The State of Indiana

Fiscal Year 2006

Highway Safety Plan
August 31, 2005

Mr. Donald J. McNamara
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Great Lakes Region
19900 Governor’s Drive, Suite 201
Olympia Fields, Illinois, 60461

Dear Mr. McNamara:

Enclosed you will find copies of Indiana’s 2006 planning document and traffic safety action plan for your information. When and if Incentive funding becomes available, we will revise our traffic safety plan accordingly to address Indiana’s traffic safety concerns.

We anticipate a very exciting and productive year in Indiana, and we look forward to a strong working partnership with the NHTSA Great Lakes Region Staff.

Thank you for your past and continued support of the State of Indiana’s Highway Safety Office and staff.

Sincerely,

Ms. Katalina Gullans
Deputy Director, Programs and Research
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
1 North Capitol Avenue, Suite 1000
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Enclosures

cc: FHWA Division Office
STATE CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES

Failure to comply with applicable Federal statutes, regulations and directives may subject State officials to civil or criminal penalties and/or place the State in a high risk grantee status in accordance with 49 CFR §18.12.

Each fiscal year the State will sign these Certifications and Assurances that the State complies with all applicable Federal statutes, regulations, and directives in effect with respect to the periods for which it receives grant funding. Applicable provisions include, but not limited to, the following:

- 23 U.S.C. Chapter 4 - Highway Safety Act of 1966, as amended;
- 49 CFR Part 18 - Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments
- 49 CFR Part 19 - Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Nonprofit Organizations
- 23 CFR Chapter II - (§§1200, 1205, 1206, 1250, 1251, & 1252) Regulations governing highway safety programs
- NHTSA Order 462-6C - Matching Rates for State and Community Highway Safety Programs
- Highway Safety Grant Funding Policy for Field-Administered Grants
CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES

The Governor is responsible for the administration of the State highway safety program through a State highway safety agency which has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized (as evidenced by appropriate oversight procedures governing such areas as procurement, financial administration, and the use, management, and disposition of equipment) to carry out the program (23 USC 402(b) (1) (A));

The political subdivisions of this State are authorized, as part of the State highway safety program, to carry out within their jurisdictions local highway safety programs which have been approved by the Governor and are in accordance with the uniform guidelines promulgated by the Secretary of Transportation (23 USC 402(b) (1) (B));

At least 40 per cent of all Federal funds apportioned to this State under 23 USC 402 for this fiscal year will be expended by or for the benefit of the political subdivision of the State in carrying out local highway safety programs (23 USC 402(b) (1) (C)), unless this requirement is waived in writing;

The State will implement activities in support of national highway safety goals to reduce motor vehicle related fatalities that also reflect the primary data-related crash factors within the State as identified by the State highway safety planning process, including:

- National law enforcement mobilizations,
- Sustained enforcement of statutes addressing impaired driving, occupant protection, and driving in excess of posted speed limits,
- An annual statewide safety belt use survey in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary for the measurement of State safety belt use rates to ensure that the measurements are accurate and representative,
- Development of statewide data systems to provide timely and effective data analysis to support allocation of highway safety resources.

The State shall actively encourage all relevant law enforcement agencies in the State to follow the
GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED FOR VEHICULAR PURSUITS ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN EFFECT.

This State's highway safety program provides adequate and reasonable access for the safe and convenient movement of physically handicapped persons, including those in wheelchairs, across curbs constructed or replaced on or after July 1, 1976, at all pedestrian crosswalks (23 USC 402(b) (1) (D));

Cash draw downs will be initiated only when actually needed for disbursement, cash disbursements and balances will be reported in a timely manner as required by NHTSA, and the same standards of timing and amount, including the reporting of cash disbursement and balances, will be imposed upon any secondary recipient organizations (49 CFR 18.20, 18.21, and 18.41). Failure to adhere to these provisions may result in the termination of drawdown privileges);

The State has submitted appropriate documentation for review to the single point of contact designated by the Governor to review Federal programs, as required by Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs);

Equipment acquired under this agreement for use in highway safety program areas shall be used and kept in operation for highway safety purposes by the State; or the State, by formal agreement with appropriate officials of a political subdivision or State agency, shall cause such equipment to be used and kept in operation for highway safety purposes (23 CFR 1200.21);

The State will comply with all applicable State procurement procedures and will maintain a financial management system that complies with the minimum requirements of 49 CFR 18.20;

The State highway safety agency will comply with all Federal statutes and implementing regulations relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin (and 49 CFR Part 21); (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which
prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps (and 49 CFR Part 27); (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse of alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

**The Drug-free Workplace Act of 1988**

*(49 CFR Part 29 Sub-part F):*

The State will provide a drug-free workplace by:

a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee’s workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

b) Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.

2) The grantee’s policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace.
3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs.

4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug violations occurring in the workplace.

c) Making it a requirement that each employee engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a).

d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:

   1) Abide by the terms of the statement.

   2) Notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction.

 e) Notifying the agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction.

f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d) (2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

   1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination.

   2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.

g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of
Paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) above.

**BUY AMERICA ACT**

The State will comply with the provisions of the Buy America Act (23 USC 101 Note) which contains the following requirements:

Only steel, iron and manufactured products produced in the United States may be purchased with Federal funds unless the Secretary of Transportation determines that such domestic purchases would be inconsistent with the public interest; that such materials are not reasonably available and of a satisfactory quality; or that inclusion of domestic materials will increase the cost of the overall project contract by more than 25 percent. Clear justification for the purchase of non-domestic items must be in the form of a waiver request submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

**POLITICAL ACTIVITY**

*(HATCH ACT)*

The State will comply with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1508 and implementing regulations of 5 CFR Part 151, concerning "Political Activity of State or Local Offices, or Employees".

**CERTIFICATION REGARDING FEDERAL LOBBYING**

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of
Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-award at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grant, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

**RESTRICTION ON STATE LOBBYING**

None of the funds under this program will be used for any activity specifically designed to urge or influence a State or local legislator to favor or oppose the adoption of any specific legislative proposal pending before any State or local legislative body. Such activities include both direct and indirect (e.g., "grassroots") lobbying activities, with one exception.

This does not preclude a State official whose salary is supported with NHTSA funds from engaging in
direct communications with State or local legislative officials, in accordance with customary State practice, even if such communications urge legislative officials to favor or oppose the adoption of a specific pending legislative proposal.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRIMARY CERTIFICATION

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the certification set out below.

2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency’s determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.

3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department or agency to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

5. The terms covered transaction, debarred, suspended, ineligible, lower tier covered transaction, participant, person, primary covered transaction,
PRINCIPAL, PROPOSAL, AND VOLUNTARILY EXCLUDED, AS USED IN THIS CLAUSE, HAVE THE MEANING SET OUT IN THE DEFINITIONS AND COVERAGE SECTIONS OF 49 CFR PART 29. YOU MAY CONTACT THE DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY TO WHICH THIS PROPOSAL IS BEING SUBMITTED FOR ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING A COPY OF THOSE REGULATIONS.

6. THE PROSPECTIVE PRIMARY PARTICIPANT AGREES BY SUBMITTING THIS PROPOSAL THAT, SHOULD THE PROPOSED COVERED TRANSACTION BE ENTERED INTO, IT SHALL NOT KNOWINGLY ENTER INTO ANY LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTION WITH A PERSON WHO IS PROPOSED FOR DEBARMENT UNDER 48 CFR PART 9, SUBPART 9.4, DEBARRED, SUSPENDED, DECLARED INELIGIBLE, OR VOLUNTARILY EXCLUDED FROM PARTICIPATION IN THIS COVERED TRANSACTION, UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY THE DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY ENTERING INTO THIS TRANSACTION.

7. THE PROSPECTIVE PRIMARY PARTICIPANT FURTHER AGREES BY SUBMITTING THIS PROPOSAL THAT IT WILL INCLUDE THE CLAUSE TITLED "CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION - LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTION," PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY ENTERING INTO THIS COVERED TRANSACTION, WITHOUT MODIFICATION, IN ALL LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS AND IN ALL SOLICITATIONS FOR LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS.

8. A PARTICIPANT IN A COVERED TRANSACTION MAY RELY UPON A CERTIFICATION OF A PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANT IN A LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTION THAT IT IS NOT PROPOSED FOR DEBARMENT UNDER 48 CFR PART 9, SUBPART 9.4, DEBARRED, SUSPENDED, INELIGIBLE, OR VOLUNTARILY EXCLUDED FROM THE COVERED TRANSACTION, UNLESS IT KNOWS THAT THE CERTIFICATION IS ERRONEOUS. A PARTICIPANT MAY DECIDE THE METHOD AND FREQUENCY BY WHICH IT DETERMINES THE ELIGIBILITY OF ITS PRINCIPALS. EACH PARTICIPANT MAY, BUT IS NOT REQUIRED TO, CHECK THE LIST OF PARTIES EXCLUDED FROM FEDERAL PROCUREMENT AND NON-PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS.

9. NOTHING CONTAINED IN THE FOREGOING SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO REQUIRE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SYSTEM OF RECORDS IN ORDER TO RENDER IN GOOD FAITH THE CERTIFICATION REQUIRED BY THIS CLAUSE. THE KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION OF A PARTICIPANT IS NOT REQUIRED TO EXCEED THAT WHICH IS NORMALLY POSSESSED BY A PRUDENT PERSON IN THE ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS DEALINGS.
10. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 6 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters-Primary Covered Transactions

(1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of record, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or Local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or Local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the Statements in this
CERTIFICATION, SUCH PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANT SHALL ATTACH AN EXPLANATION TO THIS PROPOSAL.

**Instructions for Lower Tier Certification**

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.

2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

4. The terms *covered transaction*, *debarred*, *suspended*, *ineligible*, *lower tier covered transaction*, *participant*, *person*, *primary covered transaction*, *principal*, *proposal*, and *voluntarily excluded*, as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definition and Coverage sections of 49 CFR Part 29. You may contact the person to whom this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.

