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HIGHWAY SAFETY PLANNING PROCESS

Mission
The Nevada Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) provides funding and expertise, creates partnerships and promotes education to reduce traffic deaths and injuries on Nevada roadways.

Highway Safety Plan
Nevada's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) is a statewide, comprehensive safety plan that provides a coordinated framework for reducing fatalities and serious injuries on all Nevada public roads. The SHSP strategically establishes statewide goals and Critical Emphasis Areas (CEA) developed in consultation with federal, state, local, and private sector safety stakeholders.

Nevada, under the leadership of Nevada Departments of Transportation and Public Safety, completed development of its first SHSP in 2006 and updated the plan in 2011 (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). A broad range of agencies and other organizations actively participated in the process through the leadership of the Nevada Executive Committee on Traffic Safety (NECTS) and the plan's Technical Working Group (TWG).
CEA teams conducted several activities including a review of team membership and identification of the strategies and action steps to help them achieve the measurable objectives within interim goals for the SHSP. Several resources were used in the update process including the following:

- Data showing the reduction for each CEA based on the interim goals that will help Nevada reduce fatalities and serious injuries by half by 2030
- Current CEA strategies and action steps
- Recommended strategies from the Roadshow participants
- Current tracking tools of action steps
- Local partner recommendations from Roadshows*
- Proven strategies and countermeasures (i.e., Countermeasures that Work, 2013)

The process involved a careful review of the data that resulted in the identification of five key emphasis areas:

*Nevada Department of Public Safety-Office of Traffic Safety (DPS-OTS) and NDOT jointly participate in annual Roadshows across the state, where SHSP strategies and projects are discussed with local communities to seek input on targets, chosen strategies, and what continuing efforts are needed and considered. These workshops also seek new partnerships in implementing the overall plan.

**DATA ANALYSIS, PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND SETTING TARGETS**

**Data Analysis**

Nevada's Annual Highway Safety Plan is driven by the same state and local crash data to ensure that the recommended improvement strategies and grant funded projects are directly linked to the factors contributing to the high frequency of fatal and life-changing injury crashes. The ability to access reliable, timely, and accurate data helps increase the overall effectiveness of the plan and increases the probability of directing resources to strategies that will prevent the most crashes and assist in identifying locations with the greatest need. Nevada collected data from a variety of sources as a prelude to the Highway Safety Plan, including:

- Fatality Analysis Reporting System, General Estimates System, 2011 Data (FARS)
- Nevada DOT Annual Crash Summary (NDOT)
- Nevada Citation and Accident Tracking System (NCATS)
- Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles
- Occupant Protection Observational Survey Reports
- University of Nevada Las Vegas – Transportation Research Center (TRC)
- NHTSA and NCSA Traffic Safety Fact Sheets
- Emergency Medical Systems NEEDS / NEMSIS
- State Demographer Reports
- University Medical Center – School of Medicine Trauma Records from Motor Vehicle Crashes – TREND newsletter
- "Nevada Problem Analysis, 2006-2010," TransAnalytics, LLC, Task 5.4, SAIC, NHTSA Region 8 Office
- NHTSA Program Uniform Guidelines
### Highway Safety Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities (Actual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>395</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate /100 million VMT</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Fatalities Involving Driver or Motorcycle Operator w/ &gt; .08 BAC</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Speeding-Related Fatalities</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Motorcyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Unhelmeted Motorcyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Drivers Age 20 or Younger Involved in Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Observed Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles - Front Seat Outboard Occupants</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Seat Belt Citations Issued During Grant-Funded Enforcement Activities</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>6,762</td>
<td>3,692</td>
<td>5,463</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Impaired Driving Arrests Made During Grant-Funded Enforcement Activities</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Speeding Citations Issued During Grant-Funded Enforcement Activities</td>
<td>7,752</td>
<td>15,345</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>16,612</td>
<td>14,563</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non-imputed*
Demographics

The majority of Nevada’s population (96 percent) is located within 70 miles of two metropolitan areas: Las Vegas on I-15, 40 miles from the California border; and Reno, 450 miles to the north and just 10 miles from the California border on I-80. Much of this population experiences commute times of over an hour.

The remaining balance of Nevada (roughly 300 miles by 500 miles) is rural with less than four percent of the population. Eighty-five percent of Nevada’s geography is under federal control.

The majority of traffic crashes in Nevada occur in the two urban areas, which experience the typical problems of any metropolitan area. Even without the extraordinary growth rates of the previous 18 years, the current rate of maintenance on infrastructure still does not meet the need. The rural areas of the state present a particular problem as they encompass 73 percent of the geographical area but with only four percent of the population.

When reviewing this data, the Office of Traffic Safety classifies Clark County as an urban county, (98 percent of Clark County’s population is in the greater Las Vegas Metropolitan Area). Washoe, Carson City, Lyon, and Douglas Counties are also considered as urban in character (population over 50,000). Storey and Churchill counties in the Reno area and a small corner of Nye County in the Las Vegas area are within the 70-mile zone and are also growing. This subset of rural counties has evolved into “bedroom” communities for the urban areas and has significantly increased the commuter traffic on the predominately two-lane roads and highways. The balance of the state is classified as rural/frontier. State Highway 50, that runs from California/Lake Tahoe east to Utah is famously known as “The Loneliest Highway in America.” In fact, Stephen King wrote a book based on a drive he experienced on Highway 50.

Fatalities

An upward trend in both fatalities and population growth continued from 2004 to 2006, with the highest recorded year for motor vehicle fatalities in 2006 (432). In 2007, however, the fatalities began decreasing even with continued population growth; between 2000 and 2007, the population in Las Vegas grew by more than 5,000 people per month with more than 3,000 new vehicles added to the infrastructure and roadways. 2006 was also the year that the state’s first SHSP was implemented. In 2008 the growth decreased dramatically and 2009 to 2011 became relatively stable with a slightly lower population.

Fatalities decreased 44 percent from 2006 (its highest recorded year) to 2009 (its lowest recorded year) in a short four-year period. For calendar year (CY) 2010, fatalities increased six percent (257) and through CY 2011 the fatalities decreased to 246. CY 2012 increased again with 258 fatalities for an overall increase of one percent since the 2009 record.

The majority of the fatality decreases have been in the Motor Vehicle Occupant category with motorcyclist and bicyclist types also trending down; however, with relatively small numbers, these three categories are subject to large percentage swings from year to year. Pedestrian deaths increased in 2012 (primarily in urban Clark County) with a significant spike in early 2013; additional resources are being committed to that program to improve pedestrian safety in Nevada; the current year-to-date numbers are now even with 2012.

Nevada has made progress in reducing the number of impaired fatalities. In 2006, Nevada qualified as a “high rate” state and received additional 410 funding to combat the problem; projects funded with 410 were proven countermeasures of high visibility enforcement and education, resulting in Nevada qualifying for the base 410 funding as a “low rate” state based on 2009 and 2010 data.
The Nevada fatality rate per 100,000 in the population reveals a more accurate perspective of the crash rates, as any increase or decrease in the state’s small numbers can exhibit a volatile percentage swing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Motor Vehicle</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicyclists</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population figures from Nevada State Demographer website
2012 Data is State FARS Data to date
*Non-imputed
Strategies and projects selected in the Highway Safety Plan are based on:
1. The analysis of Nevada highway safety information system data
2. Applicant's effectiveness or ability to improve the identified problem
3. DPS-OTS program assessments and management reviews conducted by NHTSA
4. Nevada's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)
5. Various partner efforts by the Department of Health and Human Services, Statewide Community Coalitions (Impaired Driving is a specific emphasis area), Traffic Records Coordinating Committee, Attorney General's Substance Abuse Work Group (Impaired Driving subcommittee), NHP Major Accident Investigation Team (MAIT), statewide law enforcement agencies, and other public and non-profit organizations.

OTS also develops statewide strategies and countermeasures in cooperation with other state, local, and non-profit agencies that partner on the SHSP. Local strategies and projects are developed by working with agencies and organizations that have expressed an interest in implementing a safety project in their community or area of responsibility (see Funding Strategy, page 7). Negotiations are conducted, when needed, to develop specifically targeted objectives and to ensure that budgets are appropriate for the work to be performed. Key stakeholders include but are not limited to:

- The motoring public
- Attorney General Substance Abuse Work Group
- Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles
- Safe Kids and other CPS Advocate Groups
- The citizens of Nevada
- Nevada Sheriffs and Chiefs Association
- Nevada Department of Transportation
- University of Nevada (Reno & Las Vegas)
- DPS – Nevada Highway Patrol
- Regional Transportation Commissions (MPO)
- Nevada Child Death Review Board
- Health, Child and Family Services (EUDL)
- Nevada Department of Health & Human Services
- Nevada Committee on Testing for Intoxication
- Office of Emergency Medical Systems
- UNLV – Transportation Research Center
- Northern Nevada DUI Taskforce
- Traffic Records Coordinating Committee
- STOP DUI
- Nevada Department of Education
- Nevada Administrative Office of the Courts
- Southern Nevada Injury Prevention Task Force

The Goal Setting Process

The highway safety planning process is circular and continuous. For example, at any one point in time, OTS may be working on previous, current, and upcoming fiscal year plans. In addition, due to a variety of intervening and often unpredictable factors at both the federal and state level, the planning process may be interrupted by unforeseen events and mandates.

The planning process diagram and chart on the next page visually capture the steps in the planning process: identifying problems, setting goals, choosing performance measures, and selecting projects. They illustrate the circular nature of the highway safety planning processes as well as the workflow.
**Funding Strategy**

The Nevada Department of Public Safety – Office of Traffic Safety (DPS-OTS) annually awards federal funds to state, local, and non-profit organizations desiring to partner in solving identified traffic safety problems. Funds awarded are strictly for use in reducing deaths and serious injuries caused by motor vehicle crashes through the implementation of programs or strategies that address driver behavior in the top three priority areas. These program areas, in alignment with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), are:

- Impaired Driving
- Occupant Protection
- Pedestrian Safety

Federal grant funds are also awarded in six other program areas:

- Traffic Records
- Distracted Driving
- Youth Driving
- Speed
- Motorcycle Safety
- Child Safety
In a perfect world, the state would receive enough grant award amounts, combined with state resources, to effectively address all traffic safety issues. As this is not the case, however, the following must also be considered when making decisions on which projects to fund, and at what level, to have a positive effect on the problem:

- Current state economy:
  - Local economies are down, affecting local agency budgets
  - Reduction in Law Enforcement Agency personnel, budgets, and other resources
  - Foreclosure rate
  - Unemployment rate
  - Gas prices (affect on VMT)
- Unknown funding levels for MAP-21 awards
- Deadlines and limitations for expending award fund balances
Countermeasures and Project Selection
Project selection begins with organizations submitting a Request for Funds (RFF), or grant proposal, for the coming year to DPS-OTS for projects that address at least one of the critical program areas and/or support strategies found in Nevada’s SHSP, and as identified in the RFF. Criteria used to select projects include:

- Is the project and supporting data relevant to the applicants jurisdiction or area of influence?
- Is the problem adequately identified?
- Is the problem identification supported by accurate and relevant (local) data?
- Is there evidence that this type of project saves lives and reduces serious crashes?
- Are the goals and objectives realistic and achievable?
- Is this project cost effective?
- Is the evaluation plan sound? (Is the performance/progress measurable?)
- Is there a realistic plan for self-sustainability (if applicable)?
- Does it use proven countermeasures (such as those discussed in Countermeasures that Work)?

Once proposals are submitted, OTS and a Peer Review Committee review and score all grant applications received and prioritize them for award. The most promising project proposals are accepted, as funding levels permit, and are noted in this Highway Safety Plan under the Performance Measure they address.

Monitoring and Technical Assistance
Projects awarded to state, local, and non-profit agencies are monitored to ensure work is performed in a timely fashion and in accordance with the Project Agreement, or grant contract. Monitoring is accomplished by observing work in progress, examining products and deliverables, reviewing activity reports, facilitating desk correspondence, and conducting on-site visits.

