, 20 projects were found to still be in existence. Of these existing programs, all 20 reported following similar objectives to those for which they had received fifth-year GM funding. Appendix B contains detailed information on which programs were contacted.

10. DISCUSSION

The results presented in the previous sections provide insights into both the process by which the GM grants were administered and the effects of the expenditures during the five years of the grants. Firm conclusions and definitive quantitative results are difficult to support with the type and extent of available data. Nevertheless, useful lessons learned and guidance for future efforts can be derived from the information at hand and answers to the four research questions around which this study was structured.

10.1 Use of the GM Grant Funds

Most projects reported the nature and extent of their activities, at least in qualitative terms. Many projects did not report the precise amounts they received. Where projects did provide cost data, however, there was virtually perfect correspondence between the GM report of the dollars granted and the recipients' indication of the amounts received. The nature and extent of PI&E activities reported by the grantees appear fully consistent with the amount of their grants. Although the data do not support a detailed quantitative analysis of, for example, the level of expenditure by media form, there are no glaringly apparent discrepancies between funding levels and the way those funds were reportedly applied.

10.2 Accomplishments and Outcomes

Despite the sparse quantitative data on the achievements of the grants, some inferences with respect to accomplishments and outcomes are possible. One area of interest concerns whether the GM grants catalyzed entirely new projects, new efforts by existing projects or merely facilitated the ongoing activities of established entities. It seems reasonable to conclude that all three types of results were supported, but the relative focus among the three types of efforts could not be determined. The grantee reports provided clear examples of new entities spawned by the availability of funding from GM. There were also cases in which existing organizations mounted new initiatives because the GM funding supplemented their standard fund sources. Finally, evidence exists that some established organizations used the GM grants to replace their normal fundraising activities. For these grantees, the GM monies did not spawn significant new activities, but facilitated on-going efforts and possibly permitted staff members to divert time that would normally have been devoted to fund raising to safety PI&E efforts.

The reports also provide a suggestion that the GM funds were used in conjunction with other funding sources to enhance program efforts. In some reports, the availability of funds from sources other than GM was acknowledged, but the amounts were rarely provided. The number of different media forms reportedly used, however, even by projects receiving relatively small GM grants, suggests that funds from all available sources were often pooled and applied to a common objective. Also, the popularity of meetings, symposia, and training as PI&E forms may have been prompted by the availability of funding from GM. These activities can be relatively costly and are often not used by safety programs unless supported from outside normal funding sources.

The distribution of funding apparently matches the specific recruiting efforts developed jointly by GM and NHTSA with assistance from other involved parties such as State highway

safety offices. For example, grants in support of the enforcement of State safety laws received almost three times the total funding of grants in support of State safety legislation even though there were an approximately equivalent number of grants in each area. Also, there were relatively few grants in support of safety organizations.

There is little quantitative information on the success of the grants in achieving their stated objectives. Where data or claims are available, most results were positive. There was also no discernible relationship between the extent of project funding and the several success measures. Small and large projects both produced positive results.

The effect of the GM funding on the longevity of the programs also could not be definitively determined. Those programs that filed fifth year (2000) reports and could be contacted were generally engaged in the same types of activities as they reported in the grantee annual reports.

Overall, definitive, quantitative answers to the four questions the present study addressed could not be derived from the available data. There was, however, a consensus of the involved project staff that GM funds were productively used in support of highway safety efforts, largely focused on alcohol and occupant restraints. The GM funds probably promoted accomplishments with respect to the awareness of these issues that could not have been achieved in the absence of the GM/NHTSA agreement and the working collaboration between the two organizations. In retrospect, additional insights into the success of the program and further process lessons might have been learned if more detailed reporting requirements had been placed on the grantees.

