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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Highway Safety Performance Plan (HSPP) Calendar


April-May  With senior staff at EOPSS, Highway Safety Division staff conducts strategic planning/listening sessions with key stakeholders to generate project proposals from them within each program area for senior staff review and acceptance. The division also generates its own project proposals for senior staff review and acceptance.

June-July  Draft the FFY 2008 HSPP for review and approval by senior staff at Executive Office of Public Safety and Security.

Conduct pre-submission meeting with NHTSA Region I. Obtain any updates to previously reviewed Federal, state, and local data and analyses.

August  With approval of senior staff at Executive Office of Public Safety and Security, submit the final plan to NHTSA and Federal Highway Administration.

September  Conduct bidders conferences and begin to issue Requests for Responses/Quotes and Applications for Grant Funding in anticipation of NHTSA’s approval of plan.

October  Begin to implement and award grants and contracts. Begin work on the FFY 2007 Annual Report.
1.2 **EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY, OFFICE OF GRANTS AND RESEARCH, HIGHWAY SAFETY DIVISION ORGANIZATIONAL CHART**

*Figure 1.1 Highway Safety Division*

1.3 **MISSION STATEMENT**

The mission of the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS), Office of Grants and Research, Highway Safety Division is to use its Federal highway safety grant funds to assist or conduct efforts to reduce fatalities, injuries, and economic losses from motor vehicle crashes on Massachusetts roadways.

1.4 **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the EOPSS’ Highway Safety Division is responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating highway safety projects with Federal funds. The division also works to coordinate the efforts of Federal, state, and local organizations involved in highway safety in Massachusetts.

This HSPP for Federal Fiscal Year 2008 serves as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ application to NHTSA for Federal funds available under Section 402 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This HSPP also reflects programs that will be conducted with grant funds previously received but
unspent under SAFETEA-LU funds or from the proceeding Federal funding legislation. Other funding sources include a Highway Safety Division/EOPSS cooperative agreement with NHTSA for the Fatal Analysis Reporting System project and Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention grants to enforce underage drinking laws and to conduct related educational programs.

The Highway Safety Division uses a data-driven strategic planning approach to accomplish its mission. The HSPP first outlines the problem identification process and data sources used to identify as well as prioritize the highway safety program areas to be addressed by the Highway Safety Division in FFY 2008. The HSPP then presents in detail the data and analyses that support the selection of the key program areas. For each key program area there follows specific problem identification information that is used to support appropriate goals, objectives, and performance measures. The next section of the HSPP has related project tasks for all program areas as well as the Highway Safety Division’s program management functions. The specific dollar amounts for each task provided in this section are for planning purposes only, subject to change, and based on the availability of the applicable Federal funds. Overall budget information as well as state certifications and assurances are at the end of the HSPP.

The overall goal of the division’s FFY 2008 work is to reduce the Massachusetts motor vehicle-related fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from 0.80 in 2005 to 0.79 in 2008.

NHTSA has a national goal of no more than one fatality per 100 million VMT by 2008.

While Massachusetts in 2005 had the nation’s lowest fatality rate per 100 VMT at 0.80, unfortunately that year there were still 441 motor vehicle-related fatalities and 5,052 incapacitating injuries on our roadways as shown in Table 1.1.

### Table 1.1 Massachusetts Fatalities and Incapacitating Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate/(100 Million VMT)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious/Incapacitating Injuries (Actual)</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td>5,052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2007 Highlights

- Worked with Federal, state, and local partners to continue to implement the October 2005 “Melanie’s Law” that increased the severity of the Commonwealth’s laws against drunk drivers, in particular repeat offenders. There were 14,298 drivers arrested for drunk driving in 2006.
• Developed new OUI brochure in cooperation with the Registry of Motor Vehicles for statewide distribution.

• The Highway Safety Division provided grant funds for the Massachusetts State Police to obtain a second Breath Alcohol Testing (BAT) Mobile which will be available at the end of FFY 2007. In FFY 2007, as of mid-August 2007, there were 58 checkpoints conducted resulting in 400 arrests by the State and Local Police Sobriety Checkpoint Partnership. Out of the 58 checkpoints, 31 sobriety checkpoints were conducted with the first BAT Mobile resulting in 260 arrests by state and local police. It is anticipated that a total of 75 checkpoints will be conducted in FFY07.

• While the Massachusetts Legislature did not reach consensus to support a primary safety belt law in its 2006 session, public support by the previous administration and an active grass roots coalition created an even greater effort to pass this critical safety legislation. Such a bill is pending in its 2007 session. So again is a booster seat bill.

• The Highway Safety Division’s June 2006 statewide safety belt survey showed Massachusetts added two percentage points to reach a historic high use rate of 67 percent.

• On March 31, 2007, an updated Massachusetts Junior Operator Law went into effect and the Highway Safety Division and the Registry of Motor Vehicles took steps to alert the public of the new provisions.

• The Division served on the Executive Leadership Committee and was an active participant in the MassHighway-led effort to develop the Commonwealth’s first Strategic Highway Safety Plan for Massachusetts which became effective in FFY 2007.

• The Division worked closely with a growing number of Federal, state, and local partners to continue its successful statewide series of Click It or Ticket (CIOT), You Drink & Drive. You Lose. (YD&DYL), Drunk Driving- Over the Limit-Under Arrest, and Road Respect (RR) Mobilizations.

• The Highway Safety Division awarded traffic enforcement grants to 233 out of 351 municipal and campus police departments to support their participation in its CIOT, YD&DYL, DD-OL-UA, and RR Mobilizations. An additional 25 departments signed up to support these mobilizations on a voluntary basis. Special efforts continued to reach diverse populations during the mobilizations.

• The division and its partners continued to implement key suggestions from the 2005 NHTSA Impaired Driving Assessment and the 2007 NHTSA Occupant Protection Assessment.
• With assistance from its traffic records contractor, the TRCC, as well as the NHTSA Region I, the Highway Safety Division submitted an application for FFY 2007 Section 408 funding. Applications also were submitted for FFY 2007 Section 1906, 2010, 405, and 410 funding.

• To recognize traffic safety accomplishments of state and local police, the Highway Safety Division conducted its third annual Massachusetts Law Enforcement Challenge in cooperation with the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association. Twenty-four local communities and the Massachusetts State Police will be recognized at a ceremony in calendar year 2007.

FFY 2008 Highlights

• Increasing safety belt use to 72 percent and decreasing alcohol-related fatalities to 40 percent of all motor vehicle-related fatalities will be the major FFY 2008 goals for the Highway Safety Division.

• The division will expand our partnerships with a growing number of Federal, state, and local organizations to achieve greater implementation of its statewide series of CIOT, Road Respect, and DD-OL-UA Mobilizations.

• Highway Safety Division will implement a Breath Test Unit upgrade program with the state police and 100 local police departments and new Drug Recognition Experts.

• To assist in the implementation of underage driving efforts, the Highway Safety Division will launch a statewide grant opportunity for colleges, universities, and local police and campus police departments in the Commonwealth.

• Highway Safety Division will assist with the implementation and updating of the MassHighway-led Commonwealth’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan in FFY 2008.

• To assist its mobilization efforts, the Highway Safety Division will re-establish the Law Enforcement Liaison Program and expand the Massachusetts Law Enforcement Challenge in partnership with the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association and the State Police.

Highway Safety Division Partnerships

The division is involved in many partnerships to enhance highway safety in Massachusetts. Examples of these types of partnerships include:

• MassHighway-led Strategic Highway Safety Plan’s Executive Leadership Committee;

• Executive Office of Transportation-led (EOT) Safest Route to School Advisory Committee;

• EOT-led Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee;
• University of Massachusetts-led (UMASS) CODES Advisory Board;
• UMASS-led Commercial Motor Vehicle Date Quality Committee;
• Massachusetts Department of Public Health-led (MDPH) Emergency Medical Care Advisory Board;
• MDPH-led Massachusetts Injury Community Planning Group;
• Registry of Motor Vehicles-led Impaired Driving Advisory Board;
• Registry of Motor Vehicles-led Junior Operator Law Committee; and
• Non-profit and for-profit advocacy groups addressing bicycle and pedestrian safety, motor vehicle-related risk-taking behaviors and issues.
2.0 Highway Safety Problem Identification Introduction

This HSPP for FFY 2008 has been developed in coordination with the following plans:

- Massachusetts’ Strategic Highway Safety Plan (FFY 2007);
- NHTSA Region I Action Plan (FFY 2007 and draft FFY 2008);
- Massachusetts’ Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan (FFY 2007);
- NHTSA’s Impaired Driving Assessment for Massachusetts (FFY 2005);
- NHTSA’s Occupant Protection Assessment for Massachusetts (FFY 2007);
- Massachusetts’ Section 408 Application/Strategic Traffic Records Plan (FFY 2007).

2.1 Problem Identification Process

The Highway Safety Division used a variety of data sources to pinpoint areas of concern warranting attention from Massachusetts’ highway safety professionals in FFY 2007. This process is outlined below.

1. **General Problem Identification.** This step uses ongoing exchanges or special “listening sessions” with key Federal, state, and local partners to identify major highway safety areas of concern. These areas are then used to guide the subsequent analyses.

2. **Selection of Program Areas.** This step uses analyses of major available data sources to confirm the general decisions regarding major areas of concern made in the first step. These data sources are described in Table 2.1.

3. **Program Area Analyses.** During this step, more detailed analyses of the above-mentioned data sources as well as other sources (for instance, telephone surveys) are done to develop a deeper understanding of program areas.

4. **Determination of Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, and Tasks.** During this step, all of the above work is used to set reasonable goals, objectives, performance measures, and develop tasks for the program areas to allocate the Highway Safety Division’s limited resources where they can be most effective. This step requires a deep knowledge of the demographics, laws, policies, and partnering opportunities and limitations that exist in the Commonwealth.
The data and analyses used to develop the problem identification section for this HSPP were primarily obtained through the Massachusetts Traffic Records Portal (http://mtrp.camsys.com).

### Table 2.1 Data Used for FFY 2008 HSPP Problem Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Source/Owner</th>
<th>Year(s) Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality</td>
<td>Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS)</td>
<td>National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)</td>
<td>2002 to 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Fatality and Injury</td>
<td>Massachusetts Crash Data System (CDS)</td>
<td>Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles (RMV)</td>
<td>2003 to 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation</td>
<td>Massachusetts Citation Data</td>
<td>Massachusetts RMV/Merit Rating Board</td>
<td>2003 to 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Belt</td>
<td>Massachusetts Safety Belt Data</td>
<td>Highway Safety Division</td>
<td>2003 to 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The crash data used in this HSPP may not be consistent with the data reported by the NHTSA’s Fatality Analysis Reporting System due to variations in data availability and to data quality improvements.

### 2.2 Massachusetts Characteristics

Massachusetts is the 44th largest state with a land area of approximately 10,555 square miles and 351 cities and towns. Despite its small geographic size, Massachusetts is the 13th most populated state. In 2005, the Commonwealth’s population was 6,398,743,\(^1\) resulting in a population density of approximately 820 persons per square mile of land. Massachusetts is the most populous of the six New England states. The highest population concentrations are in the eastern third of the state. In addition to the high concentration around the state capital and most populous city in the east, Boston, smaller pockets of population density also exist around the second and third largest cities, Worcester in central Massachusetts, and Springfield in western Massachusetts.