In addition to monitoring projects and programs, OTS program managers provide technical assistance to grantee project directors on an as-needed basis. Assistance includes providing and analyzing data, purchasing and helping with fiscal management, providing report feedback, and giving tips for project management.

Annual Report
After the end of the grant year, each project is required to submit a final report detailing the successes and challenges of the project during the year. This information is used to evaluate future projects and to substantiate the efforts of the OTS in reducing fatal crashes and serious injuries.
NUMBER OF NEVADA TRAFFIC FATALITIES

Justification for Performance Target
Fatality data for 2007 to 2011 was charted to visualize trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number of fatalities, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. Because the highest recorded number of fatalities occurred in Nevada in 2006 (431), and sharply dropped to its lowest recorded number in 2009 (243, -44%), utilizing more than the most recent three years of data would skew the results. Annual and five-year moving average trends indicated targets between 199 and 231 which are unrealistic for achievement in one year’s time from 258 in 2012, and in consideration of fatality numbers to date in 2013. With the slow but steady improvement in the economy, unemployment rates, and VMT, the more realistic performance target of 254 was chosen from CYs 2010 to 2012 data with the trend line being relatively flat. The 2012 fatality number of 258 is from state FARS data as the 2012 FARS Report is not yet final.

FY 2014 Target
Decrease traffic fatalities by seven percent, from the 2009 to 2011 average of 275, to 254 by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2007 and 2011 there were 1,443 fatalities on Nevada’s roadways. In 2012, there were 258 fatalities.
**Who:** Of the 1,433 fatalities, 563 occurred in rural areas and 875 occurred in urban areas. The fatalities also include:

- Passenger vehicle occupant fatalities (all seat positions) 897
  - Restrained 410
  - Unrestrained 430
  - Unknown 57
- Alcohol impaired driving fatalities (BAC = .08+) 432
- Speeding-related fatalities 441
- Motorcycle fatalities 241
  - Helmeted 201
  - Unhelmeted 39
  - Unknown 1
- Drivers involved in fatal crashes 1968
  - Aged under 15 2
  - Aged 15–20 201
  - Aged under 21 203
  - Aged 21 and over 1,728
  - Unknown age 37
- Pedestrian fatalities 225

**Where:** The highest fatality rate of any category was lane departures with 513 fatalities. Intersection crashes were the second highest with 397 fatalities.

The top four counties with the most crashes in 2010 were:

- Clark County: 78.9 percent
- Washoe County: 12.1 percent
- Elko County: 1.8 percent
- Carson City: 1.6 percent

Clark County led the State in fatalities (57.4 percent), injuries (82 percent), and property damage (77.2 percent).

Washoe County experienced the next highest numbers with 2.1 percent fatal crashes, 11.1 percent injury crashes, and 12.6 percent property damage crashes.

Between 2007 and 2011 more than 57 percent of the lane departure fatalities and serious injuries occurred in Clark County. Nearly 56 percent of these fatalities and serious injuries occurred on urban roadways. Between 2007 and 2011, 76 percent of intersection-related fatalities and serious injuries occurred in Clark County.

In 2010 and 2011, 44 percent of the pedestrian fatalities and injuries occurred midblock in a roadway and 25 percent on marked crosswalks (NDOT crash data).
When: From 2008 to 2010, the 4th of July weekend has had the highest fatality rate of any holiday period with a three-year total of 13 fatalities. Thanksgiving Day has been the second highest with seven fatalities, and Martin Luther King Day, Presidents Day, and Veterans Day followed with six fatalities over a three-year period. The highest number of unbelted fatalities and serious injuries occurred Friday through Sunday. Weekends prove to be the most dangerous time for impaired driving fatalities and serious injuries (NDOT data).

Why: The top three crash types in fatal crashes are non-collision, angle, and rear-end. Contributing factors to these fatal crashes include failure to keep in a proper lane, failure to yield, and driving too fast for conditions. Other contributing factors include drinking, falling asleep/fatigued, drugs, and other unsafe driving behaviors like distracted driving.

Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses proven national strategies to reduce motor vehicle fatalities and serious injuries, like High Visibility Enforcement efforts. Other cost-effective strategies used are documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Countermeasures That Work publication; the Nevada projects detailed under Performance Measure – 1 will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
Chapter 1 – Alcohol Impaired and Drugged Driving
Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
Chapter 3 – Aggressive Driving and Speeding
Chapter 4 – Distracted and Drowsy Driving
Chapter 5 – Motorcycle Safety
Chapter 6 – Young Drivers
Chapter 8 – Pedestrians

The potential effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the Countermeasures That Work publication and the reader should reference it for specifics on Nevada’s selected strategies.

Performance Goals
- Promote multi-jurisdictional enforcement of Nevada safety belt, DUI, distracted driving, pedestrian, and speeding laws.
- Reduce motor vehicle crash injuries and fatalities through public education and enforcement by seven percent, from the 2009 to 2011 average of 275, to 254 by December 31, 2014.
- Increase the number of seat belt and child seat citations issued during highly visible enforcement events from 5,757 in 2011 to 6,100 in 2014.
- Increase the number of speed citations issued during highly visible enforcement events from 14,863 in 2011 to 16,000 in 2014.
- Increase the number of DUI arrests made during highly visible enforcement events from 1,334 in 2011 to 1,500 in 2014.
- Reduce the number of pedestrian injuries and fatalities from 47 in 2011 to 41 in 2014.
- Reduce the number of distracted driving crashes and fatalities.
- Decrease the total fatalities per 100m VMT from 1.16 in 2009 to 1.00 in 2014.
Strategies

- Conduct a statewide, sustained, multi-jurisdictional law enforcement program that includes highly-visible enforcement events on safety belts, alcohol, speed, distracted driving, and pedestrian safety (Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy).
- Enhance the ability of law enforcement to conduct public education through localized programs and provide equipment, training, and/or overtime.
- Provide incentives and awards to honor top law enforcement agencies and individual officers within the State.
- Fund public information and paid and earned media endeavors to support safety belt, alcohol, distracted driving, speed, and pedestrian enforcement events.

Funding Source

Related Projects


**Funding Sources/Amounts: $187,500 (405 (d)) Distracted Driving**

Joining Forces, a multi-jurisdictional traffic enforcement program, has been successful in conducting enforcement events for various critical emphasis areas within the SHSP, including seat belt usage, impaired driving, speeding, pedestrian safety, intersections, and distracted driving. In FY 2013, 28 of Nevada's 36 law enforcement agencies participated in Joining Forces. With the recent passage of Nevada's cell phone law, Joining Forces included an emphasis on distracted driving.

Utilizing crash data and local agency knowledge of “hot spots” to identify high incident locations, OTS engages and funds Nevada law enforcement agencies to conduct high visibility enforcement events throughout the state. Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP), saturation patrols or checkpoint activity locations are based on the number and severity of local crashes or violations during the past 12 months, common types of violations leading to crashes, days of the week and times of day that crashes occur, as well as other pertinent data such as types of vehicles involved, driver ages, and seat belt usage.

Each year’s enforcement calendar is pre-planned by the agencies and OTS concurrently at annual regional workshops, or one statewide group as a whole. At least one campaign per month focuses on the concurrent national campaign, and/or one specific to Nevada's identified priority problem areas in tandem with an SHSP critical emphasis area.

The annual HVE plan includes between 11 and 15 events for the fiscal year based on funding and priorities. The plan is kept as flexible as possible to allow for additional events that may be needed that were not originally scheduled in the Joining Forces enforcement calendar. For instance, pedestrian fatalities spiked early in CY 2013, and urban law enforcement agencies asked for either more overtime
funding, or to switch funding from other enforcement events to address the pedestrian safety issue. As of June 19, 2013, pedestrian fatality numbers are down ten percent from the same time in 2012. At a minimum, quarterly meetings are held by OTS and participating agencies to accommodate any requested adjustments, provide data updates, and assist the agency coordinators with any administrative issues.

Each enforcement event runs concurrently with pertinent paid and earned media messaging. The SHSP Strategic Communications Alliance keeps partners up-to-date on current campaign talking points, creative and logo work, sample press releases, and other communication needs so that regardless of the type of media being put out or by whom, they all have a cohesive message under the ‘Zero Fatalities’ program umbrella. For example, during May’s national Click it or Ticket campaign (COIT), all SHSP partners provide education on seat belt safety and use the CIOT tag line for messaging.

The program also provides funding for an annual recognition event for agencies participating in the Joining Forces program. Costs include facilities, working meals, training sessions, business needs, lodging, travel, audio/visual services, and similar needs. Promotional, incentive, and educational materials are also provided to participating agencies.

See this project under additional Performance Measures 4, 5, 6, and 10 for additional funding sources/priority areas.


**Funding Source: $231,963 Distracted Driving (NDOT 21)**

The goal for Marketing and Media in Nevada is to educate the public, including pedestrians, and motorcyclists on safe driving behaviors. OTS will develop and publish behavior-altering public traffic safety announcements and messaging that address many critical safety areas in an effort to establish a downward trend in fatalities and serious injuries on Nevada’s roadways. All campaigns are part of and support the state’s ‘Zero Fatalities’ mission. Messaging is designed to educate the public and reduce serious injuries and fatalities in Nevada.

Each media campaign focuses on the specific goals of an individual program. Campaigns will use a mix of media channels such as TV, radio, online and social media, cinema, outdoor media, outreach, and educational materials as appropriate per campaign and target audience. These impactful safety messages will air in the media in tandem with Nevada’s 2014 Joining Forces high visibility enforcement events. OTS also partners with Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) partners and other traffic safety advocates to fill the media with educational, life-changing, and effective traffic safety messages.

See this project under additional performance measures 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10 for additional funding sources/priority areas.
Funding Source: 21
OTS will create an online dashboard to allow program managers and executive teams to have up-to-date information on hand when decisions need to be made. This dashboard will house a number of possible pieces of information such as injury / fatality reports, media placements, campaign creative, performance metrics, earned media reports and special projects reports, public outreach reports, data analysis, and potentially even campaign and program budgets. This will facilitate internal communications and program performance reporting.

Funding Source: 21 funding support for TSRP
Personal communication and one-on-one public education plays an integral role in influencing people to change driving behaviors and adopt safer roadway habits. When attending an event, OTS is well prepared with a specific contact, collateral, and conversation strategy catered to each of these events.

OTS plans to grow its outreach efforts in many areas this year, including business safety training, consistent school and driver education presentations, safety seminars, and other community network partnerships as they present themselves.

OTS also plans to expand its outreach efforts to take advantage of more earned value, added value, and bonus media opportunities this year. Media partners are very committed to traffic safety and are personally engaged in furthering the impact of campaigns. By proactively coordinating media outreach events, Nevada will see a much greater amount of exposure in the media in tandem with paid campaigns.

Along with engaging in public safety education at community and media partner events, OTS would also like to plan and organize two safety-themed community events in CY 2014. The goal of these events will be to rally the community around a common safety message and to engage local partners in the cause at a deeper level.

OTS will work with its communications agency to plan and prepare the Highway Safety Plan for next year and will continue to develop its annual program strategies and assure that each program is tracking back to specific approved performance measures.

Funding Source: 402
The Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) program is a collaboration between the Nevada Highway Patrol and DPS-OTS. The program promotes traffic safety priorities through the state’s highway safety programs addressing occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian safety, distracted driving, and speed management.

The LEL serves as a liaison between DPS-OTS and Law Enforcement agencies statewide to promote safety belt and alcohol mobilizations and best practice strategies, and works with police departments to determine gaps in funding needs. The LEL also utilizes available crash data to encourage jurisdictions with disproportionate numbers of crashes to submit proposals, and helps DPS-OTS with grant applications, proposal development and submittals. The LEL also works with DPS-OTS staff and local law enforcement to facilitate media events and press releases and coordinate multi-jurisdictional high visibility enforcement
efforts and trainings. The LEL will assist in developing Task Forces for impaired driving, seat belts, pedestrian safety, etc. and also keep law enforcement abreast of new laws and changes to existing traffic laws.

