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Executive Summary

Traffic safety continues to be one of the first and foremost concerns in the State of Maryland. Governor Robert L. Ehrlich has established safety as one of the five pillars of his administration and his commitment to safety is carried out through all government agencies, including the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), and the Maryland Highway Safety Office (MHSO). These organizations form the core for disseminating the Governor’s traffic safety messaging and emphasizing the seriousness of traffic crashes and the subsequent fatalities, injuries and property damage.

During the past year, there has been considerable good news to report. Traffic fatalities have once again decreased, declining from 643 in 2004 to roughly 614 in 2005. Perhaps most notable was the dramatic decline in impaired driving-related fatalities as reported through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA) Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). During 2005, such fatalities decreased by 18%, the second largest decline in the entire United States (US). In addition, as measured by a 2006 observational survey, Maryland’s safety belt use rate remained steady at 91%, again one of the highest use rates in the nation. Table 1, below, provides an overview of traffic safety in Maryland:

Table 1 – VMT, Fatality and Injury Information, 2001-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VMT (per 100 million miles)</th>
<th>Pct. Change</th>
<th>Fatalities*</th>
<th>Pct. Change</th>
<th>Fatality Rate*</th>
<th>Number Injured*</th>
<th>Alcohol-related Fatalities**</th>
<th>Safety Belt Use Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>60,051</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>83.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>59,517</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>85.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>58,118</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>87.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>57,409</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>89.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>55,303</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>91.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Maryland State Highway Administration, MHSO/TSAD
** Source: NHTSA, FARS

Effecting continual advances to traffic safety is difficult and the improvements experienced in Maryland are demonstrative of the top-down leadership required for long-term success. Maryland currently has the ninth lowest fatality rate in the nation and the State is steadily approaching the national goal of a 1.0 fatality rate or less. According to the NHTSA’s Motor Vehicle Safety software package, the economic impact during 2005 from each traffic fatality in Maryland was approximately $1.2 million. Using this figure, Maryland reduced the overall economic impact to the State resulting from traffic crashes by roughly $34.8 million. Most importantly, 29 less individuals were killed, impacting literally thousands of others, including family, friends, and co-workers.

Although there have been significant statewide successes in regard to highway safety, leadership throughout the State realizes that there is still much work to be done. This HSP identifies many of the major contributors to those successes and also addresses the roles of the

1 Note: In addition to public outreach efforts and high visibility enforcement, Maryland also increased roadside sobriety testing from 44% in 2004 to 75% in 2005. This figure also has an impact on the reported alcohol-related fatality figures as reported by the NHTSA FARS.
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MHSO’s partners in meeting the State’s future traffic safety needs. Relying on a tight-knit group of federal, state, and local government entities, as well as private sector organizations, crash prevention efforts conducted throughout the State involve a diverse mixture of projects.

As in the past, Maryland emphasizes an approach to highway safety that combines the “Four Es” of Education, Enforcement, Engineering, and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) to work toward its ultimate goal of saving lives and preventing injuries on its roadways. No recent endeavor has been as important to traffic safety in Maryland as the mandate by Congress for the implementation of a SHSP as a requirement for funding through the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) officially passed during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006.

Rather than merely being implemented as a step toward securing highway safety funding, Maryland’s leadership has utilized the SHSP implementation process as an opportunity to galvanize the State’s traffic safety efforts by securing commitments from a multitude of partners, many of which were not previously engaged in such programs. Maryland’s SHSP will provide a comprehensive framework for further reductions in highway safety fatalities and injuries on all public roads through the establishment of a statewide goal, objectives, key emphasis areas, and strategies.

Governor Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr. designated the Maryland SHA as the lead agency in the development of the SHSP. In partnership with the Maryland State Police (MSP), an Executive Committee was created, consisting of roughly 14 state cabinet-level Secretaries, Federal Officials, and top leaders of public and private sector agencies with a stake in traffic safety. The SHSP Steering Committee is an assembly of organizations which was tasked with developing the priority emphasis areas that form the basis of the SHSP. The SHSP Steering Committee developed these emphasis areas after a lengthy review process, incorporating many recommendations from other transportation agencies, including the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials. This marked the first time that such a diverse group of organizations was brought together specifically for the task of improving highway safety in Maryland. Emphasizing the importance of the SHSP, Maryland secured Memorandums of Understanding among all of its SHSP Executive Committee members, placing traffic safety as a top priority in the business plans of more than 30 federal, state, and local agencies.

The SHSP planning process included a historic safety summit during July of FFY 2006 where more than 320 highway safety stakeholders participated in an emphasis area work team. Those attending represented diverse backgrounds such as engineering, enforcement, EMS, education, transportation operations, and planning. During the Summit, the teams reviewed the objectives, prepared a list of strategies for each objective, and identified evaluation measures.

Stemming from this Summit, follow-up meetings were held in which Emphasis Area Team members narrowed the list of strategies to the most relevant, and most potentially effective, in reducing traffic fatalities and injuries throughout Maryland. These strategies will be incorporated into the final plan which will be presented for the Governor’s signature in September during FFY 2007 and the final plan will be submitted to the FHWA prior to September 30, 2006.

The SHSP is intended to be a working document and represents the future of highway safety in Maryland. Emphasis Area Teams will continue to monitor the progress of strategy implementation as well as to evaluate the potential impact of developing strategies. Maryland
has made a commitment to actively involve all state and local departments and agencies, as well as private sector organizations with a stake in traffic safety. In the words of MDOT Secretary Robert Flanagan, “Traffic safety is public safety.” As such, Maryland will continue to emphasize the comprehensive effort and commitment from all stakeholders – not just those in enforcement and the State government’s highway safety community.

In conjunction with efforts to provide uniformity in HSP reporting among all 50 states and additional territories, the MHSO has chosen to utilize the template provided by the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA). In brief summary, the template provides the following:

- **The Performance Plan**, including an explanation of the MHSO’s SHSP, the State’s overall problem identification process, an outline of target areas, as well as a summary of goals;
- **The Highway Safety Plan (HSP)**, containing information on the MHSO’s Program Areas;
- **The Certifications and Assurances**, containing all relevant legal information pertaining to the MHSO’s projects, signed by the Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety, Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, also the Administrator of the Maryland SHA; and
- **The Program Cost Summary**, including a detailed description of the MHSO’s funding source categories and funds allocated for projects.

For the convenience of readers and to eliminate confusing terminology, a list of commonly used terms and acronyms has been provided in *Appendix A: List of Acronyms*. 
Highway Safety Plan Overview

MHSO Mission Statement
Dedicated to saving lives and preventing injuries in Maryland by reducing the number and severity of motor vehicle crashes through the administration of a comprehensive and effective network of traffic safety programs.

Organization & Staffing

§ Section 402. Highway Safety Programs
(a) Each State shall have a highway safety program approved by the Secretary, designed to reduce traffic accidents and deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting therefrom.

In accord with the Highway Safety Act of 1966, Maryland established what is known today as the MHSO to assist in the reduction of crashes throughout the State. The MHSO is divided into two main areas – a Safety Programs Section and a Financial Management Section (FMS). The MHSO’s Chief, Mr. Vernon F. Betkey, Jr., oversees the operation of the entire office while two Section Chiefs assist in the oversight of section-specific operations.

The MHSO is a division within the Maryland SHA’s Office of Traffic and Safety (OOTS), and serves as Maryland’s designated State Highway Safety Office (SHSO). The State Highway Administrator serves as the Governor’s Highway Safety Representative and the Chief of the MHSO serves as Maryland’s Highway Safety Coordinator. Maryland’s highway safety program is facilitated by the MHSO’s staff and supported by a combination of federal highway safety incentive and innovative program funds, as well as state and local funds.

Each staff member within the MHSO is required to complete the NHTSA Program Management Course and many of the coordinators have completed the NHTSA Instructor Facilitator course as well. A complete staff listing, including positions and the names of the individuals currently assigned to these positions within the MHSO, is provided in Appendix B: Staff Listing.

During FFY 2006, a division split within the SHA’s OOTS resulted in the MHSO taking on additional staff. These employees, members of the former Traffic Safety Analysis Division (TSAD), serve as a vital link between the MHSO’s behavioral programs and the statewide data that is accessible for planning purposes. The absorption of these employees into the MHSO will only serve to strengthen the division’s effectiveness and capability in delivering top-quality non-infrastructure based programming. In addition, the MHSO was asked by the MDOT to manage the State’s Safe Routes to School (SR2S) funding and subsequently hired a SR2S Coordinator in FFY 2006. As a result of these acquisitions, potential reorganization of the MHSO’s management is pending.
Statewide Demographics

As of July 1, 2005, the Maryland Department of Planning provided an estimate stating that roughly 5.6 million people live in the State of Maryland, representing a 5.4% increase from the 2000 estimate. In contrast to its relatively small geographic size, Maryland ranks as the 19th most populated state, according to US Census Bureau Statistics. The Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) estimates that there are approximately 3.6 million licensed drivers throughout the State with more than 3.7 million vehicle registrations on record.

As with FFY 2006, Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Montgomery County, and Prince George’s County constitute the statistically densest regions in Maryland in terms of population. Roughly two-thirds of all Maryland residents live within these five areas.

Table 2, below, provides a complete breakdown of overall population growth by Maryland County. The table is listed in descending order, beginning with Montgomery County, which has experienced the most population growth since April 1, 2000.

TABLE 2 - Maryland Population Growth by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Region/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White Alone</th>
<th>Black or African American Alone</th>
<th>American Indian and Alaska Native Alone</th>
<th>Asian Alone</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>212,651</td>
<td>12,582</td>
<td>135,221</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50,193</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>14,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>29,078</td>
<td>-6,492</td>
<td>11,709</td>
<td>-207</td>
<td>20,921</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>26,420</td>
<td>-17,609</td>
<td>35,381</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>20,028</td>
<td>11,230</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>19,186</td>
<td>10,166</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>18,418</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>16,628</td>
<td>-1,349</td>
<td>16,228</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>16,533</td>
<td>13,642</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>15,801</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>7,682</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>12,703</td>
<td>10,740</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>11,170</td>
<td>9,228</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>10,736</td>
<td>-35,700</td>
<td>45,139</td>
<td>-169</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>9,824</td>
<td>7,220</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8,902</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>5,044</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's</td>
<td>4,848</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>-520</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>-240</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>-95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>-1,426</td>
<td>-1,698</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>-18,555</td>
<td>-12,169</td>
<td>-8,661</td>
<td>-177</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maryland Department of Planning, Planning Data Services, Population Division
Maryland’s population estimates from 2000 through 2005, with respect to age for both sexes combined, can be found on the next page in Table 3. Age-related information is vital to the MHSO’s comprehension of the needs and risks associated with various age groups. Analysis of this data allows the MHSO to generate programming specifically focused on delivering messages to various at-risk populations, most notably younger and older drivers.

TABLE 3 - Maryland Population Estimates by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and Age</th>
<th>July 1, 2000 Estimates base</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>July 1, 2005</th>
<th>July 1, 2004</th>
<th>July 1, 2003</th>
<th>July 1, 2002</th>
<th>July 1, 2001</th>
<th>July 1, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOTH SEXES</td>
<td>5,600,388</td>
<td>5,296,486</td>
<td>5,512,477</td>
<td>5,442,268</td>
<td>5,379,591</td>
<td>5,311,543</td>
<td>5,379,591</td>
<td>5,311,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>381,487</td>
<td>353,393</td>
<td>367,113</td>
<td>359,967</td>
<td>356,290</td>
<td>353,886</td>
<td>353,886</td>
<td>353,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>367,796</td>
<td>391,318</td>
<td>370,225</td>
<td>374,924</td>
<td>382,179</td>
<td>389,276</td>
<td>391,318</td>
<td>391,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>404,065</td>
<td>402,648</td>
<td>410,696</td>
<td>407,798</td>
<td>402,474</td>
<td>394,648</td>
<td>392,138</td>
<td>392,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>405,382</td>
<td>359,205</td>
<td>387,280</td>
<td>378,927</td>
<td>369,848</td>
<td>359,205</td>
<td>356,120</td>
<td>356,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>376,293</td>
<td>314,129</td>
<td>366,800</td>
<td>355,601</td>
<td>340,464</td>
<td>327,372</td>
<td>316,410</td>
<td>314,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>339,924</td>
<td>342,870</td>
<td>332,980</td>
<td>327,906</td>
<td>326,122</td>
<td>329,944</td>
<td>340,305</td>
<td>342,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>363,188</td>
<td>405,651</td>
<td>378,394</td>
<td>391,890</td>
<td>399,575</td>
<td>403,522</td>
<td>404,686</td>
<td>405,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>465,749</td>
<td>451,368</td>
<td>470,907</td>
<td>469,588</td>
<td>466,617</td>
<td>462,612</td>
<td>453,337</td>
<td>451,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>450,042</td>
<td>439,390</td>
<td>443,499</td>
<td>435,413</td>
<td>423,605</td>
<td>411,491</td>
<td>401,549</td>
<td>399,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>392,654</td>
<td>355,642</td>
<td>385,825</td>
<td>380,394</td>
<td>375,125</td>
<td>376,743</td>
<td>359,167</td>
<td>355,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>343,182</td>
<td>268,647</td>
<td>330,224</td>
<td>316,533</td>
<td>302,968</td>
<td>279,349</td>
<td>270,537</td>
<td>268,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>251,565</td>
<td>201,729</td>
<td>243,730</td>
<td>234,144</td>
<td>220,145</td>
<td>209,938</td>
<td>202,990</td>
<td>201,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>182,608</td>
<td>168,242</td>
<td>179,225</td>
<td>174,850</td>
<td>171,514</td>
<td>170,854</td>
<td>168,413</td>
<td>168,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>146,893</td>
<td>153,043</td>
<td>147,360</td>
<td>148,947</td>
<td>150,554</td>
<td>151,173</td>
<td>152,807</td>
<td>153,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>123,849</td>
<td>128,491</td>
<td>125,131</td>
<td>126,418</td>
<td>126,324</td>
<td>127,460</td>
<td>128,536</td>
<td>128,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>101,885</td>
<td>82,629</td>
<td>99,453</td>
<td>97,186</td>
<td>93,316</td>
<td>89,138</td>
<td>83,903</td>
<td>82,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>89,325</td>
<td>66,902</td>
<td>83,896</td>
<td>79,086</td>
<td>74,901</td>
<td>71,222</td>
<td>67,927</td>
<td>66,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The April 1, 2000 Population Estimates base reflects changes to the Census 2000 population from the Count Question Resolution program and geographic program revisions.

Suggested Citation:
Table 2: Annual Estimates of the Population by Sex and Age for Maryland: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2005 (SC-EST2005-02-24)
Source: Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau
Release Date: August 4, 2006

Source: Maryland Department of Planning, Planning Data Services, Population Division

In conjunction with an analysis of important age-based information, the MHSO also analyzes population estimates by race and gender. Analysis of ethnicity information allows the MSHO to recognize gaps in traffic safety messaging and adjust outreach efforts to meet the needs of diverse communities. The MHSO has utilized such information to place media, to create new messaging that is appealing to diverse audiences, and to aid the conduct of enforcement activities, namely enabling enforcement officers and traffic safety partners to more effectively communicate with Maryland’s diverse communities. Table 4, on the next page, provides an ethnic breakdown of Maryland’s total population:
TABLE 4 - Maryland Population Estimates by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex, Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin</th>
<th>July 1, 2005</th>
<th>July 1, 2004</th>
<th>July 1, 2003</th>
<th>July 1, 2002</th>
<th>July 1, 2001</th>
<th>July 1, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOTH SEXES</td>
<td>5,600,388</td>
<td>5,561,332</td>
<td>5,512,477</td>
<td>5,442,268</td>
<td>5,379,591</td>
<td>5,311,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td>5,515,669</td>
<td>5,479,998</td>
<td>5,434,607</td>
<td>5,367,880</td>
<td>5,307,919</td>
<td>5,242,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,599,858</td>
<td>3,583,359</td>
<td>3,574,440</td>
<td>3,547,961</td>
<td>3,525,671</td>
<td>3,499,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,640,316</td>
<td>1,617,046</td>
<td>1,590,477</td>
<td>1,561,240</td>
<td>1,534,000</td>
<td>1,504,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIAN</td>
<td>17,857</td>
<td>17,630</td>
<td>17,436</td>
<td>17,263</td>
<td>17,041</td>
<td>16,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>267,169</td>
<td>258,620</td>
<td>249,056</td>
<td>238,154</td>
<td>228,304</td>
<td>218,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>84,719</td>
<td>81,334</td>
<td>77,870</td>
<td>74,588</td>
<td>71,672</td>
<td>68,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The April 1, 2000 Population Estimates base reflects changes to the Census 2000 population from the Count Question Resolution program and geographic program revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex, Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin</th>
<th>April 1, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimates base</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH SEXES</td>
<td>5,311,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td>5,242,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,499,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,504,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIAN</td>
<td>16,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>218,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>68,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: Black = Black or African American; AIAN = American Indian and Alaska Native; NHPI = Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander

Map 1, on the following page, provides a graphic representation of Maryland’s growth with regard to race and total population density. Baltimore, Charles, Howard, Montgomery, and Prince George’s Counties experienced the largest overall minority population growth.

Local roadways clearly dominate the landscape within Maryland but the State is also dependent upon several key interstate routes, including I-95, I-495, I-695, I-97, and I-70, to maintain an efficient flow of traffic across its relatively small 9,700 square miles. As reported in the FHWA’s Highway Statistics: Miles By Ownership publication (located at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/ohim/hs04/htm/hm10.htm), roadway system, including all Federal, state, and local roads, exceeded 30,800 miles as of October 2005. Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for 2005, according to the SHA’s TSAD exceeded 55.7 billion miles.
Per 2004 statistics for Maryland’s Department of Business and Economic Development, roughly 3 million people work in Maryland. A higher percentage of the State's population is of prime workforce age (25-44) compared with the nation as a whole. The mobility of these employees, namely minimizing the impact to congestion, is a prime factor concerning Maryland when considering the State’s highway safety efforts. Maryland has experienced a 10-year workforce growth rate of roughly nine percent and this growth has continued to challenge Maryland’s already congested roadways. Maryland continues to be an emerging employment market and an additional 24,600 jobs have been added in 2006 to Maryland’s business payrolls, according to the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (source: http://www.dllr.state.md.us/lmi/mlr/junetren.htm).

Drive times in both the morning and the afternoon represent some of the busiest on Maryland’s roadways. As in the past, commuters will continue to be one of the primary targets for the MHSO's messaging during FFY 2007.

**Political Status**

Maryland will hold a gubernatorial election on November 7, 2006 and the Office of Governor, as well as numerous other elected positions, will be up for vote. The winning candidates will serve from 2007 to 2011.

Maryland’s Governor, Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr. is the first Republican to hold that particular office since Spiro Agnew vacated the office in 1969. Governor Ehrlich currently faces his major electoral competition from Baltimore City Mayor, Martin O’Malley. With the decision of current Lt. Governor Steele to run for a seat in the US Senate, Governor Ehrlich has named a new running mate, Ms. Kristen Cox, current Secretary of Disabilities and a former official with the U.S. Department of Educaiton. Governor Ehrlich has faced numerous challenges throughout 2005 and the beginning of 2006, including a lengthy price negotiation with local power company, Baltimore Gas and Electric. While the Governor is still likely to enjoy the advantages of encumbency, he will ultimately face a tough re-election campaign period.

**Major State Issues**

As with past years, a significant threat to highway safety exists in the form of potential legislation. Most notably, a repeal of the motorcycle helmet use law by adults or any legislation that could cause the loss of Maryland’s primary front-seat safety belt law would have a negative impact to the State’s injury and fatality numbers. No legislation that would impede the planning, development or implementation of Maryland's highway safety programs is anticipated.

Due to internal processes, delays have persisted in filling the vacancy of the Financial and Program Management Specialist within the MHSO's FMS. Filling future vacancies within the FMS is likely to be subject to similar delays, as all positions in this section are State positions. In addition to the aforementioned position, there has also been a lack of suitable candidates that have shown interest in applying for the vacant Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program Coordinator position. Unlike positions within the FMS, all of the MHSO’s Program Coordinators are contracted through the University of Maryland at College Park, thereby streamlining the hiring process to some degree. Finally, the MHSO and all of its employees and grantees continue to be subject to certain travel restrictions that have limited, but not yet inhibited, representation at essential out-of-state meetings and trainings.
Following the passing of SAFETEA-LU, Maryland faced challenges in interpreting and fully comprehending the various points that needed to be addressed in order to receive funding and to meet the requirements set forth in the legislation. The NHTSA proved to be an invaluable asset in these interpretations, as did other federal agencies such as the FHWA.

The SHSP process is another point of potential concern. A great deal of time, effort, and funding has been spent on constructing a HSP that is truly representative of all interests within the State of Maryland. Federal, state and local agencies have all been engaged in the process and made active and accountable participants in the process. Every attempt has been made to ensure that this process would live on in its current incarnation even in the face of a change in Maryland’s Governor. However, the eventual outcome of the SHSP may be in doubt if Governor Ehrlich is unsuccessful in his bid for re-election.

These possible changes in Maryland’s overall state political status during FFY 2007 will likely impact the MHSO in an as-yet undetermined capacity and may also have an impact on the State’s SHSP process. The possibility of turnover within the State government, particularly at the top-most levels, poses a significant potential threat to Maryland’s highway safety program.
Performance Plan

Problem Identification Process & Data Sources

To determine traffic fatality and injury trends, as well as Maryland’s overall highway safety status, crash data for the preceding years are collected and analyzed. Until recently, the MHSO had limited its analysis to the traditional sources of crash data – namely, the Maryland SHA’s TSAD, which manages the Maryland Automated Accident Records System (MAARS).

The MHSO uses the Maryland Statewide Accident Profiles, the Maryland Fatal Crash Trends Report, the Maryland Traffic Safety Facts, and the Maryland Research Note; all developed by the SHA’s TSAD to better guide its efforts. Crash data is obtained from MAARS, a system that compiles data from crash reports submitted by Maryland’s 144 law enforcement agencies. The MSP is responsible for maintaining the data contained within this system and shares information with TSAD for a wide range of analyses. Outputs include:

- number of police-reported crashes (fatal crashes, injury crashes & property damage only crashes)
- number of people affected (fatalities & injuries)
- number of vehicles involved
- fatality rate
- number injured rate

Ranking of program areas by their average annual number of crashes and determining over-representation of person, time and location related factors further focuses both educational and enforcement efforts. Specifically, age and gender are used to focus educational efforts and most of the remaining categories listed below are utilized to focus enforcement efforts. Factors analyzed include:

- age
- gender
- illumination
- time of day
- day of week
- location
- weather
- vehicle body type
- crash type
- route type
- contributing circumstance

Beginning in FFY 2004, the MHSO worked with the University Of Maryland School Of Medicine’s National Study Center for Trauma and EMS (NSC) to improve the problem identification process used by the MHSO and its grantees. Data sources included the Comprehensive Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System (CCODES), the Health Services Cost Review Commission (HSRC), the Maryland Ambulance Information System, and the Maryland Trauma Registry. Supplemental data factors included:

- statewide demographics
- exposure data (vehicle miles traveled, population, number of registered vehicles, number of licensed drivers)
- traffic citations & convictions
- driver & vehicle records
- offender & post-mortem alcohol test results
- statewide observational seat belt use rates (provided in conjunction with the local Community Traffic Safety Program (CTSP)
As a result, the NSC annually provides the following data to all 24 local CTSPs, in an effort to better focus programming efforts:

- **Data Summaries per program area** – shows areas of over-representation, and therefore target audiences, according to age, gender, month, day of week, time of day & road type
- **Impact Objectives per program area** – objectives are calculated using the same method that is used for statewide objectives
- **Ranking of program areas** – ranks program areas according to total crashes, injuries & fatalities
- **Density maps per program area** – shows general locations with a certain number or more crashes per square mile
- **Driver residence & overall crashes** – links driver residence data with license files
- **Citations per program area** – shows number of persons issued citations, as well as number of citations issued
- **Citations vs. Crashes ratio per impaired driving** – shows ratio of impaired driving citations to crashes
- **Crime-Crash Clock** – compares number of murders, assaults & associated crimes with number of fatalities, injuries & associated crashes
- **Adjudication per program area** – shows disposition of citations
- **Hospital data per program area** – shows number of inpatients, hospital days & hospital charges, as well as principal source of payment by person type
- **Top 10 Causes of Death** – shows where motor vehicle fatalities ranks as a cause of death

This data is analyzed for trends and substantial deviations from these trends. Inter-jurisdictional comparisons and comparisons with regional and national data are also used in the identification process. Ultimately, the data is used to determine target areas for action in each jurisdiction, countermeasures for which are enumerated in the CTSP Project Agreements (PA) for FFY 2007.