More than 72 percent of the Commonwealth’s residents were licensed drivers in 2005, representing a total of 4,612,829\(^1\) licensed drivers. Other key demographic facts based on U.S. Census data include:

- Eighty-one percent of the population is greater than 15 years of age compared with 79 percent nationally;

\(^1\) U.S. Department of Transportation – Bureau of Transportation Statistics, 8/2006
• Age distribution: child (0-15 years old): 20 percent; driving adult (16-64 years old): 67.1 percent; older persons (65+): 12.9 percent;

• Non-Caucasians account for 16.6 percent of the population; 20.3 percent of the population speak a foreign language other than English in the home; 14.4 percent of the total population is foreign born;

• The three largest minority populations in Massachusetts as of 2005 in rank order are Hispanic/Latinos, African Americans, and Asians; and

• Estimated U.S. Census data reveals the number of immigrants living in Massachusetts households increased more than 15 percent between 2000 and 2005. This increase consisted mainly of Brazilians and other Latin Americans and was concentrated in urban areas.

The Massachusetts economy has become increasingly reliant on academic/research, tourism, high-tech, and financial services and less reliant on the manufacturing industry. Tourist destinations on Cape Cod and in the Berkshires as well as over 120 public and private colleges and universities create significant seasonal increases in the population both statewide and regionally. County government is virtually non-existent. In general, at the local level, administrative and legislative powers rest with mayors and city councils, town councils and boards of selectmen. However, counties are still important geographical entities. The counties detailed in Table 2.2 have been used in this HSPP for purposes of localizing the traffic safety statistics.

Table 2.2 Counties of Massachusetts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County Population, per 2005 U.S. Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstable</td>
<td>226,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>131,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>546,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukes</td>
<td>15,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>738,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>72,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden</td>
<td>461,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>153,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1,459,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantucket†</td>
<td>10,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>653,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>492,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>654,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>783,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To accommodate the travel demands of this population, Massachusetts has a roadway infrastructure consisting of over 38,400 miles of roadway, including portions of 13 Interstates with 566 miles. The major roadways include Interstates 90 (the Massachusetts Turnpike), 91, 93, 95, and 495. In 2005, motorists in Massachusetts traveled over 555,000 million miles.

2.3 NORMALIZING DATA AND MAJOR STATISTICS

The values identified in Table 2.3 are used in the remainder of the report to normalize Massachusetts and national safety data.

Table 2.3 Base Data for Massachusetts and United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MA Population (100k)</th>
<th>U.S. Population (100k)</th>
<th>MA VMT (100M)</th>
<th>U.S. VMT (100M)</th>
<th>MA Licensed Drivers (100k)</th>
<th>U.S. Licensed Drivers (100k)</th>
<th>MA Total Fatalities</th>
<th>U.S. Total Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>532.70</td>
<td>28,560</td>
<td>46.86</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>43,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>64.33</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>537.10</td>
<td>28,900</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>42,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>64.17</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>547.70</td>
<td>29,630</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>42,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>63.98</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>554.60</td>
<td>29,650</td>
<td>46.12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>43,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The difference between a fatality and serious injury is often the time required to receive medical attention. In Massachusetts, this time tends to be short because of its small size and the high number of top-notch hospital and care facilities spread throughout the Commonwealth. This situation is one of the primary reasons Massachusetts has such a low motor vehicle-related fatality rate. Because of this, the prioritization of programs by the Highway Safety Division is typically based on the combination of fatalities and incapacitating injuries and not solely on fatalities.

Key Massachusetts crash data and trends are in Table 2.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crashes of All Types</td>
<td>139,038</td>
<td>141,679</td>
<td>138,633</td>
<td>158,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate/(100 Million VMT)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities – Male (Actual)</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities – Female (Actual)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious/Incapacitating Injuries (Actual)</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td>5,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and Serious/Incapacitating Injury Rate/(100 Million VMT)</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of All Fatalities that are Alcohol-Related</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Related Fatality Rate/(100 Million VMT)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Population Observed Using Safety Belts</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Vehicle Occupant Fatalities Unrestrained</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Serious/Incapacitating Injuries (Actual)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclist Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclist Serious/Incapacitating Injuries (Actual)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Serious/Incapacitating Injuries (Actual)</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of All Fatalities that are Speed-Related</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed-Related Fatality Rate/(100 Million VMT)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver Fatalities (Actual)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver Serious/Incapacitating Injuries (Actual)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Driver Fatalities (Actual)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Driver Serious/Incapacitating Injuries (Actual)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: 
(1) Some numbers reported in this FFY 2008 Highway Safety Performance Plan may differ slightly from the same numbers reported in previous reports due to changes in data availability and data quality improvements. Some crash data is new to this report and trend data may not be available with consistent reporting procedures/methodology.
(2) Any inconsistencies between total of male/female fatalities and overall reported fatalities for given year are due to gender either not being reported or was unknown on crash report.

- Young drivers are drivers age 16 to 24.
- Older drivers are drivers age 65+.

2.4 PROGRAM AREAS

The Highway Safety Division closely monitors national traffic safety trends to ensure its priorities are in line with NHTSA’s, unless state or local data and analyses show the need for a different approach. Based on the problem identification information presented above, the Highway Safety Division has prioritized its FFY 2008 efforts based on the following program areas:

- Impaired Driving;
- Occupant Protection;
- Speed and Aggressive Driving;
- Higher Risk Transportation System Users:
  - Young and Older Drivers;
  - Pedestrians;
  - Bicyclists; and
  - Motorcyclists.
- Traffic Records.

The reader will observe that there are other program areas in this document that are not noted above nor reflected in the following problem identification sections; for instance, Police Traffic Services, Traffic Engineering Services, and Planning and Administration. These program areas do however have tasks associated with them in the Program Area (8.0) section of this document. The reader also will note that while there is young driver problem identification in Section 6.1 there is no corresponding part in the Program Area (8.0) section. This is because specific young driver tasks are spread throughout the major program areas such as impaired driving, occupant protection, as well as speed and aggressive driving.
3.0 Impaired Driving

Goal
- Reduce alcohol-related fatalities from 42 percent in 2005 to 40 percent in 2008.

Problem Identification and Analysis
Massachusetts continues to make progress in its efforts to reduce impaired driving. In 2003, Massachusetts adopted a 0.08 blood alcohol content (BAC) per se law. In 2005, Massachusetts further strengthened its drunk driving laws with the passage of “Melanie’s Law.” This legislation toughened our laws in particular against repeat offenders. Since December 2002, the Highway Safety Division has supported state and local police to conduct annually between two and three “You Drink & Drive. You Lose.” Mobilizations following the NHTSA model. In 2007 the Commonwealth adopted the new NHTSA slogan to combat impaired driving, “Drunk Driving-Over the Limit-Under Arrest (DD-OL-UA).”

All these efforts are paying off. Alcohol-related fatalities in Massachusetts as a percentage of all motor vehicle-related fatalities dropped between 2003 and 2005, from 47 percent to 42 percent. The 2005 national rate was 40 percent. Alcohol-related fatalities in Massachusetts per 100 million VMT declined between 2003 and 2005, from 0.40 to 0.31. The 2005 national rate was 0.56. These numbers for Massachusetts, while the same or lower than the national numbers, still warrant the Highway Safety Division’s treating impaired driving as a major highway safety program area in FFY 2008. Efforts in this area also will address drowsy driving.

Impaired Driving Fatalities
Alcohol-related fatalities in Massachusetts have mirrored the national downward trend in recent years.

Table 3.1 Massachusetts Alcohol-Related Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alcohol-Related</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle-Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Fatality Rate</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per 100 million VMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.2 presents alcohol-related fatalities by BAC in Massachusetts. A BAC of 0.08 is considered illegally impaired in all states.
Table 3.2 Massachusetts Alcohol-Related Fatalities by Blood Alcohol Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC = 0.00</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC = 0.01-0.07</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC = 0.08+</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 3.1 shows alcohol-related crash citations by gender and age for the period 2003 to 2005. Among females the number of such crashes has dropped significantly in all categories of drivers between 2003 and 2005 especially among younger drivers. A similar trend occurred among male drivers, although they still account for a significant majority of such crashes in all age categories.

Alcohol-Related Citations

An alcohol-related citation is a citation that involved at least one alcohol-related violation.

Table 3.3 Massachusetts Alcohol-Related Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alcohol-Related Citations</td>
<td>20,395</td>
<td>19,383</td>
<td>15,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Citations, Alcohol-Related</td>
<td>4,906</td>
<td>4,498</td>
<td>3,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Alcohol Citations that Involved a Crash</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Citations, Total</td>
<td>39,344</td>
<td>38,013</td>
<td>33,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Crash Citations Alcohol-Related</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 Massachusetts Alcohol-Related Crash Citations

by Age and Gender


Figures 3.2 and 3.3 show the pattern of alcohol-related crash citations by time-of-day and day-of-week. The largest number of such crashes occur during the late night hours of Friday night/Saturday morning and Saturday night/Sunday morning. The hours between midnight and 3:00 a.m. experience the largest number of crashes, coinciding with bar closing times. A relatively high number of crashes also occur late on Sunday night but are significantly lower on Monday through Friday. Crashes during the late afternoon and evening hours are highest on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.
Table 3.4 shows the top 10 alcohol-related crash citations communities per 1,000 population in 2005. This and other analyses confirm that the alcohol-related
crash problem is a statewide one in Massachusetts. Yet “hot spots” exist, including tourist communities like Salisbury, Sturbridge, Lenox, and Gloucester. Also a college community like West Bridgewater.

**Table 3.4 Ranking: Top 10 Alcohol-Related Crash Citation Massachusetts Communities**

*Weighted by Population (2005)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgewater</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>6,821</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>8,284</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturbridge</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>10,168</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbrook</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>10,775</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>10,967</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenox</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>8,989</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>30,713</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Communities with populations less than 5,000 were excluded.

Table 3.5 presents the top 10 alcohol-related citations communities per 1,000 population in 2005. Again, this and other analyses confirm that the alcohol-related crash problem is a statewide one in Massachusetts. However there exist “hot spots” such as the college community of West Bridgewater and tourist destinations such as Sturbridge, Salisbury, Nantucket, and Orleans.
### Table 3.5 Ranking: Top 10 Alcohol-Related Citation Communities
**Massachusetts Communities Weighted by Population (2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2005 Population</th>
<th>Per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgewater</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>6,821</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>5,845</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturbridge</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>16,643</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>8,284</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>10,168</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Barnstable</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Communities with populations less than 5,000 were excluded.

Table 3.6 shows the top 10 underage drinking citation communities per 1,000 population in 2005. Again, this and other traffic records analysis confirms that the underage drinking problem is statewide. However there exist “hot spots” such as the college communities of West Bridgewater and Amherst as well as tourist destinations such as Sturbridge, Hull, and Salisbury.