The LEL is in its infancy with the state of Nevada, as Nevada has not had one for several years. The program will grow with time and may include a Senior LEL and an Assistant LEL. Both will provide the necessary resources to ensure high visibility. The LEL is encouraged to participate in DUI, seat belt, and over time shifts with local agencies, and oversees DUI Checkpoint programs. LELs help program management and may even manage programs.

**Funding Source: 21**
The Nevada Office of Traffic Safety will manage the fiscal resources necessary to provide staff time and operational needs of OTS that relate directly to planning, developing, coordinating, conducting, monitoring, evaluating, and auditing all projects within all traffic safety program areas. This project provides funds for direct coordination and direct costs incurred for the biennial SHSP Awards ceremony, which recognizes those individuals and/or agencies that went “above and beyond” for FY 2013 projects and events.

**TS-2014-NV OTS 00173 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – Program Management (All Programs)**
**Funding Source: 402, 405, 410, 2010, 406, 21**
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.

See this project under additional performance measures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 for additional funding sources/priority areas

**Funding Source: 402, 410, 406, 154**
The Nevada Office of Traffic Safety will utilize necessary fiscal resources to provide for the staff time and operational costs incurred by OTS that relate directly to planning, developing, coordinating, monitoring, evaluating, and auditing of all projects within all the traffic safety program areas. This grant project provides funds for HSP coordination and direct costs incurred by OTS staff that relate to the administration of grant projects in all programs, including Impaired Driving, Occupant Protection, Pedestrian Safety, Motorcycle Safety, and Traffic Records. Section 406 funds the implementation of ‘go-live’ processes for the Nevada eGrants grant management system. Other P&A funding sources come from Section 410 (Impaired Driving, SAFETEA-LU); Section 402 (SAFETEA-LU and MAP-21); and Section 154 (Alcohol Impaired Driving).
Limited staffing and other resources can hinder the ability of OTS to adequately meet administrative needs like travel preparations, purchasing orders, office supplies ordering, and other necessary functions. This project will provide funding for temporary programs and administrative assistance to provide direct support of federal grant projects' and programs' operating needs, enabling OTS to provide enough resources to effectively manage its grant programs.

The purpose of this project is to provide the annual public opinion telephone survey report to OTS regarding the public’s attitudes toward key traffic safety issues (e.g., safety belt usage, impaired driving, speeding behavior, and distracted driving). This data will be utilized for internal evaluation efforts, traffic safety improvements, programming interventions, community education programs, and media releases to reduce traffic fatalities, injuries, and crashes in Nevada.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 2

NUMBER OF SERIOUS INJURIES IN NEVADA TRAFFIC CRASHES

Injuries in Nevada Traffic Crashes

Justification for Performance Target
Fatality data is more complete, timely, and accurate than serious injury data from motor vehicle crashes. Serious injury data has been a Performance Measure for Nevada since 2010, when the data first became available for analysis of injuries and costs specific to motor vehicle crashes (MVC). Nevada has four trauma centers, with the only Level 1 Trauma Center located in Las Vegas by the University Nevada Reno – School of Medicine. UNSOM was able to acquire trauma record data from the other centers after being named a HIPAA-approved agency to collect the data for analysis purposes. Serious injury data from MVCs between 2008 and 2011 was charted for trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. Because of the limited data available for this performance measure, the performance target of 998 was chosen from a single-year trend line calculated from CYs 2008 to 2011 data. The 2012 serious injury number of 1,099 was provided from the Nevada DOT crash database.
Average annual decrease of 3.1 percent in fatalities and serious injuries must be achieved to halve state traffic fatalities and serious injuries by 2030.

The average number of fatalities and serious injuries from 2004 to 2008 serves as the 2008 baseline year data point for both fatality and serious injury goal trend lines.

**FY 2014 Target**
Decrease serious injuries by a conservative nine percent from the 2012 actual number of 1,099 to the 2008 to 2011 trend line estimate of 998 by December 31, 2014.

**Problem ID Analysis**
*What:* Between 2007 and 2011, 7,447 serious injuries occurred on Nevada’s roadways.

*Who:* Of the 7,447 serious injuries, males were twice as likely as females to show risk-taking behaviors and the younger the age group, the more likely they are to take risk-taking behaviors (Nevada crash data).
**Where:** The majority of serious injuries occurred at intersections (3,497) and during lane departures (2,093).

Between 2007 and 2011, more than 57 percent of lane departure fatalities and serious injuries occurred in Clark County. Nearly 56 percent of fatalities and serious injuries occurred on urban roadways. Between 2007 and 2011, 76 percent of intersection-related fatalities and serious injuries also occurred in Clark County.

In 2010 and 2011, 44 percent of pedestrian fatalities and injuries occurred midblock in a roadway and 25 percent occurred on marked crosswalks (NDOT crash data).

**When:** The highest number of unbelted serious injuries occurred Friday through Sunday. Weekends prove to be the most dangerous time for impaired driving fatalities and serious injuries (NDOT data).

**Why:** The top three crash types in a serious injury crash are rear-end, angle, and non-collision. Contributing vehicle factors to these injury crashes include failure to yield, following too close, and other improper driving (NDOT crash data).

**Countermeasure Strategy**
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s *Countermeasures That Work* publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 2, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
- Chapter 1 – Alcohol Impaired and Drugged Driving
- Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
- Chapter 3 – Aggressive Driving and Speeding
- Chapter 4 – Distracted and Drowsy Driving
- Chapter 5 – Motorcycle Safety
- Chapter 6 – Young Drivers
- Chapter 8 – Pedestrians

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the *Countermeasures That Work* publication which can be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.

**Performance Goal**
See Performance Goals for Performance Measure 1.

**Strategies**
See Strategies for Performance Measure 1.

**Funding Source**
See funding sources for projects TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00080, 00144, 00145, 00146, 00082, 00173, 00153, 00159 on page 62.

**Related Projects**
See also projects TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00080, 00144, 00145, 00146, 00082, 00173, 00153, 00159 in Performance Measure 1.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 3

NEVADA TOTAL FATALITY RATE PER 100 MILLION VMT

Justification for Performance Target
Fatality data per 100 million VMT (vehicle miles traveled) for 2006 to 2010 was charted for trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. The annual VMT number for Nevada fluctuated over the last few years due to factors from the economic recession including decreased travel and tourists, high unemployment, high foreclosure rates, and increasing gas prices. The performance target rate of 1.00/MVMT for 2014 was chosen from a linear trend line calculated from CYs 2006–2010 VMT data. This target is more feasible than the other respective predictions of .80 and .67/MVMT. The 2012 VMT numbers are not yet final.

FY 2014 Target
Decrease Nevada’s traffic fatality rate per 100M VMT from 1.22 in 2010 to 1.00 by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2007 and 2011, there were 1,443 fatalities on Nevada’s roadways. In 2012, there were 258 fatalities.
Who: Of the 1,443 fatalities, 563 occurred in rural areas and 875 occurred in urban areas. The fatalities also include:

- Passenger vehicle occupant fatalities (all seat positions) 897
  - Restrained 410
  - Unrestrained 430
  - Unknown 57
- Alcohol impaired driving fatalities (BAC = .08+) 432
- Speeding related fatalities 441
- Motorcycle fatalities 241
  - Helmeted 201
  - Unhelmeted 39
  - Unknown 1
- Drivers involved in fatal crashes 1968
  - Aged under 15 2
  - Aged 15–20 201
  - Aged under 21 203
  - Aged 21 and over 1,728
  - Unknown age 37
- Pedestrian fatalities 225

Where: Crashes at intersections have resulted in 397 fatalities and 3,497 serious injuries. Lane departures account for 513 fatalities and 2,093 serious injuries.

The top four counties with the most crashes in 2010 were:

- Clark County: 78.89 percent
- Washoe County: 12.1 percent
- Elko County: 1.8 percent
- Carson City: 1.6 percent

Clark County led the State in fatalities (57.4 percent), injuries (82 percent), and property damage (77.2 percent).

Washoe County experienced the next highest numbers with 2.1 percent fatal crashes, 11.1 percent injury crashes, and 12.6 percent property damage crashes.

Between 2007 and 2011 more than 57 percent of the lane departure fatalities and serious injuries occurred in Clark County. Nearly 56 percent of these fatalities and serious injuries occurred on urban roadways. Between 2007 and 2011, 76 percent of intersection-related fatalities and serious injuries occurred in Clark County.

In 2010 and 2011, 44 percent of the pedestrian fatalities and injuries occurred midblock in a roadway and 25 percent on marked crosswalks (NDOT crash data).

When: From 2008 to 2010, the 4th of July weekend has had the highest fatality rate of any holiday period with a three-year total of 13 fatalities. Thanksgiving Day has been the second highest, with seven fatalities, and Martin Luther King Day, Presidents Day, and Veterans Day followed with six fatalities over a three-year period. The highest number of unbelted fatalities and serious injuries occur Friday through Sunday. Weekends prove to be the most dangerous for impaired driving fatalities and serious injuries (NDOT data).
Why: The top three crash types in fatal crashes are non-collision, angle, and rear-end. Vehicle factors contributing to these fatal crashes include failure to keep in a proper lane, failure to yield, and driving too fast for conditions. Several other contributing factors include drinking, falling asleep/fatigued, drugs, and other improper driving.

The top three crash types in a serious injury crash are rear-end, angle, and non-collision crashes. Contributing vehicle factors to these injury crashes include failure to yield, following too close, and other improper driving (NDOT data).

Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Countermeasures That Work publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure 3, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:

Chapter 1 – Alcohol Impaired and Drugged Driving
Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
Chapter 3 – Aggressive Driving and Speeding
Chapter 4 – Distracted and Drowsy Driving
Chapter 5 – Motorcycle Safety
Chapter 6 – Young Drivers
Chapter 8 – Pedestrians

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the Countermeasures That Work publication, which can be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.

Performance Goal
See Performance Goals for Performance Measure 1.

Strategies
See Strategies for Performance Measure 1.

Funding Source

Related Projects
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4

NUMBER OF NEVADA UNRESTRAINED PASSENGER VEHICLE OCCUPANT FATALITIES, ALL POSITIONS

Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupation Fatalities

Justification for Performance Target
Unrestrained motor vehicle occupant data for 2007 to 2011 was charted for trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. Because of the significant drop in total fatalities from 2006 to 2009, utilizing more than the most recent three years of data would not accurately reflect current trends. The performance target of 69 was chosen from a three-year average from CYs 2009 to 2011 data. Other trend lines intimated a target of 41 unrestrained fatalities for CY 2013, but analysis of the most recent data indicated 69 as a more realistic target.

FY 2014 Target
To decrease unrestrained traffic fatalities from the 2009 to 2011 average of 72 to 69 fatalities for the 2011 to 2014 average by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2007 and 2011, 430 unrestrained fatalities occurred and 1,197 were seriously injured in Nevada traffic crashes. This was a significant decline from 494 fatalities in 2006 to 2010.
Who: 513 unrestrained fatalities occurred between 2006 and 2010. Of the 494 fatalities involving unrestrained drivers, the age groups with the highest numbers include:

- 25–34 years: 108 fatalities
- 16–20 years: 70 fatalities
- 45–54 years: 69 fatalities
- 21–24 years: 67 fatalities
- 35–44 years: 67 fatalities

Between 2007 and 2011, there were 429 unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities age five and above.

Male drivers aged 26- to 35-years old are involved in most unrestrained fatalities and serious injuries, followed by young male drivers aged 21- to 25-years old.

Where: For years 2007 to 2011, nearly two thirds (64 percent) of the State’s unrestrained fatalities occurred in Clark County. Nearly 66 percent of the State’s unrestrained fatality crashes occurred on urban roadways.

There were four counties with the most crashes in 2010:
- Clark County – 78.9 percent
- Washoe County – 12.1 percent
- Elko County – 1.8 percent
- Carson City – 1.6 percent

Mineral County had the least crashes at 59 (.11 percent).

Clark County led the State in fatalities (57.4 percent), injuries (82 percent), and property damage (77.2 percent).

