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Introduction

The Arizona Governor’s Office of Highway Safety (GOHS) is the focal point for highway safety issues in Arizona. GOHS is a cabinet agency that provides leadership by developing, promoting, and coordinating programs; influencing public and private policy; and increasing public awareness of highway safety.

The 2016 HSP is composed of seven sections – Arizona’s Highway Safety Planning Process, Highway Safety Performance Plan, Highway Safety Strategies and Projects, Performance Report, Program Cost Summary, Certifications and Assurances, and Section 405 Grant Application. The Planning Process (Section 1.0) discusses the data sources and processes used to identify Arizona’s highway safety problems and establish highway safety performance. It details, through thoughtful and thorough data analysis and problem identification, the progress Arizona is making in addressing its most significant behavioral safety problems, including impaired driving, speeding and aggressive driving, and occupant protection. These issues, which align with the national priority areas identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), are linked through specific performance measures and targets to Arizona’s goal of reducing fatalities across all program areas in the Performance Plan (Section 2.0). Arizona’s Evidence-Based Traffic Safety Enforcement Program (Section 2.2) ensures that enforcement resources are used efficiently and effectively.

The Highway Safety Strategies and Projects (Section 3.0) chapter describes the projects and activities the Arizona GOHS will implement to achieve the goals and objectives outlined in the Performance Plan. It details how Federal funds provided under the Section 402 (State and Community Highway Safety Program), 405 (National Priority Safety Programs) grant programs, and other funding will be used to support these initiatives along with Arizona’s traffic records system. Continued assessment and investment in the latter is essential for maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of traffic records data collection and analysis.

The Performance Report (Section 4.0) focuses on Arizona’s success in meeting the performance targets for the core performance measures identified in the FFY 2014 HSP. The Program Cost Summary (Section 5.0) details the proposed allocation of funds (including carry-forward funds) by program area based on the goals identified in the Performance Plan (Section 2.0) and the projects and activities outlined in the Highway Safety Strategies and Projects (Section 3.0). The funding level is based on what GOHS estimates its share will be under the Federal grant programs for the 2016 Federal Fiscal Year. The Certifications and Assurances (Section 6.0) chapter includes a certification statement signed by the Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety. Section 6.0 outlines the measures the State will take to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and
regulations, and financial and programmatic requirements mandated under the Section 402 program.

The Section 405 application Appendix D is presented in Section 7.0. Previously, national-priority safety programs were funded through a variety of Federal grant programs. Under the present Federal transportation funding legislation known as MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century), these grant programs (e.g., Section 405c Traffic Safety Information System, Section 405d Impaired Driving, and Section 405f Motorcycle) were merged into a single program, Section 405. In FFY 2016, Arizona is applying for Section 405 funds to address State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements, Impaired Driving Countermeasures, Pedestrian/Bicycle and Motorcyclist Safety.

Arizona GOHS has expended or will expend all carry forward dollars on Sections 410 and 164 as suggested by NHTSA Headquarters.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{arizona-gohs-slogan-and-logo}
\end{center}

\textit{Arizona GOHS slogan and logo.}
Mission Statement

GOHS, as the focal point for highway safety issues in Arizona, provides leadership by developing, promoting, and coordinating programs; influencing public and private policy; and increasing public awareness of highway safety.

Above: Governor Douglas A. Ducey addresses the GOHS 2014 Statewide DUI News Conference at the Arizona Capitol. Below: GOHS Director Alberto Gutier opens the GOHS 2014 Statewide DUI News Conference. This yearly event, started by Director Gutier in 1995, increases awareness of DUIs, seat belt use, child seats, speeding, and emphasizes the enforcement of all traffic laws.
1.0 Arizona’s Highway Safety Planning Process

Arizona Revised Statute §28-602 designates the Arizona Governor’s Office of Highway Safety (GOHS) as the appropriate agency to administer highway safety programs in the State. Executive Order 2004-24 designates GOHS as the State Highway Safety Agency to administer the Highway Safety Plan (HSP) on behalf of the Governor.

GOHS produces the annual HSP to serve as the implementation guide for highway safety projects throughout Arizona. The HSP also is an application for funding through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Project selection is data driven and utilizes state and national traffic safety data (e.g., crashes, fatalities, injuries, citations, etc.). Knowledge of the Arizona political, economic, and demographic environments, as well as highway safety expertise on the part of staff and other partners, also are taken into account where appropriate.

The three leading causes of death from vehicular collisions in Arizona are speeding and aggressive driving, impaired driving, and unrestrained vehicle occupants. Consequently, the majority of funding in the FY 2016 HSP is devoted to Impaired Driving, Police Traffic Services, and Occupant Protection. GOHS has established a channel of communication and understanding among the Governor’s Office, the Legislature, state agencies, political subdivisions, and community groups to address these and other aspects of the statewide highway safety program.

1.1 PLANNING PROCESS

The GOHS will submit the HSP by July 1 to fund FFY 2016 grants on October 1, 2015. Programs starting on October 1 will be funded utilizing available carry forward funds until GOHS receives current year funding from Congress.
Figure 1.1 below shows the Arizona Highway Safety Planning process.

**Figure 1.1 The Highway Safety Planning Process**

- **January**
  - Receive Next FFY Proposals
  - Proposals Due to GOHS by Mid-February

- **March/April**
  - “Major Agency Grant Proposals”
  - Next FFY Proposals Evaluated & Prioritized by Program Area

- **May**
  - Final Funding Decisions Made and Selection Completed
  - Agencies Notified of Status of Their Grant Requests

- **June/July**
  - Grant Contracts Prepared by GOHS Staff
  - Highway Safety Plan (HSP) Developed and Completed for Next FFY

- **August**
  - Final Agreements Reviewed and Mailed to Agencies

- **September**
  - FFY Ends September 30th
  - Next FFY Grants Finalized

- **October**
  - Federal Fiscal Year begins October 1st
  - Grants Implemented
  - Agencies may start spending or ordering

- **November**
  - Proposal Guide for Next Federal Fiscal Year is Sent to Grantees
  - November 1, Previous FFY Final Reports of Cost Incurred (ROI) Due to GOHS

- **December**
  - Request for Proposal Next FFY
  - Annual Performance Report (APR) for Previous FFY Completed

In November of each year, a letter outlining the Proposal Process and priority program areas is sent to political subdivisions, state agencies, and nonprofits regarding the GOHS Proposal Process. All statewide law enforcement and nonprofit agencies are encouraged to participate actively in Arizona’s Highway Safety Program. In addition to the written notification, the letter and proposal Guide are posted on the GOHS website.

Proposals are due to GOHS through the GOHS e-grants system at the end of February. Each proposal is assigned a number and pertinent information is added to an Excel spreadsheet.

Meetings with the GOHS Director, Assistant Director, Comptroller, and Project Coordinators to review the proposals take place from March through April. During these meetings each proposal is discussed and the level of funding is
GOHS Grants Philosophy:
Grants for Performance

determined. These discussions are centered on the following Grants for Performance evaluation criteria:

- Is the proposal eligible for funding?
- Does the proposal address one or more of the priority areas identified in the proposal letter?
- Did the submitting agency follow the guidelines set forth in the Proposal Guide; e.g., the agency provided:
  - Data;
  - Statistics;
  - A cover letter signed by agency head; and
  - Other.
- Has the agency previously been included in the HSP?
  - If yes, how did they perform?
  - Were narrative and financial reports completed in accordance with contractual requirements?

When evaluating grant applications, GOHS bases decisions on an agency’s past performance. If an agency exhibits poor performance - operationally or financially, the agency is less likely to receive funding. Conversely, GOHS rewards top performing agencies with additional funding if requested and needed.