APPENDIX A
CODE SHEET AND CODING RULES

The code sheet used to capture the data from the GM grantee reports was created in a collaborative effort between Dunlap and Associates, Inc., and NHTSA. Designed to identify and organize potentially useful information, the code sheet was used to create a database of information for all five years of GM funding (1995-1999 inclusive). The first version of the code sheet was pretested by coding an initial group of projects and was subsequently modified to better categorize the actual information in the received reports. The rules used in the coding process were:

- Whenever a project report did not contain information that was requested on the code sheet, those particular variables were left blank. When critical information was missing, the project was contacted to help the analyst fill in the information, and it was subsequently added if available.
- Only volunteer contributors of time and/or money were coded as other sources. Sources that were paid to work with the agency receiving the grant were not included. If the analyst was unable to determine the major dollar or value contributor, but was certain that agencies had contributed significant monies and/or time, he or she coded the nature of the other sources as “Multiple.”
- When coding the type of organization receiving funds, government organizations that were not covered by a specific code value were coded as public agencies, State or local. When a question arose as to whether a public agency or a police department received the grant money, the analyst coded the type of agency receiving the funds as a police department in order to preserve the police distinction.
- When coding the duration of a project, the analyst recorded the specified length of the project, not the duration of its GM funding. A legislative session was considered to encompass one year.
- In general, mentioning a topic was not sufficient for a project to be noted as having worked on that topic. In order for a topic and/or specific use of funds to be coded, the project must have included an example or at least referenced an example of the work that was done.
- Where determinable, all topics were listed hierarchically (most to least focused on) according to the project report(s). When in doubt, the hierarchy on the code sheet was used.
- When coding seat belt and helmet topics, seat belt legislation that targeted children was coded as child passenger protection in order to preserve the distinction.
- Where determinable, all specific uses of funds were coded from most expensive to least expensive. If an expense breakdown did not exist and the analyst could not conclude which specific use of funds was more costly to the project, the hierarchy was drawn directly from the code sheet.
- Organizational house organs or newsletters (e.g., MADD newsletters) did not qualify as publicly printed media. Such efforts were coded at the level of other print media such as mailings, pamphlets and posters.

- News articles (or any other kind of press coverage) must have been generated by the project or as a result of something the project did. Individual projects were not considered to have incurred a GM-related expense if the coverage would have been there regardless of the project's efforts. There were many instances where television and radio coverage resulted from the expenses associated with holding a press conference. In such cases, the television and radio coverage was considered to fall in the same level as press conferences.
- The project measured impact variable referred to an actual measured impact by the project, i.e., quantitative data had to be presented. Offering a number of votes, or providing evidence of a specific law being passed did not qualify. If the project suggested it was the first to introduce a particular idea and/or because of efforts unique to the project a particular result occurred, it was set aside and discussed separately among the analyst team. The project's representative was contacted when necessary to help determine whether the project would be given credit for creating a reported change.

The code sheet follows.

Code Sheet for Analyzing the GM Compliance Reports

Volume # _____

Tab # _____

Year __

Agency receiving grant: _____

Variable	Levels
	1 = C1) Support of State Safety Legislation 2 = C2) Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws 3 = C3) Support of Safety Organizations 4 = C1 + C2 5 = C1 + C3 6 = C2 + C3 7 = C1 + C2 + C3
State	2 letter postal abbreviation __ __
Year of GM funding	4 digit year of funding __ __ __ __
Dollar amount <i>granted</i> from GM for this year (as reported by GM)	\$ __ __ __ __ __ __ (6 digits actual whole dollar)
Dollar amount <i>received</i> from GM for this year (as reported by project)	\$ __ __ __ __ __ __ (6 digits actual whole dollar)
Dollar amount from GM for this year <i>actually used</i>	\$ __ __ __ __ __ __ (6 digits actual whole dollar)
Dollar amount from GM carried over from other years and used in this year	\$ __ __ __ __ __ __ (6 digits actual whole dollar)
Dollar amount deferred to future years	\$ __ __ __ __ __ __ (6 digits actual whole dollar)
Dollar amount (total) from other sources	\$ __ __ __ __ __ __ (6 digits actual whole dollar)
Nature of other sources (list major dollar or value contributor)	S = State F = Federal L = Local P = Private foundation C = Corporate M = Multiple