In the meantime, the MHSO is making strides in developing its problem identification even further, through enhanced partnerships with a number of long-time and new grantees:

- MSP
- MVA
- Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME)
- Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Information Systems
- Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems (MIEMSS)
- University of Maryland at College Park

In addition, Maryland will continue to use data available on the internet to assist in problem identification. Present sources of data being used by both the MHSO and its grantees include the Maryland Department of Planning, the US Census Bureau, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the FHWA.
Summary of Goals

Each year, the NHTSA establishes national priority program areas for the states to follow. However, each state is given the ability to adjust their priority areas using their own state and local data. Impaired driving prevention and occupant protection will continue to be the lead program priorities for Maryland’s highway safety program in FFY 2007. Data Enhancement has assumed the third priority during the grant year and Maryland continues to strive for automated mobile reporting capabilities and real-time data capture. In addition, Maryland seeks to enhance the accessibility to this data for highway safety partners. Real-time data and subsequent analysis of this data will ultimately allow Maryland to make significant programmatic adjustments to achieve the results desired by the MHSO and its highway safety partners. A more efficient and effective use of funding would allow the targeting of those populations most at risk not only in the areas of occupant protection and impaired driving prevention, but also pedestrian/bicycleshool zone safety, aggressive driving prevention, motorcycle safety, inattentive driving prevention, and those programs administered for general driver safety. The following listing identifies Maryland’s top priority traffic safety areas during FFY 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY PROGRAM AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Impaired Driving Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Occupant Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Data Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Community Traffic Safety Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aggressive Driving Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pedestrian – Pedalcycle Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Motorcycle Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inattentive Driving Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 General Driver Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Police Traffic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Diversity in Traffic Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Emergency Medical Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overall goal has been established for Maryland’s highway safety program for FFY 2007 and several objectives have also been identified as being critical to the program’s success. Individual program and general area objectives have also been set for the various priority program areas as well. Objectives have been broken down into two categories: Impact Objectives, which focus on the crash data, and Administrative Objectives, which focus on the countermeasures used to address the problems and issues identified by data. Each program area has its own set of Impact and Administrative Objectives. The general areas, such as Police Traffic Services, use a general set of overall Impact Objectives, but have their own set of Administrative Objectives. The overall Impact Objectives are listed below.

Combining variables that the MHSO’s governing agencies desire the State to follow allowed the development of Maryland’s highway safety program Impact Objectives. These agencies include the NHTSA, the GHSA, and the Maryland SHA. The objectives are written in
such a way that they are specific, measurable, action-oriented, realistic and time-bound (S.M.A.R.T.). They are broken down into three main areas:

- **Number (N)** – number of total crashes / fatal crashes / injury crashes / fatalities / injuries
- **Rate per VMT** – total crash rate / fatal crash rate / injury crash rate / fatality rate / injury rate
- **Rate per Population** – total crash rate / fatal crash rate / injury crash rate / fatality rate / injury rate

### OVERALL PROGRAM GOAL

- To substantially reduce motor vehicle-related crashes, thereby reducing the fatalities, injuries, and resulting property damage.

### OVERALL IMPACT OBJECTIVES

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 104,103 in 2004 to 99,981 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 576 in 2004 to 527 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 36,611 in 2004 to 33,067 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 643 in 2004 to 608 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 53,753 in 2004 to 43,069 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 188.87 to 177.27 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.05 to 0.85 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 66.42 to 53.43 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.17 to 0.98 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 97.52 to 69.60 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 1,873.01 to 1,848.95 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 10.36 to 8.89 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 685.70 to 557.32 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 11.57 to 10.26 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 967.12 to 725.90 in 2010.

Each program area has been assigned 15 Impact Objectives that have been developed based on progress in the previous five-year period. For example, if aggressive driving crashes decreased by three percent in the past five years, then the objective for the following five-year period would be a decrease of another three percent. Conversely, if impaired driving crashes increased by eleven percent over the past five years, then the five-year average is used as the measure. In every case, there has been a decrease and an appropriately sound measure has been used in formulating the new objectives.

Unless otherwise indicated, the MHSO is projected to meet its stated objectives by the end of 2010. Progress toward achieving these objectives in the interim is expected to be linear. This date was chosen in order for the MHSO’s goal and objectives to fall more closely in line with those addressed in the Maryland SHA’s Business Plan, as well as Maryland’s SHSP.
State of the State

In 2005, 614 people were killed in the 102,624 police-reported traffic crashes in Maryland, while 53,303 people were injured and 65,499 crashes involved property damage only. In total, 374 drivers (295 vehicle drivers and 79 motorcycle operators), 111 pedestrians (101 pedestrians-on-foot, 7 bicyclists and 3 others) and 129 passengers were killed on Maryland highways. On average, one person was killed every 14.3 hours, 152 people were injured each day (6.3 injuries every hour), and 281 police-reported traffic crashes occurred everyday.

TABLE 5 – Statewide Total Crashes, Injury Crashes, Fatal Crashes, Injuries & Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5 Year Average</th>
<th>% All Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>60,051</td>
<td>59,517</td>
<td>58,118</td>
<td>53,753</td>
<td>55,303</td>
<td>58,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>62,286</td>
<td>65,362</td>
<td>69,824</td>
<td>66,916</td>
<td>65,499</td>
<td>65,815</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>38,523</td>
<td>38,875</td>
<td>38,710</td>
<td>36,611</td>
<td>36,548</td>
<td>38,016</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>101,411</td>
<td>104,843</td>
<td>109,130</td>
<td>104,103</td>
<td>102,624</td>
<td>104,422</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maryland State Highway Administration, TSAD

Over the past five years, an average of 104,422 total crashes occurred on Maryland’s roadways and 646 people have lost their lives each year. In addition, an average of 58,080 people has been injured annually. For FFY 2007, the MHSO has been provided with detailed statistical breakdowns for all crashes. Key areas include the age of the driver, the driver’s gender, the month, day of the week, and time of day of the crash, the road type where the crash took place, and the county where the crash occurred.

However, it was a year of marked progress. Several positives are to be noted with regard to Maryland’s traffic safety statistics during 2005. For the third straight year, total statewide fatalities decreased, from 643 in 2004 to 614 in 2005. Overall, fatalities have decreased for each of the past five years, from a five-year high of 661 in 2001, as noted in Graph 1 on the following page. Over the past year, the total number of crashes decreased by 1,479 and total fatalities decreased by 29. Unfortunately, the number of injuries increased over the past year.

Additionally, the twelve-year fatality rate trend for Maryland continued to decrease from a high of over 1.59 in 1992 to a low of 1.08 in 2005. Maryland’s overall fatality rate has also consistently been lower than the national fatality rate for every year since 1992, and 2005 was no exception. Finally, the total multiple injury crashes decreased in 2005, and property crashes also decreased. Total VMT increased by slightly less than 1% to 56.7 billion in 2005. When the increase in VMT is factored into the crash statistics, the marked improvement in crash trends becomes clear, as noted in the graph on the following page, which illustrates the downward trend in the fatality rate and the upward trend of VMT.
GRAPH 1 – Maryland Vehicle Miles of Travel & Traffic Fatality Trends for State & Local Highways
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GRAPH 2 – Maryland Vehicle Miles of Travel & Traffic Fatality Rate Trends for State & Local Highways
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5-YEAR CRASH TRENDS

Table 6, below, illustrates Maryland’s highway safety crash trends over the past five years. Individual program areas are ranked by total crashes, injuries and fatalities. The rankings are computed using five-year averages with data collected from 2001 through 2005. The chart reveals that on average, the highest number of total crashes and injuries involve inattentive, young, older and alcohol impaired drivers. However, a different pattern emerges among fatalities. Persons involved in alcohol impaired, inattentive, young and older driver crashes suffer more fatal injuries.

TABLE 6 – Statewide Crashes, Injuries & Fatalities by Program Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5 Yr Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CRASHES</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive Driving</td>
<td>41,842</td>
<td>44,131</td>
<td>47,969</td>
<td>44,972</td>
<td>32,231</td>
<td>42,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver (age 16-20)</td>
<td>21,188</td>
<td>22,430</td>
<td>22,354</td>
<td>20,882</td>
<td>20,318</td>
<td>21,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Driver (65 &amp; above)</td>
<td>10,255</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>10,226</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>10,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Impaired Driving</td>
<td>8,754</td>
<td>8,774</td>
<td>8,719</td>
<td>8,556</td>
<td>8,479</td>
<td>8,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>3,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>2,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Involved</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedalcycle</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INJURIES</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive Driving</td>
<td>26,636</td>
<td>26,868</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>26,523</td>
<td>17,405</td>
<td>24,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver (age 16-20)</td>
<td>15,059</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>14,373</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>13,281</td>
<td>14,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Driver (65 &amp; above)</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>6,916</td>
<td>7,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Impaired Driving</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>4,886</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>5,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>2,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Involved</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedalcycle</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FATALITIES</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Impaired Driving</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive Driving</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver (age 16-20)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Driver (65 &amp; above)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Involved</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedalcycle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maryland State Highway Administration, TSAD

Note: Figures do not take into account exposure data such as VMT, population, registered vehicles and licensed drivers. Categories may also overlap (i.e. 16 year old alcohol/drug impaired driver). For this table, alcohol/drug impaired refers to crashes in which the operator of the motor vehicle was reported to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

Programmatic and fiscal proposals for FFY 2007 were developed utilizing the aforementioned information. The MHSO used all available data to determine levels of funding for the various program areas, a process which became especially vital with FFY 2007’s limited financial resources.
ALTERNATE SOURCES OF DATA

The MHSO continued to collaborate with the NSC to improve the problem identification process for FFY 2007. The following tables and graphs were compiled by the NSC to allow for an alternative look at the progress and/or continuing issues of those areas addressed by the Maryland highway safety program.

HOSPITAL DISCHARGES

The HSCRC collects data on patients discharged from Maryland hospitals. The following three representations contain data on 6,549 patients discharged from Maryland hospitals in 2005, after involvement in a motor vehicle crash. During the past year, victims of motor vehicle crashes accumulated over $89 million in hospital charges. The number of motorcycle admissions increased by 40% compared to 2002 data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Charge ($ in 1,000s)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Percentile ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td>40,319</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>3,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>16,031</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclist</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>17,311</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedalcyclist</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>10,144</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,549</td>
<td>89,028</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSC

When combined across all hospital visits in Maryland, drivers and passengers accounted for two-thirds of all motor vehicle related hospital charges (45.3% and 18.0%, respectively). Yet motorcyclists and pedestrians accumulated the highest median hospital charges per hospital visit ($8,247 and $5,352, respectively).

GRAPH 3 – 2005 Principal Source of Payment of Hospital Charges

Source: NSC
Slightly more than two-thirds of all payments were attributed to private insurance carriers. Pedestrians were highest in terms of payment by government sources (28%), and also had the highest percentage of self-payers (23%).

**AMBULATORY CARE**

The HSCRC also collects data on each outpatient hospital encounter, i.e. ED(ED) visit, in Maryland hospitals. However, the file does not contain information on patients treated by private physicians. The following three representations contain data on 74,181 outpatient ambulatory care visits in 2005, after involvement in a motor vehicle crash.

The distribution of ED charges (not including professional fees) among persons injured in a motor vehicle crash is displayed in the chart above.
nearly $28 million in ED charges in 2005. This, when combined with in-patient charges, brings the total in excess of $110 million. Here, drivers and passengers accounted for nearly 85% of the total (58.1% and 26.4%, respectively). Once again, motorcyclists and pedestrians had the highest median charges per visit ($419 and $402, respectively).

**GRAPH 5 – 2005 Principal Source of Payment of Ambulatory Care**

![Graph 5](image)

Source: NSC

**GRAPH 6 – 2005 Principal Source of Payment of Ambulatory Care by Person Type**

![Graph 6](image)

Source: NSC

More than half of all ED visit payments were attributed to private insurance carriers. As found in the hospital discharge data, pedestrians were highest in terms of payment by government sources (6.8%), although the proportion of the total bill paid by the government was much smaller. Passengers were highest in terms of those who self-paid or used other insurance means (approximately 46%), and motorcyclists were most likely to be covered by private insurance.
**EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Regarding EMS response time, a total of 34,546 transported cases injured in a motor vehicle crash (including motorcyclists and pedestrians) were identified in the 2004 Maryland Ambulance Information System. EMS response time was calculated as the number of minutes between the time the call was received by the EMS system to the time the ambulance arrived at the scene location. The median EMS response time was 6 minutes and the mean response time was 7.3 minutes, with a standard deviation of 6.4 minutes.

**TRAUMA REGISTRY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclist</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedalcyclist</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,997</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSC

The Maryland Trauma Registry contains a record pertaining to each primary admission to the nine trauma centers located throughout the state. A treated patient is considered a primary admission if he/she is not released from the ED within six hours of arrival. According to the 2004 Maryland Trauma Registry, a total of 5,997 persons were admitted to a trauma center for injuries sustained in a motor vehicle crash. The majority of these patients were drivers (54%) and passengers (21%). Pedestrians accounted for approximately 12% of all motor vehicle related primary admissions.

**CITATIONS / COURT**

Table 10, on the following page, contains data on the ten most commonly issued citations in Maryland in 2004. Each citation identifies a violation of the state transportation article. Through October, more than 1.1 million citations had been issued throughout the state. More than a third were issued to motorists due to a speeding violation, and another 11% were issued for improper seatbelt use. Guilt was determined in the vast majority of improper seatbelt use cases (86%) and in two-thirds of cases cited for speeding violations.
TABLE 10 – Top Ten Types of Traffic Citations, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% Guilty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>384,777</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improper belt use</td>
<td>127,180</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expired registration</td>
<td>77,505</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence (DUI) or Driving While Intoxicated (DWI)</td>
<td>57,066</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Failure to carry registration card</td>
<td>54,088</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Suspended / revoked license</td>
<td>53,294</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Registration violation (with canceled registration)</td>
<td>48,010</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Failure to obey traffic control device</td>
<td>41,867</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Failure to carry license</td>
<td>44,504</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Driving without required license and authorization</td>
<td>29,952</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>918,243</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSC

Judiciary outcomes for three of the top four cited traffic violations are listed in the table below. The pattern of outcomes for DWI/DUI cases was slightly different than that for speeding and improper belt use violations. Since multiple citations may be issued for a single DWI/DUI arrest, frequently only the most relevant citation is prosecuted while others are Nol Prossed or otherwise disposed.

TABLE 11 – Citation Type by Court Disposition, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Guilty</th>
<th>Not Guilty</th>
<th>Probation Before Judgment</th>
<th>Dismissed</th>
<th>Nol Pross</th>
<th>Jury Trial</th>
<th>Merge with Other Citation</th>
<th>Fail to Appear</th>
<th>Inactive Docket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>257,746</td>
<td>14,098</td>
<td>69,679</td>
<td>5,998</td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>25,761</td>
<td>4,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt Use</td>
<td>110,002</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>10,817</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI/DUI</td>
<td>6,346</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>9,325</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>26,521</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>6,346</td>
<td>5,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSC

All data in the above Performance Plan section, as well as a number of newly developed variables, will soon be available on the NSC website for use by the MHSO’s grantees and partners. This is being done in an effort to continually improve upon Maryland’s problem identification process and its subsequent effect on highway safety countermeasures.
Program Area Details

Throughout FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund a variety of programs, projects and activities, with federal transportation dollars, which are intended to advance the traffic safety goals set forth by the State of Maryland. For FFY 2007, these Program Areas have been arranged to coincide with their position in the MHSO’s overall set of priority Program Areas, as defined in the “Summary of Goals” section. It is important to note that the Program Area priorities have not changed from FFY 2006, with impaired driving prevention, occupant protection and the enhancement of statewide data collection and dissemination comprising the top-most priorities within Maryland.

Within each section, crash data, Impact Objectives, and Administrative Objectives will be provided. However, roughly half of the Program Areas identified utilize a general set of Impact Objectives, namely Data Enhancement, the CTSPs, General Driver Safety, Police Traffic Services, Diversity in Traffic Safety, EMS, Engineering, and Planning and Administration. In these sections, only the Administrative Objectives will be stated, as these vary according to the Program being discussed.

The use of federal Section 157, 406, 408, 410, 2010, and 163 funds (in accordance with fund use limitations) is planned and the activities for which these funds will be used are included in the appropriate program area descriptions. The Program Cost Summary section identifies the specific planned uses of the various grant funds in FFY 2007. Additionally, basic program cost summaries are provided at the end of each individual Program Area section.

As in past years, all of the program areas identified by the NHTSA as being of national priority are significant components of Maryland’s HSP. However, not all of the national priority program areas are addressed in this application. For example, the OOTS has a significant number of divisions, such as its Motor Carrier Division, that are assigned the primary responsibility for overseeing a variety of issues such as truck safety. The MHSO continues to provide maximum cooperation to these divisions to ensure the most complete highway safety program possible.

NOTE: * Unless otherwise noted, all tables and graphs included in each of the Program Areas are provided by the SHA’s MHSO/TSAD and the MAARS database.
Table 12 – Crash Summary: Driver or Pedestrian Involved Alcohol or Drug Impaired *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5-Year AVG.</th>
<th>5-Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>5,231</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>5,185</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>8,754</td>
<td>8,774</td>
<td>8,719</td>
<td>8,556</td>
<td>8,479</td>
<td>8,656</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>4,886</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years, on average, 8,656 impaired driving crashes have occurred annually on Maryland’s roadways and 187 people have lost their lives each year. This loss of life represents nearly 29% of all of Maryland’s traffic fatalities. In addition, on average, 5,154 people have been injured annually, accounting for nearly 9% of all of Maryland’s traffic injuries.

- **AGE** – Drivers 21 to 24 accounts for 16.2% of total drivers involved in impaired crashes, compared to 9.4% for statewide crashes.
- **GENDER** – Men are significantly over-represented in impaired driving, comprising 74.8% of all impaired drivers involved in crashes, 77% of impaired driver injuries and 84% of fatalities.
- **MONTH** – Total and injury crashes exhibit similar trends as total statewide crashes. Also, slightly more fatal crashes occur in August.
- **DAY OF WEEK** – A higher percentage of total and injury crashes occurs on Saturday and Sunday. A higher percentage of fatal crashes occur on Saturday, Sunday and Friday. (Please note that Saturday begins at one minute past midnight and may be a carry over from Friday evening.)
- **TIME OF DAY** – More total, injury and fatal crashes occur between 8:00 pm and 4:00 am than any other time of day. About 30.8% of total and 40% of fatal crashes occur between midnight and 4:00 am.
- **ROAD TYPE** – The total, injury, and fatal crash trends are similar to the statewide crash trends. More total crashes occur on state and county roads, injury crashes occur more often on state roads, and fatal crashes occur more often on state roads.
- **COUNTY** – Washington and Worcester Counties are over-represented in total crashes. Cecil and Charles Counties are over-represented in fatal crashes.

### IMPACT OBJECTIVES

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 8,556 in 2004 to 8,173 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 183 in 2004 to 176 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 3,082 in 2004 to 2,364 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 215 in 2004 to 206 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 4,572, in 2004 to 3,069 in 2010.
To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 15.52 to 13.21 in 2010.
To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.33 to 0.32 in 2010.
To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 5.59 to 3.82 in 2010.
To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of .39 to .37 in 2010.
To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 8.29 to 4.96 in 2010.
To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 153.94 to 137.75 in 2010.
To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 3.29 to 3.16 in 2010.
To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 55.45 to 39.84 in 2010.
To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 3.87 to 3.72 in 2010.
To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 82.26 to 51.73 in 2010.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES

To hold 100 sobriety checkpoints by September 30, 2007.
To make 26,000 impaired driving arrests by September 30, 2007.
To develop 3 new pieces of impaired driving educational material by September 30, 2007.
To distribute 230,000 pieces of impaired driving educational material by September 30, 2007.
To hold 4 Impaired Driving Coalition (IDC) meetings by September 30, 2007.
To make 5,000,000 media impressions by September 30, 2007.
To distribute, collect and analyze 300 Law Enforcement/Judiciary Surveys by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s overall Impaired Driving Prevention Program is funded from Section 410 and 402 monies. A total of $1,595,100 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $761,700 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $2,356,800 in funds to be spent on the Impaired Driving Prevention Program in FFY 2007. Costs associated with the Impaired Driving Program Coordinator are covered in this area.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will purchase $450,000 of paid media for the statewide Checkpoint StrikeForce (CPSF) campaign and additional impaired driving prevention and awareness advertising. These campaigns will be designed to support the NHTSA Mid-Atlantic Region’s law enforcement campaign’s objectives, will target Maryland-specific issues, and will be placed during the high visibility enforcement periods, and other seasonally important times. The evaluation plan for these campaigns will include the number of spots purchased, the time of day the media placements air, the stations carrying the spots, the target demographic for the announcement, and the number of media impressions made.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will partner for a third year with Virginia and the District of Columbia (DC) in the tri-jurisdictional CPSF media campaign, its mission being to curb impaired driving through the use of education, enforcement and accompanying outreach efforts throughout an expanded Central Maryland/Baltimore area, Washington Metro area, Hagerstown, and Salisbury markets of Maryland. The efforts of this campaign, while supportive of the regional law enforcement and educational program, are independent of neighboring states and are complimentary of the MHSO’s overall impaired driving prevention program and messaging. Continued coordination of the campaign message and materials will carry on
throughout FFY 2007 in order to maintain a year-long comprehensive program to increase awareness of enforcement efforts, and the consequences of impaired driving from a legal, health and emotional perspective.