GOHS requires grantees requesting $100,000 or greater and nonprofit applicants to make formal presentations before GOHS staff. These presentations provide agency background information and an overview of the project request. This process allows the GOHS Director and staff to ask questions and better assess the grant application. GOHS’ policy is to fund all proposals that meet the criteria to ensure the HSP is representative of the entire State. Once the grants and funding levels are determined by program area, Executive Staff begin HSP development and Project Coordinators begin writing contracts so they can be mailed to grantees by early September.

Agencies review grant contracts in September and gain approval (if necessary) from appropriate governing boards and councils. Once completed, the GOHS Director signs the contract and the agency can begin incurring costs pursuant to the grant contract.
1.2 GOHS ORGANIZATION

GOHS is led by the Director, Alberto C. Gutier, who is appointed by and reports to the Governor of Arizona, Douglas A. Ducey. Mr. Gutier is supported by an administrative staff and grant coordinators headed by Assistant Director, Mari Hembeck and financial staff headed by the Comptroller, Megan Darian. The dotted lines in Figure 1.2 depict the Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor and Special Project coordinator. These two positions are supported by GOHS and housed in offices outside the GOHS office.

Figure 1.2 Organizational Chart
1.3 **PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION**

GOHS supports activities having the greatest potential to save lives, reduce injuries, and improve highway safety in Arizona. A broad range of data was analyzed, together with highway safety research and the expertise of GOHS staff, to identify the most significant safety problems in the State. The relative magnitude of the various contributing crash factors was reviewed and tracked over time, as were the demographic characteristics of drivers and crash victims and whether they used, or did not use, appropriate safety equipment.

Sources of highway safety data and research used by GOHS include the following:

- Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS);
- National Occupant Protection and Use Survey;
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration;
- Arizona Strategic Highway Safety Plan;
- Arizona Governor’s Office of Highway Safety, Web Site Reporting System;
- Arizona Department of Transportation, Information Technology Group;
- Arizona Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division;
- Arizona Department of Public Safety, Crime Lab Reports;
- Arizona Department of Health Services, Health and Vital Statistics Section;
- Arizona Motorcycle Safety Council;
- Arizona DUI Abatement Council (state funds);
- Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police;
- Arizona Sheriffs Association;
- Arizona Prosecuting Attorneys Advisory Council; and
- National Safety Council.

Table 1.1 below shows the relative importance of the various contributing crash factors and demographics to crash fatalities in Arizona in 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestrained Vehicle Occupant</th>
<th>Alcohol Impaired Driving</th>
<th>Speeding Related</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Drivers Age 20 and Younger</th>
<th>Bicyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ADOT.
These data show that speeding and aggressive driving, alcohol impairment, and unrestrained occupants are the three most important factors contributing to crash fatalities in Arizona. Therefore GOHS is focusing its resources to address these areas through the following Tier 1 program areas:

- **Police Traffic Services (PT)** - To achieve and maintain compliance with traffic laws such as aggressive driving, speeding, and red light running. Enforcement must be consistent, impartial and uniformly applied to all street and highway users.

- **Alcohol and Other Drugs (AL)** - To reduce the number and severity of crashes in which alcohol and/or drugs are contributing factors.

- **Occupant Protection (OP)** - To increase the statewide seat belt/child safety seat (CSS) usage rate of motor vehicle occupants and to increase public information and education of the benefits of seat belt/CSS usage for adults and children.

Other conditions and contributing crash factors also are addressed in the HSP and are tracked through the following Tier 2 program areas:

- **Accident Investigation (AI)** - To provide training and resources for vehicular crimes units to more effectively aide in the investigation and prosecution of fatal traffic collisions.

- **Emergency Medical Services (EM)** - To support rural first responders with emergency medical services (EMS) equipment.

- **Motorcycle Safety (MC)** - To increase the public’s awareness and understanding of and participation in motorcycle safety.

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (PS)** - To increase the public’s awareness and understanding of and participation in pedestrian and bicycle safety.

- **Roadway Safety (RS)** - To improve traffic conditions in identified corridors and local jurisdictions by funding minor traffic engineering improvements, correcting signing deficiencies and promoting safety programs.

- **Traffic Records (TR)** - To develop a comprehensive data processing system that brings together the engineering, enforcement, educational, medical, behavioral health, prosecution, judicial, correctional, and emergency response disciplines.
1.4 **Performance Measures**

The primary highway safety goal for Arizona is to reduce fatalities across all program areas. GOHS tracks performance measures based on FARS data in combination with several other data sources to understand trends and set safety performance targets. Table 1.2 below summarizes the performance measures tracked by GOHS.

**Table 1.2 Arizona Performance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Number of traffic-related fatalities.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Number of traffic-related serious injuries.</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Alcohol and Other Drugs (AL)</td>
<td>Number of fatalities involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of 0.08 percent or greater.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Occupant Protection (OP)</td>
<td>Number of unrestrained vehicle occupant fatalities in all seating positions.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Occupant Protection (OP)</td>
<td>Percent of front seat vehicle occupants who are observed using safety belts.</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Police Traffic Services (PT), Alcohol and Other Drugs (AL), Motorcycle, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Safety (MC/PS), and Occupant Protection (OP)</td>
<td>Number of speeding-related fatalities.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Motorcycle Safety (MC)</td>
<td>Number of motorcycle fatalities.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Motorcycle Safety (MC)</td>
<td>Number of unhelmeted motorcycle fatalities.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Pedestrian Safety (PS)</td>
<td>Number of pedestrian fatalities.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Bicycle Safety (PS)</td>
<td>Number of bicycle fatalities.</td>
<td>FARS and ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Occupant Protection (OP)</td>
<td>Number of Seat Belt Citations issued.</td>
<td>Grant Activity Reports and GOHS Web Site Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Alcohol and Other Drugs (AL)</td>
<td>Number of Impaired Driving arrests made during grant-funded enforcement.</td>
<td>Grant Activity Reports and GOHS Web Site Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Police Traffic Services (PT)</td>
<td>Number of Speeding Citations issued during grant-funded enforcement.</td>
<td>Grant Activity Reports and GOHS Web Site Reporting System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5 Highway Safety Trends and Goals

Table 1.3 below shows the data points associated with the performance measures identified in the previous section.

**Table 1.3 Arizona Highway Safety Trends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014 (^a)</th>
<th>5-Year Average (^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>806</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious Traffic Injuries</strong></td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>4,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fatalities/100M VMT</strong></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Unrestrained Vehicle Occupant Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Impaired Driving Fatalities (BAC = 0.08%)</strong></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speeding-Related Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Motorcycle Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unhelmed Motorcycle Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers Age 20 or Younger in Fatal Crashes</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Observed Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles</strong></td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Seat Belt Citations Issued</strong></td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>5,439</td>
<td>21,828</td>
<td>29,710</td>
<td>27,840</td>
<td>24,848</td>
<td>21,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Impaired Driving Arrests Made</strong></td>
<td>14,154</td>
<td>19,482</td>
<td>31,561</td>
<td>32,174</td>
<td>31,905</td>
<td>29,250</td>
<td>28,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Other Citations (including speed) Issued</strong></td>
<td>73,600</td>
<td>101,848</td>
<td>331,269</td>
<td>377,992</td>
<td>482,190</td>
<td>565,827</td>
<td>371,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (all 2009 through 2013 data except serious injuries); ADOT for serious traffic injury data and all 2014 data. GOHS Reporting System for number of Seat Belt citations, Impaired Driving Arrests Made and Other Citations.

Notes: \(^a\) 2014 data is from ADOT. For yearly ADOT fatality data going back to 1984 and monthly data back to 2005, please see Figures B.1, B.2, and B.3 in Appendix B.