5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.

6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that is it will include
the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transaction," without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions. (See below)

7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.

8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.

9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR Part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions:

1. The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
2. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety has reviewed the State’s Fiscal Year 2006 highway safety planning document and hereby declares that no significant environmental impact will result from implementing this Highway Safety Plan. If, under a future revision, this Plan will be modified in such a manner that a project would be instituted that could affect environmental quality to the extent that a review and statement would be necessary, this office is prepared to take the action necessary to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 USC 4321 et seq.) and the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR Parts 1500-1517).

____________________
Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety

____________________
Date
FY 2006 Indiana Problem Identification

Crash Data Status: The development of a meaningful Problem Identification (PI) is highly dependent upon the availability of current and accurate crash data. With the introduction of a new crash form in March 2002 and the high speed scanning/data processing capabilities in January 2003, the expectation was that Indiana in subsequent Highway Safety Plans would be able to present not only current data but also accurate data. The system continues to be day current in data entry, has introduced a “Street Smarts” drawing package, and has a valuable mapping tool associated with the database. The electronic version of the crash report was released in October 2003 and now accounts for approximately 35 percent of the crash reports received by the Indiana State Police (ISP). However, the quality of the data in the database continues to be critically flawed, such that an accurate assessment of the non-fatal crashes cannot yet be conducted. The data and analyses presented in this PI are primarily based upon preliminary 2004 Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) data which is a highly reliable database. Only limited details have been released to the state at this time. For this reason, the most recent year that contains imputed alcohol results is 2003 and non-fatal data may only show results through the year 2000.

The state has, however, taken an aggressive approach in the first half of 2005 to address data quality. Through the Indiana Traffic Records Committee and its members, a list of potential business edits has been developed and prioritized. These prioritized edits have been provided to the ISP. A listing of minimum and maximum data entries (for scanned data elements) and recommendations to change selected data fields from a text base to a numeric base also has been provided to the State Police Records Division. It is expected that these edits will be incorporated into both the electronic form and the ISP data entry process in the fall of 2005. The last quarter of 2005 will be used to gain operating experience with these edits both from an enforcement and data entry perspective. The goal then is to operate under the conditions and rules of these business edits as of January 1, 2006. While a smooth transition is desired, it is recognized that at least in the short term, there will be challenges to overcome. Over the next 4–6 months, there will be an active campaign with chiefs of police and sheriffs to obtain their understanding of the importance and criticalness of quality data and also emphasize the value of electronic reporting. It is planned to perform routine monitoring during the next year to identify and resolve potential conflicts at the necessary levels.

The FY 2006 Indiana Problem Identification was compiled using preliminary 2004 FARS and its currently available data. Again, the most recent imputed alcohol data is for 2003 and 2000 represents the most current year for non-fatal crashes.

Problem Identification: After a record-setting year of only 792 fatalities in 2002, during 2003 the number of fatalities in Indiana jumped dramatically to 834, and most recently to 947 in 2004. The five-year period of 2000-2004 averaged 874 fatalities per year, while
the five-year period of 1995-1999 averaged 976 fatalities per year representing an average of 102 fewer fatalities each year during the most recent five-year period as compared to 1995-1999.

Included in the 947 fatalities for 2004 are increases in pedestrian, motorcyclist and bicyclist fatalities. Specifically, pedestrian fatalities increased from 62 in 2003 to 73 in 2004 (a 17.7 percent increase) and bicyclist fatalities increased from 7 in 2003 to 13 in 2004 (an 85.7 percent increase). Motorcyclist fatalities increased 33.3 percent, climbing from 81 in 2003 to 108 in 2004. Indiana’s 108 motorcycle related fatalities in 2004 represents the highest year for more than a decade and accounts for 11.4 percent of Indiana’s total 2004 fatalities, higher than the projected 9.1 percent national average\(^1\).

The actual number of vehicle miles traveled for 2004 is not yet available from the Indiana Department of Transportation. Consequently, an estimated two percent increase was made to the 2003 VMT rate in order to provide a projected fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (100 MVMT) rate. During 2004 Indiana’s estimated fatality rate per 100 MVMT was 1.25, an increase from the 1.12 as reported in 2003. Indiana’s fatality rate per 100 MVMT continues to be substantially lower than the national average (1.48 for 2004).

After two years of having a fatality rate per 100,000 population below the national rate, Indiana’s rate increased to 15.18 motor vehicle fatalities per 100,000 population, compared to the national rate of 14.69 per 100,000 population.

Consistent with the decrease in the number of fatalities in the five most recent years, safety belt usage rates have shown substantial increases when comparing the most recent five-year period to the previous five-year period. Certainly a major factor in the increase was the passage of the primary safety belt law in 1998. The primary safety belt law applies to all front seat passengers of passenger vehicles. However, pickup trucks continue to be excluded from Indiana’s primary law, as are other passenger vehicles when plated as a truck (such as station wagons, vans, minivans, and sport utility vehicles).

Each year observational safety belt use studies are conducted to determine usage rates throughout the state. As a result of the pickup truck exemption, there is a substantial difference in the observed usage rates between passenger cars at 88.4 percent and pickup trucks at 56.0 percent, as reported in the 2005 results. Although the 2005 overall usage rate of 81.2 percent for all passenger vehicles falls within the survey’s three percent margin of error, still it is slightly less than the 2004 overall usage rate of 83.4 percent which represented a record-breaking high usage rate for the state. The challenge that the state faces in determining the actual percentage of safety restraint use is convoluted by the fact that license plate information is not captured at the time of observation data collection. This is an important factor considering more and more vans, sport utility vehicles.

---

\(^1\) 2004 national motorcyclist fatalities of 3,927 are based upon the 2004 Projections for Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Fatalities and Injuries as of April 21, 2005. The national motorcyclist fatality rate is calculated using the preliminary fatality number of 43,130 as provided by FARS.
vehicles, and minivans are being plated as trucks, thereby spreading the gap between best safety practice and remaining within the letter of the law.

Indiana Crash Data

Table 1: Crash Statistics Changes, 1995-2004

This table presents a comprehensive overview of Indiana crashes. As indicated in the “Crash Data Section,” Indiana has undergone major changes, both in the crash report and the data entry process and will continue to undergo change. A critical gap remains with the 2001 and 2002 data showing substantially fewer crashes than would be anticipated. A critical data element in evaluating crashes is that the crash occurred on public roadways and not on Department of Natural Resources property or on private property. Unfortunately, in the conversion of the data from the old crash form to the new database, this particular field was not captured, and these three types of crash locations can not be separated. In FY2006, an attempt will be made to review selected and limited fields (from the old crash form) and incorporate into the new database to enhance the trending capabilities for future years.

The “all crashes” definition has been changed with the preparation of the 2004 PI. Previously, “all crashes” included not only those reported to ISP (completed on the Standard Officer’s Crash Form), but also those crashes that were only reported on the SR-21 form. The SR-21 is completed by the driver and insurance company only. Annually there are approximately 30,000–35,000 crashes where a law enforcement officer has not investigated the crash and only the SR-21 exists for the crash. Prior to the introduction of the new crash reporting system, the SR-21 crashes were included in the ISP database. Since these are no longer being captured in the database, the SR-21 reported crashes have been removed for the years 1995-2000 to allow for more congruent comparisons between the most recent years and the earlier years. Historically, the SR-21 crashes consisted principally of property damage only crashes, did not include any fatal crashes, and generally accounted for fewer than ten personal injury crashes on an annual basis. However, because the SR-21 crashes represent about 15 percent of the total reported crashes, statistics such as the percentage of alcohol-involved crashes will increase slightly as a result of this change.

Note:

Due to the unresolved problems existing in the current ISP database and the unavailability of 2004 FARS data (especially surrounding alcohol-involved fatalities), the data that is provided in this and subsequent tables and figures represent the most current and verifiable data available. As a result, the tables and figures do not encompass the same time frames and for some, the year 2000 represents the most recently available information.
## Indiana Crash Statistic Changes, 1995-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Crashes</td>
<td>203,069</td>
<td>185,821</td>
<td>187,212</td>
<td>186,170</td>
<td>190,399</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>174,583</td>
<td>175,248</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Injury Crashes</td>
<td>52,277</td>
<td>49,521</td>
<td>49,664</td>
<td>49,191</td>
<td>47,926</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40,455</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related Crashes</td>
<td>9,995</td>
<td>9,777</td>
<td>9,544</td>
<td>9,508</td>
<td>9,072</td>
<td>8,901</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries (Incapacitating)</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>6,558</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>6,361</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>5,951</td>
<td>5,642</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities and Serious Injuries (combined)</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>7,343</td>
<td>7,161</td>
<td>6,837</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related Fatalities</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related Fatalities as a Percent of All Fatalities</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Injuries</td>
<td>80,632</td>
<td>77,339</td>
<td>78,262</td>
<td>77,138</td>
<td>72,883</td>
<td>70,678</td>
<td>70,447</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedalcyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities and Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities per 100K Population</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities and Serious Injuries per 100K Population</td>
<td>125.83</td>
<td>129.26</td>
<td>126.41</td>
<td>124.30</td>
<td>120.50</td>
<td>107.82</td>
<td>107.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related Fatality Rate (100 million VMT)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population Using Safety belts</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Unbelted Drivers and Occupants Seriously Injured or Killed in a Crash</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Loss (Billions)</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>2.654</td>
<td>2.664</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data based upon Indiana State Police Crash Records Database as of June 2005
2. Data based upon FARS data published as of August 2004; * Data based upon FARS imputed alcohol-related crashes
3. Reported results were obtained from NHTSA and are based upon the FARS imputation model; * This number is an estimate based upon FARS
4. Source 1995 - 2004 Roadside Observational Survey of Safety Belt Use in Indiana
5. Estimated Results using a Historical Ratio of Serious Injuries to Fatalities
6. Included only Passenger Cars and Station Wagons - Pickup Trucks were Excluded from Survey