Washoe County experienced the next highest numbers with 2.1 percent fatal crashes, 11.1 percent injury crashes, and 12.6 percent property damage crashes.

When: The highest number of unbelted fatalities and serious injuries occur Friday through Sunday. Of the 513 (55 percent) unrestrained fatalities, 285 occurred at night. The 9 p.m. to midnight timeframe had the largest number of unrestrained fatalities between 2006 and 2010.

Why: A large portion of the unbelted fatalities and serious injuries occur in single vehicle crashes followed by angle crashes. More than one-half (51 percent) of the unbelted fatalities involved total ejection from the vehicle.

The top three crash types resulting in fatal crashes are non-collision, angle, and rear-end. Vehicle factors contributing to these fatal crashes include failure to keep in proper lane, failure to yield, and traveling too fast for conditions. Contributing driver factors include drinking, falling asleep/fatigue, drugs, and other improper driving. Nevada is a 24/7 state with many people working graveyard shifts in both the gaming and mining industries. This is a contributor to drowsy and impaired driving on both rural and urban roadways resulting in single vehicle crashes.

The top three crash types in an injury crash are rear-end, angle, and non-collision. Vehicle factors contributing to these injury crashes include failure to yield, following too close, and other improper driving (NDOT).
Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s *Countermeasures That Work* publication. For the projects detailed under this Performance Measure – 4, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
Chapter 6 – Young Drivers

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the *Countermeasures That Work* publication, which can be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies and SHSP strategies outlined.

Performance Goal
- Maintain an annual daytime observed seat belt usage rate of at least 90 percent.
- Decrease the percentage of unrestrained fatalities from 48 percent in 2011 to 47 percent in CY 2014. (Unrestrained rate equals those unrestrained + unknowns)

Strategies
- Continue to emphasize public education of Nevada’s Safety Belt Laws through enforcement and paid and earned media venues (Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy).
  - Provide paid media to support the “Click It or Ticket” enforcement campaigns.
  - Provide paid overtime for law enforcement to enforce seat belt laws throughout the year.
  - Combine DUI and seat belt enforcement events throughout the year.
  - Provide training to law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders statewide on Nevada’s seat belt and child restraint laws, proper car seat use, and availability of local resources for assistance.
- Continue to provide public education programs and partner with other traffic safety advocates on safety belts, child passenger safety, proper seating, and the use of child restraints (Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy).
- Conduct and disseminate statistical, public opinion, and awareness surveys to determine:
  - Front seat day time observed seat belt use.
  - Public opinion and attitude regarding occupant protection laws and seat belt usage.
  - Public awareness of media and enforcement campaigns.
- Continue data collection, analysis, and integration to (1) identify the discrepancies between restraint use rates observed in observational surveys and crash data; and (2) understand the characteristics of restraint non-wearing or part-time wearing individuals that increase their risk of involvement in crashes, the severity of which may be increased due to their lack of restraint use.

Funding Source
Related Projects

Funding Source: 402
It has been several years since the last NHTSA Occupant Protection assessment was conducted in Nevada (September 2004). Many changes and programs have been implemented since then and a review of outside experts needs to be convened to re-determine the program’s strengths and weaknesses, and suggest strategies for improvement in the upcoming years.

TS-2014-UNLV 00158 – University of Nevada Las Vegas – Seat Belt Usage Surveys
Funding Source: M402
The project goal is to determine the rate of seat belt use by motorists across Nevada, and in turn, use those results to evaluate the effectiveness of education and enforcement campaigns. The results would serve to measure the effectiveness of campaigns promoting seat belt usage sponsored by Nevada Office of Traffic Safety, in conjunction with those sponsored by National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The study will be based on field observation of seat belt usage rates at locations across the state “before and after” campaign.

Funding Sources/Amounts: $61,800 (405SL); $300,000 (NDOT 21)
Joining Forces, a multi-jurisdictional traffic enforcement program, has been successful in conducting enforcement events for various critical emphasis areas within the SHSP, including seat belt usage, impaired driving, speeding, pedestrian safety, intersections, and distracted driving.

Funding Source: $200,000 (402); $100,000 (405 (b))
The goal for Marketing and Media in Nevada is to educate the public, including pedestrians and motorists on safe driving behaviors. OTS will develop and publish behavior-altering public traffic safety announcements and messaging that address many critical safety areas in an effort to establish a downward trend in fatalities and serious injuries on Nevada’s roadways. All campaigns are part of and support the state’s ‘Zero Fatalities’ mission. Messaging is designed to educate the motoring public and reduce serious injuries and fatalities in Nevada.

TS-2014-NV OTS 00173 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – Program Management (All Programs)
Funding Source: $122,500 (405 (b))
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 5

NUMBER OF NEVADA FATALITIES INVOLVING A DRIVER WITH A BAC OF .08 OR ABOVE

**Justification for Performance Target**

Alcohol-related fatality data for 2007 to 2011 was charted with trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. Alcohol-related fatalities experienced a sharp decline from 2008 to 2009 (-35 percent) and has continued due to increased high visibility enforcement efforts, along with passage and updates to DUI laws, implementation of a statewide Impaired Driving Task Force, continued zero-tolerance for underage drinking, and implementation of more DUI courts. The performance target of 60 was chosen in consideration of the three-year moving average trend line calculated from CYs 2010 to 2012 data. The 2012 impaired-related fatality number of 60 is from state FARS data. Linear trend lines indicated a target of 57 and 47 fatalities for CYs 2013 and 2014, but 60 was chosen as a conservative target for CY 2014. Legislation pursuing a lower “high rate” BAC rate (from .18 to .15), and mandatory one-year BIIDs for first-time DUI offenders have failed in recent Nevada sessions.

**FY 2014 Target**

Decrease alcohol impaired driving fatalities seven percent from the 2011 calendar base year average of 70 to 60 by December 31, 2014.

*Note: Alcohol-impaired driving fatalities in crashes are defined as involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of 0.08 or greater (NHTSA final imputation).*
Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2006 and 2010, there were 506 impaired driving fatalities. The type and number of vehicles included in these fatalities are:
- Passenger cars  238
- Pickup trucks  172
- Motorcycles  86
- Trucks   4
- Other vehicles  6

Who: In 2010, 90 impaired drivers were involved in 77 impaired driving fatalities in Nevada.

Of the 90 impaired drivers in 2010 fatal crashes, 68 were male, and 44 of them were under the age of 44. Males in the 35- to 44-age group (15) and 25- to 34-age group (11) had the highest frequencies of impaired driving in the fatal crashes.

In addition, 67 of the impaired drivers had valid Nevada licenses; 10 were out of state and 13 did not possess a valid drivers license.

Where: Geographically, the 506 statewide alcohol-related fatalities were concentrated in four counties (523 of 600 alcohol related fatalities):
- Clark County  303
- Washoe County  55
- Nye County  25
- Elko County  31

Nine routes in Clark County had 10 or more impaired driving fatalities accounting for approximately one quarter of all Nevada alcohol related fatalities:

Clark County
- I-15
- US- 95
- CR-215
- SR-160
- Flamingo Rd.
- Charleston Blvd.
- I-215
- Lake Mead Blvd.
- Sahara Ave.

When: Two-thirds of the alcohol-related fatalities occurred between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. Most alcohol-related fatalities occurred between Friday and Sunday.

Why: Nevada is a 24/7 state with many people working graveyard shifts in both the gaming and mining industries. This is one contributor to drowsy and impaired driving on both rural and urban roadways resulting in single vehicle crashes. Impaired pedestrian crashes (with either the driver or pedestrian being impaired) are also over-represented in Nevada due to the 24/7 entertainment environment in the urban areas of Reno and Las Vegas.

Most impaired driving fatalities and serious injuries involved single-vehicle crashes. Of the crashes involving a fatality, the majority resulted in an overturned vehicle or a crash with a fixed object.
Performance Goals

- Decrease the percentage of alcohol-related fatalities from 27 percent in 2010 to 22 percent by 2014.
- Decrease the alcohol-related fatalities per 100M VMT from 0.31 in 2010 to 0.27 by 2014.
- Continue the downward trend in alcohol-related fatalities. The objective is to become a low tier state within three years per the preliminary MAP-21 definitions (AL-related fatality rate per AVMT below 0.30).

Strategies

- Emphasize driver education through well-publicized enforcement of State DUI laws supported by earned and paid media, appropriate public information, and educational (PI&E) material (Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy).
- Continue to expand support to the judicial system and encourage the development of new DUI courts and prosecutor training.
- Continue to expand the use of technology to reduce impaired driving such as:
  - Breath ignition interlock devices
  - Internet-based monitoring of DUI offenders
  - Simulators and demonstration devices (Seat Belt Convincer and Fatal Vision Goggles) for school and other young driver education programs
- Continue to foster an effective statewide impaired driving action committee (the Nevada Attorney General Advisory Coalition on Impaired Driving).
- Continue to encourage Law Enforcement Agencies to conduct well-publicized compliance checks of alcohol retailers to reduce sales to underage drinkers (Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy).
- Promote community programs emphasizing alternatives to driving impaired such as designated drivers, rides provided for impaired drivers (with and without getting vehicle home), and public transportation.

Funding Source


Countermeasure Strategy

OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s *Countermeasures That Work* publication. For the projects detailed under this Performance Measure – 5, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:

Chapter 1 – Alcohol Impaired and Drugged Driving
Chapter 6 – Young Drivers

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the *Countermeasures That Work*, which can also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.
Related Projects

**Funding Source: 410**
Nevada's Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) was hired by the Clark County District Attorney's Office but their budget for this position is limited to salary costs. The Office of Traffic Safety will use the funding in this project to enable help with material and supplies costs, travel throughout the State to provide training, and attendance of relevant professional development venues relating to prosecution of impaired driving cases.

**TS-2014-CC DISTRICT COURT 00058 – Carson City District Court – Carson City Felony DUI Court**
**Funding Source: 410**
The Felony DUI Court program, known as the Western Regional DUI Court, targets third time offenders and intends to implement a second or High BAC Misdemeanor DUI court to change behaviors and deter them from re-offending. As a part of the program, the Western Regional DUI Court (of Carson City) program places offenders in the National Center for DWI program that lasts for three-to-five years under the supervision of the Carson City Department of Alternative Sentencing.

**TS-2014-CLARK CO COURTS 00017 – Clark County Courts – DUI Court Program**
**Funding Source: 410**
The Moderate Offender Program (MOP), initiated through an OTS grant-funded project, was designed to address misdemeanor offenders, augmenting and undergirding the Felony DUI Court Program. As a result of the significant impact and success of the Felony DUI program, the Moderate Offender Program was patterned and designed correspondingly using the nationally recognized 10 key components of a drug court. At the present time, Las Vegas Justice Court receives OTS funding for two misdemeanor DUI Courts. Since its inception in 2003, at the close of 2012, both Moderate Offender Programs had 141 participants successfully complete the program.

**Funding Source: 410**
Current PBT technology units will allow the Nevada Highway Patrol to more effectively identify and prosecute impaired drivers in conjunction with its newly formed DUI/Distracted Driving committee as well as provide new equipment to replace the existing 10 year-old Draeger Alcotest 6510 models.

**TS-2014-EAST FORK JUSTICE 00121 – East Fork Justice Court – Douglas County DUI Diversion Program**
**Funding Source: 410**
Nevada had a high rate of alcohol-related fatalities a few years ago at 37 percent; the rate for 2012 is estimated to be at 26 percent (non-imputed). This project helps to sustain the Douglas County court's DUI Diversion Program, which addresses the underlying cause of recidivism of drug and/or alcohol dependencies related to DUI arrests. In addressing drug/alcohol dependency, the program consists of a judicial component, treatment component, DUI Case Manager, and a supervision component for monitoring the defendant's behavior. The DUI Court utilizes the 10 key components of an evidence based treatment modality sponsored by the National Center for DWI Courts. Without the program, the defendants would be incarcerated in prison and would not have the opportunity to address rehabilitation with their substance abuse issues, only perpetuating the problem.
This coalition covers three rural counties within Northeast Nevada. As an established coalition with personnel resources in each county, they are well positioned to provide community programs/events on impaired driving that reach all age groups. In addition to the community programs focused on impaired driving for adults (reaching the problem age group of 24 to 35 year-old drivers), the project also provides education and prevention activities for school-age drivers at the local high schools.