\(^b\) Five-Year Averages of fatalities are for 2009 through 2013, the most recent five years of FARS data. Averages for Serious Traffic Injuries, Percent Observed Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles, Seat Belt Citations, Impaired Driving Arrests and Other Citations are for 2010 through 2014.

\(^c\) In 2014, there were 565,827 citations issued for speed and aggressive driving which includes, speed not reasonable or prudent, excessive speed, speed not right for conditions, and reckless driving while speeding or other citations issued for other moving violations like red light running. Arizona is continually improving the capture of citation data recorded in our tracking system.
Data Sources and Figure Explanation

The following figures contain data from the following sources: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (“FARS data”), Arizona Motor Vehicle Crash Facts and ad-hoc data retrieval prepared by the Arizona Department of Transportation (“ADOT/ALISS data”) and the 2014 Arizona Seat Belt/Motorcycle Helmet Use and Driver Survey prepared by the Behavior Research Center and Preusser Research Group (“Seat Belt Survey”). FARS data were unavailable for 2014 at the time of publication. Since GOHS is committed to providing the most accurate and recent data available, ADOT data is included alongside FARS data in any figure where possible.

For most performance measures FARS data and ADOT data match very closely. In these cases GOHS strongly believes that 2014 FARS data (from which HSP goals should be made) will match closely to the 2014 ADOT data and goals are made accordingly. However, some performance measures have FARS data and ADOT data that are consistently and significantly different. This is due to differences in defining how fatalities fall into a particular category. For instance, in the alcohol-impaired driving fatalities data, the ADOT data is consistently higher than the FARS data. GOHS uses this knowledge to predict that the missing 2014 FARS data will be lower than the 2014 ADOT data and sets goals with this in mind.

The five-year moving averages in the following figures use FARS data for all years except 2014. The five-year moving average for 2014 incorporates 2009-2013 FARS data and 2014 ADOT data. In years where FARS data and ADOT data match closely this moving average should be quite accurate. In years where the data do not match as closely the average will be skewed slightly from what it would be had the 2014 FARS data been available. It is GOHS’ sincere hope that in the future FARS data will be available in a much more timely and accessible manner so that GOHS and the public can make proper year-to-year comparisons and goals without having to ‘predict’ what the final FARS data will be.
**Fatalities**

The total number of traffic fatalities decreased significantly from 849 in 2013 to 774 in 2014. Arizona had over 1,000 fatalities as recent as 2007; the trend of decreasing fatalities is tremendous news. Arizona’s population continues to grow quickly and this makes the decrease in fatalities an even better accomplishment.

**Figure 1.3 Traffic Fatalities**

![Traffic Fatalities Graph](image)

**Explanation of Fatality Goal-Setting Process**

In the 2015 HSP a goal of 828 fatalities was set for 2015. Due to the sharp decrease in fatalities in 2014, GOHS has revised the 2015 goal to be 774 fatalities with a goal for 2016 of 767 fatalities. We hope that in 2015 we can maintain the huge decrease of fatalities from 849 to 774 (a 9% decrease).
Serious Traffic Injuries

This is the second year serious traffic injuries have been included in the HSP. Previous versions of the HSP have instead included total traffic injuries. Since serious traffic injuries have not been tracked as far back as total traffic injuries, a five-year moving average before 2011 is unavailable. However, it is still apparent that there has been a slight decrease in serious traffic injuries over the past few years.

**Figure 1.4 Serious Traffic Injuries**

![Serious Traffic Injuries Graph](Image)

*Explanation of Serious Traffic Injury Goal-Setting Process*

The 2015 HSP goal of 4,159 serious injuries is still valid. In 2016 GOHS aims to continue the decrease in serious traffic injuries to 4,035. These goals aim to continue the trend of decreasing serious traffic injuries seen in the five-year moving average, but do account for the likely increase in crashes and injuries from the anticipated increase in road usage due to a continued economic recovery.
Fatality Rate

In recent years the VMT has remained fairly constant as evidenced in Figure 1.5. The falling five-year average seen is due mostly to the high level of fatalities seen in 2006, which led to a fatality rate of 2.07 per 100 million VMT. Fatality rate data for 2014 were unavailable at the time of publication.

**Figure 1.5 Fatality Rate**

![Fatality Rate Graph](image)

**Explanation of Fatality Rate Goal-Setting Process**

Since 2014 fatality rate data were unavailable at the time of publication, the 2015 goal remains unchanged at 1.35. The goal for 2016 will 1.34 per 100 million vehicle miles travelled. These goals reflect a modest decrease in the fatality rate.
Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities
ADOT data shows unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities have returned to the low level reached in 2010. The drop in ADOT fatalities should correspond to a similar drop in FARS fatalities. Unrestrained fatalities have decreased as seat belt usage in Arizona increased to 87.2 percent in 2014.

Figure 1.6  Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities

Explanation of the Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatality Goal-Setting Process
The sharp drop in unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities has led to a revised 2015 goal of 230 fatalities. The goal for 2016 will be 222 fatalities. With the anticipated continuing increase in seat belt usage rates (see Figure 1.14), these fatality goals seem very achievable. The GOHS 2014 Annual Survey showed a seat belt use rate of 87.2 percent which is above the 87.0 percent national average. This has been accomplished even with Arizona being a secondary law state.
Alcohol-Impaired Driving Fatalities

ADOT data show that alcohol-impaired driving fatalities were flat between 2013 and 2014. FARS data are normally lower than ADOT data for alcohol-impaired driving fatalities\(^1\) so GOHS predicts that 2014 FARS data will end up close to the 2013 level of 219 alcohol-impaired driving fatalities.

Figure 1.7 Alcohol-Impaired Driving Fatalities

Explanation of the Alcohol-Impaired Driving Fatality Goal-Setting Process

Arizona has some of the toughest impaired driving laws in the nation and is nationally recognized as having the best trained officers in the detection of alcohol- and drug-impaired drivers. Because of this strong enforcement GOHS has set 2015 and 2016 alcohol-impaired driving fatality goals of 218 and 210 respectively.

\(^1\) ADOT/ALISS data consider a fatality alcohol-impaired if the officer writing the crash report indicated impairment by any person involved in a crash (driver, pedestrian or pedal cyclist) whereas FARS data only count impairment if there is a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) from a driver of 0.08 or above. Thus those crashes where a BAC reading for a driver did not exist, but the officer wrote ‘impaired’, would be counted in ADOT but not FARS data.
According to ADOT data, speeding-related fatalities decreased roughly 30 fatalities from 2013 to 2014. Prior to 2008 speeding-related fatalities were consistently over 400, which explains the sharp drop in the five-year moving average. Recently speeding-related fatalities show a shallow but continual decrease.

**Figure 1.8 Speeding-Related Fatalities**

**Explanation of the Speeding-Related Fatality Goal-Setting Process**

GOHS is keeping the 2015 HSP goal of 259 speeding-related fatalities in 2015. The goal for 2016 is 251. GOHS hopes to continue the gradual decline in speeding-related fatalities.
Motorcycle Fatalities

Motorcycle fatalities increased slightly from 141 in 2012 to 151 in 2013, but fell sharply in 2014 to 127. Unhelmeted motorcycle fatalities account for the majority of this decrease. GOHS hopes this reversal of the 2010-2013 increase in fatalities holds in the coming years.