To continue elevating the efforts of CPSF, specifically its combined enforcement and education/awareness components, the MHSO will unveil and implement an enforcement and public information and education (PI&E) plan to increase sobriety checkpoints and/or saturation patrols in concert with its paid media campaign during FFY 2007. This plan recognizes that a large number of police agencies participate in CPSF but are not capable of staffing impaired driving enforcement operations without pulling resources, in other words Maryland police departments (PD) more often than not organize joint operations. These operations pull officers from various departments - typically two to four different agencies work together to carry out a sobriety checkpoint. Given this reality, the plan identifies joint enforcement teams in each county throughout Maryland. These teams are called projects and will be asked to carry out at least one sobriety checkpoint and/or saturation patrol per quarter, as well as, at least four operations during the two week national impaired driving mobilization. This does not, however, prohibit or discourage departments who can manage to carry out operations independently from doing so. In the long run the MHSO hopes this plan will help increase the total number of operations carried out statewide during FFY 2007 and in turn provide more opportunities to reach our target audience through direct contact with the law. This is an important component of the overall campaign as a recent focus group of this population revealed that males ages 18-34 are not phased by advertising efforts because they do not believe they will have contact with the law.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will continue to serve as the lead agency with regard to statewide impaired driving prevention efforts. Maryland’s IDC, facilitated and supported by the MHSO, meets quarterly and is aimed at providing networking possibilities for advocates, organizations, agencies and businesses having an interest and desire in making a contribution in the field of impaired driving prevention. The IDC will continue to consist of a diverse membership, including state agencies, local agencies, law enforcement representation and private businesses. Speakers will be invited to present cutting-edge information, new initiatives, and data research to maintain better insight into the problems and solutions in the impaired driving area. In compliance with the organizational structure developed by the coalition in FFY 2005, the IDC will continue to work in the following Sub-Committees: Public Awareness, CPSF, Improved Practice of Law, Creating Effective Legislation, Data Collection, and Education to Prevent Impaired Driving. These committees will work toward meeting and evaluation the objectives set in 2005 and will meet at least two times a year. This FFY the committees will evaluate the objectives agreed upon in FFY 2005 and compare them to the objectives established by the 2006 SHSP Impaired Driving Emphasis Area Team and adopted by the SHSP Steering Committee for the State of Maryland. Some of the objectives set by the committee in FFY 2005 include: legislative analysis of state impaired driving laws, study of best practices from other states on legislative successes, needs assessment for law enforcement and judiciary, training/brown bag lunches for law enforcement and judiciary, improved media involvement in IDC and its events/campaigns, increased cooperative efforts amongst law enforcement agencies and local prevention advocates, and the catalogue existing public awareness materials and resources to ensure concerted statewide messaging. Additionally, the IDC legislative brochure will be reprinted by a partnering agency, listing the issues the IDC deems relevant for 2007, and shall be distributed to every interested organization.
In addition to the newest law card developed in FFY 2006, the IDC will design, produce and develop impaired driving prevention materials such as posters, coasters, and seasonally appropriate materials for statewide partners to distribute locally throughout the year.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include the Judges’ Training sponsored and supported the MHSO, the Maryland Drug Treatment Commission and the Century Council; the Prosecutors’ Training, the DUI Law Enforcement Awards Ceremony, Maryland Remembers, a memorial service recognizing impaired driving victims during National Drunk and Drugged Driving Prevention Month; a Statewide Law Enforcement Day to support the National Crackdown on Impaired Driving; continuation of the CPSF campaign; and press events, one announcing CPSF and the law enforcement crackdown, and another for Maryland Remembers activities, and the results of annual campaigns.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its impaired driving prevention objectives:

**American Automobile Association (AAA) Mid-Atlantic Region – Tipsy? Taxi!**

- Non-profit
- Target audience – 21 year and older
- Target area – Baltimore Area Residents (originating at establishments within Baltimore City limits)

The Tipsy?Taxi! Program which is modeled after the Washington Regional Alcohol Program’s SoberRide Campaign will provide free taxi rides to drivers who have been drinking and need a safe ride home. The program was piloted during the 2006 July 4th holiday and more than 150 free rides were provided to potentially impaired drivers during the pilot. The program will be available for three holidays throughout the FFY 2007, beginning with the New Year’s holiday in 2006. Free taxi rides will be available to those 21 years old and older who have been drinking at an establishment (restaurant or bar) within Baltimore City limits. Those wishing to utilize the service will be directed via an intense earned media campaign prior to each ride program to call 1-877-963-TAXI for a SAFE & FREE RIDE HOME within the Baltimore metropolitan area. Riders may only request a ride home and not to another bar, party, or public location. A ride provided by Tipsy?Taxi! may not exceed $50. Anything over $50 must be paid by the Tipsy?Taxi! passenger(s). The program is committed to reducing drunk driving and recognizes that holidays can be deadly due to drunk driving fatalities. Partners of this program include AAA Mid-Atlantic, Yellow Cab of Baltimore, and the MHSO. The program partners will be working on expanding public and private partners to support this program.

**Emergency Nurses Cancel Alcohol-Related Emergencies (ENCARE) Association, Maryland Chapter – Alcohol Screening & Brief Intervention Pilot**

- Non-profit
- Target audience – 18 and older
- Target area – State of Maryland

This project is proposed to develop and provide a comprehensive guide with all the necessary tools to implement the program, including training materials, implementation strategies and resources/tools to emergency departments, with potential to reach other health care settings, on the most efficient and effective means of implementing a system for screening patients for alcohol use, provide a brief intervention and referral. The project will outline the benefits of the program while providing a guide for the long-term implementation and evaluation for an alcohol screening, brief intervention and referral program in emergency departments, starting with Montgomery County as a pilot site.
Local Law Enforcement / Statewide – Impaired Driving Enforcement

- County & local government agencies
- Target audience – general public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to increase traffic patrols and sobriety checkpoints in areas and at specific times where impaired driving has been identified as a problem in local communities and local roadways. Increased enforcement will be conducted during heavily advertised enforcement waves, building the public perception of coordinated enforcement across the state. Almost all law enforcement agencies in the state devote some portion of their traffic enforcement efforts to reducing impaired driving, and many are supported at the local level through their CTSP Coordinator. Additionally, the MHSO Law Enforcement Program Coordinator will work closely with newly formed checkpoint task forces across the state, providing them technical support as well as facilitating instruction in the form of Checkpoint Manager’s training to police supervisors. Best practices of previous pilot projects and innovative operations will be shared across the state, including a greater utilization of the low-manpower sobriety checkpoints. Additionally, training for patrol officers will continue to be offered to police agencies across the state in the form of Catch ‘em If You Can seminars which assists officers in identifying strategies for dealing with circumstances that might otherwise discourage the arrest of an impaired driver.

Maryland District Court, Anne Arundel, Harford and Howard Counties – DUI/Drug Courts

- State agency
- Target audience – Convicted subsequent DUI offenders
- Target area – Anne Arundel, Harford and Howard County District Courts

The DUI/Drug Court is designed to address individuals over the age of 18, who have been charged with a DUI/DWI or a violation of probation, on those charges, offering them a highly intensive monitoring and rehabilitative treatment program. Eligible individuals will have a prior history of DUI or DWI convictions, no pending sentences or warrants, and will not currently be on parole or probation. The program will divert offenders from long periods of incarceration. However, they must serve any minimum mandatory sentence prior to entering the treatment program. This program is intended as a post-conviction, voluntary program that utilizes a multi-faceted approach to rehabilitation. The program proposes to reduce recidivism for the repeat DUI offenders participating in each county court program, and increase abstinence from alcohol by 50 percent. Offenders will be monitored by frequent alcohol and drug tests. They will meet frequently with their team, consisting of a judge, probation monitor, treatment personnel, and their supervising officer. These meetings are likely to be weekly in the first phase and less frequent in the second and third phases. Participants will be tracked for one year following discharge to assess recidivism, drug use, and social functioning.

Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Support Services – Adult & Youth PI&E Campaign

- State agency
- Target audience – 21-24 year old males
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is reduce the incidence of impaired driving through a statewide mass media campaign. The project will target young adults, predominantly males between the ages of 21 and 24 as they account for 17 percent of total drivers involved in impaired driving related crashes. The campaign will use a multi-faceted approach to increase awareness of the impaired driving problem and its consequences. Partnering with many State and local agencies, the campaign will use traditional radio Public Service Announcements (PSA) as the medium as
well as the internet, television interviews, and public events to convey the message. The project is seeking statewide impact, reaching urban and rural communities, especially those over represented in impaired driving crashes.

Maryland State’s Attorneys’ Association – Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor

- State agency
- Target audience – Prosecutors, Judges and Law Enforcement
- Target area – State of Maryland

The Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) will provide critical support in enhancing the capability of the State’s Prosecutors to effectively prosecute DUI/DWI cases. Further outcomes of this project will include assessing training needs, developing and providing training programs for prosecutors, and law enforcement officers, working closely with the State Judicial Educator for interaction and training with judges, and other traffic safety professionals with an emphasis on the effective prosecution of impaired driving cases. Productive police/prosecutor relations will play a key role in the successful adjudication of major traffic offenses including cross training on all aspects of highway related cases including, educating a prosecutor on the nature of an officer's job on the street as well as police officers on the elements of a complete and proper courtroom presentation. The TSRP will also provide continual, progressive legal assistance, support, and information to prosecutors on impaired driving cases. The TSRP will also be tasked with improving the coordination between law enforcement, state's attorneys, judges, the MHSO, and other highway safety professionals. Innovative approaches to the prosecution and adjudication of impaired driving cases will be accomplished by annual outreach to judges and prosecutors.

Maryland State Police – Impaired Driving Enforcement

- State agency
- Target audience – General public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to maintain a coordinated statewide Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) effort. Currently in Maryland there are 110 certified DREs employed by state, county and local police agencies. This program is coordinated by the MSP who maintain officer certification information as well as evaluation data and current drug-impaired driving arrest trends. Additionally the MSP’s state coordinator is responsible for providing training for new DRE candidates and maintaining an informational network of national drug trends. This program supports the statewide chemical testing of evidentiary blood kits obtained by DREs from impaired driving arrests. A statewide notification and paging system continues to operate to improve call-out capabilities.

Washington Regional Alcohol Program – Impaired Driving: Adult & Youth PI&E Programs

- Non-profit
- Target audience – General public
- Target area – Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties; Statewide

Serving the residents of Montgomery and Prince George’s counties, as well as having statewide impact through the CPSF campaign, the focus of this program is multi-faceted, addressing the problem of impaired driving in the Washington Metro region through public education and innovative health education. Through partnering with numerous public and private partners such as AT&T Wireless, GEICO Direct, Washington Area New Automobile Dealers Association and ExxonMobil, the Washington Regional Alcohol Program (WRAP) will present programs on the effects of impaired driving to high school age youth and adults 21 – 44 years of age. The support of these businesses provides an avenue to the target population that data
shows is over-represented in crashes, fatalities and injuries. Programs such as Safe And Vital Employee, the distribution of 5,000 Corporate Guides to Safe Driving and Safe Celebrating, and WRAP’s SoberRide, providing free taxi cab rides to would be drunk drivers during major holidays, will create an extensive public awareness program. Through the combination of efforts by Maryland, Virginia, and DC, WRAP will coordinate a media campaign and press event for the NHTSA CPSF advertising buy as well as ancillary media material. Maryland’s contribution to this effort will be $450,000. WRAP will provide support for the DUI Law Enforcement Awards and Maryland Remembers event in December, which culminates overall impaired driving activities throughout the FFY 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-011</td>
<td>Tipsy? Taxi!</td>
<td>$36,900</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-027</td>
<td>Impaired Driving: Adult &amp; Youth PI&amp;E Programs</td>
<td>$547,500</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-028</td>
<td>Impaired Driving Enforcement</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-029</td>
<td>Impaired Driving Prevention – PR Campaign</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-031</td>
<td>Alcohol Screening &amp; Brief Intervention Pilot</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-067</td>
<td>Maryland DUI/Drug Court - Harford County</td>
<td>$63,500</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-068</td>
<td>Maryland DUI/Drug Court - Howard County</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-069</td>
<td>Maryland DUI/Drug Court – Anne Arundel County</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-029</td>
<td>Impaired Driving Prevention – PR Campaign</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Section 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>402 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$123,400</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds</strong> *</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,595,100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

OCCUPANT PROTECTION

From 2001 to 2005 in Maryland, 931 vehicle drivers and occupants who were killed in fatal crashes were reported as not using available safety equipment (seat belts, child safety seats, and booster seats). Using NHTSA research regarding the effectiveness of seat belts and child safety seats, nearly half of those killed could have been saved had they simply taken the time to restrain themselves and their child passengers properly. In 2005 alone, 136 out of 294 fatally injured MD drivers (46%) were not wearing their safety belts at the time of the crash. If 100% of them had been buckled, nearly half could have survived.

Maryland’s statewide seat belt use rate remained steady at 91.1% in 2006. While this figure does not appear to show any significant progress, it is well documented that once a
state’s use rate has reached the 90% mark, it is very difficult just to maintain that rate, let alone increase it. Passenger car drivers and front seat occupants were buckled up 92.4% of the time (exactly the same as in 2005), while the use rate for pickup truck drivers and passengers rose slightly from 83.7% to 84.6%. Although this increase certainly is encouraging, pickup truck drivers and occupants remain a population that continues to buckle up less than their counterparts in other vehicles. This lower use rate also is evidenced by an analysis of crash data. For example, from 2001-2005, nearly 65% of pickup truck fatalities were unbelted (160 of 249 total pickup truck fatalities).

As in other areas of crash over-representation, males 18-34 continue to buckle up less than other populations, as do drivers and occupants at night. For example, in 2005, slightly more than 24% of total crashes took place during the hours of darkness. However, nearly 40% of all fatal crashes took place during these same hours, indicating higher-risk driving and lower restraint use. In fact, from 1996 through 2005, despite around 50% belt use in overall fatal crashes, belts were used only about 35% of the time in fatal crashes taking place between the hours of 8 p.m. and 5 a.m.

Another trend that was noted during this year’s observational surveys was rather surprising. Many of the drivers and occupants who were marked as “not wearing” safety belts were, in fact, young women—most of whom were wearing the shoulder belt behind their back or under their arm. It was also observed that the older driver population continues to buckle up slightly less than the general population, often wearing the shoulder harness improperly.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will use this crash and observational data to target its educational efforts by age, gender, time of day/night, and type of vehicle driven, while focusing its specialized enforcement efforts during the national Click It or Ticket (CIOT) mobilization in May 2007. To that end, a law enforcement advisory board, which includes Maryland’s Occupant Protection Law Enforcement Liaisons, along with representation from the NHTSA Mid-Atlantic Region Office, the Maryland Committee For Safety Belt Use (MCFSBU), and the MHSO will convene to discuss ways of safely and effectively increasing seat belt use at night. One of the major functions of this group in FFY 2007 will be to determine the safest and most efficient ways in which to measure current nighttime safety belt use, and to establish standard operating procedures for conducting seat belt enforcement zones at night. Although a nighttime enforcement component has been included in the Maryland Chiefs’ Challenge for the past two years, this component will be strengthened and formalized for FFY 2007. Additionally, Maryland law enforcement will continue to give special attention to seat belt compliance throughout the year during regular patrols.

The following chart indicates the overall seat belt rates in counties that contain NHTSA survey sites, along with their percent change from 2005-2006. Although about half of the counties decreased slightly, most decreases were not statistically significant—and the others increased enough to ensure that the statewide use rate remained at 91.1%. It is important to note that Prince George’s County, which experienced a nearly 13-percentage point increase from 2004-2005, decreased by less than one percentage point in 2006. This very slight decrease indicates that the continued efforts in Prince George’s County—Maryland’s most populous county—have paid off, and must be continued to further gains that have already been made. The only county that decreased significantly was Baltimore County, which along with Washington County, will be a focus for the MHSO’s efforts as well.
Other counties in which observed seat belt use rates were either significantly lower than the statewide average, or decreased from 2005 to 2006, include Allegany, Calvert, Cecil, Dorchester, Garrett, Kent, Washington, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties. Therefore, these geographical areas will be a focus of the MHSO’s program, in partnership with each of their respective CTSP Coordinators, Regional Law Enforcement Liaisons, and law enforcement agencies.

Based on the geographical, crash, and observational data listed above, the MHSO will work with its partners to focus its programming on the following lower-use populations in FFY 2007: young drivers (both men and women); pickup truck drivers and occupants (focusing primarily on men); and seat belt use during the nighttime hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANNE ARUNDEL</td>
<td>94.28%</td>
<td>93.82%</td>
<td>-0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE CITY</td>
<td>87.43%</td>
<td>86.45%</td>
<td>-0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE COUNTY</td>
<td>85.45%</td>
<td>82.02%</td>
<td>-3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROLL</td>
<td>92.15%</td>
<td>92.65%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES &amp; ST. MARY’S</td>
<td>93.48%</td>
<td>93.64%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREDERICK</td>
<td>90.67%</td>
<td>94.43%</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARFORD</td>
<td>83.50%</td>
<td>86.39%</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD</td>
<td>97.21%</td>
<td>96.93%</td>
<td>-0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>91.56%</td>
<td>93.35%</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCE GEORGE’S</td>
<td>88.96%</td>
<td>87.99%</td>
<td>-0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>83.60%</td>
<td>82.76%</td>
<td>-0.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT OBJECTIVES

- To increase the statewide seat belt use rate from the 2000 rate of 85% to 94.5% in 2010 (interim goal of 92.5% in 2007).
- To increase restraint use in pickup trucks to 87.5% by 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities of unrestrained occupants to 65 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries of unrestrained occupants to 866 in 2010.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES

- To obtain participation in the Maryland Chiefs’ Challenge by at least 115 agencies by June, 2007.
- To achieve 55,000 paid media airplays by September 30, 2007.
- To develop at least 2 new pieces of educational material concerning occupant protection by September 30, 2007.
- To distribute 600,000 pieces of educational material on occupant protection by September 30, 2007.
- To sponsor, or provide technical assistance to, at least 35 safety seat checkup events/inspections throughout the state by September 30, 2007.
- To facilitate regular contact between more than 30 CPS Technician volunteers and Maryland’s 50 acute care and 3 pediatric rehabilitation hospitals by September 30, 2007.
• To hold a statewide ED Docs and Nurses Summit by September 30, 2007.
• To provide on-site Occupant Protection-focused SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) consultations with 6 hospitals by September 30, 2007.
• To conduct 2 Transporting Children with Special Needs workshops by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s overall Occupant Protection Program is funded from 402, 405 and 406 monies. A total of $1,225,000 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $472,700 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $1,697,700 in funds to be spent on the Occupant Protection Program in FFY 2007. In FFY 2007, the MHSO will purchase at least $400,000 of paid media for the statewide CIOT Campaign. Print ads, radio, and television PSAs will continue to utilize a strong enforcement (CIOT) message. Once again, the primary focus for the television airtime buy will be on the young male risk-taking driver—in particular pickup truck drivers—with PSAs being played on such channels as ESPN, Spike, BET, and MTV.

Evaluation of this media outreach and enforcement campaign will include a pre-Mobilization mini-observational survey in April, and the annual statewide observational seat belt use survey during the month of June to measure increases in belt use. This year, a nighttime belt use observational survey will be taken as well, to determine a more accurate nighttime belt use rate. Additionally, a comparison of fatal and injury traffic crash data, as well as enforcement data, will be performed. Results of the enforcement and evaluation efforts will be publicized following the campaign.

In FFY 2007, Maryland’s Occupant Protection Task Force) will continue to be led and supported by the MHSO. This group consists of a diverse membership from State and local agencies, local CTSP Coordinators, advocacy groups, businesses, and private organizations. Special education and technical assistance are provided by agencies and groups such as the MCFSBU, Maryland Kids In Safety Seats (KISS) program, Safe Kids Maryland State Coalition (and local Coalitions and chapters), Maryland Child Passenger Safety Association (MCPSA), Maryland Chiefs of Police Association (MCPA), and MIEMSS. Additional direction will be provided by the Occupant Protection Emphasis Area Team of the SHSP Executive Committee. The Maryland Child Passenger Safety Advisory Board, co-coordinated by the MHSO, will continue to oversee Maryland’s overall CPS initiatives.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include the Maryland Chiefs’ Challenge campaign; the Pacesetter Seat Belt Awards Program; participation in the CIOT mobilization, including a large-scale press event, enforcement, and a major paid media campaign; a celebration of the ten-year anniversary of Maryland’s Primary Enforcement Safety Belt law; the implementation of a nighttime seat belt use survey and more focused nighttime enforcement; a campaign to decrease the improper use of safety belts by adults; and numerous TOPS trainings. Buckle Up Religiously again will be a focus in Prince George’s County, Baltimore City, and in many other diverse communities throughout Maryland. Buckle Up Prince George’s County, a campaign focusing on increasing seat belt and child safety seat compliance in the most populous county in the state, will continue to be a focus for the MHSO and its partners, as the County attempts to increase its current use rate of 88%. The Road Rules and Killer in the Back Seat teen/young adult campaigns will be utilized during the school year throughout the State, as will the two State-owned Seat Belt Convincers. There are plans to purchase a third Convincer as well, since these interactive devices have proven to be so helpful in demonstrating crash forces.
Maryland will continue to use PSAs and print ads featuring a strong law enforcement message, ideally featuring Maryland law enforcement personnel as spokespersons. Press events will be held to announce National CPS Awareness Week in February and the Maryland Chiefs’ Challenge/CIOT campaigns in May. Additionally, press releases will be distributed to announce Maryland’s new safety belt use rate and other occupant protection-related topics, as the need arises. The MHSO and MCFSBU also are working with law enforcement to ensure that safety belt and child safety seat misuse or non-use are reported to the media for every crash that is covered. Awards ceremonies will be held in appreciation of Pacesetter Award recipients and for participants in the Maryland Chiefs’ Challenge. Buckle Up After Every Pit Stop, a brochure about seat belt use for pickup truck drivers and passengers, will continue to be distributed, especially in pickup truck-related locations such as home improvement stores and landfills. Maryland’s Prescription for Your Child’s Safety was translated into Spanish during FFY 2006 and will continue to be provided to health care providers, health departments (HD), and WIC programs, along with other highway safety information.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHOSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its occupant protection objectives:

**Make It Go Click Foundation - Love Life Live Long Pilot Program**

- Non-Profit/Not-for-Profit
- Target audience – African Americans
- Target area – Prince George’s, Montgomery, Howard, and Baltimore Counties and Baltimore City

The focus of this program is to increase seatbelt use in the African-American community, with a specific target of teens in Prince George’s, Montgomery, Howard, and Baltimore Counties and Baltimore City. The mission is to facilitate the program efforts through the various school systems. Students will be engaged by the powerful messages delivered by a professional speaker, and former NFL football player, and educated on the importance of safety belt use. The speaker will express culturally relevant messages for the targeted population and, at the end of each assembly session, the students will be challenged to make a commitment to safety, responsible driving practices and to encourage their peers to buckle up.

**Maryland Committee For Safety Belt Use, Inc. – Statewide Occupant Protection Initiatives**

- Non-profit
- Target audience – general public with a special focus on low-use populations such as pickup truck drivers and passengers, young women who are using the belt incorrectly, and nighttime drivers
- Target area – State of Maryland with a continued special focus on Prince George’s County, Baltimore County, and other lower-use geographical areas

The primary grant-funded programs of this project will include the Maryland Chiefs’ Challenge, a two-month, intensified enforcement & education campaign about the lifesaving benefits of child safety seats, booster seats, & safety belt use, and Maryland’s CIOT participation. The MCFSBU hopes to maintain statewide participation in the Challenge in FFY 2007 by recruiting at least 115 agencies/barracks, and obtaining final entries from at least 75% of participants. In addition, the MCFSBU partners with the MHSO on virtually all aspects of occupant protection outreach, including the Pacesetters program; media relations (including the creation/airing of PSAs and the planning/implementation of media events); the Saved by the Belt program; nighttime seat belt observational surveys; and other occupant protection initiatives, particularly as related to law enforcement. The MCFSBU will continue to place a special focus on Prince George’s County during FFY 2007, and will add Baltimore County, another large county with a lower use rate, to their emphasis area as well. The MCFSBU also will work with the MHSO.
to publicize the special pickup truck promotion, the importance of proper belt use, and the ten- 
year anniversary of Maryland’s primary safety belt law. The MCFSBU serves as the parent 
analysis for the Safe Kids Maryland State Coalition (SKMSC), which provides technical 
assistance and other resources for member agencies to conduct childhood unintentional injury 
prevention programs throughout the State. The Safe Kids Maryland Coordinator also assists 
Maryland’s CPS program greatly by serving as an advisor to the Maryland Child Passenger 
Safety Advisory Board.

Maryland Department of Health & Mental Hygiene (DHMH) – Maryland Kids In Safety 
Seats (KISS) Program

- State agency
- Target audience – children, low income families, general public, parents and caregivers
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main grant-funded programs of this project include providing information to the public 
about CPS, coordinating CPS trainings for professionals and families, providing child restraint 
installation instruction to parents and caregivers at permanent and mobile fitting stations/events, 
monitoring a CPS hotline and website, and coordinating child safety loaner programs throughout 
the State. In the coming fiscal year, KISS will take the lead on National CPS Awareness Week in 
February; sponsor or provide technical assistance in at least 35 safety seat checkup 
events/inspections throughout the state; host at least one “best practice” training for new loaner 
program coordinators and staff; provide monthly CPS e-mail updates to participating Maryland 
technicians; develop and post quarterly Best Practice public education articles on the KISS 
website for public use and distribution; develop a “Roll Call” CPS Awareness Kit to be 
disseminated to law enforcement/ training partners; create a Booster Seat Distribution Kit to be 
utilized by local jurisdictions; and conduct their annual observational child safety seat surveys at 
designated locations. KISS will continue to identify and recruit more senior checkers and 
potential CPS instructors in each region of the State; serve in a leadership role and provide the 
latest technical information for CPS technicians/instructors; co-coordinate the Maryland Child 
Passenger Safety Advisory Board; and recruit and support child safety seat loaner programs.