### Table 3.6 Ranking: Top 10 Underage Drinking-Related Citation Communities
**Weighted by Population (2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2005 Population</th>
<th>Per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>25,720</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>16,351</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>16,643</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>10,967</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturbridge</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>10,812</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>11,280</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each year in 2004 through 2006, a statewide, 500-person telephone survey was conducted by the Highway Safety Division. The purpose was to determine reported behavior, awareness of, and attitudes towards drunk driving and related laws among Massachusetts licensed drivers. Table 3.7 summarizes key survey findings.

### Table 3.7 Drunk Driving-Related Telephone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2005 Population</th>
<th>Per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>8,284</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millis</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>7,964</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>34,047</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Communities with populations less than 5,000 were excluded.

### Massachusetts Drunk Driving Survey Results

Objectives and Performance Measures

**Objectives**

2. Expand number of and evaluate impact of sobriety checkpoints.
3. Enhance and evaluate the impact of efforts to reduce impaired driving by younger drivers and underage drinking.
4. Support law enforcement with training and technical assistance aimed at increasing their effectiveness to combat impaired driving and underage drinking.

**Select Performance Measures**

1. Increase from 64 percent in 2006 to 68 percent in 2008 the number of respondents to the statewide telephone survey that were likely to abstain from drinking and driving as a result of increased enforcement.

2. Increase number of State Police led sobriety checkpoints from 75 in FFY 2007 to 90 in FFY 2008 utilizing the two BAT Mobile Units.

3. Increase number of local police department enforcement grants by including campus police departments during DD-OL-UA Mobilizations from 232 in FFY 2007 to 270 in FFY 2008.

4. Conduct first-time upgrade of Breath Test Units for evidence collection with 150 systems for cities and towns, State Police and municipal police training facilities. Utilize new advanced technology.

5. Increase number of local law enforcement agencies and college police departments participating in underage drinking enforcement partnerships from six in FFY2007 to 50 in FFY2008.

6. Conduct awareness and education programs with evaluation component designed to encourage responsible decision-making and reduce alcohol use and abuse in 50 institutions of higher education in FFY2008.

7. Conduct a NHTSA Standardized Field Sobriety Testing Assessment to determine statewide effectiveness of training programs and efforts.
4.0 Occupant Protection

Goal

- Increase statewide safety belt use rate from the 2006 rate of 67 percent to 72 percent by 2008.

Problem Identification and Analysis

Occupant protection refers to the use of safety belts, booster seats, and child safety seats by motor vehicle drivers and passengers. Massachusetts historically has one of the lowest statewide safety belt use rates in the country. In November 2002, the Highway Safety Division began supporting state and local police to conduct annually between two and three Click It or Ticket (CIOT) Mobilizations following NHTSA’s model. The spring 2003 CIOT Mobilization enabled Massachusetts to increase its safety belt use from 51 percent to 62 percent – the highest statewide rate increase ever recorded. Since then annual gains have been one or two percentage points. The FFY 2006 stated goal of 67 percent was attained.

The slow but steady gains in belt use experienced in recent years in Massachusetts are primarily the result of the Commonwealth’s weak “secondary” safety belt law. This type of law limits law enforcement to issuing safety belt violations to only after they have first stopped motorists for “primary” traffic violations, such as speeding. A primary safety belt law allows law enforcement to stop vehicles whenever unbelted drivers or passengers are observed. In 2006 the Massachusetts Legislature once again considered passage of a primary enforcement safety belt bill, but yet again it was defeated. This resulted in Massachusetts being temporarily ineligible for a $13.6 million grant offered through NHTSA’s Section 406 incentive program. In 2005 there were still 81,556 safety belt violations issued by state and local police in Massachusetts.

The Highway Safety Division will continue to apply the CIOT model in FFY 2008. Due to the fact that safety belts remain the single most effective means of preventing death or injury as a result of a crash, and the Massachusetts belt use rate remains at an unacceptable low rate, the Highway Safety Division will continue to make occupant protection a major highway safety program area in FFY 2008.

Observed Safety Belt Use Rate

The Commonwealth has historically lagged the national safety belt use rate by more than 15 percent as shown in Table 4.1. In 2006, Massachusetts’ rate of 67 percent compared unfavorably to the average rate of 85 percent of states with primary belt laws and with the 74 percent rate of states with secondary belt laws.
Table 4.1 Massachusetts Safety Belt Use Rates
2003 to 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Belt Use</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Belt Use</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Adult</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Seat Passenger</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Car</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUV</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick-up Truck</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vehicle</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-highway</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%&lt;sup&gt;<em>&lt;/sup&gt;  (67%)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Vehicle Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Highway Safety Division’s 2006 Massachusetts Safety Belt Usage Observation Study.

Note: Statewide Safety Belt Use is a weighted value to account for the sample stratification. The component data are unweighted.

<sup>a</sup> 2006 categorization different than previous years, so not directly comparable: Occupant role 2006 numbers refer to Driver – with passengers and Passenger, respectively. Roadway classification 2006 numbers refer to Arterial (Collector), respectively.

Several observations emerged from the comparison of 2005 and 2006 data. While overall safety belt usage (weighted) increased by two percent, from 65 percent to 67 percent, teen usage increased more significantly, from 57 percent to 66 percent (unweighted). Western Massachusetts has the highest usage rate, and experienced a substantial increase from 71 to 81 percent. This part of Massachusetts borders the primary belt law states of Connecticut and New York. Southeastern Massachusetts, historically with one of the lowest rates and consistently the subject of additional division attention, saw an increase of seven points to 70 percent.
The consequences of low belt use in Massachusetts are revealed in fatal crashes. Figure 4.1 presents belt use status for fatally injured vehicle occupants and survivors of fatal crashes for both the United States and Massachusetts in 2005. While 70 percent of survivors of fatal crashes at the national level were belted, only 54 percent of fatal crash survivors in Massachusetts were belted. Twenty-eight percent of fatally injured drivers were belted while 57 percent were not belted. Conversely, 54 percent of fatal crash survivors were belted while only 20 percent were not belted.

**Figure 4.1 Safety Belt Use for Vehicle Occupants Involved in Massachusetts and U.S. Fatal Crashes 2005**

![Safety Belt Use Chart](image)

Source: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS).

Table 4.2 presents motor vehicle crash ejections in Massachusetts from 2003 to 2005. Consistently, an overwhelming number of ejections were males.

**Table 4.2 Massachusetts Motor Vehicle Crash Ejections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial and Total Ejections</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>2,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Traffic Records Portal.

When compared by age, there is a noticeably higher rate of ejection per 100,000 population for 18- to 20-year-olds and 21- to 24-year-olds.
Safety Belt Citations

A safety belt citation is a citation that involved at least one safety belt-related violation (e.g., no seat belt, no child restraint, etc.). Table 4.3 presents safety belt and child safety citations issued along Massachusetts state and local-controlled roadways.

Table 4.3 Massachusetts Safety Belt and Child Safety Seat Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Belt Citations</td>
<td>90,172</td>
<td>80,067</td>
<td>78,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Safety Seat Citations</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>3,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Safety Citations</td>
<td>94,842</td>
<td>83,595</td>
<td>81,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Since the inception of the Click It or Ticket program in 2003, safety belt usage has been a top priority for Massachusetts State Police law enforcement and for statewide educational efforts. From 2003 to 2005, the number of safety belt and child safety seat citations decreased while statewide safety belt usage increased from 62 to 65 percent. This trend demonstrates that statewide safety belt awareness has increased, which is reflected by another two percent increase in statewide safety belt usage to 67 percent in 2006.

Massachusetts Safety Belt Survey Results

Each year between 2003 and 2007, 500-person statewide telephone surveys were conducted by the Highway Safety Division to determine reported behavior, awareness of, and attitudes towards safety belts and related laws among Massachusetts licensed drivers. Table 4.4 summarizes key survey findings.

Table 4.4 Safety Belt-Related Telephone Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Residents Aware of Safety Belt Law</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricter Enforcement of Safety Belt Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Favor</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Unbelted Adults will be Ticketed by Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Ticketing Those Unbelted Impact on Safety Belt Use Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much More Likely</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Pre and Post Click It Or Ticket Survey Results, Highway Safety Division, 6/2007.

Objectives and Performance Measures

Objectives
1. Enhance and evaluate the impact of the series of Click It or Ticket (CIOT) Mobilizations.
2. Expand and evaluate CIOT-related community educational initiatives among diverse populations.
3. Enhance and evaluate the impact of efforts to increase safety belt use by younger drivers and passengers.
4. Enhance and evaluate the impact of efforts to increase proper use of child safety seats, including booster seats.
5. Support law enforcement with training and technical assistance aimed at increasing their effectiveness to increase occupant protection use.

Select Performance Measures
1. Increase from 87 percent in 2007 to 90 percent in 2008 the number of respondents to the statewide telephone survey that are aware of Massachusetts safety belt law.
2. Increase number of local police and campus police high visibility enforcement grants during CIOT Mobilizations from 232 in FFY 2007 to 270 in FFY 2008.
3. Conduct a CPS Conference for up to 500 attendees in FFY 2008.
4. Increase number of child passenger safety grants awarded by Highway Safety Division’s CPS Program to 100 in FFY 2008.
6. Implement a Teen Driving Program with the Department of Public Health.
5.0 Speed and Aggressive Driving

Goal

- Reduce the percentage of speed-related fatalities from 33 percent in 2005 to 32 percent in 2008.

Problem Identification and Analysis

Speed-related fatalities are a significant highway safety problem often overshadowed by the high-profile attention given to occupant protection and impaired driving both at the national and state level. To combat this problem, the Highway Safety Division reintroduced a speeding and aggressive driving initiative it had conducted in the late 1990s called “Road Respect.” This effort involves each year a mobilization in the early spring that follows the NHTSA model for CIOT and DD-OL-UA.

In Massachusetts, 33 percent of crash fatalities were speed-related in 2005; this was higher than the national rate of 30 percent. The higher percentage of speed-related fatalities in Massachusetts as compared to the nation confirms that the Highway Safety Division should continue to treat speeding as a major highway safety program area in FFY 2008. Efforts in this area also will address aggressive and distracted driving.

There are limited data available for use in the analysis of speed-related crashes in Massachusetts. For this reason, speed-related crashes were examined primarily through the analysis of speed-related violations with a specific focus on violations issued when a crash occurred.

Speed-Related Fatalities

Table 5.1 Massachusetts Speed-Related Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed-Related Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all Motor Vehicle Fatalities</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Fatality Rate per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speed-Related Citations

A speeding citation is a citation that involved at least one speed-related violation (e.g., above speed-limit infraction, aggressive driving, etc.).

Table 5.2 Massachusetts Speeding Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding Citations</td>
<td>336,832</td>
<td>315,895</td>
<td>296,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Citations, Speed-Related</td>
<td>4,377</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>3,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Speeding Citations that Involve a Crash</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Citations, Total</td>
<td>39,344</td>
<td>38,013</td>
<td>33,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Crash Citations Speed-Related</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5.1 shows speed-related crash citations by age and gender. Among females the number of crashes has dropped significantly among all categories of drivers between 2003 and 2005. A similar trend has occurred among male drivers, although they still account for the majority of such crashes in all age categories. Speed-related crashes are approximately four times more likely to involve males than females.