N/A = Data is currently unavailable
Highway Safety Plan Benchmarks

Each year, the Indiana State Police crash data, Fatality Analysis Reporting System data, and observational data are carefully studied and analyzed to determine the primary contributing factors to crashes and fatalities. Using these indicators, Indiana has established aggressive measures and outcome projections through the year 2010. The following indicators are also goals in some areas, reflecting that the continued introduction and reinforcement of strong countermeasure programs, introduced in recent years, will yield successful results. In other areas, the projections (based upon historical data) are not sufficient to drive the desired change, and for those areas, specific objectives are further defined.
**Benchmark 1: Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled, 1995-2004, with Projections 2005-2010**

- To decrease the state fatality rate per 100 MVMT from a baseline actual of 1.49 (984 fatalities) in 1996, to 1.25 in the year 2004 (947 actual fatalities), 1.08 in the year 2005, and 0.98 in 2008, with progress demonstrated on an annual basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Upper Limit</th>
<th>Lower Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:** The fatality rate increased once again from 1.12 per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled in 2003 to 1.25 per 100 MVMT in 2004. Nonetheless, the long term trend continues to be a gradual decrease since 1995. The state has demonstrated in past years that the potential is there to considerably lower the fatality rate, but due to the increases experienced the last two years, efforts will have to be intensified to remain on track to achieve the goals established through 2010. The green upper and lower limit bands indicate that given the current programs in place, there is a 95 percent confidence level that future years’ outcomes will be between these limits. One of the current challenges as a result of the data quality is to more specifically identify over-represented areas. For example, it is reported that nearly 2/3’s of Indiana’s fatalities occur in rural areas. It is anticipated that the technological improvements that are currently being implemented to locate crashes using GIS will ensure that future Problem Identifications will be more reliable and capable of differentiating between rural and urban crashes, therefore providing the framework for continued analysis in this area. Given the increase in the number of fatalities in 2003 and 2004, the projection made in the 2003 PI for 2005 and subsequent years has been revised upward representing a modest increase in the projections. However, Indiana continues to be on track to meet the NHTSA goal of 1.00.
by 2008.
2004 represented an increase of 113 fatalities over 2003 in Indiana, resulting in a total of 947 lives lost—the highest number since the decade high of 1,020 in 1999.

The five-year period of 2000-2004 averaged 874 fatalities per year, while the five-year period of 1995-1999 averaged 976 fatalities per year representing an average of 102 fewer fatalities each year during the most recent five-year period as compared to 1995-1999.
The 108 motorcyclist fatalities represent an alarming trend that is also occurring nationally. While the number of motorcycle license endorsements\(^2\) increased from 228,236 in 1995 to 243,887 in 2004 (a 6.9 percent increase), the number of fatalities also increased from 65 in 1995 to 108 in 2004, accounting for a 66.2 percent increase in motorcycle rider fatalities.

---

\(^2\) Motorcycle license endorsement data is from the Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles Annual Registration Statistics Report.
- The motor vehicle fatality rate per 100,000 population for 16- and 17-year-olds increased from 27.08 fatalities per 100,000 population in 2003 to 36.13 fatalities per 100,000 population in 2004, accounting for the highest increase among all of the age groups. Moreover, the 16-17-year old age group has a motor vehicle fatality rate (per 100,000 population) that is nearly two times higher than the oldest group (85+).

**Figure 3: Indiana Fatality Rates for Motor Vehicle Crashes per 100,000 Population, 2004**

**Figure 4: Fatal Crash Rates by Driver Age per 10,000 Licensed Drivers, 2003 and 2004**
The 16- and 17-year-old drivers continue to be involved in the greatest number of fatal crashes among all age groups, and their fatal crash rate increased from 7.12 per 10,000 licensed drivers (LDVR) in 2003 to 8.63 per 10,000 LDVR in 2004. The increase in 2004 in this age group is predominantly driven by the 16-year-old drivers in fatal crashes.

While the 18-24-year-old drivers do not have fatal crash rates as high as the 16-17-year-old drivers, nonetheless, they are involved in twice as many fatal crashes (per 10,000 licensed drivers) as older drivers.
Benchmark 2: 16-19 Year Old Drivers in Fatal Crashes per 10,000 Licensed Drivers, 1995-2004, with Projections 2005-2010

- To reduce the involvement rate in fatal crashes of the younger driver (age 16–19) from 7.96 fatal crashes per 10,000 licensed drivers in 1996, to 5.94 in the year 2002, 6.60 in the year 2005, and 6.43 in 2008, with progress demonstrated on an annual basis.

Analysis: After some modest success in previous years, the younger drivers’ involvement rate in fatal crashes per 10,000 licensed drivers has increased the past two years. Since Indiana’s Graduated License Law went into effect on January 1, 1999, fatal crash and fatality rates among 16-19-year-old drivers have attained measurable reductions (from 7.62 in 1999 to 6.93 in 2004), but a trend analysis conducted early in 2004 projected that the fatal crash rate of 16-19-year-old drivers will experience a slight increase and then resume a period of gradual decline. What is particularly disturbing is the increase in the number of 16-year-old drivers involved in fatal crashes during 2004. Given the increase that was experienced in 2004, projections for 2005 and subsequent years have been revised slightly upward from the 2003 PI. The green upper and lower limit bands indicate that given the current programs in place, there is a 95 percent confidence level that future years’ outcomes will be between these limits.
Benchmark 3: Injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled, 1994-2003,

With Projections 2004-2009

- To decrease the state personal injury rate per 100M VMT from a baseline rate of 117.1 (77,339 injuries) in 1996, to 94.2 in the year 2002, 86.0 in the year 2005, and 78.5 in 2008, with progress demonstrated on an annual basis. (NOTE: The goals for the personal injury rate per 100M VMT were revised in 2002 to remain constant at 72,000 personal injuries through 2003, and 65,000 personal injuries through 2009, while striving to meet the goals established for decreasing the overall fatality rate. The potential for the number of personal injuries to increase as the number of fatalities decreases has thus been factored into these projected goals. Until more complete and current injury data is available, there is not sufficient statistical information to revise the goals or project results through 2010.)

Analysis: Based upon current estimations, Indiana has achieved considerable decreases in the personal injury rate per 100M VMT for 2003. At an estimated 89.4 injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled, this represents an 8.6 percent improvement over 2001, and a 28.9 percent improvement over 1994. Continued improvement in safety belt usage rates should assist the state in achieving its long-term goals in this area.

* Actual results for 2001, 2002, and 2003 were unavailable—data is estimated based upon a historical ratio of fatal to personal injuries.
Figure 5: Serious Injuries, 1991-2000

- A six-year positive trend in fewer serious injuries through 2000. Data for more recent years remains unavailable because of database quality issues.

- To decrease alcohol-related fatal crashes from a baseline of 0.47 per 100M VMT in 1996 (312 fatal alcohol crashes), to 0.31 per 100M VMT in 2002 (233 estimated fatal alcohol crashes), to 0.28 per 100M VMT in 2005, and 0.23 in 2008, with progress demonstrated on an annual basis. (Note: These goals have been revised to present objectives based upon data obtained from NHTSA using the FARS imputed results versus actual results that are obtained from the ISP data. These goals have been slightly revised downward recognizing the continued favorable performance in this area over the past two years. Projected imputed alcohol results for 2010 have not been developed as a result of the lack of 2004 imputed results.)

![Graph showing alcohol-related fatal crashes per 100 million vehicle miles traveled from 1994 to 2009. Actual results from 2004 to 2009 are projected.]

Analysis: Since 1994, alcohol-related fatal crashes decreased from 0.51 per 100M VMT to 0.31 per MVMT in 2002, and established a record low of 233. The incidence rate of alcohol-related fatal crashes for 2002 was 0.31 per 100M VMT, a record low for Indiana. Increased enforcement efforts throughout the state are a likely contributor to these successes. Despite these gains, there continues to be a number of drivers involved in fatal crashes who either are not tested for the presence of alcohol, or whose results do not get reported. Increased emphasis needs to be applied to test all drivers involved in fatal crashes, as well as increasing the criminal consequences for drivers with high BACs. While preliminary results were used for the number of alcohol related fatalities for 2003, the number of fatal alcohol related crashes has yet to be released by NHTSA.
Table 2: Alcohol Crash Statistics Changes, 1991-2003

The elimination of the SR-21 crash reports in the database resulted in a 0.4-0.5 percent absolute increase in the reported involvement of alcohol in all crashes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related (ALC) Crashes</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>9,777</td>
<td>9,544</td>
<td>9,508</td>
<td>9,072</td>
<td>8,901</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ALC Crashes</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>233*</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>-26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ALC Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC Fatalities</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
<td>-38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ALC Fatalities</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC Injuries</td>
<td>7,777</td>
<td>6,664</td>
<td>6,524</td>
<td>6,364</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>5,487</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ALC Injuries</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 These data are based upon Indiana State Police Crash Records Database
2 Reported results are estimated based upon the FARSImputation model
3 Reported results are based upon the FARSImputation model
*This number is an estimate based upon the FARSImputation model.

Table 3 shows a distribution of the blood alcohol content (BAC) test results by drivers’ age for 2003 (the most recent year available). For all drivers, test results were documented for 64.5 percent of the drivers, while there were 194 instances where test results were either unknown or tests were not administered.

Table 3: Alcohol Concentration of Killed Drivers, 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 162 | 71 | 233 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 86 | 12 | 98 | 140 | 58 | 198 | 405 | 144 | 549 |

Legend: Fem=Female; Tot=Total
Source: Fatality Analysis Reporting System, NHTSA, August 2004
Note: Drivers of motorcycles, mopeds, minibikes, motorscooters, and motorbikes are excluded.
Totals do not include drivers of unknown age and/or gender.