Maryland Regional Law Enforcement Liaisons – SHA District 7, Denton Police 
Department, and Ridgely Police Department

- State and local agencies
- Target audience – law enforcement and the general public in their respective geographical 
  regions (also serve as advisors to Maryland’s overall occupant protection program)
- Target area – State of Maryland (by region—Western, Baltimore Metropolitan, and Eastern 
  Shore)

The main grant-funded programs of these projects include attempting to gain further 
endorsement and enforcement of Maryland’s Occupant Protection laws by law enforcement in 
each region; obtaining more agency participation in such initiatives as the MD Chiefs’ Challenge, 
National CPS Awareness and Buckle Up America Weeks, Buckle Up Religiously, and CIOT; 
assisting MHSO & MCFSBU with implementation of the Pacesetter Awards program, Click It or 
Ticket campaign, media kickoff events for special emphasis weeks, the law enforcement 
subcommittee of the Maryland Occupant Protection Task Force, and in marketing programs to 
their respective regional law enforcement agencies; and serving on the task force to develop 
nighttime observational survey protocols. Other duties will include providing technical assistance 
with the overall statewide seat belt observational surveys (at both NHTSA and non-NHTSA sites), 
helping Chiefs’ Challenge participants with final entry submission, coordinating a statewide pickup 
truck campaign focused on landfills and similar target areas, and providing technical support for 
implementation of the Enrollment Centered Approach to Media Marketing statewide media plan.
MIEMSS EMS for Children Program—CPS Hospital Assessment/Special Populations Project

- State agency
- Target audience – hospital personnel and other health care providers (ED personnel in particular), CPS technicians and instructors, general public, parents and caregivers of children with special health care and transportation needs
- Target area – State of Maryland

The primary grant-funded initiatives of this project will include conducting a survey of both primary care and ED practices to determine the “hot topic” for next year’s CPS Awareness Week Conference Call; continuing the contacts between more than 30 CPS Technician volunteers and Maryland’s 50 acute care and 3 pediatric rehabilitation hospitals, so that technical assistance and links to occupant protection resources are maintained in all Maryland jurisdictions; updating/distributing the Best Practices Workbook and CD for new hospital staff, and directing previous recipients of those materials to the Hospital Project’s website for updates; hosting a CPS for Children with Special Health Care Needs two-day workshop in order to maintain current Special Needs instructors and instruct new participants on this aspect of safe travel; and providing the latest occupant protection information at regional chapter and State organization meetings for pediatric and emergency health care professionals. An exciting new part of this project will be the planning and implementation of a statewide ED Docs and Nurses Summit, to expand the focus of occupant protection activities and ensure that all ages and all types of vehicles are covered.

MIEMSS EMS for Children Program—CPS Hospital Assessment/Special Populations Project

- State agency
- Target audience – hospital personnel and other health care providers, CPS technicians and instructors, general public, parents and caregivers of children with special health care and transportation needs
- Target area – State of Maryland

The primary grant-funded initiatives of this project will include providing on-site SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) consultations with six hospitals regarding their abilities to provide the latest CPS information to their patients; conducting physician, nurse, and nurse practitioner trainings at Maryland AAP (American Academy of Pediatrics) and Maryland ENA (Emergency Nurses Association) meetings; organizing and conducting two Transporting Children with Special Needs workshops in conjunction with KISS; providing a web-based, interactive teaching conference call on a CPS topic (to be determined by a physician survey) for Maryland AAP members in February; contributing to an overall 10% increase in the number of persons receiving CPS training at any level (hospital employees, public safety professionals, and the general public); and maintaining the liaisons between CPS technicians and each of Maryland’s 47 hospitals to ensure that hospitals receive the latest training and educational materials, which are necessary for them to update and implement their CPS policies appropriately. This year, project staff also will distribute the new Maryland booster brochure that was developed and produced during FFY 2005.

**OCCUPANT PROTECTION: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-014</td>
<td>Eastern Shore LEL</td>
<td>$20,100</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-015</td>
<td>Baltimore Metro LEL</td>
<td>$19,900</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**DATA ENHANCEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Section(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-016</td>
<td>Western Maryland LEL</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-019</td>
<td>Love Life Live Long</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-020</td>
<td>CPS Hospital Assessment/Special Populations Project</td>
<td>$61,900</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-021</td>
<td>Maryland Kids In Safety Seats</td>
<td>$152,500</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-024</td>
<td>Comprehensive Occupant Protection Outreach Effort</td>
<td>$753,400</td>
<td>Sections 405/406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-028</td>
<td>Occupant Protection Program</td>
<td>$27,700</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>402 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$306,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds *</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,225,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

**IMPACT OBJECTIVES**

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 104,103 in 2004 to 99,981 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 576 in 2004 to 527 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 36,611 in 2004 to 33,067 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 643 in 2004 to 608 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 53,753 in 2004 to 43,069 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 188.87 to 177.27 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.05 to 0.85 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 66.42 to 53.43 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.17 to 0.98 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 97.52 to 69.60 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 1,873.01 to 1,848.95 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 10.36 to 8.89 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 685.70 to 557.32 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 11.57 to 10.26 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 967.12 to 725.90 in 2010.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To hold 4 full Executive Council Traffic Records Coordinating Committee meetings by September 30, 2007.
- To develop and implement the Safety and Transportation Knowledge Online (STKO) web portal for information exchange to facilitate training of all crash report users by January 1, 2009.
Maryland’s overall Data Enhancement Program is funded from Section 402, 406 and 408 monies. A total of $1,411,700 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $521,508 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $1,933,208 in funds to be spent on Data Enhancement in FFY 2007. Costs associated with the Traffic Safety Information System Coordinator are covered in this area.

In December 2005, the Maryland Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) was reconstituted based on the recommendations of Maryland’s recent Traffic Records Assessment. Membership in the TRCC was reduced and a bi-level organizational structure was developed. The current TRCC organizational structure consists of the TRCC Executive Council (EC) and the Traffic Records Technical Coordinating Committee (TRTCC).

The TRCC’s EC is comprised of chief executives that designate the membership of the technical level. The TRCC’s EC meets quarterly and the TRTCC meets monthly on the third Friday of the month.

The TRCC Member organizations are as follows:

- Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention
- MCPA
- DHMH
- Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services
- MIEMSS
- MVA
- SHA
- MSA
- MSP
- Maryland Transportation Authority
- NSC
- OCME
- Office of Information Technology

Advisory Members to the TRCC include:

- FHWA
- Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
- Governor’s Office of Homeland Security
- Maryland Judiciary
- Maryland Transportation Authority
- NHTSA

The vision of the TRCC is “enhanced transportation safety and public welfare through systems intelligence” while the defined mission of the TRCC is “to provide a strong, coordinated plan to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of traffic safety information collection and analysis and to provide the resources needed to support the resulting safety data system.” Additionally, the TRCC is committed to support data improvements at all levels of government that minimize duplication, improve uniformity, advance electronic data collection, and facilitate data access and use. The primary goal of the Committee is to ensure that complete, accurate and timely traffic safety data is collected, analyzed, and made available for decision-makers at
the national, state and local levels to improve public safety through the elimination of crashes and their associated deaths and injuries.

During FFY2007 the data enhancement strategic objectives will be as follows:

- **Data Collection** - Manual, paper-based systems will begin to be replaced by uniform electronic methods to capture pertinent information and transmit reports from the field. Systems will be developed to meet the information needs of first responders to utilize secure data sharing, a uniform data dictionary and integration between agencies. These systems will be scalable to respond to major emergency situations as identified in the data collected or by the crisis situation in progress.

- **Data Analysis** – A new online system called Safety and Transportation Knowledge Online will be developed to provide training, structured uniformity, and conformance policy for organizing and examining collected data to increase the accuracy of interpretation. This system will enable non-analysts to utilize appropriate data by taking advantage of prefabricated reports comprised of narratives, charts, graphs and tables generated in a real time environment provided by the data system.

- **Interoperability** – Maryland will begin to integrate data standards, communications systems, programs, projects, regulations and methodologies for conformance with the mission and goal of the TRCC and for conformance with national policies for safety information systems. The TRCC will enable interaction between transportation, law enforcement, public safety, and public health officials at all levels of government and develop timely, actionable, and valuable information through intensive data sharing.

- **Situation Awareness** – The Maryland Safety Information System will begin development of an enhanced infrastructure to support and optimize the timeliness of crisis mitigation and risk management by utilizing interoperability, training, personnel experience and critical information exchange to apply appropriate remedies to safety incidents and to deter negative human behavioral and performance issues.

- **Security** – The TRCC will also begin policy and systems framework for coordination, cooperation and collaboration of agency activities targeted at improving safety information systems while ensuring protection of confidential data entrusted to respective organizations. Security policies in the 21st Century require a change of institutionalized philosophy from "need to know" to "need to share."

- **Quality Assurance** – The reorganized TRCC will continue to develop mechanisms to identify, communicate and promote best practices and principles for doing business. Utilize formal planned and systematic audits for all funded projects as necessary to provide adequate confidence that the programs conform to established technical requirements and recommendations. All planned and systematic activities implemented within the safety data system will demonstrate, with adequate confidence, that the funding is appropriately allocated and that the end result of the comprised projects will fulfill all the requirements established for measuring quality results in the systems area of functionality.

Desired Outcomes of the TRCC include the following:

- A significant decrease in the loss of life, property and commerce due to transportation system deficiencies.
- Established data standards and a service-oriented organizational infrastructure.
- Further development of professional project management.
- Establishment of a consolidated incident response and crisis mitigation system.
- Complete migration to and usage of a Maryland Safety Information System.
• Consolidation of common information platforms.
• Consolidation and standardization of online training and policy resources.
• Modernization of core statewide safety business systems and practices.
• Interoperability of wireless public safety communications systems.

Implementation Steps shall be as follows:
• Facilitate infrastructure owners in developing distributed ownership agreements.
• Determine warehousing location and gateway methodology.
• Resolve legislative authority issues and global access policies.
• Catalog and coordinate existing organization modules, data models and system linkages.
• Develop the Maryland Extensible Data Model (MEDM) for data exchange then complete development and implementation of MSIS.
• Automate Collection Business Processes and consolidate redundant systems where possible.
• Complete development of communications layer for voice dispatch and data transactions.
• Utilize distributed ownership environment to implement MEDM, new linkages and expanded analysis.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its Traffic Records objectives:

**John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health – Evaluation & Training Grant**
- State Agency
- Target audience – MHSO/CTSP grantee agencies
- Target area – State of Maryland

  The goal of this program is to develop formal evaluation of administration, activity and policy for the MHSO-funded activities. This evaluation will help to determine if funded resources and activities are providing the desired outcomes of lower injuries related to highway transportation safety.

**Maryland Judicial Information Systems – ACT SAFE Project**
- State Agency
- Target audience – State agencies & other public traffic safety stakeholders
- Target area – State of Maryland

  The goal of this program is to develop an electronically integrated traffic citation system, designed to improve traffic safety. In the initial phases, the Court will develop project plans and specifications to enhance its present system, define enhanced citation data elements to be determined by the Chief Judge of the District Court with input from MSP and SHA, and establish a central data repository for the purposes of collecting citation data transmitted from the MSP.

**National Study Center for Trauma & EMS / University of Maryland – Comprehensive Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System**
- Institution of Higher Education
- Target audience – State agencies & other public traffic safety stakeholders
- Target area – State of Maryland

  The main goal of this program is to provide a resource for motor vehicle related injury data and information to state and local agencies. Data supplied to the MHSO and its grantees includes: statewide demographics, exposure data (VMT, population, number of registered
vehicles, number of licensed drivers), traffic citation & conviction data, driver & vehicle records, offender & post-mortem alcohol test results, and statewide observational seat belt use rates (provided as a service to certain local CTSPs). The Center will continue to meet with the CTSPs at the MHSO’s Annual Training Meeting (ATM) and Semi-Annual Meeting (SAM). Data provided to each jurisdiction includes: data summaries per program area, Impact Objectives per program area, ranking of program areas, density maps per program area, driver residence & overall crash data, citations per program area, citations vs. crashes, crime-crash clock, adjudication per program area, hospital data per program area – showed number of inpatients, hospital days & hospital charges, and the top ten causes of death, all using local data.

Office of the Chief Medical Examiner – *Data Sharing & Data Quality Initiative*

- **State Agency**
- **Target audience** – State agencies & other public traffic safety stakeholders
- **Target area** – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to improve the accuracy of vehicular crash fatality data quality and establish interagency, computer-based data-sharing linkages. The OCME and the NSC have been working to establish a collaborative relationship between the state computer systems managers and the traffic safety professionals for whom accurate and comprehensive data is essential. Crucial linkages with various PD crash investigation units have been developed and enhanced. With successful implementation of this network, the project will enhance the ability of traffic safety professionals across the state to access and analyze critical crash fatality data.

University of Maryland – *Monitoring the Future of Maryland Traffic Safety Programs*

- **State Agency**
- **Target audience** – State agencies & other public traffic safety stakeholders
- **Target area** – State of Maryland

The goal of this program is to develop an electronically integrated and efficient public opinion survey, designed to improve traffic safety by better understanding public perception of current laws and safety practices. The resulting data from is cross-referenced with other data sources and provides an effective online tool for evaluation and analysis of MHSO traffic safety programs.

### DATA ENHANCEMENT: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-004</td>
<td>Monitoring the Future of Maryland's TS Programs</td>
<td>95,500</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-025</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Training Project</td>
<td>104,100</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-030</td>
<td>ACT SAFE Project</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-053</td>
<td>Medical Examiner Data System</td>
<td>70,600</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-054</td>
<td>CCODES</td>
<td>197,300</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Delineated in 408 Application</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Section 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>402 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$816,200</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds</strong> *</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,411,700</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.
COMMUNITY TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS

**IMPACT OBJECTIVES**

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 104,103 in 2004 to 99,981 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 576 in 2004 to 527 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 36,611 in 2004 to 33,067 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 643 in 2004 to 608 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 53,753 in 2004 to 43,069 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 188.87 to 177.27 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.05 to 0.85 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 66.42 to 53.43 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.17 to 0.98 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 97.52 to 69.60 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 1,873.01 to 1,848.95 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 10.36 to 8.89 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 685.70 to 557.32 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 11.57 to 10.26 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 967.12 to 725.90 in 2010.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To plan and facilitate an Annual Training Meeting by September 30, 2007.
- To plan and facilitate a SAM by September 30, 2007.
- To conduct an Annual Evaluation of the CTSPs by September 30, 2007.
- To facilitate 2 MHSO/CTSP Advisory Committee Meetings by September 30, 2007.
- To establish a monitoring program by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s CTSPs are funded from Section 157, 402, 406 and 410 monies, as well as a limited amount of State funds. A total of $2,477,000 was granted to be spent on the CTSPs in FFY 2007. An additional $1,847,700 was matched by grantee agencies for a grand total of $4,324,700 to be spent on the CTSPs in FFY 2007.

Major initiatives include the Annual Training Meeting which will be geared towards programmatic issues and will include topics such as Best Practice Panels, an open forum with members of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and the University of Maryland regarding a revamp of evaluation procedures of the CTSP Programs. Awards for the outstanding CTSPs during the past FFY will also be presented at the meeting. The SAM will focus on financial and administrative issues such as SAFETEA-LU and any new procedures implemented by the MHSO.
In FFY2007, the MHSO will fund the following CTSPs, to work toward accomplishing its traffic safety objectives:

- Allegany County
- Anne Arundel County
- Baltimore City
- Baltimore County
- Calvert County
- Carroll County
- Cecil County
- Charles County
- Dorchester County
- Frederick County
- Garrett County
- Harford County
- Howard County
- Kent County
- Montgomery County
- Prince George’s County
- Queen Anne’s County
- St. Mary’s County
- Somerset County
- Talbot County
- Washington County
- Wicomico County
- Worcester County

Local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local CTSP Base</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>Sections 402/405/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local CTSP Enforcement</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Sections 402/406/410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>402 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$565,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,977,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

**COMMUNITY TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY**

**AGGRESSIVE DRIVING PREVENTION**

**TABLE 12 – Crash Summary: Aggressive Driver Involved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5-Year AVG.</th>
<th>5-Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Over the past five years, on average, 3,932 aggressive driving crashes have occurred annually on Maryland’s roadways. On average, 63 people have lost their lives each year, representing nearly 10 percent of all of Maryland’s traffic fatalities. In addition, 2,901 people, on average, have been injured annually, representing close to five percent of Maryland’s traffic injuries.

- AGE – Drivers 21 to 29 are over-represented in total crashes and injuries. Drivers 16 to 21 are over-represented in fatalities. Drivers in the 16 to 20 age group are 21.5% of all drivers involved in aggressive crashes and 29.4% of driver fatalities. These drivers however represent only 6% of Maryland’s licensed drivers.

- GENDER – Men are over-represented in total drivers, injuries and fatalities. Male drivers account for 85.3% of driver fatalities.

- MONTH – Aggressive driving crashes were most likely to occur in October, November and December. Aggressive driving injury crashes are more likely to occur in November, August and October and fatal crashes are more likely to occur from May through July.

- DAY OF WEEK – More fatal aggressive driving crashes occur on Sundays and Saturdays than any other day.

- TIME OF DAY – Total and injury crashes are more likely to occur between 2:00 pm and 6:00 pm. Fatal crashes are more likely to occur between 2:00 pm and 8:00 pm.

- ROAD TYPE – Total, injury, and fatal crashes occur more often on state and county roads than any other road type. Nearly 41% of fatal crashes occur on county roads.

- COUNTY – Baltimore and Anne Arundel Counties are over-represented in total crashes, while Baltimore City is under-represented. Prince George’s and Baltimore Counties are over-represented in fatal crashes.

### IMPACT OBJECTIVES

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 3,909 in 2004 to 3,754 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 52 in 2004 to 46 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 1,623 in 2004 to 1,559 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 58 in 2004 to 52 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 2,262 in 2004 to 2,552 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 7.09 to 6.81 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.09 to 0.08 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 2.94 to 2.83 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.11 to 0.08 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 4.76 to 4.58 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 70.33 to 67.55 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 0.94 to 0.78 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 29.20 to 28.04 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 1.04 to 0.88 in 2010.
To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 47.25 to 45.38 in 2010.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To manage police involvement across the state in 4 Smooth Operator enforcement waves by September 30, 2007.
- To make 147,000 aggressive driving contacts (citations & warnings) by Maryland police officers during the ‘Smooth Operator’ enforcement waves, by September 30, 2007.
- To develop and place 2,500 radio spots by September 30, 2007.
- To make 5 million regional media impressions by September 30, 2007.
- To create and distribute 57,000 pieces of educational material on aggressive driving by September 30, 2007.
- To attend and facilitate 10 monthly Smooth Operator meetings by September 30, 2007.
- To facilitate 2 Maryland Smooth Operator meetings by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s overall Aggressive Driving Program is funded from Section 402, 163 and 406 monies. A total of $615,400 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $106,100 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $721,500 in funds to be spent on the Aggressive Driving Program in FFY 2007. In FFY 2007, the MHSO will spend $250,000 on a paid media campaign for the tri-jurisdictional Smooth Operator Campaign, its share of about $500,000 of actual placement of paid media. The evaluation plan for this campaign will include the contracting of an independent research firm which will develop a polling tool to survey motorists in the targeted areas both before and after the campaign to gauge their perceptions of aggressive driving and their awareness of the Smooth Operator Campaign. Likewise, the evaluation of the media campaign will include a comparison of the number of media impressions made regionally during this campaign as compared with media impressions made during previous campaigns.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will partner for the tenth year in a row with Virginia and DC in the regional Smooth Operator Task Force (SOTF). Additionally, during the FFY 2006, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania joined the SOTF, making it a quad-jurisdictional cooperative initiative. The SOTF mission is “to curb aggressive driving through the use of intense, coordinated enforcement waves and accompanying public awareness efforts” throughout the expanded Washington DC-metro area, including the entire state of Maryland, and most recently, major media markets in Pennsylvania. Membership in the SOTF includes representatives from the MD/VA/DC/PA highway safety offices, departments of motor vehicles/motor vehicle administrations, state & municipal law enforcement agencies, the FHWA, the NHTSA, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the Injury Prevention Center at INOVA Fairfax Hospital, private safety organizations, and other “technical” experts. Sub-Committees consist of Law Enforcement, Media, Engineering and Evaluation. A separate Maryland SOTF will be established in FFY 2007 and will meet semi-annually. Additionally for the upcoming year the MHSO will continue to provide a Program Coordinator for the quad-jurisdictional SOTF. This coordinator will provide the administrative oversight of the program and facilitate the implementation of initiatives, as well as the fulfillment of directives agreed upon by the Smooth Operator Executive Advisory Committee.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include the annual four major enforcement waves which include media and enforcement mobilizations. These waves will primarily be one week-
long waves with a two week final wave to coincide with the opening of school around the region. These enforcement waves are preceded as well by at least one major press event in each of the Washington DC-metro and Baltimore areas to kick off the program. New brochures and posters will be developed to target at-risk operators, specifically males in the 16-29 age categories. The public education and information plan will include media spots on radio whose demographic audience include those in our targeted categories. Additionally, posters and brochures will be distributed to each CTSP across the State for use in safety fairs and community forums. A separate evaluation of data trends will provide a better measure of enforcement levels, and driver attitudes, associated with the program.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its aggressive driving prevention objectives:

**Local Law Enforcement / Statewide – Aggressive Driving Enforcement**
- County and local government agencies
- Target audience – general public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to support and expand the involvement of municipal police and county SOs in the statewide Smooth Operator program. The focus is to increase traffic patrols in areas and at specific times where aggressive driving has been identified as a problem in local communities and local roadways. Increased enforcement will be conducted during heavily advertised enforcement waves, building the public’s perception of accelerated, coordinated enforcement across the state. Almost all law enforcement agencies in the state devote some portion of traffic enforcement efforts to reducing aggressive driving, and many are supported at the local level through their CTSP. An annual training seminar will assist in raising the awareness level within the law enforcement community of the problem of Aggressive Driving across the state, as well as the strategies in place to combat the problem.

**Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration – Smooth Operator PI&E Program**
- State agency
- Target audience – General public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The focus of this program is to conduct a massive education and awareness campaign through a collaborated effort between Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia and DC-metro area highway safety offices and law enforcement. This public education campaign focuses on four enforcement waves intended to raise awareness not only of the aggressive driving problem, but also of the stepped-up enforcement activity targeting these unsafe behaviors. Included in the media portion of the program are radio and cable television spots, as well as web-based media including pod-casts, radio streaming, and internet gaming sites. Additional media includes distributed posters & brochures and outdoor advertising such as Metro busbacks. Electronic media outlets for the program include Baltimore, Washington, DC, Salisbury, and Hagerstown markets, and provide air coverage for the vast majority of the State’s driving population, especially statistically over-represented counties. The public awareness campaign for which these funds will be used begins in May, 2007 and continues through the summer, culminating with a recognition program in October to honor the efforts of the law enforcement community.