Figure 5.1 Massachusetts Speed-Related Crash Citations

by Age and Gender

When analyzing speed-related crash citations by gender and day of the week for 2003 to 2005, the data also showed that males are more likely to be involved in a speed-related crash than females. Friday, Saturday, and Sunday have the most speed-related crash citations, though the violations for males are more variable than those of women, by day-of-week.

Figure 5.3 presents speed-related crash violations by time-of-day and day-of-week. Weekdays between the hours of midnight and six in the morning have the lowest speed-related crash violations. However, those hours of the day have the largest number on weekend days.

**Figure 5.2 Massachusetts Speed-Related Crash Citations**

*by Time-of-Day (2005)*

Table 5.3 presents the top 10 speed-related crash citation communities per 1,000 population in 2005. This and other traffic records analysis confirms that the speed-related crash citation problem is concentrated in cities and towns through which run major roadways (e.g., Massachusetts Turnpike, Route 2, I-495). However there exist “hot spots” such as Worcester County communities with major roadways and tourist destinations such as Sturbridge, and Lenox.

Table 5.3  Ranking: Top 10 Speed-Related Crash Citation Communities  
Weighted by Population (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2005 Population</th>
<th>Per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sturbridge</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenox</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>17,834</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>8,989</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkinton</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>14,112</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>6,074</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>12,475</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4 presents the top 10 communities for speed-related citations per 1000 population in 2005. Again, this and other traffic records analysis confirms that the speed-related crash citation problem is concentrated in cities and towns through which run major roadways (e.g., Massachusetts Turnpike, Route 2, I-495). However there exist “hot spots” such as Worcester County communities with major roadways and tourist destinations such as Sturbridge, Eastham, and Lee.

### Table 5.4 Ranking: Top 10 Speed-Related Citation Communities

*Weighted by Population (2005)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2005 Population</th>
<th>Per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sturbridge</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>701.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>367.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>278.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Barnstable</td>
<td>5,551</td>
<td>243.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>5,885</td>
<td>186.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northborough</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>14,675</td>
<td>182.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeton</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>7,491</td>
<td>173.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>171.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>6,375</td>
<td>170.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southborough</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>9,559</td>
<td>169.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Communities with populations less than 5,000 were excluded.

### Objectives and Performance Measures

**Objectives**

1. Enhance and evaluate the impact of efforts to reduce speeding and other aggressive driving behaviors through the *Road Respect* Mobilization.
2. Support law enforcement with training and technical assistance aimed at increasing their effectiveness to reduce speeding and other aggressive driving behaviors.

Select Performance Measures

1. Increase number of local police departments and campus police departments during Road Respect Mobilizations from 232 in FFY 2007 to 250 in FFY 2008.

2. Implement a speed measurement equipment grant program for state, local and campus police departments to enable them to expand their traffic enforcement efforts in the Road Respect Mobilization.
6.0 Higher Risk Transportation System Users

6.1 Young and Older Drivers

Goals

- Reduce younger driver fatalities and incapacitating injuries from 1,783 in 2005 to 1,693 in 2008.
- Reduce older driver fatalities and incapacitating injuries from 748 in 2005 to 710 in 2008.

Problem Identification and Analysis

Fatalities involving younger drivers, those ages 16 to 24, were 27 percent of all motor vehicle-related fatalities in Massachusetts as compared to 24 nationwide. Fatalities for older drivers, those over 65 years of age, were 18 percent of all motor vehicle-related fatalities in Massachusetts as compared to 15 nationwide. Table 6.1 describes the distribution of younger and older driver fatalities and incapacitating injuries in Massachusetts.

Table 6.1 Young and Older Driver Fatalities and Incapacitating Injuries in Massachusetts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fatalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver (16-19)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver (20-24)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Driver (65+)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incapacitating Injuries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver (16-19)</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Driver (20-24)</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Driver (65+)</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The objectives and performance measures for the younger and older drivers program area are those for the alcohol, occupant protection, and speed and aggressive driving areas.
6.2 PEDESTRIANS

Goal

- Reduce the pedestrian fatalities and incapacitating injuries from 317 in 2005 to 300 in 2008.

Problem Identification and Analysis

As would be expected in a more urbanized state, pedestrian fatalities represent a higher proportion of total fatalities in Massachusetts than on the national level. In 2005, pedestrian fatalities were 17 percent of the total in Massachusetts, but only 11 percent nationally. Efforts to expand walking to school and work or for recreation will be made easier when pedestrian fatalities and injuries are further decreased.

In 2005, the general segments of the population most affected by pedestrian fatalities were adults aged 35-54, and older adults over 55. Pedestrian fatalities were greatest for older adults aged 55-64 and over 74. The general segments of the population most affected by pedestrian incapacitating injuries were children aged 0-15, adults aged 25-54, and older adults aged over 65. Pedestrian incapacitating injuries were greatest for children aged 0-15, adults aged 45-54, and older adults over 70.

Table 6.2 shows the number of pedestrian fatalities and incapacitating injuries occurring in Massachusetts.

**Table 6.2 Pedestrian Fatalities and Incapacitating Injuries in Massachusetts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Incapacitating Injuries</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In 2005, police issued 4,082 citations that involved a violation for failure to yield to a pedestrian as shown in Table 6.3.
### Table 6.3 Massachusetts Pedestrian-Related Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pedestrian-Related Citations</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>4,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Citations, Pedestrian-Related</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Pedestrian-Related Citations that Involved a Crash</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Citations, Total</td>
<td>39,344</td>
<td>38,013</td>
<td>33,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Crash Citations Pedestrian-Related</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In order to decrease the number of overall pedestrian fatalities and incapacitating injuries, drivers must be more conscious of pedestrian movement on roadways. There is a shared responsibility of both parties to ensure that safe travel is maintained.

### Objectives and Performance Measures

#### Objectives

1. Support statewide and community-level pedestrian safety initiatives.
2. Enhance pedestrian safety expertise among state and local enforcement, public health, highway planners, engineers, and other traffic safety advocates.

#### Select Performance Measures

1. Award up to 50 community pedestrian and bicycle enforcement, education and equipment grants based on problem identification.

### 6.3 BICYCLISTS

#### Goal

- Reduce bicyclist fatalities and incapacitating injuries from 79 in 2005 to 75 in 2008.

#### Problem Identification and Analysis

In 2005, Massachusetts fell below the U.S. average in bicyclist fatalities; just over one percent in Massachusetts versus two percent nationally. Ensuring the safety of bicyclists, particularly in the urban centers, will be imperative to encourage greater bicycle travel.
In 2005, the general segments of the population most affected by bicyclist fatalities were children 0-15, young adults aged 16-24 and adults 25-54 years old. Bicyclist fatalities were greatest for children and young adults aged 10-24, and adults aged 35-44 and 45-54. Similarly, the general segments of the population most affected by bicyclist incapacitating injuries were children aged 0-15 and adults aged 25-54 years old. Bicyclist incapacitating injuries were greatest for children aged 0-15 and adults aged 35-44.

Table 6.4 shows the number of bicyclist fatalities and incapacitating injuries occurring in Massachusetts.

### Table 6.4 Massachusetts Bicyclist Fatalities and Incapacitating Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclist Incapacitating Injuries</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In order to further decrease the number of bicyclist fatalities and incapacitating injuries, drivers must continue to share the roadway and show consideration for bicycle lanes of travel.

### Objectives and Performance Measures

#### Objectives

1. Support statewide and community-level bicycle safety initiatives.
2. Enhance bicycle safety expertise among state and local law enforcement, public health, highway planners, engineers and traffic safety advocates.

#### Select Performance Measures

1. Award up to 50 pedestrian and bicycle enforcement, education and equipment grants based on problem identification.
2. Increase number of community bicycle helmet grants from 250 in FFY 2007 to 400 in FFY 2008.
6.4 **MOTORCYCLISTS**

Goal


Problem Identification and Analysis

The popularity of motorcycling continues to increase in Massachusetts and across the nation. Many of these new riders are first time, older people. This in turn has driven up demand for professional rider training. In 2005, motorcycle-related fatalities comprised about 12 percent of all motor vehicle-related fatalities across the Commonwealth as compared to 12 percent nationwide.

In 2005, the general segment of the population most affected by motorcyclist fatalities were adults aged 25-54. Motorcyclist fatalities were greatest for adults aged 25-34 and 45-54. Similarly, the general segment of the population most affected by motorcyclist incapacitating injuries were adults aged 25-54. Motorcyclist incapacitating injuries were greatest for adults aged 25-34 and 35-44.

Table 6.5 presents the total number of motorcyclist fatalities and incapacitating injuries in Massachusetts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclist Incapacitating Injuries</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Despite the number of motorcyclist fatalities in 2005, 89 percent of operators/passengers involved in fatal crashes were wearing helmets, as compared to 55 percent nationwide. This demonstrates that the majority of motorcyclists in Massachusetts are aware of the importance of wearing proper safety equipment. However, helmet use is only part of the education efforts that must be conducted to ensure motorcyclist safety in Massachusetts; riders statewide must be further trained and educated on all aspects of motorcycle safety including roadway rules and regulations, licensing requirements, and proper equipment usage.
Objectives and Performance Measures

Objectives
1. Expand statewide rider training availability with special focus on increasing first-time participation by older riders.
2. Enhance and evaluate impact of statewide “share-the-road,” “ride straight,” proper riding gear use, and licensing requirement educational efforts.

Select Performance Measures
1. Increase number of riders trained from 8,502 in 2007 to 8,927 in 2008.
2. Conduct assessment of motorcycle safety program to determine effectiveness and develop strategic plan based on results.
3. Evaluate impact of communications efforts of the Registry of Motor Vehicles’ motorcycle safety program during 2008 riding season.
7.0 Traffic Records

Goal

- Ensure key highway safety stakeholders have accessible, accurate, complete, consistent, integrated, and timely data and analyses from the local, state, and Federal systems involving citation/adjudication, crash, driver, injury surveillance, roadway, and vehicle data to conduct cost-effective and successful highway safety planning, programs, and evaluations.

Problem Identification and Analysis

Traffic records data is vital to the analysis necessary for successful highway safety activity. The Highway Safety Division and its partners collect and use traffic records data to identify problem areas, develop, and implement proper programs, and to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs.

The Division’s Massachusetts Traffic Records Portal provides a central storage point for crash and citation data and allows for analysis of this data by select users in the Commonwealth. Leading by example, the Highway Safety Division utilizes this portal to conduct data-driven program planning, implementation, and evaluation as well as encourages others to do the same.

As required by the NHTSA’s Section 408 grant program, Massachusetts has an active Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC). The TRCC is chaired by the Highway Safety Division’s traffic records program manager. The TRCC seeks to improve the accessibility, accuracy, completeness, consistency, integration, and timeliness of the six traffic records systems in Massachusetts: citation/adjudication, crash, driver, injury surveillance, roadway, and vehicle. One way the TRCC does this is by ensuring that any Section 408 funds received by Massachusetts are used for eligible, prioritized projects that will enhance these systems.