Variable	Levels
Type of organization receiving funds	C = Coalition P = Police department E = Schools S = Other public agency State Level L = Other public agency <i>Local</i> Level M = MADD chapter N = Not-for-profit organization (not MADD) \$ = For-profit organization
Duration of project (not GM funding)	___ ___ years (enter 1 for 1 or less; 99=cancelled)
Level of program application	S = State/multi-county C = County/multi-city L = Local M = Multiple businesses or organizations B = Single business or organization O = Other
Alcohol Topic 1	99 = Alcohol general (non legislative) 01 = .08 BAC 02 = Administrative license revocation (ALR) 03 = Zero tolerance 04 = Open container 05 = Repeat offenders 06 = Vehicle impoundment/forfeiture 07 = Interlocks 08 = Anti-loophole 09 = Illegal per se laws 10 = PBT laws 11 = Providing to underage 12 = Alcohol other laws or multiples 13 = _____ 14 = _____ 15 = _____
Alcohol Topic 2	___ ___
Alcohol Topic 3	___ ___
Alcohol Topic 4	___ ___

Variable	Levels
Licensing Topic 1	9 = General licensing 1 = Graduated licensing 2 = Older driver issues 3 = _____ 4 = _____ 5 = _____
Licensing Topic 2	_____
Seat belt/helmet topic 1	1 = Seat belt use 2 = Child passenger protection 3 = Motorcycle helmets 4 = Primary law 5 = Other seat belt law 6 = _____ 7 = _____ 8 = _____
Seat belt/helmet topic 2	_____
Other topic 1	1 = Speed limits 2 = Aggressive driving 3 = Red light running 4 = Pickup trucks 5 = Drowsy driving 6 = Expansion 7 = _____ 8 = _____ 9 = _____
Other topic 2	_____

Variable	Levels
Specific use of funds 1	T = Television R = Radio N = Newspaper (including press releases)/magazine/public printed media P = Other print media, e.g., mailings, pamphlets, posters M = Meeting/symposium/training session/meals L = Lobbying visits and/or telephone calls (direct efforts rather than distribution of printed materials) W = Letter writing campaign C = Press conference I = Internet/Web sites D = Database development/maintenance A = Awards programs and contests E = Employee programs G = Planning Q = Purchase equipment, e.g., PBTs F = Film/movie theater H = 800 number or equivalent
Specific use of funds 2	—
Specific use of funds 3	—
Specific use of funds 4	—
Specific use of funds 5	—
Specific use of funds 6	—
Project <i>measured</i> impact (objective project reporting)	+ = Positive (project documented desired result) 0 = Neutral (project was evaluated but showed no change) - = Negative (project showed counterproductive result) N = No evaluation P = Incomplete/pending

Variable	Levels
Type of project evaluation measure	S = Survey/questionnaire F = Focus groups B = Behavioral observations C = Crash-based A = Anecdotal N = None
Project <i>judged</i> impact (subjective project reporting)	+ = Positive 0 = Neutral - = Negative N = No assessment given
Judged impact <i>potential</i> (by Dunlap analyst)	+ = Positive 0 = Neutral - = Negative ? = Unknown or too early to assess
Judged duration of the impact (by Dunlap analyst) only if + or - on judged impact	S = Short-term (likely to extinguish quickly after project end) M = Medium term (might last up to one year after project end) L = Long-term (could last more than a year after project end)
Estimated extent of process outreach	W = Widespread M = Moderate L = Limited

APPENDIX B

PROJECT SUMMARY DATA BY STATE

1. Total and Average Project Expenditures by State
2. State by State Project Summary

A few points of clarification should help the reader understand the tables generated in this section. First, the term “fund year” refers to the year in which GM granted the program funding. In some cases, individual programs chose to earmark some funding for future efforts. It is therefore possible that funding received from GM was not entirely spent during the “fund year.”