**INOVA Regional Trauma Center – Aggressive Driving Data Evaluation Project**
- Hospital
- Target Audience – Law enforcement community & general public
• Target Area – State of Maryland

The focus of this program is to provide a comprehensive and multi-method evaluation system that will measure the degree to which the education and enforcement campaigns are affecting public levels of awareness, intent and behavior regarding aggressive driving. Additionally, this evaluation component will aid in shaping future campaign strategies by obtaining and analyzing data from a variety of sources to determine the extent and effectiveness of law enforcement. Part of this project will include the expansion of sampling data by enlisting additional area hospitals and developing a system to combine disparate data bases for the purpose of extracting relevant evaluation information. Another portion of the project will be to conduct focus groups of motorists who are in mandatory driving schools. The evaluation component of the program will assist in developing targeted and effective media messages, track trends over the life of the program, and quantitatively demonstrate the impact of both the media and enforcement components of the program, and to provide recommendations.

**Maryland State Police – Aggressive Driving Enforcement**

- State agency
- Target audience – General public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The focus of this program is to increase patrols in areas and at specific times where aggressive driving has been identified as a problem. The MSP projects enhancement of its traffic law enforcement on the Capital and Baltimore Beltways, and have focused a substantial portion of their efforts on aggressive driving and excessive speed detection. MSP troopers will be deployed to areas prone to incidents of aggressive driving during those times that historically aggressive driving incidents are most likely to occur. Funding to barracks across the state will be disbursed based on a formula tracking past trends in enforcement and crash rates in areas, and on highways, of MSP jurisdiction. This new disbursement formula will aid MSP in targeting enforcement to areas / barracks where the data indicates a more extensive aggressive driving problem. Troopers will continue to utilize both conventional and non-conventional methods to identify and apprehend aggressive drivers, as well as explore new and innovative enforcement methods. Finally, this agency will continue to provide an agency representative to sit on the Executive Advisory Committee.

**AGGRESSIVE DRIVING: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-022</td>
<td>Smooth Operator – Evaluation Project</td>
<td>$26,800</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-028</td>
<td>Aggressive Driving Enforcement</td>
<td>$321,200</td>
<td>Sections 402/163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-051</td>
<td>Smooth Operator – PR Campaign</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$615,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.
**PEDESTRIAN-PEDALCYCLE SAFETY**

Table 13 – Crash Summary: Pedestrian On Foot Involved *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5-Year AVG.</th>
<th>5-Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 – Crash Summary: Pedalcycle Involved *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5-Year AVG.</th>
<th>5-Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years, on average, 2,978 pedestrian and 871 pedalcyclist crashes have occurred on Maryland’s roadways. On average, 104 pedestrians and 9 pedalcyclists have lost their lives each year, representing nearly 18% of Maryland’s traffic fatalities. In addition, an average of 2,779 pedestrians and 717 pedalcyclists has been injured annually, representing 6.0% of all Maryland’s traffic injuries.

- **AGE** – Drivers involved in pedestrian and pedalcyclist crashes are similar to those involved in all statewide total crashes. However, there are slightly more drivers 35-44 involved in pedalcycle total crashes. The percentage of drivers 60 and older involved in pedestrian total crashes is slightly higher than statewide total crashes. Pedestrians 35-44 represent 18% of fatally injured pedestrians. Pedestrians and pedalcyclists 5-15 are involved in nearly 21% of all pedestrian and 41% of all pedalcycle crashes and they are also the highest percentage of pedestrians and pedalcyclists injured in crashes.

- **GENDER** – Male drivers are involved in a higher percentage of pedestrian and pedalcyclist total crashes. They account for 50% of drivers involved in pedestrian crashes as compared to 52% in statewide crashes. Sixty-eight percent of fatally injured pedestrians and 7 of the 8 fatally injured pedalcyclists are male.

- **MONTH** – Fatal pedestrian crashes more frequently occur during January, November, and December. Conversely, a higher percentage of pedalcycle crashes occurs during the warmer months of the year (May through September). The number of fatal pedalcycle crashes is small (n=8) and difficult to ascertain monthly variances.

- **DAY OF WEEK** – Although a higher percentage of pedestrian total crashes and injuries occurs on Friday, a higher percentage of pedestrian fatal crashes occurs on Saturday. Six of the eight fatal pedalcycle crashes occurred between Monday and Wednesday (2 each day).
• **TIME OF DAY** – Pedestrian total and injury crashes are more likely to occur between 2:00 pm and 8:00 pm and a significantly higher percentage of these crashes occur between 3:00 pm and 7:00 pm. Fatal pedestrian crashes are more likely to occur between 6:00 pm and midnight. Nearly 42% of pedestrian fatal crashes occur during this period. Similarly, significantly more pedalcycle total and injury crashes occur between 2:00 pm and 8:00 pm than other times of the day. Nearly 58% of total and injury pedalcycle crashes occur during this time period compared to 38% and 40% of statewide total and injury crashes.

• **ROAD TYPE** – Sixty percent of fatal pedestrian crashes occur on state and US roadways. A higher percentage of pedestrian crashes and injury crashes occur on Baltimore City streets. Nearly 31% of total pedestrian crashes and 29% of injury crashes occur on Baltimore City streets compared to 17% and 13% of statewide total crashes. Slightly more total and injury pedalcycle crashes occur on county roads and Baltimore City streets. For instance, 26% of all pedalcycle crashes and 24% of injury crashes occur in Baltimore City compared to 17% of statewide total crashes and 13% of statewide injury crashes.

• **COUNTY** – Baltimore City is significantly over-represented for total and injury pedestrian crashes. However, more fatal pedestrian crashes occurred in Prince George’s County than any other jurisdiction. Worcester and Washington Counties are over-represented in pedalcycle crashes, while Howard County is under-represented. There was only an average of 8 fatal pedalcycle crashes over the past three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT OBJECTIVES (Pedestrian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of crashes from 2,843 in 2004 to 2,528 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 95 in 2004 to 86 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 2,405 in 2004 to 2,131 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of fatalities from 96 in 2004 to 85 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of injuries from 2,626 in 2004 to 2,237 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 5.16 to 4.08 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.17 to 0.14 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 4.36 to 3.44 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of .17 to .14 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 4.76 to 3.62 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 15.74 to 12.35 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of .22 to .17 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 11.96 to 8.72 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of .22 to .17 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 12.63 to 9.30 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT OBJECTIVES (Pedalcycle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of crashes from 875 in 2004 to 733 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 12 in 2004 to 10 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 665 in 2004 to 517 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To decrease the total number of fatalities from 12 in 2004 to 10 in 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To decrease the total number of injuries from 702 in 2004 to 552 in 2010.
To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.59 to 1.18 in 2010.
To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.02 to 0.02 in 2010.
To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.21 to 0.84 in 2010.
To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.02 to 0.02 in 2010.
To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.27 to 0.89 in 2010.
To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 15.74 to 12.35 in 2010.
To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of .22 to .0.17 in 2010.
To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 11.96 to 8.72 in 2010.
To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of .22 to .17 in 2010.
To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 12.63 to 9.30 in 2010.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To distribute 100,000 pieces of educational material on pedestrian and pedalcycle safety by September 30, 2007.
- To create a bicycle-oriented traffic safety video and distribute at least 200 copies statewide by September 30, 2007.
- To make 3,000,000 paid media impressions by September 30, 2007.
- To conduct 3 pedestrian and bicycle safety education train-the-trainer classes by September 30, 2007.
- To conduct 1 pedestrian enforcement workshop by September 30, 2007.
- To conduct 100 pedestrian safety law enforcement events by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s overall Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program is funded from Section 402 monies. A total of $309,700 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $135,900 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $ 445,600 in funds to be spent on the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program during the grant year. In FFY 2007, the MHSO will purchase $77,000 of paid media for the placement of regional media messages to promote pedestrian and bicycle safety among children and adults. The evaluation plan for this campaign will include identifying specific exposure for the campaign, earned media and making sure the target audiences are met.

During FFY 2007, a new brochure will be developed to target the need to promote the program and those teaching the program. The distribution plan will include providing the new brochure as well as a new program curriculum to teachers, school officials, health and physical educators by September 2007.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will continue its active role in pedestrian, pedalcycle, and school zone safety. Maryland’s PSTF, facilitated and supported by the MHSO, meets quarterly and serves as a clearinghouse for pedestrian safety information, activities, and best practices in pedestrian safety in Maryland and from around the nation. The PSTF includes staff from the
SHA and the MHSO, the CTSP Coordinators, law enforcement officers, state and local traffic engineers, planners, health and injury prevention specialists, pedestrian advocates, and elected officials. Sub-Committees include: Enforcement, Education, and Engineering.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include several enforcement and education efforts across the State. The MHSO will continue to expand the Maryland Pedestrian Enforcement Initiative, which provides training, resources and funding for overtime pedestrian enforcement activities in ten of the State’s most populated and affected jurisdictions – Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Charles, Howard, Harford, Montgomery, Prince George’s, Washington and Worcester Counties, as well as Baltimore City. Using overtime grant funds, training, educational and enforcement resources from the MHSO, PDs will target high-risk motorist and pedestrian behaviors and locations.

The MHSO will also coordinate the Annual Pedestrian Enforcement Recognition Luncheon for officers around the State who participate and excel in pedestrian safety enforcement. This event will serve to reward front-line officers for valuable pedestrian safety efforts, and to create an incentive for increased enforcement activity. In addition, a special emphasis will be placed on gaining greater levels of earned media attention of enforcement activities during FFY 2007.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its pedestrian and bicycle safety objectives:

**Maryland Department of Transportation – Bicycle Traffic Safety Video**
- State agency
- Target audience – General public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this project is to create a bicycle traffic safety education video to address Maryland-specific traffic safety issues, specifically an over-representation by men and boys in bicycle crashes, injuries and fatalities in the State of Maryland. The role of motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists will be addressed in this video and the product will be distributed through multiple channels, most notably statewide websites, CTSPs, bicycle clubs, advocacy groups, and promotions in Ocean City during summer months.

**Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments – Street Smart: Pedestrian, Bicycle & Traffic Safety Awareness Campaign**
- Non-Profit/Not-for-Profit
- Target audience – General public
- Target area – Washington DC-metropolitan region

The main goal of this program is to reduce pedestrian and bicycle traffic fatalities and injuries in the Washington area. The WASHCOG will coordinate a media press event to kick off the implementation of the Regional Pedestrian, Bicycle and Traffic Safety Education Campaign and will also conduct three enforcement-related events in the Washington region by May 2007. Included in the media portion of the program are plans intended to run a one-month campaign consisting of radio spots, transit advertising, print ads and collateral materials such as posters and safety hand-outs to be distributed through partner agencies. The Washington DC media markets will be heavily targeted in the program efforts. During FFY 2007 an increased amount of Spanish-language media will be purchased to address pedestrians closer to age 40 in this group. This specific arrangement of markets will provide air coverage for the vast majority of Maryland’s
driving population, especially within the statistically over-represented counties. The public awareness campaign, for which these funds will be used, will be completed by May 2007.

**Washington Area Bicyclist Association – Statewide Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Expansion**

- Non-Profit/Not-for-Profit
- Target audience – Elementary school students
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this project will be to increase the awareness of pedestrian and bicycle safety among children and their parents. Children were involved in more pedestrian and bicycle crashes than any other group. An expansion of this project in FFY 2007 will include Montgomery, Prince George’s, Howard, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Harford, and Cecil Counties and Baltimore City. Additionally, the ultimate goal of this program is to expand the training statewide. Another goal of the program will be to recruit more Maryland teachers into the program. The WABA will participate in at least four conferences to provide education about bicycle and helmet safety and as a part of the statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Expansion program, will facilitate three train-the-trainer workshops in Prince George’s and Montgomery Counties, and Baltimore City. Approximately 40 teachers will be trained statewide by September 2007.

**PEDESTRIAN-PEDALCYCLE SAFETY: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-006</td>
<td>Bicycle Traffic Safety Video</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-007</td>
<td>Statewide Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Safety Expansion</td>
<td>$75,700</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-061</td>
<td>Street Smart - PR Campaign</td>
<td>$100,100</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$309,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

**MOTORCYCLE SAFETY**

**TABLE 14 – Crash Summary: Motorcycle Involved * **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5-Year AVG.</th>
<th>5-Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years, on average, 1,448 motorcycle crashes have occurred on Maryland’s roadways. On average, 64 people have lost their lives each year, representing ten percent of all of Maryland’s traffic fatalities. In addition, on average, 1,330 people have been injured annually, representing two percent of all of Maryland’s traffic injuries.
• **AGE** – Operators 21 to 44 are involved in a higher percentage of total crashes, injuries and fatalities. Operators aged 30 to 39 are involved in more crashes than other operators, while those aged 35-44 are injured more often than others. Operators between the ages of 30 and 34 are 12.4% of all those involved in motorcycle crashes, 12.6% of operator injures and 15.4% of fatalities. The age trend has begun to change in recent years, with an increasing number of motorcycle operators over the age of 35 being involved in crashes within the past three years.

• **GENDER** – Male operators are involved in a significantly higher percentage of total, injury, and fatal crashes. Males represent 90% of operators involved in total crashes, 92% of injuries, and 98% of fatalities.

• **MONTH** – A higher percentage of total, injury, and fatal motorcycle crashes occurs during the warmer months, April through October.

• **DAY OF WEEK** – Total, injury, and fatal crashes are more likely to occur on Saturday and Sunday than other days of the week. Nearly 25 percent of total and injury crashes occur on Sunday and 32% of fatal crashes occur on that day.

• **TIME OF DAY** – The highest percentage of motorcycle total, injury and fatal crashes occurs between 3:00 pm and 7:00 pm. Nearly 36% of motorcycle crashes and 30% of fatal motorcycle crashes occur during this period.

• **ROAD TYPE** – Close to 31% of total, injury, and fatal crashes occur on county roads. Still more crashes (total, injury and fatal) occur on state roads.

• **COUNTY** – Frederick and Charles Counties are over-represented in total crashes, while Baltimore City is under-represented. Anne Arundel County is significantly over-represented in fatal crashes.

### IMPACT OBJECTIVES

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 1,570 in 2004 to 1,508 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 65 in 2004 to 62 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 1,212 in 2004 to 1,164 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 68 in 2004 to 65 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 1,388 in 2004 to 1,333 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 2.85 to 2.74 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.12 to 0.11 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 2.20 to 2.11 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.12 to 0.12 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 2.52 to 2.42 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 28.25 to 27.13 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 1.17 to 1.12 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 21.81 to 20.94 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 1.22 to 1.18 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 24.97 to 23.98 in 2010.
ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES

- To complete a comprehensive Motorcycle Safety Assessment by May 1, 2007.
- To make 50 motorcyclist contacts during the 4 Smooth Operator enforcement waves by August 1, 2007.
- To make 250,000 regional media impressions by September 30, 2007.
- To create and distribute 40,000 pieces of motorcycle safety educational material by September 1, 2007.
- To convene and facilitate 4 Motorcycle Safety Task Force meetings by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s overall Motorcycle Program is funded from Section 2010 monies. A total of $91,100 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $16,300 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $107,400 in funds to be spent on the Motorcycle Program in FFY 2007. In FFY 2007, the MHSO will purchase $25,000 of paid media for motorcycle awareness.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include a NHTSA-sponsored regional conference of motorcycle safety program professionals, a statewide training on motorcycle safety enforcement, a comprehensive assessment of motorcycle safety activities in Maryland, and continued public outreach activities. Any additional 2010 funds received in FFY 2007 may be used for improving the delivery of motorcycle safety training and for motorcycle safety awareness.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following project, to work toward accomplishing its motorcycle safety objectives:

Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration – Motorcycle Safety Assessment

- State agency
- Target audience – Organizations in Maryland involved in motorcycle safety
- Target area – State of Maryland

The focus of this program is to inventory and assess the effectiveness of motorcycle efforts throughout Maryland. A panel of experts will be convened to review all aspects of motorcycle safety in the State and the efforts undertaken to address them, including motorcycle rider skill training, law enforcement, public awareness, rider licensing and other issues. The results of the assessment, as documented in the final report, will be used to guide improvements in the delivery of motorcycle safety programs and to identify priority areas for action.

MOTORCYCLE SAFETY: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-012</td>
<td>Motorcycle Safety Program Assessment</td>
<td>$56,400</td>
<td>Section 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$115,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.
INATTENTIVE DRIVING PREVENTION

TABLE 15 – Crash Summary: Inattentive Driver Involved *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5 Year AVG.</th>
<th>5 Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>16,735</td>
<td>17,193</td>
<td>17,857</td>
<td>16,906</td>
<td>11,452</td>
<td>16,029</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>24,914</td>
<td>26,761</td>
<td>29,956</td>
<td>27,905</td>
<td>20,710</td>
<td>26,049</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>41,842</td>
<td>44,131</td>
<td>47,969</td>
<td>44,972</td>
<td>32,231</td>
<td>42,229</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>26,636</td>
<td>26,868</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>26,523</td>
<td>17,405</td>
<td>24,926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years, on average, 42,229 inattentive driving crashes have occurred on Maryland roadways. On average, 170 people lost their lives each year, representing 26% of all of Maryland’s traffic fatalities. In addition, on average, 24,926 people have been injured annually, representing 43% of all of Maryland’s traffic injuries.

- AGE – Drivers 16 to 20 are involved in a significantly higher percent of total and injury crashes and are over-represented in fatal crashes. Drivers aged 25-29 and 80 and over are also involved in a high percentage of fatalities.
- GENDER – Driver gender is similar to statewide crashes for total, injury, and fatal crashes.
- MONTH – Distributions are similar to the statewide crash trends with one exception. A higher percent of fatal crashes occurs during August.
- DAY OF WEEK – The day of week trends for total, injury, and fatal crashes is similar to the statewide crash trends.
- TIME OF DAY – Total crashes are more likely to occur between 8:00 am and 8:00 pm. A higher percentage of fatal crashes occur between 8:00 pm and 4:00 am. Moreover, the probability of a fatal crash is highest during noon and 4:00 pm.
- ROAD TYPE – A higher percentage of total and injury crashes occur on state and county roads. A significantly higher percentage, 16.3%, of fatal crashes occurs on interstate roads.
- COUNTY – Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties are over-represented in total crashes, while Baltimore City is under-represented. Charles, Cecil and Washington Counties are over-represented in fatal crashes.

IMPACT OBJECTIVES

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 44,972 in 2004 to 43,191 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 134 in 2004 to 112 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 16,539 in 2004 to 16,154 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 187 in 2004 to 139 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 24,860 in 2004 to 21,665 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 81.59 to 78.36 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.29 to 0.18 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 30.01 to 60.7 in 26.10.
To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 0.34 to 0.22 in 2010.

To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 117.1 to 91.2 in 2010.

To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 809.13 to 777.09 in 2010.

To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 2.90 to 1.89 in 2010.

To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 297.571 to 272.26 in 2010.

To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 3.36 to 2.34 in 2010.

To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 447.28 to 364.98 in 2010.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To develop and place 2 inattentive driving prevention radio spots by September 30, 2007.
- To create and distribute 50,000 pieces of educational material on inattentive driving by September 30, 2007.

Maryland's overall Inattentive Driving Program is funded from Section 402 monies. Although no monies were granted to outside agencies for inattentive driving prevention in FFY 2007, the MHSO will purchase $12,000 of paid media for the *JUST DRIVE* Program.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include the development of an official logo for the *JUST DRIVE* Program. The MHSO will increase the amount of educational materials distributed to emphasize the severity and number of distracted and drowsy driving crashes on Maryland roadways. Additional funding will be spent during FFY 2007 to create additional PSAs targeting drowsy or distracted drivers, thereby increasing the exposure of inattentive driving prevention.

Educational efforts will target all drivers, but the MHSO will specifically focus upon programs to educate young drivers. Information and assistance will also be provided to several local partners to support programs for the older driver population. The MHSO will support the annual *National Sleep Awareness Week*, sponsored by the National Sleep Foundation, by focusing on drowsy driving prevention programs during the designated week. The MHSO has recently partnered with Sleep Services of America, an affiliate of Johns Hopkins that provides sleep diagnostic services to clients in seven states, and plans to co-host several events concentrating on the dangers associated with driving drowsy. During FFY 2007, two new driver alert cards will be developed. The first card will be developed to target young drivers and the second one with be developed with the general driving population in mind. The distribution plan will include the MHSO grantees, Maryland’s CTSPs, the Maryland T-SAFE Project, and conferences, exhibits and presentations attended by the MHSO’s Inattentive Driving Program Coordinator.

**GENERAL DRIVER SAFETY**

Several programs within the MHSO are not contained to any one specific Program Area. Consequently, the efforts listed in this section contribute to the overall decrease of crashes throughout the State and benefit all Program Areas. These General Areas share many similar attributes, including universal data and Impact Objectives for FFY 2007. Some General Areas have specific data breakdowns and each General Area maintains separate Administrative
Objectives. These are provided for FFY 2007 at the beginning of the narratives. For crash information, please refer to the Statewide Crash Data as presented on page 13 in Table 5.

Over the past five years, on average, 104,422 total crashes occurred on Maryland’s roadways and 646 people have lost their lives each year. In addition, on average, 58,080 people have been injured annually. For FFY 2007, the MHSO has been provided with detailed statistical breakdowns for all crashes. Key areas include the age of the driver, the driver’s gender, the month, day of the week, and time of day of the crash, the road type where the crash took place, and the county where the crash occurred.

The breakdown below summarizes where over-representation occurs in the various categories listed on crash reports for all of Maryland’s traffic crashes. In FFY 2007, the MHSO will use this data to target educational efforts by age and gender, while focusing enforcement efforts by month, day of week, time of day, road type, and county.

- **AGE** – Younger and older drivers are over-represented in fatalities. In 2004, the 16-24 year old group made up 12% of the state’s population, yet comprised 26% of motor vehicle driver fatalities, and persons age 65-79 comprised 8% of the population and 17% of driver fatalities.

- **GENDER** – Men are over-represented in fatalities, accounting for 48% percent of Maryland’s population and 79% of driver fatalities. In addition, 51.7% of drivers in crashes were male and 50.3% of injured drivers were male.

- **MONTH** – Total crashes are more likely to occur in October, May, and December, injury crashes in June and May, and fatal crashes in August and October.

- **DAY OF WEEK** – A higher percentage of total and injury crashes occur on Friday than any other day of the week. However, more fatal crashes occur on Saturday than on Sunday and Friday, which rank 2nd and 3rd in number of fatal crashes.

- **TIME OF DAY** – Close to 50% of total and injury crashes occur between noon and 8:00 pm. The highest percentage of fatal crashes occurs between noon and midnight.

- **ROAD TYPE** – A significant percentage of total, injury and fatal crashes occur on state and county roads. A higher percentage of total and injury crashes also occur on Baltimore City roads. A very high percentage of fatal crashes occur on state roads (44.1%), in addition to the 24.5% that occur on county roads, and the 12.0% and 11.0% that occur on US and interstate roads, respectively.

- **COUNTY** – The highest percentage of total crashes occur in Baltimore City and Prince George’s, Baltimore, and Montgomery Counties. A higher percentage of fatal crashes occur in Prince George’s, Baltimore, Anne Arundel and Montgomery Counties. However, these findings are not surprising because these counties have the highest populations in the state. A somewhat different pattern emerges when exposure data is added. Over-representation is determined when a county displays a higher percentage of crashes than expected, given its percentage of VMT.
  - For example, Baltimore City accounts for 6.4% of the state’s VMT, yet it accounts for 18.2% of the state’s total crashes and 14.1% of injury crashes. Montgomery County accounts for 13.3% of the state’s VMT, and 15.0% of injury crashes.
  - Although the number of fatal crashes in Charles and Cecil Counties is small, more fatal crashes occur in those Counties than one would expect. Prince George’s County has 15.7% of the state’s VMT and 20.2% of fatal crashes.
IMPACT OBJECTIVES

- To decrease the total number of crashes from 104,103 in 2004 to 99,981 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatal crashes from 576 in 2004 to 527 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injury crashes from 36,611 in 2004 to 33,067 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of fatalities from 643 in 2004 to 608 in 2010.
- To decrease the total number of injuries from 53,753 in 2004 to 43,069 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 188.87 to 177.27 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.05 to 0.85 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 66.42 to 53.43 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 1.17 to 0.98 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100M VMT from the 2004 rate of 97.52 to 69.60 in 2010.
- To reduce the overall crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 1,873.01 to 1,848.95 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatal crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 10.36 to 8.89 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury crash rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 685.70 to 557.32 in 2010.
- To reduce the fatality rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 11.57 to 10.26 in 2010.
- To reduce the injury rate per 100K Population from the 2004 rate of 967.12 to 725.90 in 2010.