The LVMPD DUI Van project includes monthly DUI checkpoints where LVMPD Traffic enforcement squads deploy on average, twice a week, as a reminder of the risks of impaired driving. This program is in conjunction with the Every 15 Minutes program (underage drinking awareness) and extends the LVMPD Traffic Bureau's successes in DUI enforcement. These activities are aimed at reducing the number of impaired fatalities on Nevada roadways.

This project is consistent with the Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan under the Impaired Driving and Occupant Protection strategies. This will include Strategy 1 to increase the number of high-visibility DUI programs: AS 1.03 – encourage other law enforcement agencies to set up impaired driving reporting programs. It will also include Strategy 2, to enhance programs on impaired driving for young drivers: AS 2.01 – enhance DUI education within existing safe driving programs using systems viewed at national trainings as being easy to integrate into existing systems.

The project will utilize law enforcement activities and joint traffic safety education.awareness events with UNRPD and the Davidson Academy.* Awareness campaigns will encourage pedestrians to refrain from distractions while crossing the street, to use marked crosswalks and the pedestrian overpass on North Virginia Street, and to use the stutter flash function on the devices that have been installed for use in this area.

*The Davidson Academy is a free public day school for profoundly gifted students, where eligible candidates have SAT, ACT, or IQ scores in the top 1/10th of one percent and perform academically at the middle or high school level.

The Felony DUI Court project targets repeat recidivist defendants who drive under the influence of alcohol, controlled substances, or a combination of both. Each person in the program has had no fewer than three DUI offenses and is facing a minimum one year prison sentence. Treatment costs in the Felony DUI Court are funded by the defendants themselves as are other program expenses such as house arrest (including SCRAM), interlock car devices, and substance abuse counseling.
Funding Source: 402
The Judicial Education Project is intended to strengthen the knowledge of judges on all issues relating to impaired driving. As one of the three parts of the criminal justice system (law enforcement, prosecution, and courts), each needs to be aware of the latest information, legal changes, and best practices relevant to impaired driving. This project will fund an annual 1 ½- to two-day training session for up to 50 judges.

TS-2014-NVOTS 00148 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – DUI Court at Misdemeanor Level
Funding Source: 402
Washoe County, the second largest county in Nevada, does not have a DUI Court program to reduce recidivism of the non-felony offenders. With the case load split between six courts with a total of 15 judges, the best option for a self-sustaining program is a “shared” DUI Court between the Limited Jurisdiction Courts in Washoe County. The funding will provide for a Coordinator Position for a “shared” DUI Court.

Funding Sources/Amounts: $344,135 (405(d)); $280,000 (154)
Joining Forces, a multi-jurisdictional traffic enforcement program, has been successful in conducting enforcement events for various critical emphasis areas within the SHSP, including seat belt usage, impaired driving, speeding, pedestrian safety, intersections, and distracted driving.

Funding Source: $694,200 (410)
The goal for Marketing and Media in Nevada is to educate the public, including pedestrians and motorcyclists on safe driving behaviors. OTS will develop and publish behavior-altering public traffic safety announcements and messaging that address many critical safety areas in an effort to establish a downward trend in fatalities and serious injuries on Nevada's roadways. All campaigns are part of and support the state’s ‘Zero Fatalities’ mission. Messaging is designed to educate the motoring public and reduce serious injuries and fatalities in Nevada.

TS-2014-NVOTS 00173 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – Program Management (All Programs)
Funding Source: $147,314 (410)
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 6

NUMBER OF NEVADA SPEEDING-RELATED FATALITIES

Speeding Related Fatalities

Justification for Performance Target
Speeding-related fatalities have represented as high as 37 percent of all Nevada fatalities, but recent data indicates a decline to less than 30 percent for speeding-related crashes. Therefore data for 2009 to 2011 was charted for trend lines and analyzed by actual number and the three-year moving average. The performance target of 66 was chosen from a one-year trend line from CYs 2009 to 2011. The 2012 number of 69 is from state FARS data as the 2012 FARS Report is not yet final. Other trend lines indicated targets of 47 speed-related fatalities for CY 2014, but with the current uptick in roadway fatalities for NV (2012 and current 2014), 66 or 27 percent, was a more realistic target.

FY 2014 Target
Decrease speeding-related MVC fatalities three percent from the CY 2012 actual number of 69 to 66 by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2006 and 2010, there were 524 fatal speeding-related crashes on Nevada roadways. The type and number of vehicles involved were:
- Passenger cars 301
- Pick-up trucks 87
- Motorcycles 99
- Trucks 1
- Other vehicles 36
**Who:** In 2010, 118 speeding drivers were involved in 79 speeding-related fatalities. Approximately half of those speeding drivers survived the fatal crash and 23 non-speeding drivers, passengers, and pedestrians did not.

Of the 118 speeding drivers, 88 were male. The 20- to 54-age group had the highest number of speeding-related fatalities. Approximately 80 percent had valid Nevada licenses; 10 percent were out of state, and 10 percent had a suspended, revoked, or non-valid drivers license.

**Where:** More than 80 percent of speeding-related fatalities between 2006 and 2010 occurred in three counties:
- Clark County 345
- Washoe County 43
- Elko County 40

21 routes in four counties had concentrations of five or more speeding-related fatalities in the period comprising 181 of 524 fatalities (34 percent).

**Clark County**
- I-15 30
- Sahara Ave 12
- US-95 11
- CR-215 9
- Lake Mead Blvd 9
- SR-147 7
- Lamb Blvd 7
- Flamingo Rd 7
- Craig Rd 6
- Cheyenne Ave 6
- Desert Inn Rd 6
- SR-528 5
- Farm Rd 5
- SR-160 5
- SR-604 5
- Decatur Blvd 5

**Washoe County**
- McCarran Blvd 6

**Elko County**
- I-80 10
- US-93 8
- SR-225 5

**Churchill County**
- I-80 17
When: Speed is a contributing factor in a majority of lane departure and intersection crashes. 58 percent of the lane departure and intersection fatal and injury crashes occur during daylight hours and between Thursday and Saturday.

Why: Speed is a contributing factor in urban and rural, intersection and lane departure crashes. Nine out of 10 lane departure fatalities and serious injuries occur under dry road surface conditions. With the long expanse of lonely highway between communities of 70+ speed limits, or the multi-lane arterials in Las Vegas with 45 mph limits, speed is a factor in a majority of fatalities and serious injuries.

Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Countermeasures That Work publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 6, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
Chapter 3 – Aggressive Driving and Speeding
Chapter 5 – Motorcycle Safety
Chapter 6 – Young Drivers

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the Countermeasures That Work publication, which can also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.

Performance Goal
Promote multi-jurisdictional enforcement of Nevada safety belt, DUI, distracted driving, pedestrian, and speeding laws.

- Reduce motor vehicle crash injuries and fatalities through public education and enforcement by seven percent, from the 2009 to 2011 average of 275, to 254 by December 31, 2014.
- Increase the number of seat belt and child seat citations issued during highly visible enforcement events from 5,757 in 2011 to 6,100 in 2014.
- Increase the number of speed citations issued during highly visible enforcement events from 14,863 in 2011 to 16,000 in 2014.
- Increase the number of DUI arrests made during highly visible enforcement events from 1,334 in 2011 to 1,500 in 2014.
- Reduce the number of pedestrian injuries and fatalities from 47 in 2011 to 42 in 2014.
- Reduce the number of distracted driving crashes and fatalities.
- Decrease the total fatalities per 100m VMT from 1.16 in 2009 to .99 in 2014.

Strategies
- Provide adequate equipment to law enforcement to assist in monitoring and enforcing traffic laws and improve traffic safety.

Funding Source
**Related Projects**

**TD-2014-MPD 00084 – Mesquite Police Department – Lidar Hand Held Radar**  
**Funding Source: 402**  
The grant allows the purchase of two Stalker Lidar XL Radars to assist patrol officers in reducing the number of vehicles exceeding the speed limits. The City of Mesquite is located approximately 80 miles northeast of Las Vegas on Interstate 15—a major traffic corridor to western and central states. Mesquite is a state line city that borders Arizona. Having a major interstate run directly through the center of Mesquite provides unique challenges and opportunities for law enforcement. Having up-to-date radar equipment will assist patrol officers in reducing the number of vehicles exceeding the speed limits; thus reducing the number of traffic fatalities caused by aggressive driving.

**TS-2014-SPD 00040 – Sparks Police Department – Police Radar**  
**Funding Source: M402**  
Sparks is the 2nd largest city in Washoe County, adjacent to Reno and less than 20 miles from the California border. Sparks is newer than Reno and its streets are well planned and well maintained; but they have multiple lanes of higher speed limits on main arterials. Speed is a contributing factor in over a quarter of Nevada's traffic fatalities. This project will allow the Sparks Police Department to purchase 10 hand-held radar units and related equipment to detect speeding violations by motorists. Having this up-to-date technology will enable SPD to increase the number of verifiable speeding citations, as well as assist with the detection of DUI drivers, with the goal to decrease motor vehicle crashes, injuries, and fatalities.

**Funding Sources/Amounts: $370,000 (M402)**  
Joining Forces, a multi-jurisdictional traffic enforcement program, has been successful in conducting enforcement events for various critical emphasis areas within the SHSP, including seat belt usage, impaired driving, speeding, pedestrian safety, intersections, and distracted driving.

**TS-2014-NVOTS 00173 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – Program Management (All Programs)**  
**Funding Source: $148,214 (406)**  
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 7

NUMBER OF MOTORCYCLIST FATALITIES

Justification for Performance Target
Motorcyclist fatality data for 2007 to 2011 was charted for trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. The performance target of 38 was chosen from a three-year moving average trend line calculated from CYs 2009 to 2011 data. The estimated 2012 fatality number of 37 is from state FARS data as of the writing of this plan, as the 2012 FARS Report is not yet final. Other trend lines indicated a target of 26 and 22 fatalities for CYs 2013 and 2014, but these appeared to be unrealistic goals, even from the low of 37 from CY 2012.

FY 2014 Target
Decrease motorcyclist fatalities by six percent from the 2009 to 2011 three-year moving average number of 44, to the 2010 to 2012 estimate average of 38 by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
**What:** Between 2007 and 2011, 241 fatalities occurred while driving motorcycles on Nevada's roadways.

**Who:** Of the fatalities, 201 were helmeted and 39 were not wearing helmets. The majority of fatalities occurred among males age 20 to 37.
Where: 66 percent of Nevada’s motorcyclist fatalities in 2012 occurred in urban Clark County, located in southern Nevada, where the desert weather allows riding all year long. Washoe County in Northern Nevada has the second highest percentage at 16 percent of total fatalities, but this is a much less populous area which has extremely cold winters five to six months out of the year, so there is much less motorcycle riding in the north. The rural counties do not exhibit a motorcycle safety problem, per se, with one to two motorcycle fatalities per year.

### Nevada Motorcycle Fatalities by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt;20</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>&gt;59</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motorcyclist Fatalities - Clark County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatality Type</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Fatalities per 100,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motorcyclist Fatalities - Washoe County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatality Type</th>
<th>Fatality</th>
<th>Fatalities per 100,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclist Fatalities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nevada Motorcyclist Fatalities by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Name</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elko County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esmeralda County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storey County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pine County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When:** Fatal motorcycle crashes occur at all hours of the day and night; there is nothing that stands out as far as time of day. Seasonally, most of these crashes occur in the spring and summer when the weather is warm and the streets are relatively dry, and also when motorcyclists ride the most.

**Why:** Historically, 50 percent of all motorcyclist fatalities are due to impaired driving and/or speeding. Nevada is also experiencing fatalities among older riders who are returning to riding and finding the performance of current motorcycles is different than they remembered. This also applies to younger riders using high performance motorcycles that exceed their riding skills.