- 36.1 percent of killed drivers did not have a BAC test result recorded in 2003.
Benchmark 5: Indiana Observational Survey of Safety belt Use by Vehicle Type, 1986-2005

- To increase the observational safety belt usage rate in all passenger vehicles, including pickup trucks, sport utility vehicles and vans from an actual usage rate of 61.8 percent in 1998, 85.0 percent in 2005, and 88.0 percent by the year 2008.

Analysis: The safety belt usage rate for all passenger vehicles experienced a slight decrease from 2004 to 2005, going from 83.4 percent to 81.2 percent. (Observational safety belt usage data is collected annually in June; therefore, more current results can be reported for this objective area). A distinctive difference persists in usage rates between pickup truck occupants (56.0 percent) and other vehicles, as pickup trucks (and vehicles plated as trucks) remain exempt from Indiana’s primary law. The observed usage rate for occupants of passenger cars was 88.4 percent for 2005. While the 2005 observed rates are lower than those observed in 2004, the 2005 rates are within the 3 percent margin of error.
Table 4: Driver Fatalities by Age, Restraint Usage and Gender, 2003

There were 481 drivers killed in fatal crashes in 2003 (Table 4) (most recent available data). While the state of Indiana conducts annual safety belt usage observational studies, an alternate measurement of safety belt usage is the investigating officer’s assessment as to whether the killed driver was properly restrained or not. Where restraint use was known (excluding the unknowns), the overall usage rate of these killed drivers was only 45.1 percent. Given that safety belts are estimated to be 45–50 percent effective in reducing fatalities, nearly half of the 241 killed non-restrained drivers, or approximately 120 fewer driver fatalities could have occurred if all drivers had been properly restrained. A gender breakdown of the killed drivers shows that male drivers were properly restrained in less than 4 out of 10 fatalities. Female drivers were properly restrained in 6 out of 10 of their fatalities (61.0 percent). By age group, of the 23 young male drivers killed (<18 years of age), 61 percent were restrained—the highest of all of the age groups. Among killed female drivers, older drivers (age 75+) had the highest restraint use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Drivers</th>
<th>% Restraint</th>
<th>% Not Restraint</th>
<th>% Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Fem=Female; Tot=Total
Source: Fatality Analysis Reporting System, NHTSA
Note: Drivers coded as improperly restrained were classified as “not restrained”
Excluded are drivers of parked vehicles, motorcycles, and mopeds

- Forty-five percent of killed drivers were properly restrained in 2003.
- Young male drivers and older female drivers had the highest restraint usage rates of all age groups.
- An estimated 120 lives could have been saved had all killed drivers been properly restrained in 2003.
Reminder: The following tables and figures represent the most recent data available from the Indiana State Police crash database.

Figure 6 and Figure 7

Every crash investigated by a law enforcement officer is assigned a crash cause, for each vehicle and the primary cause of the crash. Up to two causes can be attributed to each vehicle, but only one primary cause for the crash can be indicated. Figure 6 shows a distribution of the leading crash causes by age group (for all crashes) that involved only a single vehicle. Figure 7 shows a similar distribution but for crashes that involved multiple vehicles for crashes that occurred in 2000 (most recent data available). One clear difference between the causes of crashes for single vehicle and multiple vehicle crashes (aside from the presence of other vehicles in the multiple vehicle crashes, which is logical), is the presence of environmental and other roadway factors in single vehicle crashes. Since the officer has the ability to identify up to two vehicle contributing factors for each vehicle involved in a crash, the percentages shown in the figure are not additive. For example, the officer could indicate both “Driver Inattention” and “Materials on Roadway” as vehicle causes in one crash.

Figure 6: Vehicular Contributing Circumstances Rate per Drivers in Crashes by Age Group: Single Vehicle Crashes, 2000

- Driver inattention and materials on roadway are the reported leading contributing factors in single vehicle crashes in 2000.
Table 5: Vehicular Contributing Circumstance Rate per Drivers in Crashes by Age Group: Single Vehicle Crashes, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicular Contributing Circumstances</th>
<th>&lt;21</th>
<th>21-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
<th>UNK</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Too Fast</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Yield</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>8,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregarded Signal/Sign</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>14,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left of Center</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Overtaking</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Too Closely</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Improper Turn</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>6,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Been Drinking</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>73,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asleep</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>73,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Inattention</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>15,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Improper Driving</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Failure</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>14,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals on Roadway</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>12,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Factors</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>8,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials on Road/Weather</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>4,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>2,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Drivers in Crashes: 15,172 8,081 14,254 12,562 8,579 4,445 2,284 1,465 6,681 73,523

Notes: Boxes identify areas where there is an over-representation.
Drivers of parked vehicles excluded.

Legend: UNK = Unknown

Note: Total column percentages may not equal 100%. More than one contributing circumstance can be cited per crash.
Driver inattention is the leading vehicle contributing factor for all age groups involved in a multi-vehicle crash in 2000.
Table 6: Vehicular Contributing Circumstance Rate per Drivers in Crashes by Age Group: Multiple Vehicle Crashes, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicular Contributing Circumstances</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>&lt;21</th>
<th>21-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
<th>UNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Too Fast</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Yield</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregarded Signal/Sign</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left of Center</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Overtaking</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed Too Closely</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Improper Turn</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Been Drinking</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asleep</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Inattention</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Improper Driving</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Failure</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals on Roadway</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Factors</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials on Road/Weather</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Drivers in Crashes: 51,586 29,813 57,895 55,037 39,918 22,540 13,887 10,003 21,768 302,447

Notes: Boxes identify areas where there is an over-representation.
Drivers of parked vehicles excluded.
Legend: UNK=Unknown
Note: Total column percentages may not equal 100%. More than one contributing circumstance can be cited per crash.
STATE OF INDIANA
2006 TRAFFIC SAFETY PLANNING DOCUMENT

IDENTIFICATION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROBLEMS

**METHODODOLOGY:**

The Governor’s Council on Impaired & Dangerous Driving serves as the public opinion catalyst and the implementing body for statewide action to reduce death and injury on Indiana roadways. The Council provides grant funding, training, coordination and ongoing support to state and local traffic safety advocates.

The Governor's Council on Impaired & Dangerous Driving serves as the traffic safety focal point in Indiana. In this role, the Council is charged with developing policies, procedures, strategies, and programs to effectively manage and administer Indiana’s highway safety program. The intended outcome of all of the Councils efforts is to reduce death and injuries, and economic costs associated with motor vehicle crashes. The Council, a division of the Criminal Justice Institute, administers federal funding from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration through targeted traffic safety grants to state and local organizations. The Council’s Advisory Board, a group of 30 volunteers, is appointed by the governor to make traffic safety policy recommendations. The Council coordinates aggressive public information campaigns designed for implementation at the state and local level and provides materials, grant funding and information to traffic safety advocates. The Council also serves as Indiana’s primary source for information and research on traffic safety issues which directly affect public safety and policy.

Each year the Council staff and law enforcement liaisons conduct regional mandatory trainings for potential enforcement grantees. The Council considers this to be a true “opportunity” to meet face-to-face with people that want to make a difference in Indiana.

The purpose of the training is to convey information about the Council’s goals, explain the funding/application
process, describe how the departments develop goals and local action plans to impact their traffic safety problems, and show how they are integral in impacting statewide goals which are provided at the time of training. Agenda time is set aside to discuss their problems, concerns, and directions they feel would benefit their local communities, groups, and organizations. During August 2004 over 220 agencies attended the trainings held in Jasper, Scottsburg, Peru and Indianapolis.

Projects must fall within one or more of the Council’s program areas which include occupant protection, alcohol countermeasures, police traffic services, community traffic safety programs, pedacyclist/pedestrian safety, motorcycle safety, or highway environment. The Governor’s Council on Impaired & Dangerous Driving (Council) contracts with the Center for the Advancement of Transportation Safety (CATS) at Purdue University to conduct an analysis of traffic records data statewide. The processes used to identify Indiana’s traffic safety problems involve obtaining and interpreting a wide variety of data. Key outcome data such as fatality, injury, and economic costs stemming from motor vehicle crashes are used. Primarily, Indiana data is examined using the Indiana State Police (ISP) crash records database and the Indiana data in the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). The most comprehensive source of traffic safety data for Indiana has been the Indiana State Police (ISP) annual crash records database. CATS has obtained this database on tape from ISP for the years 1988-2000. This database has a number of files containing data taken from police accident reports (PAR) submitted by investigating officers and the drivers of vehicles involved in reportable motor vehicle crashes. CATS has developed C++ programs, which extract desired crash data and organize this data in a relational database. Relational database software (primarily SAS and ACCESS) is then used to analyze the data in this multi-year database.

The Council has contributed resources and dollars to the updating of the Indiana crash records system. Starting in January 2003, Indiana crash records are caught up and day current and available to CATS and all police agencies for local program planning and trend data analysis.

Although the primary source of information comes from the PARs, additional sources are utilized, such as the Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV), providing a driver file, vehicle registration information, and traffic violation, arrest, and
conviction data. The Indiana Department of Transportation maintains the roadway files and specifically provides vehicle miles traveled information. Many types of data, such as driver age and gender, vehicle type, locale and roadway type, safety restraint usage and contributing circumstances, are examined to identify relationships between these variables and the outcome data. Data on factors that are possible causes of traffic crashes, such as teenage drug and alcohol use, and factors that may contribute to aggressive driving are sought and, when possible, linked to outcome data. County court records are accessed to identify criminal patterns and criminal records as they relate to crash outcomes. Reports, surveys, and journal articles related to traffic safety are obtained and reviewed. Literature searches are conducted using the Purdue library and the Internet. Briefly stated, many sources of information are used in the planning and decision-making process for effective program/project outcomes. Data and professional relationships gained through attending traffic safety conferences such as “Lifesavers” and the “International Traffic Records Forum” are invaluable in providing resources and insights into emerging highway safety issues.