Older Driver Safety

TABLE 16 – Crash Summary: Older Driver Involved *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5 Year AVG.</th>
<th>5 Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>4,447</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>5,709</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>10,255</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>10,226</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>10,374</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>6,916</td>
<td>7,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years, on average, 10,374 older driver crashes (age 65 and up) have occurred on Maryland’s roadways. On average, 106 people have lost their lives in older driver crashes each year, representing 16.4% of all Maryland traffic fatalities. In addition, an average of 7,441 has been injured annually, representing 13% of all of Maryland’s traffic injuries.

- **GENDER** – More male drivers were in crashes, injured and killed. Female drivers account for 27% of fatalities while their younger counterparts account for 28% of fatalities.
- **MONTH** – Total crashes and injury crashes exhibit the same distribution as the statewide crash trend, with more fatal crashes occurring during March, June and April.
- **DAY OF WEEK** – Total and injury crashes are more likely to occur on Friday and Wednesday. Fatal crashes are far more likely to occur on Wednesday and Monday.
• **TIME OF DAY** – More total, injury and fatal crashes occur between 10:00 am and 6:00 pm. Moreover, a high percentage of fatal crashes occur between 1:00 pm and 5:00 pm.

• **ROAD TYPE** – Total, injury and fatal crashes occur more often on state and county roads. However, close to 22% of fatal crashes occurred on US roads.

• **COUNTY** – Baltimore County is over-represented in total crashes, while Prince George’s County is under-represented. Harford and Washington Counties are over-represented in fatal crashes.

### ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To develop and place 1 new radio spot by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deliver 20 Seniors on the MOVE seminars statewide by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create and distribute 20,000 pieces of educational material on older driver safety by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend and facilitate 4 quarterly meetings of the Older Driver Consortium, by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To conduct at least 1 Older Driver Task Force meeting for CTSPs by September 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maryland’s overall Older Driver Program is funded from Section 402 monies. A total of $17,000 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $24,600 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $41,600 in funds to be spent on the Older driver Program in FFY 2007.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its older driver safety objectives:

**Johns Hopkins University – Seniors on the M.O.V.E.**

- Institute of Higher Education
- Target audience – Maryland licensed drivers aged 65 and older
- Target area – Statewide

The focus of this program is to develop a user manual for the Seniors on the M.O.V.E. training program for older drivers. The manual will help CTSP Coordinators and others implement the Seniors on the M.O.V.E. workshop series, which includes four modules on self-assessment, skill training, occupant protection and medication-impairment issues. The manual will also document the results of the program evaluation conducted in FFY 2006.

### OLDER DRIVER: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-005</td>
<td>Seniors on the M.O.V.E.</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.
Young Driver Safety

TABLE 17 – Crash Summary: Young Driver Involved *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>5 Year AVG.</th>
<th>5 Year Statewide %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>9,368</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>8,524</td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td>12,947</td>
<td>13,374</td>
<td>12,249</td>
<td>12,044</td>
<td>12,530</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes</td>
<td>21,188</td>
<td>22,430</td>
<td>22,354</td>
<td>20,882</td>
<td>20,318</td>
<td>21,434</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of All Fatalities</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Injured</td>
<td>15,059</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>14,373</td>
<td>13,927</td>
<td>13,281</td>
<td>14,388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years, on average, 21,434 crashes involving young drivers have occurred on Maryland’s roadways. On average, 130 people have lost their lives each year in younger driver crashes. This loss of life represents twenty percent of all of Maryland’s traffic fatalities. In addition, on average, 14,388 people have been injured in these crashes annually, accounting for one-quarter of all of Maryland’s traffic injuries.

- **AGE** – On average, more 20-year old drivers were killed in crashes than any other in this age group.
- **GENDER** – More male drivers were involved in crashes and more female drivers were injured.
- **MONTH** – Young drivers are involved in more total crashes during June, and more fatal crashes during September and November.
- **DAY OF WEEK** – A higher percent of total crashes occurs on Friday and most fatal crashes occurred on the weekend (Saturday and Sunday).
- **TIME OF DAY** – Young drivers are more likely to be involved in total and injury crashes between noon and 10:00 pm. However, fatal crashes are more likely to occur between 10:00 pm and 4:00 am.
- **ROAD TYPE** – A higher percent of young driver total, injury, and fatal crashes occur on state and county roads. Moreover, a significant percent of total crashes occur on US roads and Baltimore City streets.
- **COUNTY** – Anne Arundel County is over-represented in total crashes, while Baltimore City is under-represented. Anne Arundel County is also over-represented in fatal crashes, while Baltimore City is under-represented.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To distribute 20,000 young driver law cards by April 30, 2007.
- To make 5,000 young driver and liquor establishment contacts during high visibility impaired driving enforcement operations by September 30, 2007.
- To develop and place 2 young driver safety radio spots by August 30, 2007.
- To distribute 50,000 pieces of educational material on young driver by September 30, 2007.
- To facilitate 4 meetings of the *Young Driver Task Force (YDTF)* by September 30, 2007.
Maryland’s overall Young driver Program is funded from Section 402 monies. A total of $10,000 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $ 19,000 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $ 29,000 in funds to be spent on the Young driver Program in FFY 2007.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will continue to convene and facilitate meetings of the YDTF, which provides information on new and innovative programs and technical assistance to traffic safety program coordinators and other allied traffic safety partners.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include the promotion of the new underage DUI law, as well as the development of roll-call training and collateral materials to support enforcement of young driver laws. An innovative program to integrate traffic safety subject matter into high school curriculum will be pilot tested in Anne Arundel County. Finally, Alcohol Compliance Enforcement waves will be promoted statewide in FFY 2007.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its young driver prevention objectives:

**Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration – Supplemental Driver Training Curriculum for Parents of Novice Drivers**
- State agency
- Target audience – Parents of novice drivers
- Target area – State of Maryland

The focus of this program is to increase the involvement of parents in the training of young drivers and the establishment and enforcement of appropriate family policies toward young driver behavior. Topics will include coaching strategies for supervised driving practice, parent-young driver contracts and awareness of aggressive, inattentive and impaired driving issues.

### YOUNG DRIVER: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-008</td>
<td>Supplemental Training Curriculum for Parents of Novice Drivers</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total *</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds *</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

**Public Awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>.ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To hold 6 major press events by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To achieve 16,000 traffic safety message broadcasts by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To achieve at least a 10:1 return on NCSA grant funding by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To develop 8 new PSAs by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland’s overall Public Awareness effort is funded from Section 402 and 2010 monies. A total of $446,500 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. Costs associated with the Writer & Public Relations Coordinator are covered in this area. Matching funds for this grant are slightly unusual in that the Broadcaster’ Association guarantees a minimum rate of return of 4:1, meaning that for every dollar invested in the purchase of this unused airtime, the MHSO will receive $4 in additional media value. During FFY 2007, $16,500 of the granted funds will be used for the development of additional messaging, with the balance of $100,000 going toward the actual airtime. A minimum of $400,000 will be provided in matching funds by way of unused airtime value, for a grand total of $846,500 in funds to be spent on Public Awareness in FFY 2007. The grant has historically achieved a much higher rate of return on airtime, returning a total value of roughly $2 million worth of airtime during FFY 2006, a ratio of 20:1. Matching funds, and thereby total funds, spent on Public Awareness, will likely be much higher than the targeted figure presented in this document.

The MHSO continues to be proactive in regard to public awareness efforts and in every instance seeks to raise the profile of traffic safety throughout the State. Educating the general public is one of the MHSO’s primary focal points and the agency seeks to accomplish this mission through targeted messaging and programming which best fits the needs of Maryland’s various traffic safety audiences. The male 18-34 year old demographic is the MHSO’s primary audience for a wide variety of messaging, and in many instances, educational programming is formulated with this group in mind.

The MHSO is continually evaluating new methods for exposing traffic safety messages, and partnerships to further expand the reach of Maryland’s traffic safety messages are developed at the federal, state and local levels. The MHSO also partners with private sector businesses, advocacy groups, victims’ services organizations, other SHSOs, and traffic safety organizations, serving to further disseminate vital traffic safety messages.

During FFY 2006, a Request for Proposal was submitted, essentially placing much of the MHSO’s public awareness efforts up for contract. The effort, initiated in conjunction with the SHA, is designed to provide a more streamlined approach to PI&E efforts, as well as to develop a consistent and standardized approach to marketing both the agency and its programs. A final vendor selection will be made during FFY 2007 and this vendor will be responsible for initiating website development, coordinating the development and production of collateral materials, conducting focus groups and other research, and other associated activities. The winning company will report directly to the MHSO’s Writer & Public Relations Coordinator and will assist the MHSO in other public awareness projects as required.

Major Public Awareness initiatives for FFY 2007 will include organizing and hosting press conferences and events, including, but not limited to those for CIOT, CPSF, Maryland Remembers, and Smooth Operator. The MHSO is targeting six major public events throughout FFY 2007 to coincide with various outreach efforts in the Program Areas of Aggressive Driving Prevention, Impaired Driving Prevention, Occupant Protection, and Young Driver Safety. In addition, the MHSO helps the CTSP Coordinators schedule, organize and facilitate local events as requested.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its public awareness objectives:
Maryland/DC/Delaware Broadcasters Association – Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement (NCSA) Program

- Association
- Target audience – general public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to coordinate the release of NCSAs, similar in nature to PSAs, to radio stations throughout Maryland for broadcast during unused commercial airtime. Paid media on both television and radio, while extremely effective under the correct circumstances, is costly. The MHSO has granted funding to the Maryland/D.C./Delaware Broadcaster’s Association for its innovative NCSA Program to bridge the gap between the extraordinary costs for expensive paid media and the ability to successfully deliver media messaging. The grant provides the MHSO with the capacity to deliver a massive amount of messaging with some ability to target those messages by location and station format, at a very reasonable cost. This grant achieved an airplay value of over 20:1 during FFY 2006 and the MHSO has set a target return rate of 10:1, based upon the fact that in the event the Broadcaster’s Association takes on new clients, it will reduce the MHSO’s return rate due to increased volume of NCSA’s throughout the State. Additionally, through the beginning of FFY 2007, Maryland will be experiencing heavy election-related media purchases and donated air time, thus impacting a portion of the MHSO’s Return on Investment.

PUBLIC AWARENESS: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-026</td>
<td>NCSA Program</td>
<td>$116,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total *</td>
<td></td>
<td>$511,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds *</td>
<td></td>
<td>$520,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals include all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

Business & Community Outreach

ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES

- To hold the Drive Safely Work Week (DSWW) Symposium and kick-off event by October 31, 2006.
- To hold 1 training seminar in conjunction with the MHSO Program Coordinators by May 30, 2007.
- To distribute 1,000 T-SAFE Employer Guidebooks by September 30, 2007.
- To distribute 1,000 “Drive Safe. Or Pay The Price” employer toolkits by September 30, 2007.
- To hold a minimum of 2 EC meetings by September 30, 2007.
- To complete a restructuring of the T-SAFE EC by September 30, 2007.
- To increase T-SAFE membership by 25 percent by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s overall Business and Community Outreach Program is funded from Section 402 and Section 406 monies. A total of $105,100 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $166,500 was matched by grantee agencies for a grand total of $271,600 in funds to be spent on Business and Community Outreach in FFY 2007. Costs associated with the T-SAFE/Community Outreach Coordinator are covered in this area. In FFY 2007, federal funds will be used to purchase a minimal amount of paid media for the statewide
DSWW Campaign and overall Traffic Safety Awareness For Employers (T-SAFE) outreach. The majority of the paid media will be covered by T-SAFE EC member agencies and the general T-SAFE membership.

During FFY 2007, the Maryland T-SAFE Project will continue to serve as the lead employer traffic-safety program for the state. The T-SAFE EC, made up of a diverse group of top Maryland employers, will meet a minimum of twice a year. The Council’s main initiatives this year will include the following tasks: recruit, expand and restructure the EC; ensure that the EC is diversely represented; and strategize on further recruitment restructuring options for general membership.

The following items comprise the major T-SAFE initiatives for FFY 2007. First, Maryland’s T-SAFE Coordinator will continue to develop employer traffic-safety seminars and programs in coordination with each of the MHSO’s program area coordinators, as well as sponsor DSWW activity in coordination with the national Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS). The DSWW campaign will be promoted in conjunction with the national campaign. T-SAFE will continue to promote and increase employer participation in the Pacesetters Program. In an effort to promote all program areas, T-SAFE will continue to work to promote and distribute the “Drive Safe. Or Pay The Price” campaign employer toolkits in conjunction with the following program areas: Impaired Driving, Aggressive Driving, and Inattentive Driving. In addition, T-SAFE will use the PSAs developed in FFY 2004 for the Drive Safe. Or Pay The Price campaign and purchase airtime to promote the campaign. A T-SAFE Employers Guidebook, similar to the NETS material, will be developed and distributed to all T-SAFE members.

The T-SAFE website will continue to be managed and expanded. Furthermore, existing program area education and information materials will be revised with assistance from the MHSO Program Coordinators for continued distribution of useful education and information to the general public and employers. T-SAFE will seek to exhibit at least on major statewide annual business conference, as well as other statewide conferences relevant to the expansion of the T-SAFE Project. T-SAFE will continue to provide on-going information to members and make contact with them at least once per quarter or more often as required depending on projects and events, via e-mail and the T-SAFE e-newsletter distributed bi-annually.

Finally, T-SAFE will continue to recognize EC Members for exemplary commitment, support and promotion of the T-SAFE Project, recruitment efforts and overall workplace traffic-safety campaigns, through an annual award program and the distribution of certificates of recognition to members.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its Business and Community Outreach objectives:

**Chesapeake Region Safety Council – Comprehensive Highway Safety Training**

- Non-profit
- Target audience – employers
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goals of this program include: training professional drivers through corporate fleets or general employers, encouraging employers to conduct regular traffic safety training/education programs, and encouraging employers to establish and enforce corporate policies regarding traffic safety. The project will promote and present programs related to the hazards of speeding,
alcohol/drug impaired driving, and the importance of an occupant protection program. In FY 2007 the program will revise its offering to provide an improved comprehensive program.

Positive Alternative to Dangerous and Destructive Decisions, Inc. – *Positive Alternatives to Dangerous Actions*

- Non-profit
- Target audience – employers & judicial system
- Target area – State of Maryland

The goal of this program is the implementation of traffic-safety presentations to at-risk drivers appointed to the program through the court system and via employers and their employees. The program will focus on impaired driving, inattention, speeding, safety belt use, and aggressive driving. It is expanding statewide and targeting the 16-47 year olds with 37 dedicated classes for this group. It will also increase its focus on the 18-34 year old male population where there continues to be a rise in impaired driving crashes. The presentations are unique in that the presenters include paramedics, a funeral home director, law enforcement personnel, a recovered patient of a traffic crash, and a trauma nurse. The program will help inform and educate employers and other at risk drivers of the serious consequences of dangerous driving behaviors.

**BUSINESS & COMMUNITY OUTREACH: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-035</td>
<td>Comprehensive Corporate Highway Safety Training</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-048</td>
<td>Positive Alternatives to Dangerous and Destructive Decisions, Inc.</td>
<td>$65,100</td>
<td>Section 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-063</td>
<td>Drive Safely Work Week</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>402 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$140,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds</strong> *</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$205,400</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

**POLICE TRAFFIC SERVICES**

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To increase the number of police agencies across the state participating in 4 *Smooth Operator* enforcement waves by September 30, 2007.
- To conduct 2 NHTSA *Instructor Facilitator* Training sessions by September 30, 2007.
- To attend and assist in facilitation of 8 monthly meetings of the Maryland Crash Reconstruction Committee by September 30, 2007.
- To facilitate, attend, and present at 2 MSP Traffic Command Summits by September 30, 2007.

Maryland’s overall Police Traffic Services Program is funded from Section 402 monies. A total of $76,300 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. Additionally, a total of $45,500 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $121,800 in funds to be spent on
The MHSO administers a variety of federally funded highway safety programs and projects. A major portion of almost every program includes a law enforcement component. Given the number of enforcement agencies across Maryland on the state, county and local levels, a need for coordination of the law enforcement response in highway safety initiatives has been identified. Training, program overviews, and needs assessments are required for the most efficient deployment of enforcement resources. Site visits, statewide meetings, and training symposiums offered to the MSP and allied agencies afford the MHSO an opportunity to implement effective techniques for maximum impact in the various project areas.

Needs assessments have been conducted across Maryland, and gaps in both the training of officers and in the coordination of targeted enforcement efforts were identified. To resolve these issues in FFY 2007, frequent contacts with the MSP Grants Management Unit and regional meetings for law enforcement across the State will be conducted to provide project guidance and coordination of enforcement efforts as well as identify and assess the various needs at the street enforcement level. Likewise, continued meetings and liaison with key law enforcement executives through the MCPA and the Maryland Sheriff's Association (MSA), will provide the opportunity to reaffirm the role these agencies play in an effective highway safety program as well as identify for them resources available through the MHSO.

To ensure a more comprehensive partnership with the law enforcement community the MHSO will collaborate with officials at all levels to provide training opportunities and recognition for officers who are actively involved in highway safety initiatives, as well as to recruit more of such involvement from police officers in general. Towards this end, the MHSO will continue to promote the University of Maryland’s Institute for Advanced Law Enforcement Studies (DUI College) by providing technical and logistical support, as well as recruiting potential students from the law enforcement community and providing agencies with scholarship assistance for their personnel. Additionally, in conjunction with the Maryland Police Training Commission, the MHSO will strive to develop a statewide Traffic Safety Specialist classification in recognition of police officers who have attained advanced levels of training in highway safety initiatives, and have demonstrated their interest and proficiency in this area. Finally, during FFY 2007 the MHSO will begin implementing suggestions to improve the marketing efforts of traffic safety efforts to law enforcement officers. These suggestions were collected as the result of a FFY 2006 study on methods to improve officer participation in enforcement campaigns. These programs will work in concert with plans to better ‘market’ traffic enforcement initiatives within the statewide law enforcement community, as well as to develop future police leaders in highway safety.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its police traffic services objectives:

**Baltimore County Police – Police Crash Reconstruction Training**

- County agency
- Target audience – traffic crash investigators from MSP and allied agencies
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to increase the number of highly trained traffic crash reconstruction investigators across the State. Due to attrition, promotion and change of assignment, the MSP and other allied PDs continue to experience a drastic reduction of officers...
trained in traffic crash reconstruction methods. This program will provide training in the most advanced techniques of crash investigation and reconstruction to officers from across the State. Likewise to promote the sustained growth of a solid statewide crash reconstruction program, two NHTSA-sponsored Instructor / Facilitator training courses will be offered to crash investigators so that they will be able to provide instruction in future classes. Additionally, through partnership and participation in the Maryland Crash Reconstruction Committee, the Baltimore County PD will facilitate training for troopers and allied police officers in advanced collision investigation and various levels of crash reconstruction. This centralized training program will provide uniform reporting and investigative procedures across the state for all police officers, as well as cover pending topics of concern.

**Maryland State Police – Police Traffic Services/Training**

- State agency
- Target audience – general public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The focus of this project is to promote greater communication and cooperation between the MSP Command staff and the MHSO. Command Summits provide the Law Enforcement Coordinator an opportunity to address MSP administration, as well as commanders at the barrack level, in reference to priority areas in highway safety, grants management, and current best practices in enforcement techniques. As the lead law enforcement agency in the State, MSP and its command staff, plays a crucial role in the implementation of Maryland’s HSP.

**POLICE TRAFFIC SERVICES: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-013</td>
<td>Police Crash Reconstruction Training</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-028</td>
<td>Police Traffic Services/Training</td>
<td>$16,300</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

**DIVERSITY IN TRAFFIC SAFETY**

**ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES**

- To develop 2 new pieces of educational material concerning diverse populations by September 30, 2007.
- To distribute 25,000 pieces of educational material on diversity in traffic safety by September 30, 2007.
- To attend and facilitate 1 statewide Diversity in Traffic Safety Task Force Meeting and to coordinate one Diversity Summit by September 30, 2007.
Maryland’s overall Diversity in Traffic Safety Program is funded from Section 402 monies. A total of $90,300 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $96,400 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $186,700 in funds to be spent on the Diversity in Traffic Safety Program in FFY 2007.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will partner for the first time with Millennium Health & Human Services Development Corporation and the Love Life Live Long-Make It Go Click Foundation. While these partnerships are new, these organizations are well rounded in the field of diversity and community involvement and will be essential to the future of the MHSO’s Diversity in Traffic Safety Program.

The MHSO felt it crucial to modify the structure of the Diversity in Traffic Safety Task Force (DTF) for FFY 2007. As opposed to past years in which quarterly meetings were being held, the MHSO will administer only one statewide meeting, with that meeting being further complimented by a summit for Diversity in Traffic Safety. Additionally, the MHSO will continue its active role in increasing the level of awareness of traffic safety issues amongst diverse communities, develop culturally specific messages and build partnerships with community-based programs to provide education to all populations. Through the streamlined DTF and the implementation of the Summit as a key focal area of the group, the MHSO is hopeful that membership in the overall Task Force will increase by the end of FFY 2007.

Major initiatives for FFY 2007 will include the Diversity Safety Summit and numerous community outreach initiatives. The summit will specially focus on Maryland communities and problems surrounding these communities. This year, new flyers will be produced to target diverse audiences and the MHSO will also offer a variety of materials in languages other than English. The distribution plan will include facilities such as senior centers, churches, barbershops, local community centers, PTAs, local retail shops, retirement communities and other non-traditional outreach sites where targeted age groups frequently visit.

In addition in FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following project, to work toward accomplishing its diversity in traffic safety program objectives:

**Millennium Health & Human Services Development Corporation – “M-CHOOSE” Multicultural-Community Highway Outreach Safety Education Pilot Program**

- Non-Profit
- Target audience – Diverse audiences
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to identify target audiences (diverse communities) based on census data and develop highway safety countermeasures to address the issues facing these communities. Countermeasures will include creating materials for the MHSO Diversity in Traffic Safety Resource Binder (“Do’s & Don’ts” lists for various communities, highway safety materials translated into other languages, etc.); programming to non-traditional outlets (depending upon target audience); and working with select agencies to secure commitments to add highway safety components to existing agency action plans.
DIVERSITY IN TRAFFIC SAFETY: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-006</td>
<td>“M-CHOOSE” Multicultural-Community Highway Outreach Safety Education Pilot Program</td>
<td>$90,300</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$127,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Funds*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$127,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES

- To contact 100 businesses and government agencies for potential Bystander Care partnership by January 1, 2007.
- To recruit 10 additional Bystander Care trainers by January 1, 2007.
- To conduct 5 Bystander Care train-the-trainer programs by January 30, 2007.
- To hold 25 Bystander Care training programs, with a minimum of 10 students per session, by June 1, 2007.
- To develop an equipment tracking system for use by MIEMSS by September 30, 2007.

Maryland's overall EMS effort is funded from Section 402 and 406 monies. A total of $203,600 was granted to this program area for FFY 2007. In addition, a total of $207,900 was matched by grantee agencies, for a grand total of $411,500 in funds to be spent on EMS in FFY 2007.

In FFY 2007, the MHSO will fund the following projects, to work toward accomplishing its EMS objectives:

Maryland Institute For Emergency Medical Services Systems – Statewide EMS Equipment Project

- State agency
- Target audience – general public
- Target area – State of Maryland

The main goal of this program is to promote crash response education and scene safety during motor vehicle crashes. This is an integral part of keeping Maryland roadways safe and secure. As a function of this grant, MIEMSS will provide mini-grants to Fire/EMS companies to purchase eligible EMS equipment necessary for scene safety and effective crash response, including rescue/extrication equipment, medical equipment for first responders, scene safety equipment, and training equipment. This year MIEMSS will continue its efforts to develop tags to identify MHSO purchased equipment, determine ways to track use of equipment purchased with grant monies and design a draft evaluation tool to verify use data.