**Performance Goal**
- Decrease the number of motorcyclist fatalities from 41 in 2011 to 36 by 2014.
- Decrease the percentage of unhelmeted fatalities from a three-year average of 7.87 percent to five percent by calendar year end 2014.
Strategies
Nevada’s OTS hosted a NHTSA Assessment of its motorcycle safety program in November 2011. Various recommendations from their report have already been acted upon or initiated to date. Strategies for the program in FY 2014 below reference both NHTSA Assessment recommendations as well as strategies listed in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (in regard to impaired riding):

- Develop a coalition of motorcycle safety advocates to review and identify new strategies and safety countermeasures to reduce fatalities and serious crashes in Nevada. There will be a wide spectrum of participants including state agencies, safety professionals, and the riding public.
- Utilize the talents of the coalition to review and identify new strategies to educate the driving public (motor vehicle drivers and motorcyclists) on how to share the road and encourage the use of proper protective gear.
- Increase the number of Basic Rider courses (beginning) and higher-level course opportunities for the more experienced riding public.

Funding Source

This program is also supported by State funds of $209,721.00.

Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Countermeasures That Work publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 7, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:

Chapter 1 – Alcohol Impaired and Drugged Driving
Chapter 3 – Aggressive Driving and Speeding
Chapter 4 – Distracted and Drowsy Driving
Chapter 5 – Motorcycle Safety

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the Countermeasures That Work publication, which should also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.

Related Projects

Funding Source: $208,800 (NDOT 21)

The goal for Marketing and Media in Nevada is to educate the motoring public, including pedestrians and motorcyclists on safe driving behaviors. The Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) will develop and publish behavior-altering public traffic safety announcements and messaging that address many critical safety areas in an effort to establish a downward trend in fatalities and serious injuries on Nevada’s roadways. All campaigns are part of and support the state’s ‘Zero Fatalities’ mission. Messaging is designed to educate the motoring public and reduce serious injuries and fatalities in Nevada.
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 8

NUMBER OF NEVADA UNHELMETED MOTORCYCLIST FATALITIES

Justification for Performance Target
Unhelmeted motorcyclist fatality data for 2007 to 2011 was charted for trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. Linear year-to-year charting has no consistency with relatively small numbers moving from 15 to two, for example, in years 2008 to 2009, and then back up to 10 in 2010. The performance target of four was chosen from a three-year moving average trend prediction calculated from CYs 2009 to 2011 data. The estimated 2012 fatality number of five is from state FARS data as of the writing of this plan, as the 2012 FARS Report is not yet final. Other trend lines indicated targets of three unhelmeted fatalities for CYs 2013 and 2014, where a target of four seemed more realistic with current year-to-date data, and because these numbers are relatively small.

FY 2014 Target
Decrease unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities from the 2009 to 2011 moving average of five to four unhelmeted fatalities by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2007 and 2011 there have been 39 unhelmeted fatalities.

Who: As with all motorcyclist fatalities, the unhelmeted fatalities are predominantly male adults age 25 to 54. Of the five unhelmeted fatalities in 2012, 60 percent or three of the unhelmeted fatalities occurred in Clark County.
Where: 66 percent of Nevada’s motorcyclist fatalities in 2012 occurred in urban Clark County, located in southern Nevada, where the desert weather allows for riding all year long. Washoe County in Northern Nevada has the second highest percentage at 16 percent of total fatalities, but this is a much less populous area, which has extremely cold winters five to six months out of the year, so there is much less motorcycle riding in the north. The rural counties do not exhibit a motorcycle safety problem, per se, with one to two motorcycle fatalities per year.

When: Fatal motorcycle crashes occur at all hours of the day (and night); there is nothing that stands out as far as time of day. Seasonally, most of these crashes occur in the spring and summer when the weather is warm and the streets are relatively dry, and also when motorcyclists ride the most.
Why: Because Nevada has a universal helmet law covering all ages, it has a relatively small number of motorcyclist fatalities that were unhelmeted at the time of the crash. However, Nevada hosts several large motorcycle rally events throughout the State in the spring and summer which bring in many riders from out-of-state, who do not necessarily have a helmet law, although most of them know and abide by it.

Performance Goal
See Performance Goals for Performance Measures 1 and 7.

Strategies
See Strategies for Performance Measures 1 and 7.

Funding Source
See funding source for project TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00080 on page 62.

Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Countermeasures That Work publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 8, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
Chapter 5 – Motorcycle Safety

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the Countermeasures That Work publication, which can also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.

Related Projects

Funding Source: $208,800 (NDOT 21)
The goal for Marketing and Media in Nevada is to educate the public, including pedestrians and motorcyclists on safe driving behaviors. OTS will develop and publish behavior-altering public traffic safety announcements and messaging that address many critical safety areas in an effort to establish a downward trend in fatalities and serious injuries on Nevada’s roadways. All campaigns are part of and support the state’s ‘Zero Fatalities’ mission. Messaging is designed to educate the motoring public and reduce serious injuries and fatalities in Nevada.

TS-2014-NVOTS 00173 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – Program Management (All Programs)
Funding Source: $96,000 (2010)
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 9

NUMBER OF DRIVERS AGE 20 OR YOUNGER IN NEVADA FATAL CRASHES

Justification for Performance Target
Fatality data from this age group of drivers for 2007 to 2011 was charted for trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. Because a significant drop occurred after 2006 (GDL law first implemented), the performance target of 20 was chosen from a three-year trend line calculated from CYs 2009 to 2011 fatality data. The 2012 fatality number of 13 is estimated from state FARS data as of the writing of this plan the 2012 FARS Report is not yet final. Other trend lines indicated a target of seven young driver fatalities for CY 2014 but 20 is a more realistic and conservative target (-8/year trend).

FY 2014 Target
Decrease the number of fatalities of drivers age 20 and under by 25 percent from the three-year average (2009 to 2011) of 28 to 20 by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2007 and 2011, 1,968 drivers were involved in fatalities on Nevada roadways. Of those, 201 drivers were aged 15 to 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 15-20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who: Between 2006 and 2011, 10 motorcyclist fatalities occurred among drivers under 20 years old.

Between 2006 and 2010, 70 unrestrained fatalities occurred among vehicle occupants under age 20, and 10 distracted driving related fatalities involved people ages 16 to 20.

CDC data: In 2010, the motor vehicle death rate for male drivers and passengers age 16 to 19 was almost two times that of their female counterparts.

Where: Crashes for this age group of drivers occur primarily on major arterials, or conversely in isolated rural areas (during parties, etc.). 10.4 percent of all Nevada crashes in 2010 involved drivers age 16 to 20, a drop from 2008 that can be directly tied to Nevada’s Graduated Drivers Licensing (GDL) law implemented in 2005. A noted trend in this age group is that they are getting full licensure at a later age: 18 rather than 16. This may be in part due to the GDL requirements as well as the economic recession.

When: Among the 15- to 20-age group, crash risk is particularly high during the first month of licensure. Because of curfew requirements in the State’s GDL law, there have been fewer nighttime crashes in this age group in the last three years.

Why: Teens are more likely to underestimate dangerous situations, speed, and distraction factors simply because of their inexperience or limited time behind the wheel. Teens that die or are injured in crashes frequently ride unrestrained, with multiple occupants, and/or with positive blood alcohol levels.

Performance Goal
• Reach approximately 25 percent of students in participating schools.

Strategies
• Encourage safe-driving habits among young drivers by increasing awareness of seat-belt usage and the dangers of distracted and impaired driving through media campaigns and in-school programs.
• Continue working with Nye County Sheriffs’ office promote and educate teens on safe driving behaviors.
• Educate teens on traffic safety messages through community based organizations by providing workshops, educational opportunities, mentoring, and resources for effective traffic safety projects.
• Research and develop public education programs that will effectively reach and engage the intended target audience.

Funding Source
Countermeasure Strategy

OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s *Countermeasures That Work* publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 9, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:

- Chapter 1 – Alcohol Impaired and Drugged Driving
- Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
- Chapter 3 – Aggressive Driving and Speeding
- Chapter 4 – Distracted and Drowsy Driving
- Chapter 6 – Young Drivers

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the *Countermeasures That Work* publication, which should also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.

Related Projects


**Funding Source: 21**

The objective of STARS (Supporting Teens and Roadway Safety) is to encourage safe-driving habits among young drivers and increase awareness of seat-belt usage and the dangers of impaired and distracted driving; critical safety issues for this age group. The program runs several months throughout the year and has two distinct phases of activity. The first part of the year, the STARS program works to connect with school student body leaders and teachers and create a grassroots interest in teen safe driving. The program also encourages parents to learn along with their teens and take an active role in teaching and mentoring safe driving practices.

While this first phase continues, the second phase begins mid-school year and uses a contest format to encourage teens to create traffic safety advertisements. Teen teams work with teachers and mentors to create PSA ads centered on safe driving campaign themes (i.e. teens talking to teens). A panel of state safety experts judges the ads submitted by the teens, and OTS produces the winning entries for public broadcasting and/or dissemination. Teens who participate in the contest are also invited to attend a special weekend event where they learn hands-on safe-driving skills and compete with each other in traffic safety-themed activities. At this event, they also learn more about the critical emphasis areas for young adult drivers in regard to occupant protection, impaired driving, and distracted driving. At the end of the program, winners are recognized at an awards ceremony.
Nevada Traffic Data Analysis – Young Drivers
Funding Source: 402
This project will provide resources for collection and analysis of young driver crash and driving record data in Nevada. In past years, it has been difficult to obtain actual driving record data for drivers age 16 to 20 that have participated in safe youth driving programs sponsored by DPS-OTS and other partners. This has made it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs on young drivers who have and have not participated. DPS-OTS does not have the staff, time, or the skill set to acquire and effectively analyze this data to prove effectiveness of the funded programs, although they are inherently valuable to the participants and their parents. DPS-OTS looks to measure the effectiveness of these programs in consideration of future funding requests.

TS-2014-Driver’s Edge 00126 – Driver’s Edge – Teen Safe Driving Program
Funding Source: 21
The Driver’s Edge program provides drivers, 21 and under, with a comprehensive four-hour training session that teaches basic and advanced safe driving skills. The sessions are taught by professional driving instructors. The driving portion puts young drivers behind the wheel, while supervised by an instructor, and allows them to learn hands-on how to operate a car safely in emergency situations. Driving exercises include skid control, panic breaking, and avoidance procedures.

Along with the driving exercises, these sessions also provide special classroom instruction about the critical safe driving emphasis areas for young adult drivers such as occupant protection, impaired driving, and distracted driving. The program provides valuable learning time and resources to young drivers and parents who take a renewed interest in traffic safety as their child learns to drive. The program specifically address the top three contributing factors in overall fatal crashes: failure to maintain proper lane, exceeding authorized speed limits, failure to yield right of way.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 10

NUMBER OF NEVADA PEDESTRIAN FATALITIES

Justification for Performance Target
Pedestrian fatality data for 2007 to 2011 was charted for trend lines and analyzed three ways: actual number, three-year moving average, and five-year moving average. Because the highest recorded number of fatalities occurred in Nevada in 2006, and sharply dropped to its lowest recorded number in 2009 (-44 percent), utilizing more than the most recent three years of data seemed to skew the data. The performance target of 39 for 2012 fell short of the actual number of 61 (from state FARS data as the 2012 FARS Report is not yet final). The 2014 target of 39 was chosen in consideration of the three-year average trend line calculations from CYs 2008 to 2011 (-27/year), in combination with the recent uptick in fatalities for NV (2012 and current 2013). Other calculations indicated a target of 36 fatalities for CY 2014 but it was prudent to choose a more realistic target. It is hoped that the high number of pedestrian fatalities in CY 2012 was an anomaly, while additional efforts are being worked on to combat the problem in FY 2014.

FY 2014 Target
Decrease pedestrian fatalities by 10 percent from the 2011 actual number of 46 to the 2008 to 2011 trend line estimate of 39 by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: Between 2007 and 2011, there were 225 pedestrian fatalities on Nevada’s roadways.
Who: Pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries occur among all age ranges, with the higher fatalities among the zero- to 15-age group in Clark County, and the 26- to 35-age group in Washoe County (2011–2012).