Second, as part of the generation of this report, Dunlap and Associates, Inc., attempted to contact every program that was awarded funding in the fifth year of the GM grant period (1999). The goal of this effort was to determine if these programs were still in existence in 2007-2008, and, if so, whether they were following the same objectives for which they received GM funding. Programs that were either unable to be contacted or were otherwise incapable or reluctant to attest to the program’s current status are denoted by question marks (“?”) in the State-by-State Project Summary table. In some special circumstances, programs that were contacted identified themselves as no longer in existence in the same form as they were in 1999, but also as continuing their dedication to the same or very similar objectives. These programs are labeled with an “N” in the “Still Exist?” column, and a “Y” in the “Same Objectives?” column.

Table B-1. Total and Average Project Expenditures by State

State	Total Grants	Average Grant	Number of Grants
Multi	\$275,000.00	\$91,666.67	3
AL	\$100,000.00	\$33,333.33	3
AR	\$50,000.00	\$25,000.00	2
AZ	\$187,500.00	\$37,500.00	5
CA	\$32,500.00	\$16,250.00	2
CO	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	1
CT	\$152,500.00	\$21,785.71	7
DC	\$905,000.00	\$90,500.00	10
DE	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	1
FL	\$645,000.00	\$64,500.00	10
GA	\$255,000.00	\$42,500.00	6
HI	\$90,000.00	\$45,000.00	2
IA	\$390,000.00	\$78,000.00	5
ID	\$60,000.00	\$30,000.00	2
IL	\$580,000.00	\$52,727.27	11
IN	\$560,000.00	\$80,000.00	7
KS	\$115,000.00	\$57,500.00	2
KY	\$377,500.00	\$47,187.50	8
LA	\$202,000.00	\$25,250.00	8
MA	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	1
MD	\$299,500.00	\$59,900.00	5
ME	\$70,000.00	\$35,000.00	2
MI	\$577,500.00	\$57,750.00	10
MN	\$355,000.00	\$50,714.29	7
MO	\$55,000.00	\$18,333.33	3
MS	\$122,500.00	\$20,416.67	6
MT	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	1
NC	\$202,500.00	\$40,500.00	5
ND	\$120,000.00	\$30,000.00	4
NE	\$40,000.00	\$20,000.00	2
NH	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	1

Table B-1. Total and Average Project Expenditures by State			
State	Total Grants	Average Grant	Number of Grants
NJ	\$85,000.00	\$21,250.00	4
NM	\$350,000.00	\$50,000.00	7
NV	\$225,000.00	\$45,000.00	5
NY	\$200,000.00	\$33,333.33	6
OH	\$47,500.00	\$23,750.00	2
OK	\$376,000.00	\$75,200.00	5
OR	\$420,000.00	\$105,000.00	4
PA	\$40,000.00	\$20,000.00	2
RI	\$65,000.00	\$21,666.67	3
SC	\$422,500.00	\$38,409.09	11
TN	\$55,000.00	\$18,333.33	3
TX	\$1,040,000.00	\$94,545.45	11
UT	\$182,500.00	\$30,416.67	6
VA	\$50,000.00	\$12,500.00	4
VT	\$40,000.00	\$20,000.00	2
WA	\$292,500.00	\$41,785.71	7
WI	\$380,000.00	\$42,222.22	9
WV	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	1
Total	\$11,230,000.00	\$47,991.45	234