Maryland Institute For Emergency Medical Services Systems, Region I – Bystander Care Program Pilot

- State agency
Target audience – employers, including State and local agencies, with fleets
Target area – Western Maryland, including Allegany, Frederick, Garrett and Washington Counties

The main goal of this program is to provide participants with the knowledge, skills and confidence to act in roadside emergency situations. The program emphasizes five important steps to successfully handling a roadside emergency: 1) Recognize the emergency, 2) Stop to help, 3) Call 9-1-1, 4) Start the Breathing, and 5) Stop the Bleeding. The program uses a curriculum, a video, and supporting materials developed through past collaborations between the MHSO and the MIEMSS. The program’s Coordinator, hired at the MIEMSS’ Region I, works jointly with the areas CTSPs to coordinate training sessions. Recruitment of instructor candidates will begin with pre-hospital care providers and emergency room nurses. The program will be piloted in the four western-most counties and will aim to target employers whose workforce spends the majority of their day on the roadways. In addition to T-SAFE partners from the private sector, the initial push will be made with public sector partners with fleets – the SHA, for example.

**EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES: PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-070</td>
<td>Bystander Care Program Pilot</td>
<td>$26,900</td>
<td>Section 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-071</td>
<td>Statewide EMS Equipment Project</td>
<td>$176,700</td>
<td>Section 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>402 Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$176,700</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds</strong> *</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$203,600</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes all administrative and programmatic funds not listed.*
Management Details

**FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To conduct at least 36 monitoring site visits on projects with $50,000 or more funds obligated by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To complete the conversion of monitoring forms to allow on-site entry of site visit information at the time of the visit by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FMS will conduct monitoring site visits on at least 36 projects to which $50,000 or more in funding is obligated. Monitoring is necessary to track the progress of projects in meeting objectives and performance measures, as well as to maintain compliance with both the internal MHSO Monitoring Policy and federal requirements contained in 49 CFR Part 18, Sect. 18.40 - 43.

To facilitate implementation of the MHSO Monitoring Policy, the FMS has been working to convert the MHSO’s site visit forms and other documentation relevant to monitoring and administration into a format which will allow a direct input of information into the form. Presently, it is necessary to transcribe information from a hand-written form and the conversion to electronic format will save time and allow for more accurate, efficient and expeditious site visits.

The FMS will continue exploring ways to improve communications among the Grants Management System (GMS), the State Financial Management Information System (FMIS) and the NHTSA’s Grants Tracking System (GTS). Upgrades of this nature will enhance the MHSO’s ability to manage the program and associated projects.

The Rules for Financial Management of Highway Safety Projects will be reviewed, revised or updated as needed based on the reauthorization of the previous legislation. When revisions are made to the NHTSA Grants Management Manual, the MHSO will incorporate those revisions as well as other updates to existing materials to improve the overall operation and management of the program. As the MHSO’s effectiveness and efficiency improves, the MHSO will be able to expand its on-site monitoring to encompass all projects.

**Grants Management**

The following section outlines the steps the MHSO and its grantees take throughout the year to establish, implement, monitor and close out projects. The MHSO has put a considerable amount of effort not only into documenting the process, but in tweaking and improving the existing process. This has been done in an effort to create accountability and efficiency for Maryland’s Highway Safety Program.

The following outline covers two calendar years of activity, in the sense that preparation for the FFY begins well in advance of its formal starting date (October 1), and closeout extends beyond its formal ending date (September 30).
A - Establish Program Direction (January - March)

1) The Planning Team (PT) consists of the MHSO Chief, Safety Program Section (SPS) Chief, FMS Chief, Financial and Program Monitoring Specialist (F&PMS) and Data Analyst and TRCC Coordinator (DA&TC). It meets several times in the months before the grant application process begins.

2) The Financial Parameters Team (FPT) consists of the MHSO Chief, FMS Chief, and SPS Chief. It meets several times in the months before the grant application process begins.

B1 - Disseminate Information to Existing NON-CORE & Potential NON-CORE Grantees (January - February)

1) A non-core grantee mailing list is developed for the dissemination of materials. The list includes existing non-core grantee agencies (includes state agencies, non-profits, not-for-profits, associations, hospitals, institutions of higher education, etc.) and potential non-core grantee agencies. New potential grantee non-core agencies are sought according to the priorities determined at the PT & FPT meetings, as well as general new contacts that are desired. Non-core grantee agencies vary from year to year, according to the data priorities determined for that FFY year – unlike the core grantee agencies, that remain fairly consistent over the years.

2) Marketing materials are developed to advertise the upcoming Grant Applicant Seminars (GAS).

3) GAS Binders are developed for distribution at the seminars. Contents are broken down by General Information, Grant Information, Grant Forms, Problem Identification, and Presentations. A disk with grant application forms is included. For existing grantees, MHSO/SHA logos and logo policies are also included. Contents are updated each year, depending upon administrative updates and programming priorities set during PT & FPT meetings.

4) GAS Presentations are developed by Project Managers who have identified problem areas and are seeking counter measures to address these specific issues.

5) Two seminars are held, the Grant Applicant Seminar-Existing Grantees & the GAS-Potential Grantees for non-core grantees (March), to educate grantees on:
   - what types of highway safety funding are available (attendees are given rough estimates of appropriate funding request levels & how requests are being rated)
   - where Maryland stands data-wise & what upcoming FFY priorities will be
   - what highway safety programs are already being funded
   - new administrative grant requirements
   - applicants must attend the appropriate seminar to be considered for grant funds.

B2 - Disseminate Information to Existing CORE Grantees (January - March)

1) A core grantee mailing list is developed, using updated information from the MHSO’s contact database, maintained in the ACT! software. Core grantee agencies (those housing the CTSPs) remain fairly consistent over the years – unlike the non-core grantee agencies, that vary each year according to the data priorities determined for
that FFY. The consistency of these agencies over the years is important, as the CTSP has a vital role in fulfilling the goals of the State’s overall highway safety program. One-third of the CTSP programs are housed in HDs, one-third in law enforcement agencies, and the rest in various county offices.

2) Marketing materials are developed to advertise the upcoming SAM.
3) SAM Binders are developed for distribution at the seminars. Contents are broken down by General Information, Grant Information, Grant Forms, Problem Identification, and Presentations. A disk with grant application forms and MHSO/SHA logos is also included. Contents are updated each year, depending upon administrative updates and programming priorities set during PT & FPT meetings.
4) SAM Presentations are developed by Project Managers who have identified problem areas and are seeking counter measures to address these specific issues.
5) A mandatory Semi-Annual CTSP Project Directors’ Meeting for core grantees (April) is held to educate grantees on fiscal and administrative issues (same as above) pertinent to the CTSP.

C1 - NON-CORE Grantees Submit Expressions of Interest (EOIs) to MHSO (Late April)

1) The NON-CORE Grants Review Team (GRT) is established. The central part of the NON-CORE GRT is comprised of the SPS Chief, FMS Chief, F&PMS, and Maryland’s Regional Program Manager from NHTSA Mid-Atlantic Region. The MHSO Project managers join the GRT during the review of the EOIs that relate to their program areas.
2) Existing and potential non-core agencies submit EOIs each year. Since the data priorities are determined year by year, the agencies that can effectively address these priorities from year to year might change as well.
3) Various members of the MHSO input information from the EOIs into the NON-CORE GRT Database. The NON-CORE GRT is an in-house database that logs tracking, contact, budgetary and revisions information from the EOIs. A similar CORE GRT Database is established as well.
4) F&PMS inputs information from the EOIs into the GMS.
5) Office Manager (OM) creates binder (contains EOIs broken down by Project Manager & blank EOI Review Sheets) for each member of the NON-CORE GRT.

C2 - CORE Grantees Submit PAs to MHSO (Early June)

1) The CORE GRT is established. The central part of the CORE GRT is comprised of the SPS Chief, F&PMS, and MHSO’s Statewide CTSP Project Manager.
2) Core agencies submit PAs each year. The core agencies address the full gamut of highway safety program areas and thus need not “apply” each year. Instead, they submit a PA that addresses their proposed program, which varies from year to year according to their local data priorities. Various members of MHSO input information from the EOIs into the CORE GRT Database.
3) F&PMS inputs data into GMS.
4) OM creates binder (contains PAs broken down by county & blank PA Review Sheets) for each member of the CORE GRT.

D1 - MHSO Coordinator & NON-CORE GRT Review EOIs & Develop Funding Recommendations (Mid-May)
1) FMS GRT members review EOIs for financial issues. SPS GRT members review EOIs for programmatic issues. Questions are referred to the appointed MHSO Program Manager for that EOI, to be answered before the GRT meetings. Each GRT member establishes a score for each EOI using EOI Review Sheet. The EOIs are graded according to weighted categories, equaling 100 points:

- Expression of Interest Complete (5 points)
- Problem Identification (20 points)
- Project Description (10 points)
- Project Objectives (15 points)
- Project Activities (15 points)
- Project Evaluation (15 points)
- Estimated Expenditures (5 points)
- Innovation (10 points)
- Administrative Performance (5 points)

2) The NON-CORE GRT meets to formally review each EOI. The SPS Chief leads a discussion of the Grant Program Direction Sheet, which illuminates issues concerning funding and data, as well as any changes in NHTSA directives. If any emerging trends have appeared in the EOI submittals (for instance, increases in requests for travel, equipment, incentive items, etc. from the previous year), the SPS leads a discussion on what areas might be best considered for overall cuts. The NON-CORE GRT does the following:

   a) Establishes a group score (percentage) for each EOI. A score above the mean for each program area qualifies the agency for the possibility of funding. This score does not determine the percentage of funding committed to the agency in terms of the total funds for which they applied.

   b) Recommends financial and programmatic revisions to each EOI using the codes found in the EOI /PA Revisions Legend.

3) F&PMS updates GRT database with proposed revised figures and revision codes.

D2 - Statewide CTSP Program Coordinator & CORE GRT Review PAs & Develop Funding Recommendations (mid-June)

1) FMS GRT members review PAs for financial issues. SPS GRT members review PAs for programmatic issues. Questions are referred to the CTSP Program Coordinator, to be answered before the GRT meeting. Each GRT member establishes a score for each PA as noted above.

2) The CORE GRT meets to formally review each EOI. The SPS Chief leads a discussion of the FFY Grant Program Direction Sheet, which illuminates issues concerning funding and data, as well as any changes in the NHTSA directives. The CTSP Program Coordinator provides financial programmatic breakdowns of past FFY expenditures (salary, travel, equipment, incentive items, etc.), for review purposes. The CORE GRT does the following:

   a) Establishes a group score (percentage) for each EOI.

   b) Establishes base funding levels according to the UMCP formula. This formula produces a weighted value for each county that determines the level of funding they will receive based on variables
such as fatality rate (VMT), injury rate (VMT), crash rate, population, and the alcohol impaired driving crash rate (VMT)

c) Pre-set guidelines are used for additional funds for individual projects when available (for instance, incentive enforcement funds – guidelines include mandatory designated weeks, set number of sobriety checkpoints required, etc).

d) Additional funds may also be included for Stellar Awards, awarded to counties that have submitted stellar PAs, as noted by above-average group score, and run an exemplary program.

e) Develop funding recommendations.

3) F&PMS logs the recommended figures into GRT files by PAs.

E - MHSO Develops Program & Obtains Approval (June)

1) SPS Chief generates the FFY GRT Recommendation Worksheet from the Core and Non-Core GRT EXCEL files. SPS Chief and FMS Chief meet with MHSO Chief to discuss recommendations.

2) F&PMS makes necessary programmatic and financial changes to GRT files by EOI/PA. At this point, EOI/PA funding requests may be in excess of estimated available funding.

3) F&PMS and SPS Chief discuss programmatic and/or financial changes with Program Coordinators.

4) MHSO Chief, SPS Chief and FMS Chief approve updated GRT Recommendation Report.

5) FMS Chief updates the FFY Projected Funding and generates FFY Highway Safety Program Summary from information in the updated GRT Recommendation Report. The FFY Projected Funding is adjusted frequently and reflects the latest estimated funds available. The FFY Highway Safety Program Summary becomes the basis of the Annual Application for Federal Highway Safety Funds (Benchmark Report) to NHTSA.


7) OOTS Directors and MHSO Chiefs meet to review Program Overview Report, GRT Recommendation Report and FFY Highway Safety Program Summary.

8) OOTS Directors and MHSO Chiefs meet with SHA Administrator to review Program Overview Report, GRT Recommendation Report and FFY Highway Safety Program Summary.

9) SHA Administrator, OOTS Directors and MHSO Chiefs approve the program. (At any time during Steps 6, 7 and 8, changes may be made resulting in updates to the program recommendation package.)

F - MHSO Commits Funding to NON-CORE Grantees (July)

1) F&PMS sends a letter to each agency that submitted an EOI based on the approved program recommendation package. This is performed through a mail merge of the GRT Database (in Excel) with the Commitment Letter templates (in Word).

a) A Commitment Letter is sent to each agency that submitted EOI & was included in the final program, either funded in full or in part, and includes:
- total amount committed to the project, as well as by fund category
- suggested programmatic, financial, or general revisions to the grant
- key grant requirements
- instructions on the paperwork which needs to be returned to MHSO, including Project Conditions

b) A Denial Letter is sent to each agency that submitted an EOI that was not included in the final program.

2) F&MMS sets up a project file for each committed project. A MHSO Project number is assigned and folders are made for the main project file.

3) F&PMS updates GRT files with the date the letters are sent.

G - Establish Financial Data for new FFY (June)

1) The FFY Funding Summary with Federal Account/Project Numbers worksheet is created using the FFY Highway Safety Program Summary (Excel spreadsheet) by the FMS Chief.

2) Financial Data is entered into three different systems:
   a) GTS
   b) GMS
   c) FMIS

3) Reports generated include:
   a) HSP Cost Summary Transaction Report
   b) HSP Cost Summary Report

H - Grantees submit corrected/signed PAs to MHSO (August)

1) MHSO receives (2 original) revised PAs (initially called EOIs) from non-core grantees and revised PAs from core grantees, which are signed by grantee agency’s Project Director & Authorizing Official.

2) MHSO Program Coordinators and F&PMS verify against the GRT Excel files and the project files that requested changes have been made.

I - Executed PAs are Sent to CORE and NON-CORE Grantees (August - September)

1) MHSO Chief signs two original PA pages from each grantee.

2) F&PMS sends an Executed Agreement letter, along with one original, back to the grantee. The other original is kept at MHSO in the project file.

3) Following GMS application instructions, F&PMS converts the EOI file to a PA file.

J - Update Financial Systems (August - September)

1) Update GMS.

2) Update FMIS.

K - Submit Annual Application for Federal Highway Safety Funds (Benchmark Report) to NHTSA (September 1)
1) The Application (required by the NHTSA) is the formal plan resulting from the final budget and program approved by Maryland’s Governor’s Highway Safety Representative (GR)/SHA Administrator (during the June meeting). The Application is coordinated by the SPS Chief and the MHSO’s Writer & Public Relations Coordinator, but written in large part by the MHSO’s DA&TC and Project Managers.

2) Each September 1st, MHSO submits Maryland’s Annual Application for Federal Highway Safety Funds (Benchmark Report) to the NHTSA Mid-Atlantic Region Office. Typically, the NHTSA approves the application on or around October 1 through a formal letter. Any issues are resolved prior to approval by the NHTSA.

3) FMS Chief electronically submits HSP-1 in GTS and NHTSA electronically approves HSP-1.

L - NHTSA Notifies MHSO of Federal Funding Available and MHSO Updates Financial Systems (On or after October 1)

1) On or after October 1st, the MHSO Chief is notified by letter of the federal funds available (Obligation Limitation) for the new FFY.

2) The FMS Chief is notified by e-mail that a new Obligation Limitation is available for obligation in GTS.

3) FMS Chief uses HSP-1 (the approved plan) as a guide to allocating and obligating the federal funds received.

4) FMS Chief reviews Project Obligation Report and Status of Funds Report in GMS to confirm and aid in determining federal fund allocation in GMS.

5) The funds allocated to the federal accounts codes in GMS are then input to the NHTSA GTS to create the Obligation Cost Summary (HCS-1).

6) On-going prior FFY projects are reviewed by MHSO staff for potential unexpended balances from prior year’s approved application/program.

7) HCS-1 is electronically verified within GTS, and submitted to the NHTSA for review.

M - MHSO monitors grantees to ensure compliance with standards & Agreement (October - September)

1) MHSO conducts a limited number of site visits with grantees each grant year based on project difficulties or random selection.

2) MHSO staff attends grantee functions and meetings.

N - Pre-approval of Equipment, Travel, Educational Materials, Incentive Items, Media for all Grantees, & Activity Requests for Core Grantees, are processed (October - September)

1) Core and Non-Core Grantees submit Equipment Pre-Approval Requests. If a grantee submits an Equipment Pre-Approval Request for which the federal share will be more than $1,000 per unit cost, written pre-approval must be obtained from MHSO. Equipment costing $5,000 or more per unit cost must also be pre-approved by NHTSA.

2) Core and Non-Core Grantees submit Educational Material/Incentive Item/Media Requests. If Educational Materials, Incentive Items, or Media are to be purchased as a part of the grant, an Educational Material/Incentive Item/Media Request must be submitted and approved before procurement is performed and any money is spent by the grantee agency.
3) Non-Core Grantees submit Travel Requests. If Travel is to be taken as part of the grant, and is not specifically outlined in the grantee’s PA, a Travel Request must be made to the MHSO.

4) Core Grantees submit Activity Requests. These Requests are reviewed and approved/denied by their MHSO Project Manager (the CTSPP Coordinator) and forwarded to F&PMS for concurrence. In some cases, the MHSO Chief and SPS Chief are given final review before a decision is made.

O - Grantees submit Required Reports (October - September)

1) At the conclusion of each activity, core grantees complete an evaluation of the activity and submit an Activity Evaluation form.

2) MHSO receives quarterly reports from core and non-core grantees for each PA as specified in the PA Conditions by the following dates – January 31 (October – December), April 30 (January – March) and July 31 (April – June).

3) MHSO receives and processes the report package, which includes the Status Report, Reimbursement Claim, Reimbursement Itemization Report, and Equipment Accountability Report (if necessary).
   a) **Status Report** - summarizes activities performed during the project period.
   b) **Reimbursement Claim** - summarizes the monies for which the grantee agency requests to be reimbursed for the reporting period.
   c) **Reimbursement Itemization Report** - details the expenses summarized on the claim.
   d) **Equipment Accountability Report** - submitted if equipment has been purchased or disposed.

P - Budget Modifications made to PAs (October – September)

1) Budget Modification - made to the grants during the FYF to add funds, change cost categories, or change fund type. They may be initiated by the grantee or MHSO Project Manager.

2) The MHSO PM puts the request in writing, including the amount of funds, the type of fund, the change in cost categories, the change or addition of activities, and a clear and concise reason for the change.

3) A Budget Modification Form is prepared with a letter (signed by the MHSO’s Chief) and sent to the grantee for signatures of the Project Director and Authorizing Official and returned.

5) Budget Modifications are then executed, one set of originals is sent to the grantee and one set is put in main Project File. The Budget Modification Form is placed in front of the subsequent first page of the PA.

6) The F&PMS makes changes in GMS and to the Blanket Purchase Orders in FMIS, if necessary.

7) Copies of the Executed Letters are sent to the SPS Chief, the MHSO Project Manager, and the FMS Chief, who then initiates necessary changes to GTS.

Q - Grantees submit Final Narrative Evaluation Report, Final Reimbursement Claim & Final Reimbursement Itemization Report (October 31)
1) **Final Narrative Evaluation Report** - summarizes and evaluates activities performed during the entire project period. All final reports are used to develop the Annual Report submitted to the NHTSA.

2) **Final Reimbursement Claim** - summarizes the monies for which the grantee agency requests to be reimbursed for the final project period.

3) **Final Reimbursement Itemization Report** - details the expenses summarized on the Claim.

**R - Project Closeout (October - December)**

1) FMS Chief reviews project file for completeness.

2) Most projects are completed by September and closed out of the system by December 31st.

**S - Submit Annual Report to the NHTSA (December 31)**

1) The Annual Report, required by the NHTSA, evaluates the overall program presented in the Annual Application for Federal Highway Safety Funds (Benchmark Report), as well as any additional components of the program that were approved and added throughout the FFY.

2) Each December 31st, MHSO submits Maryland’s Annual Report to the NHTSA Mid-Atlantic Region Office.

**T - Closeout of FFY (October 1 - December 31)**

1) Reconcile GMS to GTS.

2) Place unexpended funds in the new FFY program. Determine where these funds are needed based on new project obligations and assign funds accordingly.

3) Prepare new HCS-1 from GTS for each fiscal year, including the year being closed and the current FY.

4) Prepare and Process a final voucher for ($0), as required by NHTSA.

---

**OFFICE MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To develop and implement an item distribution tracking feature for the Resource Inventory database by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To add 1 major resource tracking component to the MHSO’s resource database by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To convert 3 office forms to web-based forms by September 30, 2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In FFY 2007 the administrative staff will be working with the staff, especially newer members, to gain a complete understanding of their work and the support requirements. They will be training the new staff on the current location of files, electronic forms, and office policies and procedures.
During FFY 2007, the Administrative staff will be adding new components to the Resource Inventory Database. The new component will tally the number of items ordered and distributed over a given year. It will also produce a report for each coordinator to know which resources they have and the current quantity. This report will notify the coordinators when supply is low of a particular resource so that it may be ordered in a timely fashion ensuring that a reasonable supply of materials is always on hand. The database will also have a section to identify in which of the three locations the Resource is located and the quantity at each location.

The office staff will continue to provide administrative support by continuing to develop Policies and Procedures, automating general use office forms and templates. With the increasing responsibilities of the MHSO, the Administrative staff is vital to the organization’s continued success and positive growth.
Conclusion

The 4.5% decrease in total fatalities experienced during calendar year 2005 is extremely encouraging, as is Maryland’s ability to maintain its exceptional safety belt use rate. Traffic safety has repeatedly been emphasized as a statewide priority by the leadership at the highest levels in the State, most notably that of Governor Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr. and Secretary of Transportation, Robert Flanagan. Maryland’s SHSP will ensure that more agencies are brought into the fold to assist the State in reaching its fatality and injury reduction goals.

Maryland boasts one of the most complete traffic safety networks in the nation, with a collection of traffic safety partners that are completely dedicated to eliminating needless tragedies on the State’s roads. The MHSO will depend upon this vast network, including CTSPs, state and local agencies, community-based groups, associations, non-profit organizations, hospitals, institutions of higher learning, and the private sector, to affect a lasting change throughout the State. Strategies to improve the planning and development of highway safety programs will receive continual attention throughout the year as will methods to enhance data collection and dissemination. Throughout FFY 2007 and into the future, the MHSO will continue to conduct periodic assessments to monitor the State’s progress in meeting stated goals and objectives. These assessments also ensure accountability for both programmatic and fiscal responsibilities.

Maryland continues to be poised to make further strides to reducing fatalities over the next several years. Federal funding levels are critical to Maryland’s success in achieving this goal. With the authorization of SAFETEA-LU and the continued implementation and clarification of funding rules, the MHSO looks forward to providing a stable, efficient, and effective highway safety program and is staunchly committed to saving lives.
Certifications & Assurances

The following are scanned copies of the required Certifications and Assurances for FFY 2007, as secured through the Governor's Highway Safety Representative and SHA Administrator, Mr. Neil J. Pedersen. Please note that the NHTSA received an original copy of the Certifications & Assurances in the HSP documents submitted to the agency on September 1, 2006.