As a result of the data analysis, a document entitled “Problem Identification” is developed, that provides a “snapshot” of Indiana’s traffic crash problems, trends and characteristics at a state level. This document guides the Council to provide appropriate direction for programs, policies, and legislative agendas.

The Council, in cooperation with CATS, works together to analyze and refine the state level data to identify specific sub-groups, locations, etc. to ascertain the primary contributing causes. Additional documents are developed that provide demographic and geographic information to further target programs addressing the most over-represented sub-groups and localities. CATS produces several documents that provide information to the Council revealing the most problematic county and municipal locations in the state. County and municipality rankings provide a comparable gauge to help identify problem locations and specific issues within those areas. This document is developed by recording the number and types of crashes (fatal, personal injury, property damage, alcohol-related, aggressive driving and age-related). The process provides information as to how each county ranks compared to other counties and to statewide averages. The process utilizes a weighting scheme, with recent years’ data more heavily weighted than earlier data. Rankings are based on
crashes per 1,000 licensed drivers per county, and on miles traveled. Rankings are provided on a statewide basis, by performance, strata using county census data, ISP regions, and OTS regions. These documents are available in printed format, CD-ROM, and also displayed on the CATS web site.

Operation Pull Over (OPO) is a major enforcement tool used by the Council that also raises awareness within the general public about the value of wearing seat belts. Funding for the media, education, monitoring, and enforcement phases is primarily provided to the Council by NHTSA. CATS has developed a monitoring tool to measure the effectiveness of the individual participating law enforcement agencies. The results are provided to the agencies on a quarterly basis and utilize a weighting methodology to evaluate the impacts of the events (media, education, monitoring, and enforcement).

In 2004, CATS conducted the annual seat belt survey for the State. The methodology for the survey was modified in 2002 to allow the exclusion of the 15 percent lowest population areas (consistent with NHTSA guidelines). In 2001, the survey was further modified by increasing the number of sites in certain cells (road categories). These cells represented road types that previous sampling identified as having a high degree of variance, and, therefore, had the potential to increase sampling error. As a result, the number of sites has been increased from 79 to 113 sites. The methodology was submitted to NHTSA and accepted by them. Also in 2003, the Council’s law enforcement liaisons were used to conduct mini-surveys and the annual seat belt survey in conjunction with CATS’s staff.
Methodology for Establishing Traffic Safety Performance Benchmarks

For FY 2006, traffic statistics for the years 1991 through 2004 were compiled and statistically analyzed to develop “benchmarks” and to predict future outcomes. Specifically, benchmarks were established for the state fatality rate per MVMT, state personal injury rate per MVMT, alcohol-related fatal crash rate, seat belt usage rates, and fatal crash rate involving young drivers. This methodology was first used to set goals for the year 1999.

For each of the above traffic safety indices, an “exponential decay” model was used to predict future results. While the rate fluctuates each year due to chance, generally, the trend for traffic fatalities shows a decrease each year since 1980, although some years such as 1986, 1990, and 1994 show a substantial increase over the previous year. If the actual number of fatalities for a low year, such as 1993, or a high year, such as 1994, were used as a baseline for setting goals, it is likely that the chosen goals would be unrealistically high or low.
PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

Task Narrative

Task 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This task will support the planning, administration and evaluation of Indiana Traffic Safety Action Program. This involves the fiscal management of the program and the administrative support necessary to undertake the program. The resources allocated to this task will cover costs associated with salaries, fringe benefits, travel, conference costs, equipment, computer supplies and service, public information materials, office rent, films, and other related operational expenses.

The Governor's Council on Impaired & Dangerous Driving (Council) will incur expenses for our affiliation with membership in the Governors' Highway Safety Association. Membership fees and travel will be included in the planning and administration budget.
**OCCUPANT PROTECTION**

**Task Narratives**

**Task 1: Program Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>402</th>
<th>$53,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To increase statewide safety belt usage, the Governor’s Council on Impaired & Dangerous Driving (Council) will employ a program coordinator to oversee the occupant protection initiatives. On a statewide and local level, the program coordinator will promote the importance of Indiana’s safety restraint laws.

This task will provide salary, fringe benefits, travel costs to in- and out-of-state conferences and training seminars for one full-time program coordinator for the occupant protection program area. The occupant protection coordinator will provide for the administration and coordination of occupant restraint initiatives within the state.

**Task 2: Child Passenger Safety (Children, Minority) **

| 405a | $612,000.00 |
| 2003b - J3 | $363,000.00 |
| **Total** | **$975,000.00** |

As indicated through problem identification, youth are over-represented in traffic crashes. In an effort to target the youth population, ages 0-19, the Council will coordinate with the Automotive Safety Program (ASP) Indiana University School of Medicine. ASP will conduct statewide public information and education programs to increase correct use of occupant restraints through statewide involvement and utilization of child passenger safety advocates. ASP’s goals are:

1. Education and Training. Conduct or support a minimum of 20 car seat clinics throughout the state; conduct a minimum of 20 information presentations to targeted audiences; conduct a minimum of 30 programs for school-aged children using programs such as Buckle Up Bug or Risk Watch; conduct at least 2 and support a minimum of 20 NHTSA Child Safety Seat Technician and Instructor trainings; conduct a minimum of 3 CPS refresher courses for technicians and instructors; continue the SAFE KIDS training and chapter establishment; develop write and distribute a quarterly newsletter and maintain a web site; provide a minimum of 2 trainings entitled “Transporting Children with Special Health Care Needs”; work to educate caregivers at daycares throughout Indiana using NHTSA’s Moving Kid’s Safety Curriculum.
2. Data collection and Interpretation. Conduct an observational child safety seat use and misuse survey; produce a report by analyzing state and local, and other secondary data sources on motor vehicle related injury; collaborate with the Children’s Health Services Research Department on traffic safety related research and produce at least on manuscript from this research; produce a report by analyzing data from the permanent fitting stations.

3. Resources and Information. Continue the 1-800-KID-N-CAR number and the ISSKC 888 number; maintain and expand the web site to include information related to school bus, bike and pedestrian safety issues; conduct press conferences and 5 interviews with the media; participate in child passenger safety awareness campaigns; act as a resource to all appropriate safety groups; distribute car seats and provide resources through various programs including at least 70 permanent fitting stations, Boost America!, the low-income program, and project L.O.V.E.

4. Advocacy. Continue to advocate for traffic safety and injury prevention issues by expanding programs and involving organizations and individuals from across the state interested in these issues; maintain and manage a statewide Advisory Council; serve on Governor’s Council Advisory Board; host the eighth annual Child Safety Advocate Awards ceremony; work to strengthen and improve child passenger safety laws in Indiana; add 5 additional chapters to the SAFE KIDS program.

5. The ASP will also work closely with other Agencies to implement an action plan that address the 8-15 year old age group in regards to belt issues. Training, public information and education, other materials, and media events will be developed to address this age group of children.

In order to develop and monitor child safety seat distribution programs throughout the state, as well as provide technical assistance, training, car seats and booster seats, a coordinator for Project L.O.V.E. and the Permanent Fitting Stations will be funded to provide those services. A concentrated effort will be made to target the Indiana State Police and local law enforcement agencies throughout the state. We will also look for opportunities to expand into other partnerships outside of the Automotive Safety Program. Funding may be used for car seats related items such as towels, locking clips and educational materials, as well as salary, fringe benefits, and travel expenses for the staff at Automotive Safety, conferences, and other related costs.

The Automotive Safety Program (ASP) administers “Project L.O.V.E.,” which is a voucher program for law enforcement officers. When an officer stops a vehicle for noncompliance with Indiana’s child restraint law, the officer at his/her discretion, may issue a voucher to the driver for a free child safety seat. The driver then calls a number on the voucher and makes arrangement to pick up the child safety seat and receive instructions on the proper use of the seat. The ASP will make a
concerted effort to recruit officers to participate in the program, as well as train additional law enforcement with the NHTSA CPS Technician course. Permanent Fitting stations will provide a network of trained individuals statewide to accommodate the increase in child occupant awareness. This task will provide resources and funding for a minimum of 92 permanent fitting stations across the state, as well as expand the voucher program to cover all 92 counties as well. Funding may be used for car seats, related items such as towels, locking clips and other educational materials as needed. There will be three regional trainings held specifically for law enforcement officers. Funding will help cover class registration fees, lodging and per diem.

The Automotive Safety Program (ASP) has established three regional Child Passenger Safety Coordinators, who are responsible for increasing the number of law enforcement departments that require their traffic officers be trained in child passenger safety. The training conducted by these coordinators will utilize a modified 4 hour version of NHTSA’s Operation Kids - Law Enforcement curriculum. The primary goal of this project is to increase use and decrease misuse of child restraints throughout the state of Indiana; through training of law enforcement officers about child passenger safety and Project Love. Law enforcement officers are in contact with the general public on a daily basis and have a “free” opportunity to educate parents about child passenger safety. A secondary objective of this program will continue to be to encourage officers to go the next step to become Child Passenger Safety Technicians.

In addition, a special effort will be made to offer trainings, such as the CPS Technician class, to individuals working with the Hispanic population to increase the availability of information and education to this audience. This task will provide funding for program coordination as well as training for new CPS technicians and set up of permanent fitting stations within the Hispanic community.

The Automotive Safety Program (ASP) propose development of a model program designed to evaluate the effectiveness of a faith based permanent fitting station when compared to the more traditional stations; such as hospitals and police/fire stations. This project will consist of choosing a specified number of churches in the NESCO area to act as the experimental group. Volunteers from each church will be trained as Certified CPS Technicians. Each church will become an ASP permanent fitting station. Prior to initiation of the project; and again after six months of duration, an observation survey will be conducted to determine use/misuse rates among the applicable church population. A concurrent observational survey will be conducted at an ASP permanent fitting station established at a police/fire station. The results of the two surveys will be compared and an analysis of results will be presented in the form of a report. Funds for this project will primarily be used for training and child safety seat purchases and distribution. (405a - J2 $612,000 and 2003b J3 - $363,000.00)
### Task 3: Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>$1,600,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 INN</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,550,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For FY-2006 the Council will continue to support the Operation Pull Over (OPO) program, which provides grant funding to local and state law enforcement departments for the purpose of conducting enhanced traffic enforcement during periods designated by the Council. These scheduled quarterly blitzes correspond with NHTSA’s scheduled mobilizations, and operate a total of eight weeks per blitz period with an emphasis on increasing seat belt and child restraint use and decreasing impaired driving crashes. The overtime enforcement program provides for saturation patrols and seat belt enforcement zones, which are coordinated at the state level.