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
Multi	Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)	95	\$200,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	No	Yes		
Multi	Techniques for Effective Alcohol Management (TEAM)	97	\$50,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	No	No		
Multi	Techniques for Effective Alcohol Management (TEAM)	95	\$25,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	No	No		
AL	Alabama Safekids Campaign	97	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
AL	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Alabama State Office	96	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
AL	Southeast Child Safety Institute (Alabama)	96	\$45,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes		
AR	Arkansas Seat Belt Coalition	96	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
AR	MADD Arkansas State Office	99	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Y	Y
AZ	Arizona DUI Task force	95	\$65,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
AZ	Arizona DUI Task force	96	\$30,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
AZ	Arizona Governor's Office of Highway Safety	98	\$50,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
AZ	Arizona SADD (Students Against Driving Drunk)	95	\$22,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
AZ	MADD - Arizona State Organization	98	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	No		
CA	California Safe Roads	96	\$12,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	No		
CA	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - California State Organization	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	Yes		
CO	Colorado MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving)	95	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
CT	American Academy of Pediatrics; Connecticut Chapter	98	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	No	No		
CT	Connecticut Childhood Injury Prevention Center	95	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	No	Yes		
CT	Drugs Don't Work!, The Governor's Partnership (Connecticut)	97	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	Yes		
CT	Hezekiah Beardsley Connecticut Chapter of The American Academy of Pediatrics	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	No	No		
CT	MADD - Connecticut	95	\$12,500.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
CT	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Connecticut State Office	96	\$5,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
CT	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Connecticut State Office	97	\$10,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
DC	D.C. Safe Kids Campaign	96	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
DC	D.C. Safe Kids Coalition	99	\$60,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
DC	D.C. Safe Kids Coalition/The George Washington University Center for Injury Prevention and Control/The Metropolitan Police Department	98	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes		
DC	District of Columbia Safe Kids Coalition	97	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
DC	National Safe Kids Campaign	98	\$75,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	No	No	Yes	No		
DC	National Safety Council	97	\$85,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	No	Yes	No	No		
DC	Network of Employers for Traffic Safety(NETS)	97	\$200,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	No	No	Yes	No		
DC	Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS)	95	\$150,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
DC	Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS)	98	\$150,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	No	No	Yes	No		
DC	Washington (D.C.) Regional Alcohol Program	97	\$35,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	Yes		
DE	Delaware Office of Highway Safety	98	\$20,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
FL	Chiefs Challenge Award Program of the International Association of Chiefs of Police	97	\$10,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
FL	Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles	95	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
FL	Florida Highway Patrol	96	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
FL	Florida Highway Patrol	97	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
FL	Florida Highway Patrol	98	\$90,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
FL	Florida MADD	95	\$10,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
FL	Florida Seat Belt Alliance	95	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
FL	Florida Seat Belt Alliance	96	\$45,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
FL	Lifesavers Conference, Inc.	96	\$25,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
FL	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Florida State Office	96	\$10,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
GA	Children and Youth Coordinating Council, Office of the Governor, Georgia	97	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
GA	Georgia Arrive Alive	95	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
GA	Georgia Coalition for Driver Safety	98	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
GA	Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety	98	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
GA	<i>Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Georgia State Office</i>	97	\$20,000.00	<i>Support of State Safety Legislation</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>		
GA	<i>SAFE KIDS of Georgia</i>	99	\$25,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Y</i>
HI	<i>Keiki Injury Prevention Coalition and SAFE KIDS Hawaii</i>	99	\$75,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>?</i>
HI	<i>Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Honolulu (Hawaii) Chapter</i>	96	\$15,000.00	<i>Support of State Safety Legislation</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>		
IA	<i>Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau</i>	95	\$75,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		
IA	<i>Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau</i>	96	\$140,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		
IA	<i>Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau</i>	97	\$70,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		
IA	<i>Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau</i>	98	\$65,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		
IA	<i>Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau</i>	99	\$40,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Y</i>
ID	<i>Magic Valley and Treasure Valley (Idaho) SAFE KIDS Coalitions</i>	99	\$50,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>?</i>
ID	<i>Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Idaho State Office</i>	97	\$10,000.00	<i>Support of State Safety Legislation</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		
IL	<i>American Academy of Pediatrics</i>	95	\$25,000.00	<i>Support of Safety Organizations</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		
IL	<i>American Academy of Pediatrics</i>	96	\$25,000.00	<i>Support of Safety Organizations</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
IL	American Academy of Pediatrics	97	\$25,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	No	No	Yes	No		
IL	Illinois Department of Transportation	97	\$100,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
IL	Illinois Division of Traffic Safety	95	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
IL	Illinois Division of Traffic Safety	96	\$100,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
IL	Illinois MADD	95	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
IL	Illinois Safe Kids Coalition	98	\$70,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
IL	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Illinois State Office	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
IL	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Illinois State Office	97	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
IL	National Safety Council	98	\$40,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
IN	Indiana Criminal Justice Institute	96	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
IN	Indiana Criminal Justice Institute	97	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
IN	Indiana Criminal Justice Institute	98	\$100,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
IN	Indiana Criminal Justice Institute	99	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	?	?