**Figure 1.9 Motorcycle Fatalities**

*Explanation of the Motorcycle Fatality Goal-Setting Process*

Based on the sharp decline of motorcycle fatalities in 2014, GOHS has revised the 2015 goal to 127. The 2016 goal for motorcycle fatalities is 125.
Unhelmed Motorcycle Fatalities

Unhelmed motorcycle fatalities increased from 69 in 2012 to 83 in 2013, but fell to 58 in 2014. This sharp decline in unhelmeted motorcycle fatalities explains the majority of the decrease in motorcycle fatalities in 2014. According to ADOT’s 2014 Crash Facts, 3.1 percent of accidents involving a motorcycle operator with a helmet resulted in a fatality, while 7.5 percent of those involving an operator without a helmet resulted in a fatality. Not wearing a helmet almost doubles the risk of fatal injury.

Figure 1.10 Unhelmed Motorcycle Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of the Unhelmed Motorcycle Fatality Goal-Setting Process

Due to the sharp decrease in unhelmeted motorcycle fatalities in 2014, GOHS has revised down the 2015 goal to 65. The goal for 2016 is 63. Unhelmed motorcycle fatalities comprised almost half of the motorcycle fatalities in 2014.
Young Drivers in Fatal Crashes

The number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes has been very volatile since 2008. In 2014, drivers age 20 or younger were involved in 86 fatal crashes, a drop of over 30.

Figure 1.11  Drivers Age 20 or Younger in Fatal Crashes

Explanation of the Drivers Age 20 or Younger in Fatal Crashes

Goal-Setting Process

Based on the 2014 fall in drivers age 20 or younger in fatal crashes, GOHS has revised the 2015 goal to be 94. The goal for 2016 is 90 drivers age 20 or younger in fatal crashes.
Pedestrian Fatalities

There was virtually no change in pedestrian fatalities from 2013 to 2014. Furthermore, the level of pedestrian fatalities has remained fairly flat from 2010 to 2014.

Figure 1.12 Pedestrian Fatalities

Explanation of the Pedestrian Fatalities Goal-Setting Process

A light rail system was opened in Phoenix in December 2008 and has been steadily expanded since then. GOHS hopes to continue to prevent pedestrian fatalities through implementation of the Arizona Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety Plan and an enforcement program it started in 2014 to prevent pedestrians from crossing light rail tracks in unsafe locations. Other programs aimed at pedestrian safety target both children and adults in Arizona’s urban areas. Arizona and its major cities are vehicle dependent due to population growth and travel distances. Educating drivers and pedestrians in having mutual respect towards each other will go a long way toward reducing fatalities. Through these measures, GOHS hopes to decrease pedestrian fatalities from 157 in 2014 to a goal of 144 in 2015 and 136 in 2016.
Bicycle Fatalities

This is the second year that bicycle fatalities are included in the HSP. While bicycle fatalities are a small portion of total fatalities in the state of Arizona, they are certainly a focus of GOHS. Up until 2012, bicycle fatalities hovered around 20 fatalities. However, in 2013 bicycle fatalities jumped to 30 and there were 28 fatalities in 2014.

Figure 1.13  Bicycle Fatalities

![Figure 1.13  Bicycle Fatalities](image)

Explanation of the Bicycle Fatalities Goal-Setting Process

GOHS has set the goals for 2015 and 2016 to be 24 and 22 respectively. This will return bicycle fatalities closer to the level seen before 2013. Arizona and its major cities are vehicle dependent due to population growth and travel distances. GOHS will continue implementation of the Arizona Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety Plan in 2016. Educating drivers and bicyclists in having mutual respect towards each other, coupled with enforcement programs, will go a long way toward reducing fatalities.
Percent Observed Seat Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles

The observed seat belt rate increased from 84.7 percent in 2013 to 87.2 percent in 2014. There has been a steady increase in the seat belt use rate since 2008 when seat belt usage was only 79.9 percent.

Figure 1.14  Percent Observed Seat Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles

Explanation of the Percent Observed Seat Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles

Goal-Setting Process

Based on the trend data shown above, GOHS has set the 2016 goal for observed seat belt use at 88.8 percent. This continues the steady increases seen since 2008. Even though Arizona is a secondary seat belt law state there has been a continual increase in the seat belt rate. Arizona has surpassed the national seat belt use rate of 87.0 percent in 2014.
1.6 ADDITIONAL DATA AND ANALYSIS

GOHS analyzes a variety of other safety data as part of the problem identification and performance goal setting process. In particular, GOHS analyzes safety data related to who is being impacted (age and ethnicity), what types of vehicles are involved, where the crashes are occurring (counties), and when they are taking place (time of day, day of week, and month of year). These data are shown in the following series of tables.

Tables 1.4 shows restraint use for vehicle occupants age 4 and under, while Table 1.5 shows restraint use for occupants age 5 and above.

Table 1.4  Vehicle Occupant Fatalities Age 4 and Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrained</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestrained</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Restraint Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1.5  Vehicle Occupant Fatalities Age 5 and Above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrained</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestrained</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Restraint Use</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6 shows fatalities among American Indian, Non-Hispanic/Unknown increased from 113 in 2008 to 114 in 2012. These figures include occupants and non-occupants (pedestrians, pedal cyclists, and unknown non-occupants).

GOHS can only impact two of the 23 tribes in Arizona with Federal grants because the sovereignty issue in GOHS contracts is not waived by the other tribes. GOHS attempts to provide grant assistance to other tribes, but has been told by these tribes they object to the grant reporting requirements of data including impaired driving arrests and convictions of tribal members in and around the reservations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Type by Race/Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupants (All Vehicle Types)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Non-Hispanic/Unknown</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Non-Hispanic/Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Race and Unknown Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>792</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Occupants (Pedestrians, Pedal cyclists and Other/Unknown Non-Occupants)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Non-Hispanic/Unknown</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Non-Hispanic/Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Race and Unknown Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>938</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS).
### Table 1.7  Fatalities by Person Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Car</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck – Pickup</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck – Utility</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck – Van</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck – Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Truck</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown Occupants</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupants</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorcyclists</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoccupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclist and Other Cyclist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown Nonoccupants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonoccupants</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:  FARS.

### Table 1.8  Fatalities by Crash Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Fatalities (All Crashes)</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Vehicle</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving a Large Truck</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving Speeding</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving a Rollover</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving a Roadway Departure</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving an Intersection (or Intersection-Related)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:  FARS.
Figure 1.15  Fatalities by County
2013 and 2014

Figure 1.16  Crashes and Fatal Crashes by Day of Week  
2014

![Crashes and Fatal Crashes by Day of Week 2014](image)


Figure 1.17  Crashes and Fatal Crashes by Month  
2014

![Crashes and Fatal Crashes by Month 2014](image)

1.7 **COORDINATION WITH THE STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN**

GOHS has been an active partner in Arizona’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) process since the first plan which was adopted in 2007. GOHS participated in the recent update of the SHSP which was released in 2014. The plan is data-driven and includes statewide goals, objectives, and emphasis areas which represent the state’s crash problems. The 2014 plan includes the following behavioral emphasis areas which are also addressed in the 2016 HSP:

- Speeding and Aggressive Driving
- Impaired Driving
- Occupant Protection
- Motorcycles
- Nonmotorized Users (Pedestrians and Bicycles)

The first four emphasis areas are associated with Arizona’s highest number of fatalities and serious injuries and have been designated by the SHSP Executive Committee as a top focus emphasis area. Fact sheets for the above emphasis areas are included in the following pages. It is clear from a review of the strategies section on each fact sheet that GOHS plays a major role in achieving a reduction in the State’s fatalities and serious injuries. The FFY 2016 HSP includes strong programs in these areas, which will support SHSP implementation.

The GOHS Director is a member of the SHSP Executive Committee. Director Gutier coordinated with ADOT to ensure the performance measures common between the HSP and their Highway Safety Improvement Program, or HSIP, (fatalities, fatality rate, and serious injuries) are defined identically as coordinated through the SHSP. The Agency will use the HSP and its resources to support the behavioral emphasis areas included in the plan.