Where: The majority of Nevada’s pedestrian fatalities occur in the Las Vegas metropolitan area, representing approximately 70 percent of the State’s totals each year. Las Vegas in Clark County encompasses approximately 75 percent of the State’s population. Even with approximately 40 million visitors per year to this area, the fatalities are surprisingly not visitors but instead residents of Las Vegas.

When: There is no trend in the day or time when pedestrian fatalities occur. Pedestrian fatalities can occur at anytime of the day or month.

Why: An additional complication to the pedestrian fatality problem is the city’s infrastructure. Las Vegas was the fastest growing city in the nation for more than a decade until 2008. With such rapid growth, maintaining, improving, and providing new infrastructure to meet the growing need was difficult. Wide multilane streets, higher speed limits in residential areas (average 45 mph), poor lighting, minimal sidewalks, long distances between crosswalks, and other similar conditions create an “unfriendly” environment for pedestrians and bicyclists in the urban areas of both Clark and Washoe Counties.
Performance Goal
• Decrease the number of pedestrian fatalities from 46 in 2011 to 41 by December 31, 2014.

Strategies
• Continue to develop community-based programs for educating the public on pedestrian safety, and laws pertaining to the issue (Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy).
• Continue to collaborate with local planning commissions and the Nevada Department of Transportation on pedestrian safety action plans toward livable communities.
• Conduct highly visible enforcement campaigns at high crash locations (Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy).
• Conduct at least one statewide public awareness campaign (“Pedestrians Don’t Come With Airbags,” “Share the Road,” etc.) on pedestrian safety (Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan strategy). Messaging will be prepared for both the motorist (to watch out for them), as well as the pedestrian (to stay alert and stay alive). NDOT Flex funding received this year will allow OTS to fund additional paid media in tandem with the 2014 Joining Forces calendar for pedestrian enforcement events, as well as provide additional overtime funding for these events.

Funding Source

Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Countermeasures That Work publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 10, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
Chapter 4 – Distracted and Drowsy Driving
Chapter 6 – Young Drivers
Chapter 8 – Pedestrians

The effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the Countermeasures That Work publication, which can also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s strategies.

Related Projects

TS-2014-NLVPD 00041 – North Las Vegas Police Department – Traffic Safety “Look Out for Pedestrians” Safety & Education
Funding Source: 21
Together with enforcement efforts, this project promotes pedestrian safety, including a pedestrian safety awareness education campaign (Stop, Look and Listen) to city elementary school children, highlighting the importance of automobile and pedestrian safety and providing instruction to students at NLV elementary schools on how to safely cross the street. Stop, Look and Listen is designed to keep very young children interested in learning about pedestrian safety by utilizing colorful graphics such as traffic light simulators and by keeping the educational presentation fairly brief (approximately one hour).
In order to change the existing upward trend of pedestrian fatalities, the Reno Police Department will be enforcing pedestrian safety laws and providing education to distracted pedestrians. Specifically, this project’s activities will focus on distracted pedestrians talking on their cell phones while walking, not paying attention, and/or wearing headphones that restrict the ability to hear oncoming traffic.

This project works to address pedestrian safety issues and road safety for all users, working with the Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit, Regional Planning Commissions Light Rail, and the current City of Las Vegas Pedestrian Safety Zone. It also provides before and after studies to other entities to encourage their participation on similar programs, continue the Pedestrian Education and Legislation Task Force activities, and work as part of the Complete Streets group, bus shelter advisory group, Road Safety Audits, and with the SHSP CEA team as needed and directed.

The project will utilize law enforcement activities and joint traffic safety education/awareness events with UNRPD and the Davidson Academy. For pedestrian safety, awareness campaigns will encourage pedestrians to refrain from distractions while crossing the street, to use marked crosswalks and the pedestrian overpass on North Virginia Street, and to use the stutter flash function on the devices that have been installed for use in this area.

For impaired driving, this project will concentrate on reducing the incidents of impaired driving by young adults and students, by providing information on alternate forms of transportation and the use of designated drivers. Information is made available at sporting events and other special events at the University. Support efforts are being solicited from alcohol outlets near the campus and surrounding vicinity.

Joining Forces, a multi-jurisdictional traffic enforcement program, has been successful in conducting enforcement events for various critical emphasis areas within the SHSP, including seat belt usage, impaired driving, speeding, pedestrian safety, intersections, and distracted driving.
Funding Source: $335,600 (M402)
The goal for Marketing and Media in Nevada is to educate the public, including pedestrians and motorcyclists on safe driving behaviors. OTS will develop and publish behavior-altering public traffic safety announcements and messaging that address many critical safety areas in an effort to establish a downward trend in fatalities and serious injuries on Nevada’s roadways. All campaigns are part of and support the state’s ‘Zero Fatalities’ mission. Messaging is designed to educate the motoring public and reduce serious injuries and fatalities in Nevada.

TS-2014-NVOTS 00173 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – Program Management (All Programs)
Funding Source: $15,000 (402)
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 11

TRAFFIC RECORDS

Justification for Performance Target
An assessment of Nevada’s Traffic Records Program in 2010 recommended that the TRCC and Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) work with the individual courts to automate the process of receiving conviction information from all courts in Nevada. It also suggested that Nevada create a citation tracking system to track tickets from issuance to disposition to reduce the incident of inconsistent commercial vehicle data, and to assess the enforcement process. This performance target for FY 2014 is a step toward both of these recommendations, as it automates getting the citation information to the AOC (and the 32 courts the AOC serves) through the NCJIS interface into the courts’ Case Management System (CMS).

FY 2014 Target
Increase the number of law enforcement agencies submitting traffic citations electronically to the Administrative Office of the Courts in 2012 to 18 agencies by September 30, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
State and local governments in Nevada recognize the need to collaborate in the development and implementation of a Highway Safety Information System improvement program to provide more timely, accurate, complete, uniform, integrated, and accessible data to the traffic safety community. Achieving a statewide-integrated data system supports decision-making when determining what countermeasures to pursue with the finite resources that are available. The State’s Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) includes members from all participating law enforcement agencies as well as the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), Department of Transportation (NDOT), Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Department of Health’s Emergency Medical Systems (EMS), and Commercial Vehicle representation (NHP and FMCSA).

Law enforcement and other agencies collaborate by contributing statewide traffic data to the Nevada Citation and Accident Tracking System known as NCATS. NCATS supplies traffic crash and citation data to government and non-governmental agencies as well as the public through the Nevada Department of Transportation – Safety Engineering Division. NCATS data is used in many ways, from planning or mitigating roadway construction and improvement projects to safety program data for better, safer roadways and vehicles. NCATS data is also used to improve outcomes in emergency and trauma medical care.

Performance Goal
The Nevada Traffic Records program will continue to collect, analyze, and utilize crash data to determine appropriate countermeasure activities and to plan resource allocation. Currently, crash data from three large agencies (Las Vegas Metropolitan, Henderson, and Reno Police Departments) is collected by individual data pushes through a manual process. Methods for automating the collection of crash data are continually being researched to decrease the number of days it takes to input crash reports into the NCATS repository.
Strategies

- Continue NCATS Modernization Project currently being implemented, due for completion in FY 2014. The vendor awarded is Brazos Technology from College Station, Texas. The six agencies currently using citation software only will be adding the crash data software along with at least two additional agencies committed to implementing both software packages in FY 2014.
- Identify and seek permanent funding sources to support hardware and software needs of participating agencies, such as fine enhancements, penalty assessments, or other fees attached to traffic convictions to support the Traffic Records system.
- Continue to improve on partnerships and collaboration with state agencies currently participating in the TRCC, including Emergency Medical Systems, Department of Motor Vehicles, and local, municipal, and state courts.
- Continue coordination with the SHSP partners, with critical emphasis on data quality.
- Determine the new “home” for the NCATS database, based on negotiations with DOT and Brazos Technology to best integrate frontend and backend users of NCATS.
- Develop automated agency report feedback. This will be developed with the NCATS Modernization Project. The backend user should be able to utilize the data gathered in the State repository. TRCC will prioritize the integration of data to state agency data in 2014.
- Update the State crash repository to become more compliant with current MMUCC standards. Subcommittee meetings through TRCC are scheduled to begin in January 2014.

Funding Source

Countermeasure Strategy
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Countermeasures That Work publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 11, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
Chapter 1 – Alcohol Impaired and Drugged Driving
Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints
Chapter 3 – Aggressive Driving and Speeding
Chapter 4 – Distracted and Drowsy Driving
Chapter 5 – Motorcycle Safety
Chapter 6 – Young Drivers
Chapter 8 – Pedestrians

The potential effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the Countermeasures That Work publication, which should also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s selected strategies.
Related Projects

TS-2014- NVOTS 658-00138 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – NCATS Modernization (Nevada Citation & Accident Tracking System) & Traffic Records
Funding Source: 405
In July of 2010, Brazos Technology was awarded the contract for software for the NCATS project. This project funds a portion of those contract services. Brazos and the TRCC are currently implementing the software with 15 law enforcement agencies, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and NDOT. Based on successful implementation, the number of participating law enforcement agencies is expected to be at least 18 by the end of FY 2014. This project also increases flexibility in awarding limited fixed deliverable grants by allowing agencies to apply for TR equipment grants and provides funding for direct costs such as facilities and travel expenses to conduct meetings to continue the progress of the NCATS MOD project and other TR projects. This project is also supplemented with NDOT funding.

TS-2014-UNR-UNSOM 00151 – University of Nevada School of Medicine – Risk Taking Behaviors and Vehicular Crashes: Data Driven Identification of Behaviors and Intervention
Funding Source: 21
In order to obtain an overall understanding of injuries and lives lost, one needs to consider multiple sources of data that exist in standalone systems. Without a system that can integrate these sources of data, we can only partially quantify the total impact of vehicular crashes in the state. UNSOM created a linked database using 2005 to 2012 NDOT crash records and statewide Nevada trauma records, which has been a valuable resource of hard medical cost data and outcomes for all vehicular injuries that are treated in Nevada’s statewide Trauma System.

The project allows for improved technology that can integrate data and quantify the total impact of vehicular crashes in Nevada; this provides valuable information on the events leading up to a crash. By using this data, Nevada is able to develop a methodology and provide a more comprehensive analysis of priority program areas.

TS-2014-NVOTS 00173 – Nevada Office of Traffic Safety – Program Management (All Programs)
Funding Source: $119,714 (405(c))
Program Managers must assure that all elements of a particular program, or Uniform Guidelines, are being reviewed, considered, implemented, and evaluated at any given time of the grant cycle. Each safety program requires problem identification, data analysis, and multiple grant project development, implementation, and evaluation. The coordinating and monitoring of each project in a program area, along with the evaluation and fiscal monitoring, contribute to the successful completion of a given project and its meeting of specific goals, objectives, and tasks contained within the project agreement.
PERFORMANCE MEASURE 12

CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY

Children age 0-6 Injuries in Traffic Crashes

- Target
- Actual

* Data for targets prior to 2012 is not available.

Justification for Performance Target
The trend data provided by the Nevada School of Medicine – Trauma Center indicated that more than 1,194 child crash victims were brought to Trauma Centers from 2007 to 2011. Among those who were admitted, only 68.9 percent were restrained. Nevada State crash data shows increased numbers of unrestrained children in 2011 and 2012 ages one to eight when compared to the same data for 2007 through 2010. According to this crash data, numbers for restrained children ages one to four in motor-vehicle crashes declined in 2010 but increased for children ages five to 12. The performance target is based on the age group zero to six to coincide with Nevada’s primary child restraint law.

FY 2014 Target
Decrease the number of serious injuries for children between ages zero to six from the three-year average of 70 (2010 to 2012) to 68 (2011 to 2014) by December 31, 2014.