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
IN	Indiana Safe Kids	98	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
IN	Indiana University	99	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes	?	?
IN	MADD Indiana State Office	99	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	Yes	?	?
KS	Kansas Seat Belt Education Office	97	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
KS	Kansas Seat Belt Education Office	98	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
KY	Kentucky Safe Kids Coalition	99	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No	?	?
KY	Kentucky State Police	95	\$95,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
KY	Kentucky State Police	96	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
KY	Kentucky State Police	97	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes		
KY	MADD Kentucky	95	\$22,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	No		
KY	MADD Kentucky State Office	99	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No	N	Y
KY	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Kentucky State Office	96	\$20,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
KY	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Kentucky State Office	97	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
LA	Louisiana Highway Safety Commission	96	\$19,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
LA	Louisiana Seat Belt Use Coalition	95	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes		
LA	Louisiana Seat Belt Use Coalition	97	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
LA	Louisiana Seat Belt Use Coalition	98	\$35,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
LA	Louisiana Seat Belt Use Coalition	99	\$20,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No	?	?
LA	MADD Louisiana State Office	98	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	No	No		
LA	MADD Louisiana State Office	99	\$3,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	No	Yes	?	?
LA	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Louisiana State Office	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
MA	Students Against Destructive Decisions (SADD)	98	\$25,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	No	No	No	No		
MD	MADD Maryland State Office	98	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
MD	MADD Maryland State Office	99	\$22,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	No	N	N