GOHS coordinates the HSP with the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Targets for fatalities, serious injuries and the fatality rate must be consistent between the FFY 2016 HSP and the HSIP. However, the current HSIP does not include targets for these three performance measures. The HSIP will begin having targets in 2016, at which time GOHS will ensure that the HSP and HSIP targets are identical.
Arizona Strategic Highway Safety Plan Endorsement

As part of the Arizona 2014 Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) update process, the Executive Committee serves in a leadership capacity for developing, promoting and implementing cost-effective transportation-safety strategies within the state to reduce the number and severity of crashes on all of Arizona’s public roadways.

This SHSP was developed through a data-driven, collaborative approach amongst Arizona’s safety stakeholders. The SHSP represents our state safety goal statement and identifies the Emphasis Areas that we will focus on to achieve our goal. The SHSP is an overarching strategic statewide safety document to guide our existing safety planning and programming processes; facilitate implementation of recommended safety strategies and action steps or countermeasures through our existing plans and programs; and modify our current planning processes over time to adopt and institutionalize a change in Arizona’s transportation safety culture.

2014 SHSP Executive Committee Members

- John S. Halikowski, Director, Arizona Department of Transportation
- Alberto Guter, Director, Arizona Governor’s Office of Highway Safety
- Robert Halliday, Director, Arizona Department of Public Safety
- Dr. David Harden, Strategic Planning and Communications Section Chief, Arizona Department of Health Services
- Karla Petty, Arizona Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration
- Matthew Finley, Arizona Division Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
- Christopher Murphy, Region 9 Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
- James McLaughlin, Region 9 Program Manager, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

We, on behalf of the State Agency members of the Arizona Strategic Highway Safety Plan Executive Committee, approve this SHSP.

John S. Halikowski
Director, Arizona Department of Transportation

Alberto Guter
Director, Arizona Governor’s Office of Highway Safety

Robert Halliday
Director, Arizona Department of Public Safety

Will Humble
Director, Arizona Department of Health Services

In coordination with the following federal transportation-safety agencies:
Speeding is the leading behavioral factor contributing to fatal and serious-injury crashes in Arizona. Speeding is commonly associated with other high-risk behaviors, such as aggressive or impaired driving and lack of restraint use. Speeding substantially increases both the occurrence and severity of collisions. Speeding-related fatalities and serious injuries are counted from all crashes involving at least one motorist driving above the speed limit or driving too fast for conditions. These crashes contributed to 39 percent of all fatalities and 34 percent of all serious injuries in Arizona from 2005 to the end of 2014.

### Purpose Statement

Save lives through education, enforcement and engineering, and promote safe and respectful driving on all Arizona roadways.

### Goal

Reduce fatalities and the occurrence and severity of serious injuries resulting from crashes involving speeding and aggressive driving on all public roadways in Arizona.

### Strategies to Achieve Goal

- Increase highly visible and effective enforcement to reduce the frequency of crashes associated with speeding and aggressive driving.
- Institute a statewide speed-management strategic initiative.
- Educate all road users about the dangers and consequences of speeding and aggressive driving.
- Use engineering design to reduce speeds.
- Use crash-related data to target enforcement and public information campaigns.
- Utilize marketing efforts, such as a multimedia approach, to educate drivers.

Executive Committee designated top focus Emphasis Area.
Impaired Driving

Impaired-driving fatalities and serious injuries include all instances in which a driver is under the influence of alcohol, drugs or medication. These crashes are more likely to be very severe and represent a far larger proportion of fatalities than that of less-severe crashes. In Arizona, 35 percent of all fatal crashes and 20 percent of crashes resulting in serious injuries involved an impaired driver. While alcohol remains the largest contributor to impaired-driving crashes that result in fatalities or serious injuries, the trend in alcohol-related crashes is steadily declining; however, fatal and serious-injury crashes involving a driver impaired by drugs and medication are increasing.

Purpose Statement

Prevent alcohol- and drug-related crashes through education and enforcement.

Goal

Reduce fatalities and the occurrence and severity of serious injuries resulting from impaired-driving-related crashes on all public roadways in Arizona.

Strategies to Achieve Goal

- Conduct high-visibility impaired-driving enforcement initiatives.
- Increase educational efforts for everyone about the dangers and consequences of driving impaired.
- Work with the court system to promote policies and practices that result in the imposition of meaningful penalties for impaired-driving convictions.
- Partner with employers to suggest policies and procedures aimed at reducing impaired driving by their employees.
- Improve public awareness of and access to alternate forms of transportation.
- Improve data collection to understand and address impaired driving more effectively.
- Treat alcohol and drug dependency of DUI offenders.

Occupant Protection

Occupant-protection fatalities and serious injuries are counted in crashes involving drivers or passengers not wearing a seat belt or a child not being properly restrained in the appropriate child safety seat. Just over 30 percent of people who died in a crash in Arizona were not properly restrained. This figure compares to 14 percent of those who sustained serious injuries and 8 percent of those who sustained minor injuries. Simply stated: Crash data show that seat belts and child safety seats save lives. Collisions in which motorists are unrestrained are also associated with a higher number of other behavioral characteristics, such as speeding and impaired driving, where safety risk is further increased.

Purpose Statement
Everyone is buckled up, every time.

Goal
Reduce fatalities and the occurrence and severity of serious injuries resulting from crashes involving unrestrained or unprotected occupants on all public roadways in Arizona.

Strategies to Achieve Goal
- Couple enhanced enforcement of existing restraint-use laws with high-visibility marketing about enforcement efforts.
- Strengthen outreach and education about the proper use of seat belts and child-restraint devices to identified target audiences.
- Strengthen driver education and safety-restraint-usage outreach to identified target audiences.
- Improve restraint-usage data collection, integration, analysis and sharing between agencies at all levels.
- Research and identify effective policies to increase restraint usage that can be implemented by state, local and tribal governments.
- Promote employer engagement in efforts to encourage restraint usage 100 percent of the time.

Executive Committee designated top focus Emphasis Area.
Motorcycles

Motorcycles require more skill to safely operate than a passenger vehicle. The relationship of speed and balance is a key consideration when operating a motorcycle. A motorcycle offers no protection in a crash as opposed to the protective features of passenger vehicles. In Arizona, high-severity motorcycle crashes have reduced substantially since 2005, while most other crash categories have gone down significantly. For most rider age groups, severe motorcycle crashes have actually decreased but, among riders ages 55 and older, these crashes have increased dramatically.

Purpose Statement

Create a safer Arizona for all motorcyclists through education and training, and promote accountability and responsible attitudes of all road users.

Goal

Reduce fatalities and the occurrence and severity of serious injuries resulting from crashes involving motorcycles on all public roadways in Arizona.

Strategies to Achieve Goal

- Improve public awareness, education and training for motorcyclists, motorists and all safety stakeholders to promote safer driving behaviors.
- Research, identify and implement effective policies to improve motorcycle safety at the state, local and tribal government levels.
- Enhance rider training programs to improve motorcycle safety.
- Develop and execute enforcement programs to improve motorcycle safety.
- Improve infrastructure features to help reduce the number and severity of motorcycle crashes.
- Improve motorcycle crash, registration and licensing data collection, integration, analysis and sharing between agencies at all levels.
- Seek funding to support motorcycle-related safety projects and programs.