The TRCC’s FFY 2007 Section 408 application and strategic plan for traffic records update, submitted to NHTSA in June 2007, contains extensive details on the current capabilities and challenges of the Massachusetts traffic records system. It also reports on the progress made to date on projects funded with FFY 2006 Section 408 funds. The application/plan update also details how hoped-for FFY 2007 Section 408 funds would be utilized for up to five proposed projects that were prioritized by the TRCC. The traffic records part of Section 8 of this HSPP provides brief descriptions of both the FFY 2006 Section 408-funded projects that are continuing in FFY 2007 as well as the proposed projects that would use the anticipated FFY 2007 Section 408 funds.
SAFETEA-LU, and specifically the Section 408 grant program, enhances the role played by traffic records within highway safety, requiring it to be a major highway safety program area for the Highway Safety Division in FFY 2008.

**Objectives and Performance Measures**

**Objectives**
1. Enhance the workings of the Massachusetts Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC).
2. Ensure ongoing implementation of the TRCC’s FFY 2007 Massachusetts Strategic Plan for Traffic Records as well as apply for new Section 408 funding.
3. Expand on-line access to and use of local, state, and Federal traffic records data and analyses.

**Select Performance Measures**
1. Enhance the TRCC’s Data Quality and Strategic Plan/408 Application subcommittees.
2. Fund and monitor the TRCC’s FFY 2006 and 2007 408-funded projects as well as submit on behalf of the TRCC a FFY 2008 Section 408 Application and Massachusetts Strategic Plan for Traffic Records Update.
3. Continue to provide access for select users to the Massachusetts Traffic Records Portal.
8.0 Program Planning

8.1 IMPAIRED DRIVING PROGRAM AREA

Project Number – AL-08-01

**Project Title** – Drunk Driving-Over the Limit-Under Arrest. (DD-OL-UA) Paid and Earned Media

**Project Description** – Develop and implement a statewide paid and earned media plan for the following DD-OL-UA Mobilization periods: December 2007 to January 2008 and August to September 2008. Provide earned media support to the State and Local Police Sobriety Checkpoint Partnership and Breath Alcohol Testing Mobiles, in particular during holiday periods not covered by Click It or Ticket and DD-OL-UA Mobilizations. All these efforts will educate the public about the dangers and costs of impaired driving as well as heightened enforcement by state and local police of the Commonwealth’s impaired driving laws. Primary audience will be males ages 16 to 44.

**Project Staff** – Brook Chipman and Carol Dingle

**Project Budget/Source** – $1,500,000 of Sections 410, 164 and 163

Project Number – AL-08-02

**Project Title** – DD-OL-UA State Police Enforcement Campaign

**Project Description** – Provide funds for overtime enforcement by the Massachusetts State Police for participation in the December 2007 to January 2008 and August to September 2008 DD-OL-UA Mobilizations. Enforcement efforts will focus on apprehending impaired drivers and be done during high-risk times and locations based on the latest available state and local crash and citation data. Total in-kind match for all five Mobilizations will be $6.75 million.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $378,800 of Section 410

Project Number – AL-08-03

**Project Title** – State and Local Police Sobriety Checkpoint/BAT Mobile Partnership

**Project Description** – Provide funding for sobriety checkpoints with the Massachusetts State Police and top 30 local police departments selected based on alcohol-related crash and citation data. Deployment of Breath Alcohol Test
Mobiles to checkpoints will be based on availability. State police in-kind will be $378,000. Local police department in-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $881,522 for state police of Section 410; $150,000 for local police of Section 410

**Project Number** – AL-08-04

**Project Title** – Sobriety Checkpoint Support Department of Corrections and Sheriffs Departments

**Project Description** – Provide funds for overtime enforcement for DOC and Sheriffs’ Departments officers assigned to work with state and local police at statewide Sobriety Checkpoints. This initiative will not be implemented without prior NHTSA written approval based on the submission of a comprehensive proposal.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $100,000 of Section 410

**Project Number** – AL-08-05

**Project Title** – DD-OL-UA Local and Campus Police Enforcement Campaign

**Project Description** – Provide funds for overtime enforcement by approximately 270 local police and college campus police departments for the December 2007 to January 2008, and August to September 2008 Mobilizations. Enforcement efforts will focus on apprehending impaired drivers and be done during high-risk times and locations based on the latest available state and local data. Special consideration for funding will be given to communities with higher alcohol-related crash citation rates weighted by population. Conduct regional bidders’ conferences and grant orientation meetings to ensure maximum participation and compliance with grant requirements. Utilize Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) Program to increase mobilization participation by local police departments and increased regional media outreach. Local in-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $1,200,000 of Sections 410 and 163

**Project Number** – AL-07-06

**Project Title** – Impaired Driving State and Community Educational Initiatives

**Project Description** – Through a contractor, fund development, purchase, and distribution of educational and incentive materials for the DD-OL-UA Mobilizations in English, as well as Spanish and Portuguese. Provide state and local law enforcement, public health and health care organizations, employers,
and other campaign partners with mobilization kickoff meetings and materials to encourage maximum support. Develop web-based “Best Practices” community impaired driving educational initiatives for use by local police departments, higher and secondary educational institutions, and traffic safety partners.

**Project Staff** – Brook Chipman and Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $300,000 of Section 410

**Project Number** – AL-08-07

**Project Title** – Breath Test Units Upgrade – Evidence Collection

**Project Description** – Provide initial funding for the Massachusetts State Police to upgrade 150 Breath Alcohol Test System (BATS) units thus eliminating the external computer and its associated problems requiring constant replacement or repair. The initial project was funded by Highway Safety in 2002-2004 for distribution to all cities and towns, state police and municipal police training facilities. Funds were allocated in subsequent years to repair instruments. An EOPSS review was completed in FFY2007 and determined the present computers continue to fail due to their design; parts are also difficult and at times impossible to obtain due to rapidly changing technology. This new upgrade initiative was included in the FFY07 HSPP but was delayed to complete a review of this new technology. Each new unit is estimated at $3,400. State Police in-kind match will total $251,000. Upgrades will be provided based on need.

Provide funding for purchase of 25 Preliminary Breath Test Devices (PBT) and 25 simulators for five State Police troops and up to 100 PBTs and 100 simulators for local police departments based on numbers of OUI arrests and for new Drug Recognition Experts. PBTs are estimated at $445 each, and simulators $517 each. Phase One of PBT purchases for local departments was completed in FFY05. State police in-kind match for PBT Program will be $20,000. Local in-kind match estimated at $30,000.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron and Caroline Hymoff

**Project Budget/Source** – $500,000 of Section 164 for State Police and Local Department Breath Test Unit Upgrades; $25,000 of Section 164 for State Police PBTs; $100,000 of Section 164 for Local Department and Drug Recognition Experts PBT Program

**Project Number** – AL-08-08

**Project Title** – Alcohol Youth Program

**Project Description** – Identify contractors to conduct youth impaired driving prevention programs in middle schools, high schools, universities and state and local colleges. Programming will include using positive messages and methods: educating youth on crash and injury risks, effects of alcohol abuse, providing positive role models, promoting positive norms, and encourage youth non-
alcohol activities. Program will include up to 100 mini-grants to address dangers of alcohol impairment. In-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Rebecca Donatelli

**Project Budget/Source** – $400,000 of Sections 164 and 410

**Project Number** – AL-08-09

**Project Title** – Youth Presentations

**Project Description** – Identify and fund a contractor to conduct highway safety presentations, primarily at middle schools and high schools, on the dangers of aggressive and impaired driving as well as speeding and the benefits of occupant restraint use. Special consideration will be given to communities with higher alcohol-related crash citation rates weighted by population.

**Project Staff** – Rebecca Donatelli

**Project Budget/Source** – $50,000 of Section 410

**Project Number** – AL-08-10

**Project Title** – Statewide and Community Alcohol/Underage Drinking Enhanced Enforcement and Equipment Program

**Project Description** – Continue to fund the Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission (ABCC) to conduct enhanced liquor enforcement program to reduce underage drinking and impaired driving. Current grant award of $130,000 in OJJDP funds to ABCC for summer 2007 through summer 2008 initiatives. Estimated grant award to ABCC at $90,000 for FFY 2008 based on receipt of new 2007 OJJDP award. ABCC in-kind match will be determined.

Identify and fund up to 50 local law enforcement agencies (utilizing OJJDP and Section 164 funds) to conduct underage drinking enforcement in partnership with ABCC, community organizations, and youth groups, and/or with grantees at documented high-risk times and locations. Special consideration for funding will be given to communities with higher underage drinking violations rates weighted by population. This effort will be coordinated as best as possible with DD-OL-UA Mobilizations. Grants estimated at up to $10,000 per department for enforcement; $250,000 in equipment based on average of up to $5,000 award per department. Equipment may include, but not be limited to, preliminary breath test units and simulators, passive alcohol sensors, and fatal vision goggles. HSD will seek NHTSA approval for all equipment purchases in accordance with Federal regulations. Local police department in-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Rebecca Donatelli

**Project Budget/Source** – $100,000 in OJJDP and $500,000 of Section 164; $130,000 in carry-forward OJJDP and Section 164 for ABCC Program; $90,000 for ABCC based on new OJJDP award.
Project Number - AL-08-11

Project Title - Community/College Impaired Driving/Underage Drinking Organizations

Project Description - Identify and fund approximately five communities to create or enhance community and/or college impaired driving task forces. Special consideration for funding will be given to communities with higher underage drinking violation rates weighted by population. Partner with local substance abuse and public health organizations about underage drinking reduction initiatives. Estimate grant award at $15,000 per site. In-kind match to be determined.

Project Staff – Rebecca Donatelli

Project Budget/Resources – $75,000 of OJJDP funds

Project Number - AL-08-12

Project Title – Higher Education Program

Project Description – Fund up to 50 colleges and universities to develop environmentally focused programs to reduce alcohol use/abuse. Partner with Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH) to develop and disseminate model policy and promising strategies to all college and universities. Also with MDPH, provide opportunity for colleges to showcase model underage drinking/substance abuse programs. In-kind match to be determined.

Project Staff – Rebecca Donatelli

Project Budget/Source – $75,000 of OJJDP funds; $500,000 of Section 164

Project Number - AL-08-13

Project Title – Statewide and Community Alcohol/Underage Drinking Media Project

Project Description – Conduct a paid and earned media campaign in close coordination with Statewide and Community Alcohol/Underage Drinking sites.

Project Staff – Rebecca Donatelli

Project Budget/Source – $100,000 of OJJDP funds; $100,000 of Section 410

Project Number - AL-08-14

Project Title – Standardized Field Sobriety Test (SFST) Training Assessment

Project Description – Work in cooperation with NHTSA and the Municipal Police Training Committee to conduct a three-day assessment to determine strengths and gaps in statewide SFST program to increase effectiveness of effort to train law enforcement in the apprehension of impaired drivers.
Program Staff - Caroline Hymoff

Program Budget/Source – $30,000 of Section 410

Project Number – AL-08-15

Project Title – Officer, Judicial and Prosecutor Trainings

Project Description – Judicial Institute - Conduct judicial trainings regarding impaired driving through The Judicial Institute of the Massachusetts Trial Court. Provide funding for development of an OUI Bench Book for judges and other publications. In-kind match to be determined.