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
MD	Maryland Committee for Seat Belt Use	95	\$32,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
MD	Maryland Committee for Seat Belt Use	97	\$135,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
MD	Maryland Committee for Seat Belt Use	98	\$80,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
ME	Maine Coalition for Safe Kids	97	\$25,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
ME	Maine Transportation Safety Coalition	98	\$45,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
MI	MADD Michigan State Organization	99	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	Yes	Y	Y
MI	Michigan SAFE KIDS	99	\$60,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
MI	Mississippi Division of Public Safety Planning	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	No	No		
MI	Traffic Safety Association of Michigan	96	\$50,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
MI	Traffic Safety Association of Michigan	96	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
MI	Traffic Safety Association of Michigan	97	\$100,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
MI	Traffic Safety Association of Michigan	98	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
MI	Traffic Safety Association of Michigan	99	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No	?	?
MI	Traffic Safety Association of Michigan / Michigan Seat Belt Coalition	95	\$37,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
MI	Traffic Safety Association of Michigan / Office of Highway Safety Planning	95	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
MN	MADD Minnesota State Office	98	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
MN	MADD Minnesota State Office	99	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No	?	?
MN	Minnesota Department of Public Safety	96	\$80,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
MN	Minnesota Department of Public Safety	97	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
MN	Minnesota Department of Public Safety	99	\$60,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
MN	Minnesota Safety Council	96	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
MN	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Minnesota State Office	97	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
MO	MADD Missouri State Office	98	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
MO	MADD Missouri State Office	99	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No	?	?
MO	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Missouri State Office	97	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
MS	Coalition for Citizens with Disabilities and Mississippi Safekids Coalition	97	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
MS	Coalition for Citizens with Disabilities and The Mississippi Safe Kids Campaign	99	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes	?	?
MS	MADD Mississippi State Office	98	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	Yes		
MS	MADD Mississippi State Office	99	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No	?	?
MS	Mississippi Division of Public Safety Planning, Office of Highway Safety	95	\$22,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
MS	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Mississippi State Office	97	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
MT	Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies, the Montana Coalition and Montana's SAFE KIDS Campaign	99	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	Yes	No	?	?
NC	AAA Carolinas	97	\$50,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
NC	AAA Carolinas (North Carolina)	98	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
NC	North Carolina Governor's Highway Safety Program	95	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes		
NC	North Carolina Passenger Safety Association	95	\$22,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	No	No		
NC	North Carolina Passenger Safety Association	96	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
ND	North Dakota Nurses Association	95	\$35,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
ND	North Dakota Nurses Association	96	\$25,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
ND	North Dakota Peace Officers Association	98	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
ND	North Dakota Peace Officers Association	99	\$20,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	No	Yes	Y	Y
NE	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Nebraska State Office	97	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
NE	Project Extra Mile (Nebraska)	99	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	Yes	Y	Y
NH	Trustees of Dartmouth College (New Hampshire)	98	\$10,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	Yes	No		
NJ	Brain Injury Association of New Jersey	98	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
NJ	MADD New Jersey State Office	98	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
NJ	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - New Jersey State Office	96	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
NJ	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - New Jersey State Office	97	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	No		
NM	Lifesavers Conference, Inc.	95	\$25,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
NM	Safer New Mexico Now	95	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
NM	Safer New Mexico Now	96	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
NM	Safer New Mexico Now	97	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
NM	Safer New Mexico Now	98	\$60,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
NM	Safer New Mexico Now	99	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No	?	?
NM	Safer New Mexico Now and The Safekids Coalition	98	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
NV	Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety	96	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
NV	Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety	97	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
NV	Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety	98	\$25,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
NV	Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety	99	\$50,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	?	?
NV	Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety - Office of Traffic Safety	95	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
NY	Capital Region Safe Kids Coalition	99	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No	?	?
NY	MADD - New York	95	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
NY	MADD New York State Office	98	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
NY	MADD New York State Office	99	\$10,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No	Y	Y
NY	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - New York State Office	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	Yes		
NY	New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee	98	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	Yes		
OH	Lifesavers Conference, Inc.	97	\$30,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
OH	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Ohio State Office	96	\$17,500.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
OK	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Oklahoma State Organization	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
OK	S.A.F.E. (Seatbelts are for Everyone) In Oklahoma	97	\$160,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
OK	<i>S.A.F.E. (Seatbelts are for Everyone) In Oklahoma Coalition</i>	96	\$31,000.00	<i>Support of State Safety Legislation</i>	No	No	Yes	No		
OK	<i>S.A.F.E. In Oklahoma</i>	98	\$90,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	No	No	Yes	Yes		
OK	<i>S.A.F.E. On Oklahoma (Seatbelts are for Everyone)</i>	99	\$75,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No	?	?
OR	<i>Oregon Department of Transportation</i>	96	\$140,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
OR	<i>Oregon Department of Transportation</i>	97	\$140,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
OR	<i>Oregon Department of Transportation</i>	98	\$70,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
OR	<i>Oregon Department of Transportation</i>	99	\$70,000.00	<i>Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws</i>	Yes	No	No	Yes	Y	Y