Executive Committee designated top focus Emphasis Area.
Nonmotorized Users | Pedestrians

Pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries are counted from all crashes involving a pedestrian and a motor vehicle. Every year in Arizona, more than 1,500 pedestrians are struck by a motor vehicle, and nearly 10 percent of those crashes result in a pedestrian fatality. These crashes contributed to 16 percent of all fatalities and seven percent of serious injuries during the eight-year period analyzed. As populations in Arizona grow and communities and cities become more walkable, pedestrian safety continues to be a critical safety focus.

Purpose Statement
Create a safer Arizona for all nonmotorized users through education and training, and promote accountability and responsible attitudes of all road users.

Goal
Reduce fatalities and the occurrence and severity of serious injuries resulting from crashes involving nonmotorized users on all public roadways in Arizona.

Strategies to Achieve Goal
- Reduce pedestrian exposure to vehicle traffic.
- Improve sight distance and/or visibility between motor vehicles and pedestrians.
- Increase enforcement of existing laws designed to promote pedestrian safety, such as jaywalking and vehicles failing to stop for pedestrians at pedestrian crossings.
- Increase pedestrian-safety education for all roadway users.
- Reduce vehicle speeds in predictable locations, such as areas of high pedestrian traffic and school bus stops.
- Utilize the Safe Routes to School Program.
Nonmotorized Users | Bicyclists

Bicyclist fatalities and serious injuries are counted from all crashes involving a motor vehicle and a bicycle or other pedalcycle. These crashes contributed to 2.6 percent of all fatalities and just over four percent of all serious injuries in Arizona during the last ten years. Bicycling is increasing in popularity both as recreation and a means of travel. These nonmotorized road users are more difficult to see and especially vulnerable to impact by motor vehicles. While awareness and efforts related to bicycle safety continue to increase, bicycle fatalities and injuries remain high and have increased in some areas.

Purpose Statement

Create a safer Arizona for all nonmotorized users through education and training, and promote accountability and responsible attitudes of all road users.

Goal

Reduce fatalities and the occurrence and severity of serious injuries resulting from crashes involving nonmotorized users on all public roadways in Arizona.

Strategies to Achieve Goal

- Improve public awareness to promote safer behavior by all roadway users relative to bicycle traffic.
- Improve infrastructure features to reduce the frequency of bicycle crashes.
- Conduct enforcement programs for all roadway users relative to bicycle traffic.
- Enhance training programs for all roadway users and safety practitioners.
- Improve data collection, integration, analysis and sharing at all levels.
- Seek funding to support safety programs to improve bicycle safety.
- Research and identify effective policies to improve bicycle safety that can be implemented by state, local and tribal governments.

Trend in Bicyclist Crash Fatalities and Serious Injuries
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2.0 **Highway Safety Performance Plan**

During the problem identification process, emphasis was given to assessing changes in severity over a five-year period or a reduction over the previous year’s data; whichever showed the most realistic incremental change for improved highway safety. While the HSP is a one-year plan, behavioral change takes time. A countermeasure instituted to address a particular traffic safety problem may not show measurable impact for several years or more. For this reason, GOHS establishes performance targets that reflect incremental but important gains in safety. Measured over a series of years, these reductions in crashes and resulting injuries and fatalities add up to safer travel for everyone on Arizona’s roadways.

2.1 **Highway Safety Goals for FFY 2016**

Table 2.1 identifies the program areas, performance targets, and performance measures which are the focus of the GOHS HSP efforts for FFY 2016. The three national activity measures, are included, however no targets have been set for them. Arizona will report progress on the grant activity measures annually.

**Table 2.1 Performance Targets and Measures**
### CORE OUTCOME MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-1 Traffic Fatalities (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce total fatalities by 5.7 percent from 813 (2009-2013 average) to 767 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-2 Serious Injuries in Traffic Crashes (ADOT)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>4,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce serious traffic injuries by 7.7 percent from 4,371 (2009-2013 average) to 4,035 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-3 Fatalities/VMT (FARS/FHWA)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce fatalities/VMT by 0.8 percent from 1.35 (2009-2013 average) to 1.34 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-4 Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities, All Seat Positions (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions by 6.4 percent from 237 (2009-2013) to 222 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-5 Alcohol-Impaired Driving Fatalities (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce alcohol impaired driving fatalities by 2.8 percent from 216 (2009-2013 average) to 210 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-6 Speeding-Related Fatalities (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce speeding-related fatalities by 12.9 percent from 288 (2009-2013 average) to 251 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-7 Motorcyclist Fatalities (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce motorcyclist fatalities by 2.3 percent from 128 (2009-2013 average) to 125 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-8 Unhelmeted Motorcyclist Fatalities (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities 7.4 percent from 68 (2009-2013 average) to 63 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-9 Drivers Age 20 or Younger Involved in Fatal Crashes (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce drivers age 20 and younger involved in fatal crashes by 11.8 percent from 102 (2009-2013) to 90 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-10 Pedestrian Fatalities (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce pedestrian fatalities by 0.8 percent from 137 (2009-2013 average) to 136 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-11 Bicyclist Fatalities (FARS)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce bicyclist fatalities 4.4 percent from 23 (2009-2013 average) to 22 by 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORE BEHAVIOR MEASURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-1 Observed Seat Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles, Front Seat Outboard Occupants (State Survey)</strong></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants by 1.6 percentage points from 87.2 percent in 2014 to 88.8 percent in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DATA SOURCE: Except for C-2, B-1, all figures reflect the most recent FARS figures as shown on the NHTSA State Traffic Safety Information (STSI) Website. 5-Year Moving Averages are unavailable for Serious Injuries before 2011.*
2.2 EVIDENCE-BASED TRAFFIC SAFETY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

A significant portion of Arizona’s highway safety grant funds is awarded to law enforcement agencies each year. The GOHS has developed policies and procedures to ensure that enforcement resources are used efficiently and effectively to support the goals of the state’s highway safety program. Arizona incorporates an evidence-based approach in its statewide enforcement program through the following components:

Data-driven Problem Identification

The statewide problem identification process used in the development of the HSP has been described in Section 1.0; the data analyses are designed to identify who is involved in crashes and when, where and why crashes are occurring. Key results summarizing the problems identified are presented in the statewide and individual program area sections of the HSP.

All enforcement agencies receiving grant funding must also use a data-driven approach to identify the enforcement issues in their jurisdictions. Data documenting the highway safety issue identified must be included in the funding application submitted to GOHS, along with the proven strategies that will be implemented to address the problem.

Implementation of Evidence-based Strategies

To ensure that enforcement resources are deployed effectively, law enforcement agencies are directed to implement evidence-based strategies using the data provided. The HSP narrative outlines Arizona’s broad approach to address key problem enforcement areas and guides the local jurisdictions to examine local data and develop appropriate countermeasures (using Countermeasures That Work and other proven methods) for their problem areas. Examples of proven strategies include targeted enforcement focusing on specific violations, such as distracted driving and speeding, or on specific times of day when more violations occur, such as nighttime impaired driving road checks and seat belt enforcement. High visibility enforcement, including participation in national seat belt and impaired driving mobilizations, is also required. Several mandated holiday enforcement blitzes are also included. The Data Driven Approach to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS) model and other strategies that use data to identify high crash locations are also proven strategies. By implementing strategies that research has shown to be effective, more efficient use is made of the available resources and the success of enforcement efforts is enhanced. Multi-jurisdictional enforcement efforts are encouraged and supported by the GOHS. Further detail on specific enforcement efforts can be found in each of the program areas.
Continuous Monitoring

Continuous monitoring of the implementation of enforcement programs is another important element of the enforcement program. Enforcement agencies’ deployment strategies are continuously evaluated and adjusted to accommodate shifts and changes in their local highway safety problems. Several methods are used to follow-up on programs funded by GOHS. The law enforcement agencies receiving grant funding are required to report on the progress of their programs in their activity reports. These reports must include data on the activities conducted, such as the area and times worked and the number of tickets issued. Funding decisions for subsequent years are based on the effectiveness of the implementation and performance of the enforcement project.