Also, this year we are requiring the OPO Agencies to conduct 20% of their enforcement efforts on Nighttime Seat belt enforcement zones. Training in zone operations at night were provided at the grant trainings, and additional assistance, as needed, will be provided by the LEL’s. Agencies participating and that have political permission will conduct 20% of their EZ during the night hours during darkness. The program, which began in October of 1994, is currently supported statewide by 220 local law enforcement departments, as well as the Indiana State Police (ISP). The local law enforcement participation represents by jurisdiction over 80% of the state’s population. However, with the State Police’s participation, all Hoosiers are affected by the program. This task will support the goals and objectives of OPO within local communities in the form of law enforcement mini-grants. Communities will coordinate their programs in conjunction with the OPO established schedule (included). Funding will cover: salaries for overtime enforcement and administrative costs (402 $1,600,000.00) (410 $300,000.00)

Indiana will also participate in two mobilizations regarding the rural demonstration project in November of 2005 and during Click it or Ticket in May of 2006. Media and enforcement overtime will be dedicated with a rural initiative and message with the intent of increasing seat belt usage in Indiana’s rural areas, which have traditionally had lower usage rates. Media events, media messages, increased enforcement, and Seat belt enforcement zones will be conducted, during selected dates, with the Indiana State Police conducting activities in areas that are not covered by OPO Agencies.

### Task 4 – Child Passenger Safety Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indiana will work with NHTSA and GLR to conduct a Child Passenger Safety Assessment
Task Narratives

Task 1: Program Management

402  $53,000.00

Program Coordination provides funds for the planning, coordination and monitoring of impaired driving countermeasure projects. Funding will be available for salary, fringe benefits, travel and other related expenses. Impact is statewide and the project is on going. (402 - $53,000.00)

Task 2: Impaired Driving Training/Coordination

154AL  $575,000.00

Standardized Field Sobriety Testing/Drug Recognition Expert (SFST/DRE) - Provides funding for a state coordinator to sustain, manage and oversee SFST courses, and the Indiana DRE program. The Indiana Law Enforcement Academy will continue to house the coordinator and maintain the project. Courses will be offered regionally and open to all police departments statewide. Funding will also provide for DRE Basic courses to be held. Funding will provide for salary of the coordinator and instructors travel, printing costs of manuals, certificates and other related expenses. Training materials and classes will be developed and implemented on issues related to drug / Methamphetamine impaired driving. We will also work with the Indiana State Department of Toxicology to better identify testing for drug impaired drivers. (154AL - $185,000.00)

The Council will fund the Marion County Traffic Safety Partnership Fatal Alcohol Crash Team (FACT). The goal of the Team is to have uniform protocol and practices for how fatality and serious bodily injury crashes are investigated. There are currently 25 officers working in four man squads representing the six law enforcement partnership agencies. Each squad consists of a supervisor, who works closely with the O.W.I. Prosecutor to ensure consistency with current statutes and case law, an OWI specialist, usually a DRE, a crash investigation Reconstructionist and a witness statement specialist. The team has virtually eliminated the procedural mistakes made in the field that can lead to the suppression of evidence necessary to secure a conviction or even the failure to identify a particular crash as involving an impaired driver. Refresher training for FACT Team members and training for others involved in fatal crashes, such as EMTs, will occur. Also with this program, The Council funds the Marion County Prosecutors Office to provide a DUI Vehicular Homicide Deputy Prosecutor to work with the Fatal Alcohol Crash Team. The function of this person is to serve as a specially trained prosecutor to handle any cases involving fatal DUI crashes in Marion County. Prior to 2003, the vehicular homicide cases were randomly assigned to various deputy prosecutors working
within the six major felony courts in Marion County. When an alcohol-related fatality occurs in Marion County, the DUI Deputy Prosecutor will be paged and respond to the scene to assist the law enforcement investigators and the FACT in the accident investigation to ensure that evidence is collected properly, to assist in obtaining search warrants, to screen charges and file the case and follow to trial. In the past year this has proven to greatly increase the conviction rate of fatal DUI arrestees from 70% to 100%. Another noteworthy item is that no piece of evidence that has been seized by a FACT member during an OWI Crash investigation has been suppressed by a Court of Law. (154AL - $170,000)

Through the Indiana Prosecuting Attorney’s Council a Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor will train prosecuting attorneys on the most effective methods of investigating and prosecuting impaired drivers and other traffic related offenses to fulfill a prosecuting attorney’s ethical responsibility to see that “justice is done.” In order for this to occur, prosecutors and law enforcement officers must be continuously trained in the current applicable state statutes and regulations that govern traffic offenses as well as the ever changing case law produced by appellate court decisions that impact traffic offense cases.

Training for prosecutors and law enforcement officers on traffic safety related topics will be offered on the following topics throughout the year: Pre-trial motions and evidentiary objections in OWI cases (prosecutors only); the Drug Recognition and Evaluation Program; Standardized Field Sobriety Testing, OWI case report writing, OWI trial preparation, and OWI trial testimony (Protecting Lives, Saving Futures Conference); a traffic safety case law and statutory update; a review of issues involving toxicology evidence; investigating and prosecuting fatal crash cases (Lethal Weapon conference), detecting and prosecuting the meth impaired driver, search and seizure issues in regards to methamphetamine impaired drivers and rolling meth laboratories, and additional training and counsel to Police Agencies regarding the statutory requirement for chemical testing of drivers involved in SBI and fatal crashes for FARS purposes.

The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor maintains superior knowledge of the issues as they relate to traffic offenses on a state and national level. To this end, the Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor will attend no less than four conferences dedicated to traffic safety related issues. The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor will also review each new amendment to Indiana Code Title 9 (the Traffic Code) and each Indiana appellate court decision that relates to traffic offenses. The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor will be available for telephone or e-mail consultations on any traffic offense cases to all prosecutors and law enforcement officers in Indiana. The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor will also be available to travel to any jurisdiction throughout Indiana to provide on-site consultations to prosecutors on pending impaired driving fatality or serious bodily injury cases to assist them in preparing for trial. In exceptionally complicated or unique cases that could impact appellate court decisions, the Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor will be available for appointment as a Special Deputy Prosecutor and actually assist the local prosecutor or deputy prosecutor with the trial of such a case. (154 AL $220,000)
Task 3: Enforcement/Operation Pull Over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>410 – J8</th>
<th></th>
<th>410 – J8</th>
<th></th>
<th>154 AL</th>
<th>$3,100,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$660,000.00</td>
<td>$3,760,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enforcement efforts will be conducted on a statewide basis by the Indiana State Police (ISP) to conduct the Operation Pull Over (OPO) program as well as overall statewide enforcement activity. ISP will be the lead agency in conducting simultaneous statewide, saturation patrols. Funding may provide for overtime salaries, and equipment purchases that may include in-car video cameras, portable breath test instruments or other traffic safety equipment. (410 - $500,000.00)

This task will also support local community programs in the form of mini-grants to meet the goals and objectives of OPO within local communities. Communities will coordinate their programs in conjunction with the OPO dates using the established schedule. Funding will cover the costs of salaries for overtime enforcement, and administrative costs. (154 AL $1,500,000.00)

DUI: Taskforce Indiana provides overtime funding for DUI: Taskforce Indiana. The statewide overtime enforcement program targets specific counties, which have a history of high alcohol-related crashes. Counties/cities with a large population base and/or a university or colleges were also a consideration in determining the counties involved. Each funded county has a multi-jurisdictional DUI taskforce that will use saturation patrols and sobriety checkpoints in the effort to reduce the amount of impaired drivers in their counties. This program started in July 2001 with nine counties that already had a Countywide DUI Taskforce formed. Their successes extended to the participation of 25 counties that cover approximately 65% of the state's population by DUI: Taskforce Indiana. There will be two statewide blitz periods along with monthly saturation patrols and sobriety checkpoints conducted. (154-AL $1,600,000.00)

Operation Pull Over Awards Conference - The Council will hold the Traffic Safety Challenge conference in the fall of 2005. The conference will feature the OPO program accomplishments and recognize those departments, groups and organizations that significantly contributed to the program's success. (410- J8 $160,000.00)

Task 4: Youth Alcohol Programs

| 410 – J8 | $445,000.00 |

Youth Alcohol and Impaired Driving Enforcement - Indiana State Excise Police will conduct the Stop Underage Drinking and Sales (SUDS) and Cops in Shops (CIS) program, collaborate with agencies participating in Operation Pull Over, as well as participating in various educational programs. The SUDS program will target
events and locations where minor consumption of alcohol and youth impaired
driving are likely to occur. The CIS program will provide a cooperative effort
between law enforcement and packaged liquor storeowners to deter underage
alcohol purchasing, increase the perception of risk among youth, and educate store
clerks on checking questionable identification cards. The Indiana Excise Police will
also conduct Server Training throughout the state in an effort to educate businesses
and their employees on the laws and regulations concerning the serving of alcohol.
Project costs include overtime salaries, equipment, and educational material. (410
- $250,000.00)