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
PA	MADD – Pennsylvania	95	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
PA	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Pennsylvania State Office	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
RI	MADD Rhode Island State Office	98	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
RI	MADD Rhode Island State Office	99	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No	N	Y
RI	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Rhode Island State Office	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
SC	MADD - South Carolina	95	\$42,500.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
SC	MADD South Carolina State Office	98	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
SC	MADD South Carolina State Office	99	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No	?	?
SC	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - South Carolina State Office	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
SC	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - South Carolina State Office	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
SC	South Carolina Department of Public Safety	95	\$95,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
SC	South Carolina Department of Public Safety	96	\$75,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
SC	South Carolina Safe Kids Coalition	96	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
SC	South Carolina Safe Kids Coalition	97	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
SC	South Carolina Safe Kids Coalition	98	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
SC	South Carolina Safe Kids Coalition	99	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No	Y	Y
TN	MADD Tennessee State Office	99	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	?	?
TN	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Tennessee State Office	97	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
TN	SAFE KIDS of Tennessee	99	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No	Y	Y
TX	MADD Texas State Office	98	\$30,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
TX	MADD Texas State Office	99	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No	Y	Y
TX	Mothers Against Drunk Driving	96	\$200,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	No	Yes		
TX	Mothers Against Drunk Driving	97	\$200,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
TX	Mothers Against Drunk Driving	98	\$200,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	No	No		
TX	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Texas State Office	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	No	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
TX	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Texas State Office	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
TX	Texas Department of Health	97	\$100,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
TX	Texas Department of Transportation	96	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
TX	Texas Department of Transportation	98	\$90,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
TX	Texas Department of Transportation - Traffic Operations Division	95	\$140,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
UT	Coalition for Utah Traffic Safety	99	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	Yes	No	?	?
UT	International Association of Chiefs of Police	98	\$7,500.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
UT	Utah Department of Public Safety	96	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
UT	Utah Department of Public Safety	97	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
UT	Utah Highway Patrol	95	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
UT	Utah Safety Council	97	\$20,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
VA	International Association of Chiefs of Police Chief's Challenge Program	96	\$10,000.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
VA	MADD Virginia State	98	\$10,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
VA	MADD Virginia State Office	99	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
VA	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Virginia State	97	\$10,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	No		
VT	Fletcher Allen Safekids Fund (Vermont) Vermont Safekids Coalition	98	\$15,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	Yes	Yes	No		
VT	Vermont Governor's Highway Safety Program	99	\$25,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No	Y	Y
WA	Lifesavers Conference, Inc.	98	\$37,500.00	Support of Safety Organizations	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
WA	MADD Washington State Office	99	\$25,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No	Y	Y
WA	MADD-Washington State Office	98	\$25,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
WA	Washington State Safety Restraint Coalition	99	\$40,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No	Y	Y
WA	Washington Traffic Safety Commission	96	\$40,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	No		
WA	Washington Traffic Safety Commission	97	\$80,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	No	No		
WA	Washington Traffic Safety Commission	98	\$45,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		

Table B-2. State-by-State Project Summary

STATE	AGENCY	FUND YEAR	Grant Amount	Primary PI&E	Alcohol Topic?	Licensing Topic?	SafetyBelt/Helmet Topic?	Other Topic?	Still Exist?	Same Objectives?
WI	MADD Wisconsin State Office	99	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No	Y	Y
WI	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Wisconsin State Office	96	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		
WI	Mothers Against Drunk Driving - Wisconsin State Office	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	No	Yes		
WI	Wisconsin Department of Transportation	98	\$50,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No		
WI	Wisconsin Department of Transportation Bureau of Transportation Safety	96	\$100,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	No		
WI	Wisconsin Office of Transportation Safety	95	\$100,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
WI	Wisconsin Safe Kids Coalition	97	\$20,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
WI	Wisconsin Safe Kids Coalition	99	\$25,000.00	Support of Enforcement of State Safety Laws	No	No	Yes	No	Y	Y
WI	Wisconsin Safekids Coalition	98	\$25,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	No	No	Yes	Yes		
WV	West Virginia Safety Council	96	\$35,000.00	Support of State Safety Legislation	Yes	No	Yes	No		

DOT HS 811 223
October 2009



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