Enforcement grants are also monitored throughout the year by the GOHS. Representatives of police agencies and associated Law Enforcement Liaisons (LELs); contact with enforcement agencies is maintained through meetings, conferences, grant monitoring sessions, phone calls and press events. Enforcement deployment strategies are continuously evaluated for their impact, effectiveness and modifications are made where warranted. A citation/arrest database is used to track and monitor enforcement efforts. Special projects are implemented as needed.

3.0 Highway Safety Strategies and Projects

The Arizona FFY 2016 Highway Safety Plan (HSP) commences October 1, 2015 and ends September 30, 2016. It is a flexible working document that can be revised to accommodate necessary changes to existing programs, as well as to introduce new programs. It contains a statewide overview and detailed summaries of traffic safety data, as well as program and project descriptions and budgets for the allocation of available funding.

Funding for FFY 2016 is estimated based on allocated amounts from prior years plus carry forward funding. The amounts listed with each project are estimates as of the submission date for this Highway Safety Plan. For FFY 2016, GOHS is utilizing the remaining carry forward Section 402 and 405d funding for some projects. Carry forward funding will fund Section 402 and 405d grants until all FFY 2015 funds are expended and new Section 402 and 405d funding is received. Additionally, GOHS manages funding from the Arizona DUI Abatement Fund. These funds are not programmed through the HSP and are addressed separately in Appendix A.
The GOHS philosophy and commitment is “Grants for Performance”; in other words, we treat every taxpayer dollar granted to law enforcement agencies, nonprofits, fire districts, and city and county transportation departments with respect. All funds are devoted to improving safety on our roadways, and all grantees are required to report their progress and expenditures in a timely manner, in addition to quarterly and final reports of cost incurred. Our monitoring process is designed to fulfill our commitment to the public we serve and ensure State and Federal compliance with statutes, rules, and guidelines.

Program Overview

The number one predictor of traffic crashes is the amount of travel a state’s citizens experience. The more we travel, the more we are exposed to the possibility of crash involvement. Between 2006 and 2011, Arizona was among the states hardest hit by a severe recession and an increase in fuel prices. Exemplary law enforcement, training, education, and public awareness programs, together with the troubled economy, resulted in the achievement of dramatic reductions in fatal and serious injury crashes. Arizona’s economy has begun to stabilize and improve since the 2007 recession. In 2010, Arizona realized the beginning of a recovery, which resulted in more jobs, increased home values, and increased economic activity. With a strengthened economy and lower fuel prices, our citizens bought new vehicles. They traveled more often and for longer distances. As might be expected, congestion increased on our highways, and with increased exposure, crashes, fatalities and injuries began to increase. Despite the increase in economic activity, there was a tremendous drop in traffic fatalities in 2014 to 774. This fall from 849 traffic fatalities in 2013 is wonderful news.

The following sections provide details on the program areas, goals, performance measures, strategies, task or project descriptions, funding levels and sources. Multiple projects are included under most strategies to provide consistency with the Arizona accounting system. Therefore, a summary budget is included at the end of each section. The emphasis areas in Arizona’s FFY 2016 HSP include speeding and aggressive driving, impaired driving, occupant protection, motorcycles, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, traffic records, accident investigation, and planning and administration.
administration. GOHS used Countermeasures That Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices, Seventh Edition, 2013 (CTW) as a primary reference aid in the selection of effective, evidence-based countermeasure strategies for the FFY 2016 HSP program areas. Citations referencing CTW provide the chapter and the section number (e.g., CTW, Chapter 2, Section 2.1). The citations are identified in the program/project descriptions and denote the effectiveness of the related countermeasure strategy where appropriate. Note: the effectiveness of GOHS administrative and management functions and activities is not evaluated or referenced. The seventh edition of CTW can be found on the NHTSA web site at: http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/nti/pdf/811727.pdf.

3.1 IMPAIRED DRIVING PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Drivers and pedestrians impaired by alcohol and both legal and illegal drugs continue to be a challenge in Arizona. Reducing the number of alcohol-related fatalities, and injuries occurring on the highways remains a top safety focus area for Arizona. According to the NHTSA Fatality Analysis and Reporting System (FARS), in 2013, 219 fatalities involving at least one driver with a BAC of 0.08 percent or greater occurred. This represents a 4.8 percent decrease from 2012. Research shows sustained, long-term, highly visible enforcement coupled with effective education programs reduces impaired driving crashes and fatalities.

GOING OUT TONIGHT?...SO ARE WE

Southeastern Arizona DUI Task Force

DRIVE HAMMERED...GET NAILED

Southeastern Arizona DUI Task Force.

In 2014, Arizona law enforcement agencies made over 1,100,000 traffic stops and 29,000 DUI arrests. Though Arizona has some of the toughest impaired driving laws in the country, Arizona is experiencing an alarming increase in arrests
stemming from drug impaired driving. Prescription drug abuse is an epidemic, and “medical marijuana” is legal. As drugged driving has become more prevalent in Arizona arrests have increased dramatically, from about 700 in 2008 to about 4,200 in 2014. This increase is most likely due to the focus on drugged driving recognition (DRE) training for law enforcement. The State has a cadre of superbly trained officers in alcohol- and drug-impaired driver detection, but the challenges continue. Most law enforcement training in drugged driving recognition is through the advanced roadside impaired driving enforcement (ARIDE) course. This course is targeted to NHTSA Standardized Field Sobriety Test (SFST) certified officers.

The Arizona Governor’s Office of Highway Safety provides continuing support for aggressive impaired driving enforcement. The law enforcement agencies work closely with Director Alberto Gutier and the GOHS office to communicate the impaired driving issues affecting their respective areas of responsibility. In turn, grantees collaborate with local schools, civic groups and media organizations for public awareness and education opportunities. Because of these working partnerships, GOHS uses data collected on the GOHS DUI reporting website to provide an effective distribution of funding in support of statewide impaired driving enforcement needs.

In FFY 2015, GOHS allocated funding through 89 contracts to law enforcement and non-law enforcement agencies, county sheriff’s departments, the state highway patrol and other state agencies to participate in overtime enforcement details and purchase equipment to enhance impaired driving enforcement statewide, including participation in the national high-visibility enforcement mobilization over the Memorial Day holiday period. The purchase of Portable Breath Testing devices (PBTs), Intoxilyzers, Phlebotomy supplies, and mobile Dual Channel Blood Alcohol Analyzers equipment are essential to improve the efficiency of impaired driver processing in addition to decreasing the time an arresting officer spends out of service for processing.

GOHS ensures mobility for the statewide impaired driving task force participants through the purchase of DUI Processing Vehicles. The vehicles are often conversion vans containing equipment, materials and supplies necessary to process an impaired driver. Such equipment often includes phlebotomy chairs, Intoxilyzers and booking capability to include LiveScan equipment. GOHS also provides funding for larger DUI Processing Vehicles to allow law enforcement officers the capability to process more than one suspect at a time in addition to providing space for officers with special training to evaluate and identify drug impaired drivers.

The purchase of capital outlay equipment such as Agilent GC/FID Blood Alcohol Analysis equipment for the agency crime labs is a testament to the dedication exhibited by GOHS toward removing impaired drivers from the roadways. Current issues in impaired driving include not only alcohol but also drug-impaired drivers. The purchase of reliable, current equipment is necessary to process blood evidence collected from drivers arrested for driving under the
influence. Properly analyzed evidence is an important component when prosecuting an impaired driver.