Indiana Students against Destructive Decisions: The Governor’s Council on
Impaired & Dangerous Driving began funding Indiana’s statewide Students against
Destructive Decisions (SADD) program in FY-2002 and plans to continue this
program in FY-2006. The mission of SADD is to serve as a peer leadership
organization and provide students with the best prevention and intervention tools
possible to deal with the issues of underage drinking, impaired driving, drug abuse,
and other destructive decisions such as not wearing a seat belt. The goal of this
program is to provide support to the existing 200 SADD chapters in Indiana, while
increasing the number of chapters to 225 in FY 2005. This year, five SADD
Chapters, in target areas where there is an active collaboration with police agencies
that participate in the state’s Operation Pull Over program and school authorities,
will be selected to receive up to $1,000 in mini-grant funds to conduct a traffic
safety promotion within their school. In addition, schools that desire to start a new
SADD Chapter will be awarded mini-grants up to $1,000 to assist them in a
successful beginning. Funds can be used for signage, posters, educational
materials, parking lot stenciling, etc. Premium items will not be permitted. Schools
will be encouraged to have seat belt policies for their students and work with their
local law enforcement agencies. This task will provide for the salary, fringe benefits,
travel expenses, conferences, mini-grants, and other related costs to conduct an
effective program for the youth of our state. (410 - $140,000.00)

Indiana Youth Summit 11 - Provides funding for The Governor’s Council on
Impaired & Dangerous Driving and the Governor’s Commission for Drug-Free
Indiana to host the Indiana Youth Summit: Developing the Voice of Indiana Youth.
Youth Summit is an annual event designed to promote positive youth choices while
educating youth on current trends/issues that directly affect them. During the two
and one-half day summit, which is scheduled for October 22 - 25, 2005, more than
300 high school students from across the state will come together to work with
their peers, as well as individuals who directly influence the laws that affect young
adults. Students will select and attend workshops/panel discussions in the areas of
underage drinking, over-the-counter drugs, traffic safety, and club drugs to
formulate recommendations on current bills being addressed in the Indiana General
Assembly. At the conclusion of the event, a written report on these
recommendations will be submitted to policy-makers and the media. In addition,
during the final day of the Summit, student will have the opportunity to work with
trainers from Mothers against Drunk Driving to create their own community action
plans. Funds will provide lodging, meals, trainer fees, and other related costs. (410
Mothers against Drunk Driving: To broaden the scope of the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute’s youth division, we would like to host three one-day trainings from the Mothers Against Driving Drunk Organization. This action-packed, one-day interactive learning program is designed to increase knowledge of impaired driving and traffic safety issues and to encourage youth to become agents for social change. Participants will work on their own and in small groups to design a plan of action to solve a problem in their community. The program will combine instruction and practical exercises to help guide young people as they identify strategies to reach an entire community. Participants will leave this workshop possessing new skills and understanding how young people can become the catalyst for changing their own community. A mentorship program follows the training to further empower youth in their partnerships with adults. The training also encourages youth to create messages to deliver to legislators, law enforcement, educators and other constituencies that make decisions that impact youth. This task will provide site fees, training binders, trainer fees, meals, and other related costs. (410 - $16,500.00)

Youth Legislative Day – During this one day training, youth and adults will learn about the legislative process and how Hoosier youth can participate in developing safer communities around Indiana. Objectives of the event are to educate young people on the legislature and to increase awareness of youth as advocates and active citizens. Youth will participate in an interactive morning program designed to increase awareness about the many pressing issues facing today’s youth, including: traffic safety, underage drinking, tobacco and other drugs, as well as other public safety issues. At the conclusion of the training, attendees will have the opportunity to meet face to face with their Indiana legislators at the Statehouse and discuss with them the issues that affect them and their peers. This conference reached over 325 youth and adults from throughout Indiana last year, however we have changed our venue for this upcoming year so that we may increase the number of possible participants to 500. This task will provide for the food provided at the event. (410 - $2,000.00)

Middle School Summit – This is a new youth conference being offered to 6th - 8th graders throughout the state. This one-day training will include workshops and special presenters geared toward youth, with a separate track provided for adults. This task will provide food for the event. (410 - $15,000.00)

IYI Conference Exhibit Sponsorship – This conference will allow us to set up a display and present our organization to approximately 1,000 of Indiana’s youth-serving professionals, nonprofit managers, educators, and others who work with youth. This task will provide for the display registration fee. (410 - $1,500.00)

Youth Alcohol Forum – The social costs of underage drinking has been estimated at $53 billion, $19 billion from traffic crashes. Underage drinking is an $867 million dollar a year problem in Indiana. A one day Forum is being convened
to address the top three alcohol-related issues facing Indiana today: criminal justice, treatment, education and prevention. The Forum will call on representatives from law enforcement, traffic safety advocates, educational leaders, alcohol prevention groups and youth to share information on what is currently happening in Indiana in regards to their specific issue. Each workshop group will emerge with a plan of action to serve as a starting point in dealing with each of the three issues and work toward reducing the amount of alcohol related incidents throughout the state. (This is Included with Clarian Hospitals program activities in the CP Section).

**Task 5 – Allen County DUI Prosecutor**

| 154AL       | $ 75,000.00 |

Due to the increased case load in Allen County, the Allen County Prosecutor's Office will be funded an OWI Prosecutor. This prosecutor will ensure that the cases that are generated in Allen County are efficiently and expediently prosecuted and adjudicated. This Prosecutor is responsible for hundreds and hundreds of cases of Operating while intoxicated each year, and this will be that Prosecutor's only type of cases. The Allen County Sheriff's Department and the Fort Wayne Police Department have increased their Operating while intoxicated arrests exponentially so that the Prosecutors Office is unable to handle the case load that is being generated by these officers. (154AL – $75,000.00)

**Task 6 - Deleted**

**Task 7 – Evaluation**

| 154AL       | $ 76,000.00 |

The Indiana Judicial Center program is devised to assess the effectiveness of Indiana courts alcohol and drug programs by statistically analyzing the recidivism of program clients, including DUI offenders, and comparing those results to results of other analogous statistical recidivism studies. For years, research provided a rather dreary view of the effectiveness of drug treatment. Debates over how to respond to the illegal drug problem often quickly disintegrated into arguments between locking up all users and outright legalization. More recently, however, research has begun to challenge the notion that little can be done to address illegal substance abuse. Indeed, a number of studies have emerged that show the promise of substance abuse education and treatment. One of the most promising areas related to court-ordered treatment. It appears that interventions that combine the coercive power of the court, effective monitoring and meaningful education and treatment can significantly reduce levels of recidivism. This is a multi-year study consisting of 6 stages. Stages 1-4 have been completed and stages 5 and 6 are scheduled for completion by 2006. This is a continuing project, and not a new appropriation of money. A final written recidivism report will be submitted to Indiana Judiciary Center. (154AL $ 76,000.00)
**Task # 8 – Future Projects**

410 J8  $ 800,000.00

The Council reserves this category for the funding of future alcohol measures such as the expansion of the Fatal Alcohol Crash Team (FACT) concept or other initiatives as determined by the Council. (410 J8 - $ 800,000.00)

Note: All public information components are a part of a complete program located in the Community Traffic Safety section of this plan.

Evaluation of impaired driving programs is programmed in the traffic records section of this plan.

---
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POLICE TRAFFIC SERVICES

Task Narratives

Task 1: Program Management

402 $ 53,000.00

Coordination provides funds for the planning, coordination and monitoring of Programs in this area. Funding will be available for salary, fringe benefits, travel and other related expenses. Impact is statewide and the project is on going. (402 - $53,000.00)

Task 2: Statewide Traffic Safety Training

402 $75,000.00

Officer training is an important component in an effective Police Traffic Services program. The upgrading of skills and knowledge of Indiana’s law enforcement officers is essential in providing safer roadways for all Hoosiers.

The Council will work with the established regional training sites to deliver traffic safety training for law enforcement. Through quarterly meetings with the Council’s Big City/County departments information on their project progress is exchanged as well and specialized training. The meetings help to challenge and motivate departments through peer to peer assistance. The Law Enforcement Academy maintains the records system for all law enforcement training statewide and will continue to do so with a new system that will assist the Council in determining the level of training and identify additional training needs. The Council may provide funds to train law enforcement officers in the areas of: Project Management; Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies, Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST) (see alcohol section of this plan); Public Information and Education for Law Enforcement; Child Passenger Safety Technical workshops; Safe and Legal Traffic Stops, and other training programs as needed. ($75,000.00)

Task 3: Indiana State Police Field Enforcement Division Assistance

157 Inc $1,500,000.00

The Indiana State Police will receive funding for comprehensive traffic enforcement projects. State Police projects under this task will emphasize the enforcement of speed limits, unsafe driving behavior by motorists and occupant
restraint use. State Police will target their patrols to roadways under their jurisdictions which are identified as high fatality, injury and crash locations, with special emphasis on holiday time periods and Operation Pull Over blitz periods. The Indiana State Police will also be notified as to “Problem Areas” that are identified by Data and crash records for highly visible saturation patrol efforts.

Technology assistance will also be provided to the Indiana State Police in the form of grants to purchase computer equipment for the field enforcement division. These purchases will be for field enforcement personnel in the form of laptop computers for their vehicles for the electronic reporting of citation information to the various court clerks and to expedite the filing of OWI paperwork to allow more time for patrol and arrest and decrease the amount of time spent on paperwork and delivering that paperwork to the different county and Court Clerks when alcohol arrests are made by troopers.

**Task 4: Equipment Purchases**

410 (J8) $750,000.00

Law enforcement agencies participating in the Operation Pullover, Big City / County, and DUI Task Force enforcement projects can compete for equipment grants that include Radars, Preliminary Breath Testing devices, In Car Video Cameras, and other equipment that will enhance their enforcement efforts in Occupant Protection strategies, Alcohol Related Enforcement, and the prosecution of these offenders. These grants will require a 25% cash match, and awards will be given out based on the need for such equipment.

**Task 5: Match**

State $5,000,000.00

The Indiana State Police provides a match in traffic safety services for the state’s portion of the plan.