Massachusetts District Attorneys Association - Conduct trainings and conferences for district attorneys and prosecutors on impaired driving issues through the state District Attorneys Association (DAA). Provide funding for full-time Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (NHTSA TSRP) to coordinate HSD-DAA projects through the MDAA. In-kind match estimated at $62,492.

Specialized Highway Safety Trainings for Municipal Police. Conduct specialized classroom and/or distance learning trainings for local police officers in Standardized Field Sobriety Test (SFST), Drugs That Impair Driving, Drug Evaluation and Classification Program, and other highway safety courses through the Massachusetts Municipal Police Training Committee (MPTC). In-kind match to be determined.

Drug Evaluation and Classification Program (DEC). Conduct statewide training and professional development on Massachusetts-model of national Drug Evaluation and Classification to improve detection and prosecution of impaired driving by Massachusetts state and local police officers. Through contracted services, conduct Call-Out Policy Program for Drug Recognition experts to conduct evaluations on impaired drivers and to provide court testimony on these cases.

Drug Impairment Training for Educational Professionals (DITEP). As a pilot program, implement NHTSA-Massachusetts Drug Impairment Training for Educational Professionals (DITEP) for law enforcement, school educators, and administrators. In-kind match to be determined.


Project Staff – Caroline Hymoff (judicial, prosecutors, Drug Evaluation and Classification programs, drug court conference), and Jean Barron (MPTC).

Project Budget/Source – $25,000 of Section 410 for Judicial Program; $200,000 of Section 410 for MDAA Program; $76,220 of Section 402 for MPTC Program; $200,000 of Section 410 for DEC Program; $45,000 of Section 410 for DITEP Pilot Program; $25,000 of Section 410 for NEADCP Conference
Project Number – AL-08-16
Project Title – Impaired Driving Telephone Survey
Project Description – Before and after the August-September 2008 DD-OL-UA Mobilization, a contractor will conduct statewide telephone surveys to determine whether there has been an improvement in Massachusetts’ residents knowledge and perception of impaired driving laws, enforcement of those laws, and awareness of the media campaign. Promote survey results with earned media.

Project Staff – Brook Chipman
Project Budget/Source – $50,000 of Section 410

Project Number – AL-08-17
Project Title – Program Management
Project Description – Provide sufficient staff to conduct alcohol-related programming described in this plan as well as cover travel, conference fees and miscellaneous expenses.

Project Staff – Caroline Hymoff, Brook Chipman, Rebecca Donatelli, Jean Barron, and Carol Dingle.
Project Budget/Source – $255,500 of Sections 164, 410, 402, and OJJDP

8.2 OCCUPANT PROTECTION PROGRAM AREA

Project Number – OP-08-01
Project Title – Click It or Ticket (CIOT) Paid and Earned Media
Project Description – Develop and implement a statewide paid and earned media plan for the following CIOT Mobilization periods: November 2007 and May-June 2008. Media effort will educate the public about the benefits of safety belt, booster seats, and child safety seat use as well as the Commonwealth’s occupant protection laws. Primary target audience will be males and females ages 16 to 34, with stronger emphasis on males.

Project Staff – Brook Chipman and Carol Dingle
Project Budget/Source – $1,000,000 of Sections 405, 402, and 163

Project Number – OP-08-02
Project Title – CIOT State Police Enforcement Campaign
Project Description – Provide funds for overtime enforcement by the Massachusetts State Police to participate in the November 2007 and May-June 2008 Mobilizations. Enforcement efforts will focus on increasing compliance with occupant protection laws and be done at high-risk times and locations for
motor vehicle crashes based on the latest available state and local crash and citation data. Total in-kind match for five Mobilizations is $6.75 million.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $350,000 of Section 405

**Project Number** – OP-07-03

**Project Title** – CIOT Local and Campus Police Enforcement and Equipment Campaign

**Project Description** – Provide funds for overtime enforcement by approximately 270 local police and campus police departments with M.G.L. Chapter 90 powers for the November 2007 and May-June 2008 Mobilizations. Enforcement efforts will focus on increasing compliance with occupant protection laws and be done at high-risk times and locations for motor vehicle crashes based on the latest available state and local data. Special consideration for funding will be given to communities with higher motor vehicle crash rates weighted by population. Conduct regional bidders’ conferences and grant orientation meetings to ensure maximum participation and compliance with grant requirements. Utilize Law Enforcement Liaison to increase mobilization participation by local police departments.

Provide funding to enforcement grant communities for traffic enforcement equipment ranging in price from $3,000 to $20,000 per community. Equipment will include items on federally approved list for enforcement and education. HSD will comply with state and NHTSA requirements as applicable to all equipment purchases obtaining prior approval as needed. In-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Jenny Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $800,000 of Sections 402 and 163 for enforcement, $750,000 of Section 402 for equipment

**Project Number** – OP-08-04

**Project Title** – Occupant Protection State and Community Educational Initiatives

**Project Description** – Through contracted services, fund development, purchase, and distribution of educational and incentive materials for the CIOT Mobilizations in English as well as Spanish and Portuguese. Provide law enforcement, public health and health care organizations, employers, and other campaign partners with mobilization kickoff meetings and materials to encourage maximum support. Promote six web-based “Best Practices” community-based safety belt educational initiatives for use by local police departments, higher and secondary educational institutions, and traffic safety partners. Expand CIOT “photo album” to promote safety belt initiatives conducted by police departments and other partners on state web site.
**Project Staff** – Brook Chipman and Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $310,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – OP-08-05

**Project Title** – Child Passenger Safety (CPS) Program Administration and Training

**Project Description** – Through the contracted Municipal Police Institute of the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, conduct a statewide CPS program to retain existing 500 child passenger safety technicians and 17 instructors. Train up to 200 new technicians and up to 10 new instructors to address turnover but ideally create expansion. Continue to utilize Spanish-speaking CPS instructor. Program will organize up to 10 trainings with emphasis on low-income and diverse communities as well as rural areas. Conduct up to eight recertification trainings for those technicians whose certifications have expired. Conduct up to three train-the-trainer workshops for CPS instructors on the proper restraint of children on school buses. Promote program and availability of technicians to the public through earned media and the state web site. Through contractor, maintain a CPS hotline to assist public with questions on CPS installation, training, and all other CPS-related information. Conduct up to 15 child passenger safety checkpoints with emphasis on low-income and diverse populations. All above services will be provided through contractor and HSD program oversight. In-kind match to be provided.

Provide funding to the State Police Child Passenger Safety Training Program for State Police personnel. MSP in-kind match estimated at $35,000.

**Project Staff** – Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** –

Contracted services $165,000 of Section 402; State Police $10,000 of Section 405 and 402

**Project Number** – OP-08-06

**Project Title** – CPS Equipment Grants for Cities and Towns

**Project Description** – Implement a CPS equipment mini-grant program for a maximum of 100 police and fire departments, health care providers, and other agencies providing services to families and children. Provide grant funds to other state agencies dealing with child-related services to purchase CPS equipment. Grants will range from $2,000 to $20,000 each. Equipment includes, but is not limited to, car seats, booster seats, special needs seats, trailers on wheels, signage and other equipment to complete a fitting station or checkpoint location. Grant recipients must identify and receive prior approval for any one equipment purchase over $5,000 in advance to meet NHTSA and state funding requirements. This requirement will apply to all equipment grants in all program areas throughout the HSPP. Partner with Massachusetts Department of
Public Health and other agencies to enhance and expand program to include the possibility of car seat loaner programs. Additional partners may be added based on availability of additional funding. In-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $200,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – OP-08-07

**Project Title** – CPS Conference

**Project Description** – Conduct the 2008 Annual Massachusetts Child Passenger Safety Conference for up to 500 attendees, including all certified technicians and instructors. Topics will include national and state updates and changes in current CPS laws, regulations, and standards about child passenger safety seats.

**Project Staff** – Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $18,300 of Section 402

**Project Number** – OP-08-08

**Project Title** – Teen Driving Program, Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH)

**Project Description** – Provide funding for interventions in a pilot program by using health education, targeted public media campaigns and community messaging, and an increase in high visibility enforcement on the local level to reinforce “buckle up” message. Initiatives include statewide educational outreach to parents of teen drivers to promote compliance with junior operator law, statewide social marketing campaign targeted teen population, two community-level motor vehicle occupant protection pilot programs. DPH in-kind match estimated at $21,163.

**Project Staff** – Brook Chipman

**Project Budget/Source** – $80,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – OP-08-09

**Project Title** – Rollover Simulator

**Project Description** – Provide funds for State Police and a second public safety agency to each purchase a simulator, mannequins, several child safety seats, and public address system for community education and media events about the importance of safety belt use. Estimate cost $29,600 for each purchase. Special consideration for presentations will be given to communities with higher motor vehicle crash rates weighted by population. State Police in-kind match for 100 demonstrations will be $28,000. Written authorization will be obtained from
NHTSA in advance of approval to purchase any single item over $5,000. HSD will follow state and Federal requirements.

**Project Staff** – Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $59,200 of Section 402

**Project Number** – OP-08-10

**Project Title** – Occupant Protection Law Enforcement, Judicial and Department of Fire Services Trainings

**Project Description** – Contract with Municipal Police Training Committee to conduct Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies (TOPS) trainings for state and local police and traffic safety advocates as well as update existing curriculum. Conduct up to three instructor trainings and a maximum of 10, four-hour trainings in TOPS. Conduct two clerk magistrate trainings and judges trainings on occupant protection and highway safety issues through The Judicial Institute of the Massachusetts Trial Court. Fund the Massachusetts Department of Fire Services to conduct instructor trainings, training evaluation, and provide printed material for Fire Services personnel.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron and Caroline Hymoff

**Project Budget/Source** – $75,000 of Section 402 for TOPS at MPTC (Jean Barron); $11,800 of Section 402 for Fire Services TOPS Training (Jean Barron); $15,000 of Sections 402 for Clerk Training, (Caroline Hymoff)

**Project Number** – OP-08-11

**Project Title** – Statewide Safety Belt Observation Survey

**Project Description** – Before the May-June 2008 CIOT Mobilization, conduct through a contractor a sub-sample safety belt observational survey. After this mobilization, the contractor will conduct a statewide version of the survey. Both surveys will follow a NHTSA approved methodology to determine statewide safety belt use rate.

**Project Staff** – Brook Chipman

**Project Budget/Source** – $90,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – OP-08-12

**Project Title** – Safety Belt Telephone Survey

**Project Description** – Before and after the May-June 2008 CIOT Mobilization, a contractor will conduct statewide telephone surveys to determine whether there has been an improvement in Massachusetts’ residents knowledge and perception of occupant protection laws, enforcement of those laws, and awareness of the
media campaign. Promote survey results with earned media and use survey results for CIOT paid media development efforts.