Problem ID Analysis
What: The motor vehicle trauma patients data provided by the Nevada School of Medicine – Trauma Center indicated that more than 562 child crash victims (ages zero to six) were brought to NV Trauma Centers from 2005 through 2011. According to these, child restraint usage declined from 95 in 2005 to 59 in 2008; then it rose to 78 in 2010 and declined to 62 in 2011.
**Who:** Studies show that children involved in rollover crashes had the highest incidence rates of incapacitating injuries. In rollover crashes, the estimated incidence rate of incapacitating injuries among unrestrained children was almost three times greater than for restrained children. In near-side impacts, unrestrained children were eight times more likely to sustain incapacitating injuries than children restrained in child safety seats. During 2005 through 2011, most traffic related injuries were sustained by children two and six years of age.

**Where:** Trauma data for Northern Nevada indicate no significant changes in non-restrained injuries between 2005 (four injuries) and 2011 (three injuries). The same data for Southern Nevada demonstrates a decline from 22 to eight unrestrained injuries from 2005 through 2008 respectively; an increase in 2009 to 11 injuries and a decline to seven injuries in 2010. The overall number of children injured in car crashes declined from 2005 to 2009 but rose in 2010.

**When:** Data shows that a majority of Nevada’s children ages zero to six were injured in traffic crashes on Friday and over the weekend.

**Why:** Studies show that children who are correctly using the appropriate restraint for their sizes and ages are at a significantly lower risk of sustaining serious or fatal injuries.

**Funding Source**

This program is also supported by State funds of $14,999.00.

**Countermeasure Strategy**
OTS projects are coordinated with the strategies found in Nevada’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (www.zerofatalitiesnv.com). Nevada also uses the cost-effective strategies documented within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s *Countermeasures That Work* publication. For the projects detailed under Performance Measure – 12, OTS will utilize strategies outlined in the following problem-specific countermeasures:
Chapter 2 – Seat Belts and Child Restraints

The potential effectiveness of these strategies is documented within the *Countermeasures That Work* publication, which should also be referenced for specifics on Nevada’s selected strategies.

**Related Projects**

**TS-2014-DCSO 00001 – Douglas County Sheriff’s Office – Child Passenger Safety**
**Funding Source:** M402

The Douglas County Sheriff’s Office will continue to operate a permanent fitting station. This station will provide child passenger services to parents and caregivers in Douglas County and neighboring communities. Additionally, this project will sponsor one 40-hour public CPS certification training opportunity to the public.
Funding Source: 402
Mason Valley Fire Department is part of the statewide network of child passenger seat education, outreach, and installation fitting stations. This project will enable the program to expand their current coverage from Central Lyon County. Lyon County is a rural area that has grown leaps and bounds in the past decade and is a bedroom community found within the 70-mile urban radius of northwest Nevada. MVFD is located in Yerington in Central Lyon County, more southern and rural, and is the main provider of child seat education and installation services for the local communities.

Funding Source: M402
Ron Wood Family Resource Center will continue to serve as a child seat inspection station and provide CPS related education to parents and caregivers in Carson, Lyon, Douglas, Storey, and outlying county areas. Child passenger safety seems to not be a priority for an unacceptable number of families in the Northern Nevada rural regions.

TS-2014-TRAUMA SERVICES 00166 – Safe Kids Clark County – Child Safety Seat Inspection Station
Funding Source: M402
This project provides a Child Safety Seat Inspection Station in Clark County in partnership with Clark County Fire Department, enabling parents and caregivers to learn how to safely transport children using the appropriate child safety seat or safety belt correctly. The inspection station includes a one-on-one tutorial instruction provided by certified CPS technicians on the proper use and installation of child restraints.

Funding Source: 402
To ensure child passenger safety, it is essential that public safety personnel, emergency responders, and other appropriate persons receive necessary CPS training. This information and training will enable them to educate and inform parents and caregivers throughout Nevada to enhance public access to child passenger safety information and education.

Funding Source: M402
These funds will be used for purchasing child car seats, OP/OPC related promotional items that will be distributed to communities at various traffic safety events, OP/OPC related public education, assistance to the public to obtain a 40-hour National CPS certification training, and other OP/OPC program related operating needs. It will also support minimal operating needs of Nevada’s Child Passenger Safety Task Force.

Also see projects TS-2014-NYE COMM 00029 in Performance Measure 5.
# Nevada Performance Targets 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PM 1 Fatalities</th>
<th>PM 2 Injuries</th>
<th>PM 3 Fatalities/ VMT</th>
<th>PM 4 Unrestrained</th>
<th>PM 5 Impaired</th>
<th>PM 6 Speeding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 3-year average</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 3-year average</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 3-year average</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 3-year average</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Est. 3-year average</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Est. 3-year average</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Est. 3-year average</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-imputed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PM 7 Motorcycle</th>
<th>PM 8 Unhelmeted</th>
<th>PM 9 Under 20</th>
<th>PM 10 Pedestrian</th>
<th>PM 11 Traffic Records</th>
<th>PM 12 Child Passenger Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 3-year average</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 3-year average</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 3-year average</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 3-year average</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Est. 3-year average</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Est. 3-year average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Est. 3-year average</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00061</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>STARS - Supporting Teens And Roadway Safety</td>
<td>$265,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00075</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Law Enforcement/EMS/FD/Hospital CPS Training</td>
<td>$11,076.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00078</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>State OP/OPC Program</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00080</td>
<td>402, 405, 410, 402, 21</td>
<td>Public Communication and Media Plan</td>
<td>$1,770,563.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00082</td>
<td>154, 402, M402, 405, 406, 410, 23, 21</td>
<td>NV Joining Forces – High Visibility Enforcement Events</td>
<td>$1,983,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00113</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>UNLV/TRC Partnership Nevada Traffic Data Analysis – Young Drivers</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00115</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>SHSP Awards for 2013</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00132</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Impaired Driving Professional Development - TSRP</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00138</td>
<td>408, 405</td>
<td>NCATS Modernization (Nevada Citation &amp; Accident Tracking System) &amp; Traffic Records</td>
<td>$591,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00144</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dashboard</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00145</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>PR//HSP/Outreach</td>
<td>$230,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00146</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>LEL: Law Enforcement Liaison</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00147</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Judicial Education Annual Training and Outreach</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00153</td>
<td>402, 410, 406, 154, M402</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Admin (P&amp;A)</td>
<td>$408,482.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00156</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>OP Assessment</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00159</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>OTS Grant Support/Temp/Printing</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NVOTS 658-00173</td>
<td>402, 405, 410, 21, 2010, 406</td>
<td>Program Management All</td>
<td>$760,542.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-LVMPD 00003</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>DUI Van</td>
<td>$88,269.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-Clark Co Courts 00017</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>DUI Court Program</td>
<td>$88,098.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-UNR 00014</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pedestrian Safety; Distracted Walking/Driving Awareness/“Do the Ride Thing”</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-UNR UNSOM 00151</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Risk Taking Behaviors and Vehicular Crashes: Data driven identification of behaviors and intervention</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-UNLV 00095</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Center for Safety Research and Outreach-Pedestrian Only</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-UNLV 00158</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Seat Belt Usage Surveys</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-DPS NHP 00165</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>DUI detection / PBT devices</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-East Fork Justice 00121</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Douglas County DUI Diversion Program</td>
<td>$41,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-Frontier Comm 00052</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Tri-County Impaired Driving Awareness Program</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-CC District Court 00058</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Carson City Felony DUI Court</td>
<td>$52,847.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-Nye Comm 00029</td>
<td>402, M402</td>
<td>Nye Communities Coalition Impaired Traffic Safety</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-WC 2nd Jud Ct 00093</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Felony DUI Court</td>
<td>$29,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-WC 2nd Jud Ct 00148</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>DUI Court At Misdemeanor level</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-MPD 00084</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Lidar Hand Held Radar</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-SPD 00040</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Police Radar</td>
<td>$15,931.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-Drivers Edge 00126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Driver’s Edge - Teen Safe Driving Program</td>
<td>$258,210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-Nye Comm 00098</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Nye Occupant Protection</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-RPD 00106</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Reno Police Department PED Grant 2013-2014</td>
<td>$34,012.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-NLVPD 00041</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Traffic Safety &quot;Look out for Pedestrians Safety &amp; Education&quot;</td>
<td>$73,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-DCSO 00001</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Child Passenger Safety</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-MasonFire 00054</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Kids In Correct Seats (K.I.C.S.) on the Move</td>
<td>$8,853.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-RWFRC 00047</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Ron Wood Child Car Seat Safety Program</td>
<td>$52,889.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2014-Trauma services 00166</td>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Clark County Child Safety Seat Inspection Station</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGACID</td>
<td>Attorney General's Advisory Coalition on Impaired Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL/ID</td>
<td>Impaired Driving (Alcohol or Impaired Driving)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Courts (state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVMT</td>
<td>Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/P</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Blood Alcohol Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDR</td>
<td>Bill Draft Request (Legislative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIID</td>
<td>Breath Ignition Interlock Device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Critical Emphasis Area (SHSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOT</td>
<td>“Click it or Ticket” seat belt campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Child Passenger Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Calendar Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Distracted Driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Department of Motor Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS-OTS</td>
<td>Department of Public Safety’s-Office of Traffic Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRE</td>
<td>Drug Recognition Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Driving under the Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUDL</td>
<td>Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highways Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMCSA</td>
<td>Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>Fatality Analysis Reporting System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>Federal Fiscal Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Governor's Representative for Highway Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC</td>
<td>Highway Safety Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Plan (Behavioral Traffic Safety)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTOX Committee</td>
<td>Committee on Testing for Intoxication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>Joining Forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEL</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-21</td>
<td>Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMUCC</td>
<td>Minimum Model Uniform Crash Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization (in NV = RTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVMT</td>
<td>Million Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVO</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Occupant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATS</td>
<td>Nevada Citation &amp; Accident Tracking System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCJIS</td>
<td>Nevada Criminal Justice Information System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSA</td>
<td>National Center for Statistics &amp; Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary

NDOT      Nevada Department of Transportation
NECTS      NV Executive Committee on Traffic Safety
NEMSIS     National Emergency Medical Services Information System
NHP      NV Highway Patrol
NHTSA     National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
OP      Occupant Protection
OPC      Occupant Protection for Children
OTS      Department of Public Safety’s-Office of Traffic Safety
P&A      Planning & Administration
PA      Project Agreement
PBT      Preliminary Breath Tester
PD      Police Department
PED      Pedestrian Safety
PM      Performance Measure
RFF OR RFP     Request for Funds, or Request for Proposal
RTC      Regional Transportation Commission
SAFETEA-LU     Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Transparent, Efficient
                Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users
SFST      Standardized Field Sobriety Test
SHSP      Strategic Highway Safety Plan (many partners)
SO      Sheriff’s Office
TRCC      Traffic Records Coordinating Committee
TWG      Technical Working Group
UNLV      University Nevada – Las Vegas
UNR      University Nevada – Reno
UNSOM     University of Nevada School of Medicine
TRC      UNLV’s Transportation Research Center
VMT      Vehicle Miles Traveled

**OTS Program Areas:**

AL/ID      Alcohol/Impaired Driving
OP      Occupant Protection
JF      Joining Forces
MC      Motorcycle Safety
PS      Pedestrian Safety
SP      Speed
TR      Traffic Records
P&A      Planning & Administration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Open Container Penalty Transfer Funds (ID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Section 402 of SAFETEA-LU Highway Safety Act authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Section 405 of SAFETEA-LU Highway Safety Act authorization and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405(*)</td>
<td>National Priority Safety Programs of MAP-21 Highway Safety Act authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(405 (b) OP, 405 (c) TR, 405 (d) DD, and 405 (f) MC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Section 406 of SAFETEA-LU Highway Safety Act authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Section 408 of SAFETEA-LU Highway Safety Act authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Section 410 of SAFETEA-LU Highway Safety Act authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Section 405(d) DD of MAP-21 Highway Safety Act authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nevada Department of Transportation HSIP funding, MAP-21 Highway Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Section 2010 of SAFETEA-LU Highway Safety Act authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M402</td>
<td>Section 402 of MAP-21 Highway Safety Act authorization Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>