**Task 6: Future Projects**

157 Incentive $2,000,000.00

The Council reserves this amount for the funding of future projects as the need arises. However, the awards will be based on need, impact on Highway safety projects, and cover areas such as increased enforcement of OWI issues, Occupant Protection Issues, Speed related Projects, or others as needed and approved.
Counties with the highest number of fatal crashes or people fatally injured will be eligible for incentive grants to conduct high visibility enforcement of seat belt laws, OWI laws, or other problems properly identified with crash data for their jurisdictions. Eligible counties can submit a grant detailing the problem with crash data, and an effective plan to reduce the number of fatalities in their jurisdiction with high visibility enforcement, equipment purchases, or other items as approved.

**Task 7: Enforcement Project – Big City / Big County Enforcement**

The Big City/County Seat Belt Enforcement Program (BCC) will continue during FY-05. Indiana utilized federal seat belt innovative dollars to target occupant protection enforcement. BCC has 52 county and municipal agencies statewide participating in seat belt patrols and seat belt enforcement zones. The BCC coordinators, along with the DUI Taskforce coordinators, attend quarterly meetings in Indianapolis. During FY 2005, legal updates on occupant protection, impaired driving and drug recognition were given as well as updates on FARS and the Indiana crash records system. Select departments report on their activities during each meeting. The networking that occurs is instrumental in keeping ideas flowing and the morale at a high level. Funding will pay for overtime enforcement salaries. (157 IN $600,000)

**Task 8: Gasoline Reimbursement**

Agencies that participate in the OPO /BCC /DUI Task Force Indiana will be given a one time award that equals 10% of their total enforcement award to used to purchase gasoline in order to assist these agencies with cost associated with the operation of the enforcement projects.

**TRAFFIC RECORDS**
Task Narrative

Task 1: Traffic Records Improvement/Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402 - TR</td>
<td>Traffic Records Improvement</td>
<td>$233,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 - AL</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>$245,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$425,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council will continue to work with the Center for the Advancement of Transportation Safety (CATS) at Purdue University. CATS provides program evaluations and information that describes and identifies motor vehicle crashes and characteristics, provides data documents, data tables, observational safety belt surveys, crash facts books, etc. The information is used in planning, policy and legislative public safety decisions. CATS will coordinate the implementation of Indiana’s Strategic Plan for Traffic Records. Through the assistance of various state and federal agencies, CATS is providing integral support for improvement of Indiana’s traffic records system. With CATS assistance additional funding has come to Indiana to further improve traffic records in the state.

There will also be an evaluation conducted to determine the impact of Indiana’s Graduated Driver’s license law for young drivers. As younger drivers are an increasing risk in fatal crashes, Indiana passed a graduated driver’s license law. This needs to be evaluated including the impact the law has had, ways to strengthen the law, and other related information to further address the needs of young drivers.

Funding will cover salaries, fringe benefits, indirect costs, travel costs, printing and other related costs. (402-TR - $200,000.00; 154AL - $225,000.00)

Task # 2: Program Management

To increase the quality of the Indiana State Police Crash Records System, recruit agencies to report electronically, and to serve as the “Champion” for Crash Records, the Governor’s Council on Impaired & Dangerous Driving (Council) will employ a program coordinator to oversee and manage all the crash records initiatives. On a statewide and local level, the program coordinator will promote the importance of data quality and will utilize the 2005 Indiana Crash Records assessment as a guide for these improvements.

This task will provide salary, fringe benefits, travel costs to in- and out-of-state conferences and training seminars for one full-time program coordinator for the occupant protection program area. The occupant protection coordinator will provide for the administration and coordination of occupant restraint initiatives within the state. (402 TR - $ 53,000.00)
The State Department of Homeland Security enveloped the former Emergency Management Agency, which oversees much of Indiana’s Emergency Medical Services’ activities. Although the Council has not allocated any funding for this program area, EMS is represented on the Council’s Advisory Board as well as the Traffic Records Steering Committee.
COMMUNITY TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS

Task Narratives

Task 1: Program Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>funding will provide the two Communications Team employees salaries, fringe benefits, travel and other related costs. Approximately 75% of their time will be charged to this task. Impact in this task is statewide and funding is ongoing.</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Innovative</td>
<td>The Council will contract with six Law Enforcement Liaisons (LEL’s) to assist the state in reducing death, injury and economic costs as a result of motor vehicle crashes. The LEL’s are responsible for maintaining an effective program that concentrates on methods and activities as developed at the state and national level. The two main program areas are occupant protection and impaired driving. Specific responsibilities include meeting with law enforcement departments to assist in developing traffic safety programs and policies. The LEL’s travel both in and out of state representing the Council at events, workshops, meetings and conferences.</td>
<td>$420,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To achieve statewide visibility for traffic safety programs, encourage support from the media, provide employers with valuable information, and to promote awareness of the importance of traffic safety requires an experienced public relations staff. The Council employs a Communications Team of Two individuals who assist in statewide and local public awareness activities. This task will provide for program management services in the area of Public Information and Education. Funding will provide the two Communications Team employees salaries, fringe benefits, travel and other related costs. Approximately 75% of their time will be charged to this task. Impact in this task is statewide and funding is ongoing. (402 - $80,000.00)

The Council will contract with six Law Enforcement Liaisons (LEL’s) to assist the state in reducing death, injury and economic costs as a result of motor vehicle crashes. The LEL’s are responsible for maintaining an effective program that concentrates on methods and activities as developed at the state and national level. The two main program areas are occupant protection and impaired driving. Specific responsibilities include meeting with law enforcement departments to assist in developing traffic safety programs and policies. The LEL’s travel both in and out of state representing the Council at events, workshops, meetings and conferences, (157 innovative - $420,000.00)

Task 2: Marketing/Public Information and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402 (OP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405a J2 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 IN OP</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 – J8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 - AL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,600,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A critical element of improving highway safety is targeted and timely public information and education campaigns. Major public awareness efforts for the coming year include continued promotion of the “Click It or Ticket” and “You Drink & Drive, You Lose” campaigns. Ongoing sponsorships continue to be a vital part of the overall public information and education goals. Sponsorships with the Indiana
State Fair, Verizon Wireless Music Center, the Indiana Black Expo, Circle City Classic, and other partnerships enable the key messages to continue to reach over a million additional Hoosiers.

The Council employs strong public information efforts in the following programs:

- Operation Pull Over – a traffic safety campaign to increase seat belt usage and reduce impaired driving.
- DUI: Taskforce Indiana – a program for saturation patrols and sobriety checkpoints in areas where alcohol-related crashes are high;
- Effective July 1, 2005, the new child passenger safety/booster seat law went into effect that will have a coordinated public information and education campaign for the general public and law enforcement;
- Point of Youth – a group of high school students who make recommendations to lawmakers and develop outreach initiatives regarding traffic safety issues that affect youth in Indiana;
- Indiana Criminal Justice Institute – the agency helps build safe communities by connecting specific traffic safety issues to broader criminal justice issues: for example, unrestrained children as a form of neglect and impaired driving as a violent crime.

The Council contracts with an advertising/public relations agency to develop materials for its campaigns. Campaigns have an internal focus geared toward law enforcement and an external focus geared toward the public. Each enforcement blitz targets the general public and often a specific group within the larger population. Past campaigns have targeted seat belt usage among teen-age drivers, child passenger safety among mothers with young children, and impaired driving among 21-35 year-old males. The Council also has devoted past educational resources to address specific traffic safety concerns within minority populations. In all campaigns, regional news conferences, as well as print and electronic materials, highlight the efforts of local law enforcement and help to and develop community support.

Funding also provides for traffic safety planning kits for local communities, athletic events, seasonal activities, holidays, special contests and progress reports.

The Council, through the Automotive Safety Program, provides materials for distribution to various groups to promote safe cycling and pedestrian safety on an as-needed basis.

The Council collaborates with other groups to focus on such issues as child passenger safety, drowsy driving, underage drinking and minority issues.
**Task 3: Public Information Evaluation**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154AL</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$205,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation component of the public information campaigns is conducted by Council staff, Purdue University and Indiana University’s Public Opinion Laboratory. (154AL $55,000.00 and 157 IN OP $55,000.00)

The Council will contract with Clarian Health Promotions to provide local level community awareness planning with the primary focus on seat belt usage and impaired driving. The law enforcement departments that are more rural and do not have the expertise in setting up media events will be targeted. Funding will provide for salary, fringe benefits, travel, print materials, computer hardware and software and other related expenses. (402 – CP $50,000.00; 154AL - $50,000.00)

**PEDACYCLIST / PEDESTRIAN SAFETY**

The area of pedacyclist / pedestrian safety will be addressed through public information and education conducted in cooperation with the Automotive Safety Program which houses the Safe Kids State Coordinator as discussed in the Occupant Protection program area.

**MOTORCYCLE SAFETY**

The area of motorcycle safety will be addressed through public information and education in association with the Department of Education’s Division of School Traffic Safety and Emergency Planning, which coordinates the Indiana Motorcycle Operator Safety Education Program.
Highway Environment

Task 1: Hazard Elimination

Through the Indiana Traffic Records Steering Committee the Indiana State Police is continuing to improve the infrastructure of the vehicle crash records system (VCRS). A written plan for Vehicle Crash Records System self sufficiency has been submitted to NHTSA for approval and comments. The major areas of improvements during FY-05 are:

1) Providing web access to the VCRS system functionality and data for roughly 650 law enforcement agencies, and recruiting agencies to submit reports electronically.

2) Expand the GIS functionality so all agencies will have the ability to map any collision(s) they need to analyze. When these crashes are mapped, the agency will have the ability to display the primary and secondary causes of the crashes if so desired.

3) Develop a presence with the Access Indiana (state web-site), to conduct transactions of crash reports so the general public, insurance agencies, legal agencies may procure the crash report via the web. This is included with the self sufficiency plan.

4) Through the traffic records steering committee, provide business edits and implement those edits to further “Clean” the data so that it is more accurate.

The Council, in cooperation with INDOT, will fund future projects as the year progresses. (154HE $10,000,000.00)