**Project Staff** – Brook Chipman

**Project Budget/Source** – $50,000 of Section 402

---

**Project Number** – OP-08-13

**Project Title** – Older Driver Initiative, Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH)

**Project Description** – Implement program in cooperation with Massachusetts Healthy Aging Initiative, facilitated by DPH and the Executive Office of Elder Affairs. Through a part-time position, develop safe driving information to improve access to health promotion materials for 27 aging services agencies and 348 Councils on Aging on “Safe Driving for a Lifetime,” develop statewide campaign to promote driver safety, coordinate social marketing, communications and evaluation components for initiative. In-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Carol Dingle

**Project Budget/Source** – $65,000 of Section 402

---

**Project Number** – OP-08-14

**Project Title** – Program Management

**Project Description** – Provide sufficient staff to conduct occupant protection-related programming described in this plan as well as cover travel, conference fees and miscellaneous expenses.

**Project Staff** – Caroline Hymoff, Brook Chipman, Jean Barron, Carol Dingle, Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $181,400 of Section 402 and 405

---

### 8.3 **SPEED AND AGGRESSIVE DRIVING PROGRAM AREA**

**Project Number** – SC-08-01

**Project Title** – Road Respect (RR) Paid and Earned Media

**Project Description** – Develop and implement a statewide paid and earned media plan for the April 2008 RR Mobilization. This effort will educate the public about the dangers and costs of speeding and aggressive driving as well as the Commonwealth’s applicable laws. Primary target audience will be males ages 16 to 34 with secondary audiences of diverse populations as well as residents of western and southeastern Massachusetts.

**Project Staff** – Brook Chipman and Carol Dingle
**Project Budget/Source** – $150,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – SC-08-02

**Project Title** – RR State Police Enforcement Campaign

**Project Description** – Provide funds for overtime enforcement by the Massachusetts State Police to participate in the April 2008 RR Mobilization. Enforcement efforts will focus on speeding and aggressive driving and be done at high-risk times and locations based on the latest available state and local data. Special consideration for funding will be given to communities with higher speed-related crash citation rates weighted by population. In-kind match for all five Mobilizations estimated at $6.75 million.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $180,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – SC-08-03

**Project Title** – RR Local Police and Campus Police Enforcement Campaign

**Project Description** – Provide funds for overtime enforcement grants by approximately 250 local police and campus police departments with M.G.L. Chapter 90 powers to enable participation in April 2008 RR Mobilization. Enforcement efforts will focus on speeding and aggressive driving and be done at high-risk times and locations based on the latest available state and local data. Special consideration for funding will be given to communities with higher speed-related crash citation rates weighted by population. Conduct regional bidders’ conferences and grant orientation meetings to ensure maximum participation and compliance with grant requirements. Utilize Law Enforcement Liaison Program to increase Mobilization participation by local police departments. In-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $400,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – SC-08-04

**Project Title** – Law Enforcement Corridor Projects

**Project Description** – In partnership with MassHighway Department and as part of the Massachusetts Strategic Highway Safety Plan, select engineering, state and local law enforcement, EMS and education communities, develop and implement strategies to address problems at specific lane departure crash locations. Locations to be identified by MassHighway as part of first phase of project initiated during FFY07. Provide limited funding through bid process for select traffic safety countermeasures.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron
Project Budget/Source: $100,000 of Section 402

Project Number - SC-08-05
Project Title – Speed Management Workshop
Project Description – In partnership with MassHighway Department and the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, conduct one train-the-trainer NHTSA-FHWA Speed Management Workshop for state and local law enforcement, highway planners, and engineers.
Project Staff – Caroline Hymoff

Project Budget/Source – $10,000 of Section 402

Project Number - SC-08-06
Project Title – CMVI Training for Court Personnel and Clerk Magistrate Trainings
Project Description – Fund four half-day programs for staff in the District Court and Boston Municipal Court departments focusing on processing CMVIs, preparing abstracts for and communicating with the Registry of Motor Vehicles, regarding topics relevant to their roles in these important cases. Fund two one-day trainings for clerks and assistant clerk magistrates focusing on civil motor vehicle infractions, including a presentation on LIDAR/Radar, impaired driving and/or safety belt issues. In-kind match to be determined.
Project Staff – Caroline Hymoff

Project Budget/Source – $24,000 of Section 402

Project Number - SC-08-07
Project Title – Speed and Aggressive Driving Equipment
Project Description – Fund speed measurement equipment for state, local police and campus police departments to enable them to expand their traffic enforcement involvement in the Road Respect Mobilization. State police in-kind support will be $2.887 million. HSD will request written authorization from NHTSA prior to equipment purchases in accordance with Federal regulations. Speed measurement equipment ranges from tire deflation devices, $3,000 to $4,000 for each LiDAR and Radar Unit to approximately $25,000 for Speed Boards per unit per department. In-kind match to be determined.
Project Staff – Jean Barron

Project Budget/Source – $1,000,000 of Section 402

Project Number - SC-08-08
Project Title – Program Management
Project Description - Provide sufficient staff to conduct speed-related programming described in this plan as well as cover travel and miscellaneous expenses.

Project Staff – Caroline Hymoff, Brook Chipman, Jean Barron, Carol Dingle

Project Budget/Source – $60,800 of Section 402

8.4 BICYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM AREAS

Project Number – PS-08-01
Project Title – Statewide Bicycle Helmet Program

Project Description – Expand the Statewide Bicycle Helmet Distribution program to 400 police and fire departments, service clubs, and community organizations. Distribute bicycle helmet informational cards, helmet pledge cards, helmet law posters, and incentives statewide. Print cards and posters in English as well as in Spanish and Portuguese to address diverse populations.

Project Staff – Darline Duncan

Project Budget/Source – $200,000 of Section 402

Project Number – PS-08-02
Project Title – Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Conference

Project Description – Co-sponsor the Annual Pedestrian and Bicycle Conference with the Executive Office of Transportation, MassHighway, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, and other state partners for 200 attendees representing public health, law enforcement, highway planners, traffic safety advocates, and highway engineers.

Project Staff – Darline Duncan

Project Budget/Source – $1,000 of Section 402

Project Number – PS-08-03
Project Title – Pedestrian Enforcement Education and Equipment Program

Project Description – Based on state and local crash and citation data, award up to 50 grants of up to $10,000 each to local police departments to conduct enforcement and education aimed at reducing the incidences of pedestrian fatalities and injuries. Equipment and materials will include but not be limited to retro-reflective signage, speed measurement equipment, programmable message boards or speed boards. Departments will be required to receive prior authorization for all equipment by HSD and by NHTSA for any single item purchase over $5,000. Special consideration for funding will be given to communities with high-risk populations. Develop and implement supporting
paid and earned media in English as well as in Spanish, and other languages as needed. In-kind match to be determined.

**Project Staff** – Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $500,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – PS-08-04

**Project Title** – Program Management

**Project Description** – Provide sufficient staff to conduct bicycle and pedestrian safety-related programming described in this plan as well as cover travel and miscellaneous expenses.

**Project Staff** – Darline Duncan

**Project Budget/Source** – $22,325 of Section 402

### 8.5 **MOTORCYCLISTS PROGRAM AREA**

**Project Number** – MS-08-01

**Project Title** – Motorcycle Safety Program Enhancements

**Project Description** – Fund enhancements to the Registry of Motor Vehicles’ motorcycle safety program (yet to be determined). Special efforts will be made to recruit first-time riders for training.

**Project Staff** – Carol Dingle

**Project Budget/Source** – $110,000 of Section 2010

**Project Number** – MC-08-02

**Project Title** – Program Management

**Project Description** – Provide funds to cover travel and miscellaneous expenses of staff working on motorcycle-related programming.

**Project Staff** – Carol Dingle

**Project Budget/Source** – $13,500 of Section 2010

### 8.6 **TRAFFIC RECORDS PROGRAM AREA**

**Project Number** – TR-08-01

**Project Title** – Traffic Records Research

**Project Description** – With the assistance of a yet to be identified traffic records contractor, HSD will prepare data and analyses for its FFY 2007 Annual Report
and FFY 2008 Highway Safety Plan. This contractor will aid HSD to respond to research requests on traffic records-related subjects from its staff, Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) members, the media, and other highway safety partners. This contractor will assist HSD to prepare for TRCC approval a FFY 2008 Section 408 Application, including a 2008 update to the Massachusetts Strategic Plan for Traffic Records, by June 2008.

**Project Staff** – Robert Kearney

**Project Budget/Source** – $300,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – TR-08-02

**Project Title** – Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC)

**Project Description** – With the assistance of a yet to be identified traffic records contractor, HSD will provide leadership and administrative support to the Massachusetts TRCC to successfully implement its 2007 update to the Massachusetts Strategic Plan for Traffic Records, in particular the Section 408-funded projects noted below. Hold annually approximately six TRCC meetings as well as sub-committee meetings.

**Project Staff** – Robert Kearney

**Project Budget/Source** – $100,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – TR-08-03

**Project Title** – Massachusetts Traffic Records Portal (MTRP)

**Project Description** – HSD, along with a yet to be identified traffic records contractor, will explore various options for continuing to provide online traffic records data and analysis as it has done recently through its Massachusetts Traffic Records Portal. The lead option at this time is to explore the next generation of this portal.

**Project Staff** – Robert Kearney

**Project Budget/Source** – $300,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – TR-08-04

**Project Title** – Fatal Analysis Reporting System (FARS)

**Project Description** – Provide NHTSA with required fatal crash data for FARS and FastFARS through Registry of Motor Vehicles position.

**Project Staff** – Robert Kearney

**Project Budget/Source** – $75,000 of Section 402
Project Number – TR-08-05

Project Title – FFY 2006 Section 408 Project #1 – Outreach to State and Local Police

Project Description – Through December 31, 2007, with the assistance of the HSD, Registry of Motor Vehicles (RMV), and MassHighway, the University of Massachusetts will finalize a report on the results of a paper and e-survey sent to state and local police in the summer of 2007. This survey sought information from law enforcement on the best ways to improve the quality and quantity of crash reporting, especially by e-reporting. This project also involves the production and distribution of a paper and on-line manual by December 2007 to help state and local police better complete and submit crash reports. This part of the project will be handled by the HSD with technical assistance from the RMV and MassHighway.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – Balance of $95,000 from FFY 2006 Section 408

Project Number – TR-08-06

Project Title – FFY 2006 Section 408 Project #2 – Year One of Massachusetts Ambulance Trip Record Information System (MARTIS) and Statewide Trauma Registry

Project Description – By March 31, 2008, the Massachusetts Department of Public Health and the Division of Healthcare Finance and Policy will complete the pilot test of the Statewide Trauma Registry as well as build MARTIS.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – Balance of $350,000 of FFY 2006 Section 408

Project Number – TR-08-07

Project Title – FFY 2006 Section 408 Project #3 – Year One of Increase Electronic Submission for Crash Data System (CDS)

Project Description – Through December 31, 2007, the Registry of Motor Vehicles will continue to increase the e-submission of crash reports by approximately 200 local law enforcement agencies using the same records management software vendor, IMC. The RMV also will fix technical problems with the CDS that hinder access to e-submitted crash reports with errors as well as allow for editing by RMV staff of such reports prior to full entry into the CDS.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – Balance of $187,736 from FFY 2006 Section 408
Project Number – TR-08-08

Project Title – FFY 2007 Section 408 Project #1 – Year Two of Increase Electronic Submission for CDS

Project Description – RMV plans to continue its E-Submission for CDS project that began funding under FFY 2006 Section 408. Year Two of this project continues with rolling out e-submission software to local law enforcement agencies throughout Massachusetts as well as further enhancing the current crash data system. New additions to the project for Year Two include developing “middleware” software and protocols that will enhance the storage ability and retrieval possibilities for data submitted to the CDS; and creating a website with the capability to allow end-users to access crash data via the Internet.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – $360,680.68 is the requested funding amount for Year Two of the E-Submission for CDS project

Project Number – TR-08-09

Project Title – FFY 2007 Section 408 Project #2 – Year Two of MARTIS and Statewide Trauma Registry

Project Description – Massachusetts Department of Public Health will deploy statewide the Statewide Trauma Registry as well as pilot test and deploy statewide MARTIS. Acquire and provide related training for portable data collection units for up to five EMS regions. Test linking capabilities of Trauma Registry and police-submitted crash report data.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – $506,500 has been requested by DPH to fund Year Two of the Statewide Trauma Registry/MATRIS project

Project Number – TR-08-10

Project Title – FFY 2007 Section 408 Project #3 – Year Two of Police Training on Crash Reporting

Project Description – University of Massachusetts will develop and pilot test an on-line training for state and local police to enhance the quality of the crash reports they submit to RMV.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – $67,791 has been requested by UMass to fund Year Two of the Police Training on Crash Reporting project
Project Number – TR-08-11

Project Title – FFY 2007 Section 408 Project #4 – Expansion of Roadway Inventory Data

Project Description – Support Executive Office of Transportation to hire a state-approved GIS Specialist to oversee addition of archived traffic volume data into its Road Inventory Database Model.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – $80,640 has been requested by the EOT to fund the Roadway Inventory Data project.