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 drawdowns 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 State will provide a drug-free workplace by:

k. 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;

l. 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.

m. 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).

n. 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.

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

p. 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.

q. 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:

18. 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.
19. (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.

20. 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

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

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. 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.

27. 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.

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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

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

32. 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.

33. 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.

34. 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.

35. 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.

36. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that is 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)

37. 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.

38. 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.

39. 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:

40. 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.

41. 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 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).

[Signature]
Governor's Representative for Highway Safety

[Signature]
Date

June 30, 2007
## Program Cost Summary

| Project No. | Agency Abbr. | Program Area/Projects | Section 402 | Section 403 | Section 404 | Section 405 | Section 406 | Section 407 | Section 408 | Section 409 | NHTSA Federal | State Funds | TOTALS | State/Local Match | Grand Totals |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|----------|------------------|-------------|
| 07-022      | INDIA        | Aggressive Driving Safety Programs | Smooth Operator - Evaluation Project | $26,800 | $ - | $ - | $250,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $26,800 | $ - | $26,800 | $46,400 | $71,200 |
| 07-023      | MISP         | Aggressive Driving Enforcement | $61,600 | $ - | $259,600 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $321,200 | $ - | $321,200 | $214,160 | $535,360 |
| 07-210      | MHSO        | MHSO-Law Enforcement/Agg Driv-Safety Program | $ - | $ - | $17,400 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $17,400 | $ - | $17,400 | $ - | $17,400 |
|             |              | Total Aggressive Driving Safety Programs | $88,400 | $ - | $277,600 | $ - | $250,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $615,400 | $ - | $615,400 | $320,200 | $935,600 |
| 07-208      | MHSO        | Initiative/Driver Safety Programs | MHSO-Initiative Driving Prevention Program | $17,400 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $17,400 | $ - | $17,400 | $ - | $17,400 |
| 07-022      | MISP         | Initiative/Driver Safety Program | $74,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $74,200 | $ - | $74,200 | $ - | $74,200 |
|             |              | Total Initiative Driving Safety Programs | $91,600 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $91,600 | $ - | $91,600 | $ - | $91,600 |
| 07-006      | District Court | Impaired Driving Safety Programs | Maryland OUI/DUI Court - Anne Arundel County | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $73,000 | $ - | $73,000 | $87,800 | $160,800 |
| 07-007      | Harf Co      | Impaired Driving Safety Program | Maryland OUI/DUI Court - Harford County | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $62,500 | $62,500 | $62,500 | $29,900 | $92,400 |
| 07-008      | How Co       | Impaired Driving Safety Program | Maryland OUI/DUI Court - Howard County | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $56,500 | $56,500 | $56,500 | $26,700 | $83,200 |
| 07-027      | WRAP         | Impaired Driving Enforcement | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $547,500 | $547,500 | $547,500 | $312,000 | $859,500 |
| 07-028      | MISP         | Impaired Driving Safety Programs | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $324,800 | $324,800 | $324,800 | $222,500 | $547,300 |
| 07-029      | MIESS       | Impaired Driving Prevention - PR Campaign | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $100,000 | $100,000 | $100,000 | $66,700 | $166,700 |
| 07-031      | ENCCRE       | Alcohol Screening & Brief Intervention Pilot | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $36,900 | $36,900 | $36,900 | $24,600 | $61,500 |
| 07-011      | AAA          | Specified Safety Resource Prosecutor | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $32,000 | $32,000 | $32,000 | $21,900 | $53,900 |
| 07-026      | MHSO        | MHSO-Impaired Driving Prevention Program | $49,100 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $27,500 | $27,500 | $27,500 | $18,100 | $45,600 |
| 07-022      | MISP         | MHSO-Impaired Driving Coordination | $74,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $74,200 | $ - | $74,200 | $ - | $74,200 |
|             |              | Total Impaired Driving Safety Programs | $123,400 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $1,471,700 | $1,595,100 | $1,595,100 | $793,100 | $2,388,200 |
| 07-012      | NIVA        | Motorcycle Safety Programs | Motorcycle Safety Program Assessment | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $56,400 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $56,400 | $ - | $56,400 | $16,300 | $72,700 |
| 07-212      | MHSO        | MHSO-Motorcycle Safety Program | $ - | $ - | $ - | $34,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $34,700 | $ - | $34,700 | $ - | $34,700 |
|             |              | Total Motorcycle Safety Programs | $ - | $ - | $ - | $91,100 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $91,100 | $ - | $91,100 | $ - | $91,100 |
| 07-024      | MDFSBU      | Occupant Protection Programs | Comprehensive Occupant Protection Outreach Effort | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $257,600 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $257,600 | $ - | $257,600 | $ - | $257,600 |
| 07-021      | MHSI        | MHSI Occupant Safety Program | Maryland Kids in Safety Seats | $152,500 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $152,500 | $ - | $152,500 | $ - | $152,500 |
| 07-015      | DTPD        | DTPD Occupant Safety Program | Baltimore Metropolitan Area Law Enforcement Liaison | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $19,900 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $19,900 | $ - | $19,900 | $ - | $19,900 |
| 07-014      | Kickstarter  | Kickstarter Occupant Safety Program | Eastern Shore Law Enforcement Liaison | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $20,100 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $20,100 | $ - | $20,100 | $ - | $20,100 |
| 07-016      | RidePat      | RidePat Occupant Safety Program | Western Maryland Law Enforcement Liaison | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $18,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $18,200 | $ - | $18,200 | $ - | $18,200 |
| 07-019      | Lit LC       | Lit LC Occupant Safety Program | Love Life Law Enforcement Program | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $40,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $40,000 | $ - | $40,000 | $ - | $40,000 |
| 07-020      | MIESS       | MIESS Occupant Safety Program | CPS Hospital Assessment/Special Population Project | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $61,900 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $61,900 | $ - | $61,900 | $ - | $61,900 |
| 07-028      | MISP         | MISP Occupant Safety Program | $27,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $27,700 | $ - | $27,700 | $ - | $27,700 |
| 07-026      | MHSO        | MHSO-Occupant Safety Program | $74,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $74,200 | $ - | $74,200 | $ - | $74,200 |
|             |              | Total Occupant Protection Programs | $306,500 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $527,600 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $200,800 | $ - | $200,800 | $ - | $200,800 |

**Total Aggressive Driving Safety Programs:** $88,400

**Total Impaired Driving Safety Programs:** $123,400

**Total Occupant Protection Programs:** $306,500

**Total Motorcycle Safety Programs:** $123,400

**Total Initiative Driving Safety Programs:** $91,600

**Total Motor Vehicle Safety Programs:** $460,300
| Project No. | Agency Abbr. | Program Area/Projects | Section | Section | Section | Section | Section | Section | Section | NHTSA Federal | State Funds | TOTALS | State/Local Match | Grand Total |
|-------------|--------------|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------------|------------|--------|------------------|------------|
| 07-061      | WASHCOC      | StreetSmart - PR Campaign | $100,100 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 160,100 | $ - | $ 54,400 | $ - | $ 154,500 |
| 07-006      | MDOT         | Maryland Bicycle Traffic Safety Video | $25,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 25,000 | $ - | $ 28,500 | $ - | $ 53,500 |
| 07-007      | WMATA        | Statewide Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Expansion | $75,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 75,700 | $ - | $ 53,000 | $ - | $ 128,700 |
| 07-207      | MHSO         | MHSO-Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety Program | $34,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 34,700 | $ - | $ 34,700 | $ - | $ 34,700 |
| 07-002      | UMCP         | UMCP-Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety Coordination | $74,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 74,200 | $ - | $ 74,200 | $ - | $ 74,200 |

**Total Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Programs**

| $308,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 308,700 | $ - | $ 128,700 | $ - | $ 437,400 |

| $54,400 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 54,400 | $ - | $ 54,400 | $ - | $ 54,400 |

| $25,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 25,000 | $ - | $ 28,500 | $ - | $ 53,500 |

| $75,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 75,700 | $ - | $ 53,000 | $ - | $ 128,700 |

| $34,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 34,700 | $ - | $ 34,700 | $ - | $ 34,700 |

| $74,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 74,200 | $ - | $ 74,200 | $ - | $ 74,200 |

| **Total Traffic Safety Programs**

| $872,600 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 872,600 | $ - | $ 1,035,000 | $ - | $ 1,907,600 |

| $489,500 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 489,500 | $ - | $ 489,500 | $ - | $ 979,000 |

| $279,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 279,200 | $ - | $ 279,200 | $ - | $ 279,200 |

| $330,600 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 330,600 | $ - | $ 330,600 | $ - | $ 330,600 |

| $29,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 29,000 | $ - | $ 29,000 | $ - | $ 29,000 |

| $50,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 50,000 | $ - | $ 50,000 | $ - | $ 50,000 |

| $29,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 29,000 | $ - | $ 29,000 | $ - | $ 29,000 |

| $29,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 29,000 | $ - | $ 29,000 | $ - | $ 29,000 |

| $26,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 26,000 | $ - | $ 26,000 | $ - | $ 26,000 |

| $370,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 370,000 | $ - | $ 370,000 | $ - | $ 370,000 |

| $186,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 186,700 | $ - | $ 186,700 | $ - | $ 186,700 |

| $90,400 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 90,400 | $ - | $ 90,400 | $ - | $ 90,400 |

| $14,500 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 14,500 | $ - | $ 14,500 | $ - | $ 14,500 |

| $104,800 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 104,800 | $ - | $ 104,800 | $ - | $ 104,800 |

| $500,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 500,000 | $ - | $ 500,000 | $ - | $ 500,000 |

| $1,212,100 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 1,212,100 | $ - | $ 1,212,100 | $ - | $ 1,212,100 |

| $489,500 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 489,500 | $ - | $ 489,500 | $ - | $ 489,500 |

| **Total Community Traffic Safety Programs**

| $324,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 324,700 | $ - | $ 324,700 | $ - | $ 324,700 |

| $2,800 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 2,800 | $ - | $ 2,800 | $ - | $ 2,800 |

| $2,800 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 2,800 | $ - | $ 2,800 | $ - | $ 2,800 |

| $74,200 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 74,200 | $ - | $ 74,200 | $ - | $ 74,200 |

| $2,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 |

| $2,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 |

| $2,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 |

| $2,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 | $ - | $ 2,000 |

| **Total Community Traffic Safety Programs**

| $505,500 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 505,500 | $ - | $ 505,500 | $ - | $ 505,500 |

| $829,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 829,700 | $ - | $ 829,700 | $ - | $ 829,700 |

| $500,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 500,000 | $ - | $ 500,000 | $ - | $ 500,000 |

| $1,000,000 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 1,000,000 | $ - | $ 1,000,000 | $ - | $ 1,000,000 |

<p>| $4,324,700 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 4,324,700 | $ - | $ 4,324,700 | $ - | $ 4,324,700 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Agency Abb.</th>
<th>Program Area/Projects</th>
<th>Section 402</th>
<th>Section 157</th>
<th>Section 163</th>
<th>Section 465</th>
<th>Section 2010</th>
<th>Section 466</th>
<th>Section 410</th>
<th>NHTSA Federal</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th>State/Local Match</th>
<th>Grand Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Safe Communities Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Safe Communities Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Police Traffic Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-013</td>
<td>Balto Co PD</td>
<td>Police Crash Reconstruction Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-028</td>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Police Traffic Services/Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-002</td>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>UMCP-Law Enforcement Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Police Traffic Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>150,500</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-070</td>
<td>MEMESS</td>
<td>Bystander Care Program Pilot - Western Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-071</td>
<td>MEMESS</td>
<td>Statewide EMS Equipment Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>176,700</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>176,700</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-001</td>
<td>MHISO</td>
<td>MHISO-Business Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-002</td>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>UMCP-Safety Programs Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-002</td>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>UMCP-Office Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-002</td>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>UMCP-Clerical &amp; Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>272,900</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>3,775,600</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>489,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>277,600</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>527,600</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,716,100</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Available (Est. as of 08/15/06 - Includes carryover)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>3,775,600</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>489,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>277,600</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>527,600</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,716,100</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprogrammed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Prior Approved Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Bal.</td>
<td>Incre/(Decre)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>NHTSA 402</td>
<td>Planning and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA-2007-15-01-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>275,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>272,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA-2007-15-02-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>222,900.00</td>
<td>222,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>222,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Administration Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>275,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>272,900.00</td>
<td>272,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>AL-2007-03-05-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>123,400.00</td>
<td>123,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>123,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>123,400.00</td>
<td>123,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>123,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>EM-2007-13-01-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>166,400.00</td>
<td>176,700.00</td>
<td>176,700.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>176,700.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>166,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>176,700.00</td>
<td>176,700.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>176,700.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection</td>
<td>OP-2007-05-01-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112,200.00</td>
<td>180,200.00</td>
<td>180,200.00</td>
<td>76,200.00</td>
<td>180,200.00</td>
<td>76,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>126,300.00</td>
<td>126,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>126,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>PS-2007-06-01-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>135,900.00</td>
<td>200,800.00</td>
<td>200,800.00</td>
<td>175,800.00</td>
<td>200,800.00</td>
<td>175,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>135,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>309,700.00</td>
<td>309,700.00</td>
<td>175,800.00</td>
<td>309,700.00</td>
<td>175,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Traffic Services</td>
<td>PT-2007-01-01-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44,900.00</td>
<td>26,800.00</td>
<td>26,800.00</td>
<td>26,800.00</td>
<td>26,800.00</td>
<td>26,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Traffic Services</td>
<td>PT-2007-01-03-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>214,100.00</td>
<td>61,600.00</td>
<td>61,600.00</td>
<td>61,600.00</td>
<td>61,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Traffic Services</td>
<td>PT-2007-02-01-00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91,600.00</td>
<td>91,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Prior Approved Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Bal.</td>
<td>Incre/(Decr)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PT-2007-12-01-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$45,500.00</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$76,300.00</td>
<td>$76,300.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PT-2007-12-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$74,200.00</td>
<td>$74,200.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Traffic Services Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$304,500.00</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$330,500.00</td>
<td>$330,500.00</td>
<td>$86,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Records</td>
<td>TR-2007-09-01-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$461,600.00</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$637,900.00</td>
<td>$637,900.00</td>
<td>$148,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TR-2007-09-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$74,200.00</td>
<td>$74,200.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Records Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$461,600.00</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$712,100.00</td>
<td>$712,100.00</td>
<td>$148,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Project</td>
<td>CP-2007-07-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$22,200.00</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP-2007-07-03-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$104,100.00</td>
<td>$104,100.00</td>
<td>$104,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP-2007-07-05-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$222,600.00</td>
<td>$222,600.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP-2007-08-01-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$96,400.00</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$90,300.00</td>
<td>$90,300.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP-2007-10-01-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$1,521,367.00</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$488,500.00</td>
<td>$488,500.00</td>
<td>$488,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP-2007-10-01-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP-2007-10-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$77,000.00</td>
<td>$77,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Project Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$2,139,967.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$1,012,500.00</td>
<td>$1,012,500.00</td>
<td>$712,900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Education</td>
<td>DE-2007-07-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$43,600.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE-2007-07-05-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$52,200.00</td>
<td>$52,200.00</td>
<td>$26,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE-2007-08-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$14,500.00</td>
<td>$14,500.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driver Education Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$43,600.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$93,700.00</td>
<td>$93,700.00</td>
<td>$43,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Advertising</td>
<td>PM-2007-07-01-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$429,740.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$437,600.00</td>
<td>$437,600.00</td>
<td>$107,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid Advertising Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$429,740.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$437,600.00</td>
<td>$437,600.00</td>
<td>$107,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Prior Approved Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Bal.</td>
<td>Incr/(Decr)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA 402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,068,907.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,775,600.00</td>
<td>$3,775,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Occupant Protection</td>
<td>J2-2007-05-01-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,174.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$33,084.00</td>
<td>$33,084.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Occupant Protection Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,174.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$33,084.00</td>
<td>$33,084.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 OP SAFETEA-LU Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$196,914.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$494,516.00</td>
<td>$494,516.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA 406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$89,912.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$225,800.00</td>
<td>$225,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Safety Belts Incentive Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$210,312.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,366,100.00</td>
<td>$1,220,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Alcohol</td>
<td>K4AL-2007-07-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$122,100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$65,100.00</td>
<td>$65,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Alcohol Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$122,100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$65,100.00</td>
<td>$65,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>K4EM-2007-13-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$41,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26,900.00</td>
<td>$26,900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Emergency Medical Services Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$41,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26,900.00</td>
<td>$26,900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Police Traffic Services</td>
<td>K4PT-2007-01-02-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$61,200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Police Traffic Services Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$61,200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Prior Approved Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Bal.</td>
<td>Incre/(Decre)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Driver Education</td>
<td>K4DE-2007-07-02-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$22,200.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Driver Education Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22,200.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA 406 Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$457,312.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$1,718,100.00</td>
<td>$1,718,100.00</td>
<td>$1,322,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Data Program SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>K9-2007-09-03-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Data Program Incentive Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Data Program SAFETEA-LU Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Alcohol SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>K8-2007-03-01-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$144,500.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$393,000.00</td>
<td>$393,000.00</td>
<td>$193,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8-2007-03-02-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$585,300.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$711,900.00</td>
<td>$711,900.00</td>
<td>$662,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8-2007-03-03-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$223,200.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$334,800.00</td>
<td>$334,800.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8-2007-03-04-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$21,900.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8-2007-10-01-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$553,133.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$92,300.00</td>
<td>$92,300.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Alcohol SAFETEA-LU Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,528,033.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$1,564,000.00</td>
<td>$1,564,000.00</td>
<td>$979,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td>K6-2007-04-01-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$16,300.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$56,400.00</td>
<td>$56,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6-2007-04-02-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$34,700.00</td>
<td>$34,700.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6-2007-07-01-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$33,086.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Motorcycle Safety Incentive Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$49,386.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Motorcycle Safety Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$49,386.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Incentive Funds</td>
<td>157CP-2007-10-01-00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$326,333.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Community Traffic Safety Project Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$326,333.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Prior Approved Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Bal.</td>
<td>Incre/(Decre)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Incentive Funds Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$326,333.00</td>
<td>$0.00 $489,500.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td>$489,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,640,059.00</td>
<td>$0.00 $8,674,800.00</td>
<td>$8,674,800.00</td>
<td>$4,855,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,640,059.00</td>
<td>$0.00 $8,674,800.00</td>
<td>$8,674,800.00</td>
<td>$4,855,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A: List of Acronyms

AAA  American Automobile Association
CCODES  Comprehensive Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System
CIOT  Click It or Ticket
CPS  Child Passenger Safety
CPSF  Checkpoint Strikeforce
CTSP  Community Traffic Safety Program
DA&TC  Data Analyst and TRCC Coordinator
DC  District of Columbia
DHMH  Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
DRE  Drug Recognition Expert
DSWW  Drive Safely Work Week
DTF  Diversity in Traffic Safety Task Force
DUI  Driving Under the Influence
DWI  Driving While Intoxicated
EC  Executive Council
ED  Emergency Department
EOI  Expression of Interest
EMS  Emergency Medical Services
F&PMS  Financial and Program Monitoring Specialist
FARS  Fatality Analysis Reporting System
FFY  Federal Fiscal Year
FHWA  Federal Highway Administration
FMIS  Financial Management Information System
FMS  Financial Management Section
GAS  Grant Applicant Seminar
GHSA  Governor’s Highway Safety Association
GMS  Grants Management System
GRT  Grants Review Team
GTS  Grants Tracking System
HCS-1  Obligation Cost Summary
HD  Health Department
HSCRC  Health Services Cost Review Commission
HSP  Highway Safety Plan
IDC  Impaired Driving Coalition
KISS  Kids in Safety Seats
MAARS  Maryland Automated Accident Reporting System
MCFSBU  Maryland Committee for Safety Belt Use
MCPA  Maryland Chiefs of Police Association
MDOT  Maryland Department of Transportation
MHSO  Maryland Highway Safety Office
MIEMSS  Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems
MSA  Maryland Sheriff's Association
MSP  Maryland State Police
MVA  Motor Vehicle Administration
NCSA  Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement
NETS  Network of Employers for Traffic Safety
NHTSA  National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NSC  National Study Center for Trauma and EMS
OM  Office Manager
OOTS  Office of Traffic and Safety
PA  Project Agreement
PD  Police Department
PI&E  Public Information and Education
PSA  Public Service Announcement
PSTF  Pedestrian Safety Task Force
SAFETEA-LU  Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SAM  Semi-Annual Meeting
SHA  Maryland State Highway Administration
SHSO  State Highway Safety Office
SHSP  Strategic Highway Safety Plan
SO  Sheriff's Office
SOTF  Smooth Operator Task Force
SRTS  Safe Routes to School
TF  Task Force
TRCC  Traffic Records Coordinating Committee
TRTCC  Traffic Records Technical Coordinating Committee
TSAD  Traffic Safety Analysis Division
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-SAFE</td>
<td>Traffic-Safety Awareness For Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>University of Maryland at College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAP</td>
<td>Washington Regional Alcohol Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDTF</td>
<td>Young Driver Task Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: SHS Attachments

Maryland Highway Safety Office
State Highway Administration
7491 Connelley Drive, Hanover, MD 21076
410.787.4050 / 410.787.4020 (fax)
mhso@sha.state.md.us

CHIEF
Vernon F. Betkey, Jr.
Chief, Maryland Highway Safety Office / Maryland Highway Safety Coordinator
410.787.5824 / vbetkey@sha.state.md.us

SAFETY PROGRAMS SECTION
Joy Marowski
Chief, Safety Programs Section
410.787.4014 / jmarowski@sha.state.md.us

Liza Aguila-Lemaster
Impaired Driving Program Coordinator
410.787.4076 / laguilalemaster@sha.state.md.us

Fran Counihan
Traffic-Safety Awareness For Employers Program Coordinator
410.787.4079 / fcounihan@sha.state.md.us

Bob Deale
Statewide CTSP Program Coordinator
410.787.4075 / rdeale@sha.state.md.us

TBD
Pedestrian, Bicycle & School Zone Program Coordinator
410.582.5578 / TBD@sha.state.md.us

Tom (TJ) Gianni
Law Enforcement Program Coordinator
(Aggressive Driving)
410.787.4074 / tgianni@sha.state.md.us

Meg Miller
Occupant Protection Program Coordinator
410.787.4077 / mgobrecht@sha.state.md.us

Peter Moe
Motorcycle, Younger & Older Driver Program Coordinator
410.787.4096 / pmoe@sha.state.md.us

Joe Pelaia
Safe Routes To School Coordinator
410.787.7620 / jpelaia@sha.state.md.us

Gregg Presbury
Data Analyst & TRCC Coordinator
410.787.4068 / gpresbury@sha.state.md.us
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FINANCE AND DATA SECTION

Joseph Tubman
Chief, Financial Management Section
410.787.4029 / jtubman@sha.state.md.us

Miriam King
Financial & Monitoring Management Specialist
410.787.4049 / mking1@sha.state.md.us

TBD
Financial & Program Management Specialist
410.787.4052 / TBD@sha.state.md.us

R. Courtney Anderson
Web Site Manager
410.787.5836 / canderson@sha.state.md.us

Susie Wilson
Quality Assurance Specialist
410.787.5848 / swilson@sha.state.md.us

Gary Klein
Database Analyst
410.787.5829 / gklein@sha.state.md.us

Kevin Brown
Database Analyst
410.787.5845 / kbrown@sha.state.md.us

Yeshitla Argaw
Transportation Engineer Technician
410.787.5846 / yargaw@sha.state.md.us

OFFICE MANAGEMENT

Joyce Kregelka
Office Manager
410.787.4069 / jkregelka@sha.state.md.us

Tish Galloway
Administrative Assistant II
410.787.4050 / ngalloway@sha.state.md.us
Barbara Beckett (MHSO grantee - housed at SHA)
Executive Director, Maryland Committee For Safety Belt Use, Inc.
State Coordinator, Maryland SAFE KIDS Coalition
410.787.5893 / 410.787.4025 (fax)
bbeckett@sha.state.md.us

www.marylandroads.com/safety/safety.asp