Project Number – TR-08-12

Project Title – FFY 2007 Section 408 Project #6 – Develop Plan for E-Citation System

Project Description – Enable Massachusetts Merit Rating Board to hire a consultant to develop a business plan for developing an e-citation system.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney

Project Budget/Source – $180,000 has been requested by MRB to fund the E-Citation System project.

Project Number – TR-08-13

Project Title – Program Management

Project Description – Provide sufficient staff to conduct traffic records-related programming described in this plan as well as cover travel and miscellaneous expenses.

Project Staff – Robert Kearney and Sheila Burgess-Hill

Project Budget/Source – $91,000 of Section 402
8.7 **POLICE TRAFFIC SERVICES PROGRAM AREA**

**Project Number – PT-08-01**

**Project Title** – Massachusetts Law Enforcement Challenge (MLEC)

**Project Description** – Conduct the Fourth Annual Massachusetts Law Enforcement Challenge, in cooperation with the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association and the Law Enforcement Liaison Program. The Challenge provides an opportunity for state and local law enforcement agencies to showcase traffic safety programs. All entries are submitted to the International Association of Chiefs of Police Association program for national recognition. Conduct award ceremony for all participants and recognize traffic safety accomplishments conducted during calendar year 2007.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $40,000 of Section 402

**Project Number – PT-08-02**

**Project Title** – Law Enforcement Liaison Program

**Project Description** – Fund services of Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) and program costs to assist with Highway Safety Division’s efforts to conduct traffic enforcement and safety initiatives, and provide technical assistance with Massachusetts municipal police agencies.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $100,000 of Section 402

**Project Number – PT-08-03**

**Project Title** – Law Enforcement Conference

**Project Description** – Conduct a one-day statewide law enforcement conference for up to 500 attendees aimed at increasing participation and support for CIOT, DD-OL-UA, and RR Mobilizations and other HSD initiatives.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $40,000 of Section 402

**Project Number – PT-08-04**

**Project Title** – Anti-Racial Profiling Program

**Project Description** – Through contractors, continue efforts established in year one of Section 1906 funding. Support initiatives including, but not limited to, data collection and analysis, public information and outreach, program
management, program development, training law enforcement professionals regarding the problem of racial profiling.

**Project Staff** – Caroline Hymoff

**Project Budget/Source** – Carry-forward FFY07 funds estimated at $600,000; additional FFY07 Section 1906 funds estimated at $643,000.

**Project Number** – PT-08-05

**Project Title** – Local Police Training

**Project Description** – Conduct specialized training for local police in Accident Investigation and Accident Reconstruction through the Massachusetts Municipal Police Training Committee (MMPTC). Conduct specialized training in classroom or distance learning for local police in Speed Measurement. Conduct new FHWA Work Zone Safety Trainings and NHTSA Traffic Safety Strategies Trainings for law enforcement.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $34,000 of Section 402 for Crash Investigation/Reconstruction; $4,800 of Section 402 for Speed Measurement Training; $4,240 of Section 402 for Law Enforcement Work Zone Safety; $4,240 for NHTSA Traffic Safety Strategies Training

**Project Number** – PT-08-06

**Project Title** – Law Enforcement Technical Assistance

**Project Description** – Through contracted services, strengthen working relationship with municipal police departments in the areas of highway safety, trainings, data collection, traffic records, and surveys.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron

**Project Budget/Source** – $25,000 of Section 402

**Project Number** – PT-08-07

**Project Title** – Program Management

**Project Description** – Provide sufficient staff to conduct police traffic services-related programming described in this plan as well as cover travel, conference fees and miscellaneous expenses.

**Project Staff** – Jean Barron and Caroline Hymoff

**Project Budget/Source** – $65,000 of Sections 402 and 1906
8.8 **TRAFFIC ENGINEERING SERVICES PROGRAM AREA**

**Project Number** – HE-08-01

**Project Title** – Hazard Elimination

**Project Description** – Provide funds allocated by the U.S. Department of Transportation to MassHighway for statewide hazard elimination and safety improvement projects.

**Project Staff** – Caroline Hymoff

**Project Budget/Source** – $13,000,000 of Section 164

8.9 **PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION**

**Project Number** – PA-08-01

**Project Title** – Administration of Statewide Traffic Safety Program

**Project Description** – Plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate programs and projects for the FFY 2008 Highway Safety Plan (HSP). Provide required staff salaries, professional development, travel funds, office space, equipment, materials, and fiscal support. Produce FFY 2007 Annual Report and FFY 2008 HSP.

**Project Staff** – Sheila Burgess-Hill, Susan Burgess-Chin, Denise Veiga, and selected support staff

**Project Budget/Source** – $310,000 of Sections 402, 164, 410
9.0 Certifications

9.1 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:

- 49 CFR Part 18 – Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments;
- 23 CFR Chapter II – (§§1200, 1205, 1206, 1250, 1251, and 1252) Regulations governing highway safety programs;
- NHTSA Order 462-6C – Matching Rates for State and Community Highway Safety Programs; and
- 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; and
- 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 currently are 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 (42U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; f) the comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse of alcoholism; g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

**The Drug-free Workplace Act of 1988 (49 CFR Part 29 Sub-part F):**

The State will provide a drug-free workplace by:

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; and
   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; and

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 10 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; and

      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.

**RESTRICSON 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 it will include the clause titled “Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion – Lower Tier Covered Transaction,” without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions. (See below.)

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 2008 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).

Kevin M. Burke, Secretary, Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety and Security & Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety

August 30, 2007
Date
DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE ACT CERTIFICATION

1. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts certifies on behalf of all state agencies that apply for Federal grants that it will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

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

   (b) Establishing an ongoing 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; and

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

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

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

       (1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

       (2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than 5 calendar days after such conviction;

   (e) Notifying the Federal sponsoring agency in writing, within ten calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d) 2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such
conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to every grant office or other designee on whose grant activity the convicted employee was working, unless the Federal agency has designated a central point for the receipt of such notices. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions within 30 calendar 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, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employees to participate satisfactory in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by the Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

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

2. State agencies applying for Federal grants will identify workplaces at the time of application.

Martin Benison, Comptroller

Federal fiscal year 2007
Dated: October 2, 2006
## 10.0 Highway Safety Plan Cost Summary

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

State: Massachusetts

Highway Safety Plan Cost Summary

2008-HSP-1

For Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Approved Program Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Previous Balance</th>
<th>Increase/(Decrease)</th>
<th>Current Balance</th>
<th>Share to Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA 402</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Administration</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Administration Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$101,770.00</td>
<td>$101,770.00</td>
<td>$76,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$101,770.00</td>
<td>$101,770.00</td>
<td>$76,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$84,163.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$2,549,452.00</td>
<td>$2,549,452.00</td>
<td>$2,010,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$84,163.00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$2,549,452.00</td>
<td>$2,549,452.00</td>
<td>$2,010,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$723,325.00</td>
<td>$723,325.00</td>
<td>$701,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$723,325.00</td>
<td>$723,325.00</td>
<td>$701,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Traffic Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$00</td>
<td>$282,280.00</td>
<td>$282,280.00</td>
<td>$205,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Prior Approved Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Traffic Services Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$282,280.00</td>
<td>$282,280.00</td>
<td>$205,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Records</td>
<td>TR-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$791,000.00</td>
<td>$791,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Records Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$791,000.00</td>
<td>$791,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Control</td>
<td>SC-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,350,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,774,800.00</td>
<td>$1,774,800.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Control Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,350,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,774,800.00</td>
<td>$1,774,800.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Advertising</td>
<td>PM-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Advertising Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA 402 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,634,163.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,872,627.00</td>
<td>$6,872,627.00</td>
<td>$3,992,320.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 OP SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>K2-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,700,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$485,380.00</td>
<td>$485,380.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Occupant Protection Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,700,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$485,380.00</td>
<td>$485,380.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Paid Media</td>
<td>K2PM-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Paid Media Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 OP SAFETEA-LU Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,700,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$785,380.00</td>
<td>$785,380.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Data Program SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>K9-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$366,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,828,348.00</td>
<td>$1,828,348.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Data Program Incentive Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$366,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,828,348.00</td>
<td>$1,828,348.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Data Program SAFETEA-LU Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$366,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,828,348.00</td>
<td>$1,828,348.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Alcohol SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>K8-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,140,492.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,795,489.00</td>
<td>$3,795,489.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</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>$3,140,492.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,795,489.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,795,489.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Alcohol Planning and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8PA-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Alcohol Planning and Administration Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Alcohol SAFETEA-LU Paid Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8PM-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$575,000.00</td>
<td>$575,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Alcohol SAFETEA-LU Paid Media Total</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$171,845.00</td>
<td>$171,845.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Motorcycle Safety Incentive Total</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 Prohibit Racial Profiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K10-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$378,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,887,226.00</td>
<td>$1,887,226.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 Prohibit Racial Profiling Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Transfer Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164AL-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,106,650.00</td>
<td>$2,106,650.00</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Alcohol Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Paid Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164PM-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$575,000.00</td>
<td>$575,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Paid Media Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Hazard Elimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164HE-2008-00-00-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,000,000.00</td>
<td>$13,000,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Hazard Elimination Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Prior Approved Program Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
<td>Share to Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Transfer Funds Total</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$15,681,650.00</td>
<td>$15,681,650.00</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA Total</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$8,273,655.00</td>
<td>$31,652,565.00</td>
<td>$31,652,565.00</td>
<td>$5,192,320.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$8,273,655.00</td>
<td>$31,652,565.00</td>
<td>$31,652,565.00</td>
<td>$5,192,320.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>