GOHS developed a strategic, statewide impaired driving task force which includes members from state, county, local, and tribal law enforcement personnel in addition to non-law enforcement agencies. The strategic task force works to increase impaired driver recognition training for law enforcement personnel and enhance enforcement efforts in addition to identifying best practices to increase public awareness and education about the dangers and consequences of impaired driving. The strategic task force coordinates with law enforcement agencies statewide to encourage the implementation of additional HVE impaired driving efforts such as saturation patrols, Wolf Packs, and Task Force details.

Each agency schedules enforcement details specific to the impaired driving issues in their respective areas. Overtime details include sobriety checkpoints as well as saturation patrols and DUI Task Force details set up to address holiday and special event enforcement. Staffing for the overtime details includes full time officers, deputies and detention officers, who detect, evaluate, arrest and process impaired drivers.

Figure 3.1 below is the advertisement distributed for the 2015 Super Bowl held in Glendale, Arizona. One million copies were printed by the NFL.

**Figure 3.1  2015 Super Bowl Program Advertisement**
Media Advisories are sent to all TV stations, their reporters and producers, radio stations and their anchors as well as newspaper reporters, columnists and editorial writers before major enforcement activities. After the holiday enforcement (Cinco de May, Labor Day, etc.), news releases summarizing the arrests and citations made during the activity are released.

During the Thanksgiving to New Year’s holiday, these news releases are sent often to the media and they are used in a cumulative manner to show enforcement, citations, and arrests through January 2nd of the New Year. Figure 3.2 is a sample of the Arizona Statewide Memorial Day weekend DUI Enforcement Media Advisory (sent before enforcement begins).
Figure 3.2 2015 Statewide Memorial Day weekend DUI Enforcement Media Advisory

ARIZONA STATEWIDE HOLIDAY DUI ENFORCEMENT

PHOENIX — These are the impaired driving deployment activities that will occur during the Memorial Day weekend throughout the state. DHS Director, Alberto Gutierrez said “We want everyone to enjoy the Memorial Day weekend; don’t do so by having a sober designated driver calling a friend, or having a bad time.”

For more information, contact: Alberto Gutierrez - Office: (602) 255-3216
Cell: (602) 577-1200
Home: (602) 944-1015
Email: agutierrez@azsos.gov
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### Table 3.1 Performance Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce alcohol impaired driving fatalities by 2.8 percent from 216 (2009-2013 average) to 210 by 2016</td>
<td>Number of fatalities involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of 0.08 percent or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies

To combat the prevalence of impaired driving, GOHS devotes significant resources to overtime enforcement, equipment, and training for law enforcement officers statewide. Arizona’s impaired driving program utilizes enforcement, education, training, and public awareness to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries resulting from alcohol- and drug-impaired collisions. GOHS will pursue the following strategies in FFY 2016 to reduced impaired driving on our roadways.

1. DUI enforcement program;
2. Funding for equipment and supplies;
3. Training;
4. Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor; and
5. Public awareness activities.

GOHS will continue to fund these proven effective strategies to reduce the number of alcohol and drug driving-related fatalities by increasing the number of DUI arrests, training law enforcement on effective tools and techniques, and regularly informing the public about the danger associated impaired driving and the threat of arrest for those who break the laws. For an overview of Arizona DUI Enforcement Statistics from 2005 through 2014, see Figure B.5 in Appendix B.

### Programs and Projects

**Project Title:** Impaired Driving Enforcement Program

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with NHTSA’s Grant Tracking System (GTS) and the Arizona accounting system (See Table 3.2).

**Description:** Arizona’s DUI enforcement program includes parallel enforcement activities: 1) year-long sustained enforcement efforts and 2) periodic enhanced enforcement campaigns, such as the Holiday DUI Task Force enforcement efforts. Arizona’s DUI Enforcement Program mobilizes enforcement efforts where a high frequency of fatal and/or serious injury impaired driving collisions occur. The GOHS requires each of the 70 agencies receiving DUI enforcement funds to conduct educational and public awareness campaigns in their respective communities.
**Budget:** $2,148,641.00  
**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 1, Sections 2.1, and 2.2

### Table 3.2  Impaired Driving Enforcement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-001</td>
<td>ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY PD</td>
<td>$25,979.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-002</td>
<td>CAMP VERDE MO</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-003</td>
<td>CLARKDALE PD</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-004</td>
<td>CLIFTON PD</td>
<td>$6,365.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-005</td>
<td>COOLIDGE PD</td>
<td>$15,135.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-006</td>
<td>DEPT OF LIQUOR LICENSES AND CONTROL</td>
<td>$41,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-007</td>
<td>EL MIRAGE PD</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-008</td>
<td>FLAGSTAFF PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-009</td>
<td>FLORENCE PD</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-010</td>
<td>GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-011</td>
<td>GLOBE PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-012</td>
<td>JEROME PD</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-013</td>
<td>MARICOPA CSO</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-014</td>
<td>MARICOPA CSO</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-015</td>
<td>MARICOPA PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-016</td>
<td>MESA PD</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-017</td>
<td>MESA PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-018</td>
<td>NAU PD</td>
<td>$12,108.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-019</td>
<td>NAVAJO CSO</td>
<td>$23,843.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-020</td>
<td>NOGALES PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-021</td>
<td>ORO VALLEY PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-022</td>
<td>PARKER PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-023</td>
<td>PATAGONIA MO</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-024</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-025</td>
<td>PHOENIX PD</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-026</td>
<td>PHOENIX PD</td>
<td>$81,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-027</td>
<td>PHOENIX PD</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-028</td>
<td>PIMA CSD</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-029</td>
<td>PIMA PD</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-030</td>
<td>PINAL CSO</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-031</td>
<td>PINETOP-LAKESIDE PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-032</td>
<td>PRESCOTT PD</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-033</td>
<td>PRESCOTT VALLEY PD</td>
<td>$25,711.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-034</td>
<td>SAFFORD PD</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-035</td>
<td>SAHUARITA PD</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-036</td>
<td>SALT RIVER PIMA MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-037</td>
<td>SAN LUIS PD</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-038</td>
<td>SANTA CRUZ CSO</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-039</td>
<td>SCOTTSDALE PD</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-040</td>
<td>SIERRA VISTA PD</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-041</td>
<td>SNOWFLAKE-TAYLOR PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-042</td>
<td>SPRINGERVILLE PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-043</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS PD</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-044</td>
<td>SURPRISE PD</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-045</td>
<td>TEMPE PD</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-046</td>
<td>TEMPE PD</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-047</td>
<td>THATCHER PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-048</td>
<td>TOLLESON PD</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-049</td>
<td>TUCSON PD</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-050</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-051</td>
<td>WELLTON PD</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-052</td>
<td>WICKENBURG PD</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-053</td>
<td>WILLCOX PD</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-054</td>
<td>WILLIAMS PD</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-055</td>
<td>YAVAPAI CSO</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-056</td>
<td>YUMA PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-001</td>
<td>APACHE CSO</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-002</td>
<td>APACHE JUNCTION PD</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-003</td>
<td>AVONDALE PD</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-004</td>
<td>BUCKEYE PD</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-005</td>
<td>CASA GRANDE PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-006</td>
<td>CHANDLER PD</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-007</td>
<td>COCHISE CSO</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-008</td>
<td>COTTONWOOD PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-009</td>
<td>DOUGLAS PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-010</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-011</td>
<td>FLAGSTAFF PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-012</td>
<td>GRAHAM CSO</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-001</td>
<td>GILBERT PD</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-002</td>
<td>GLENDALE PD</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-003</td>
<td>GOODYEAR PD</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-004</td>
<td>KINGMAN PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-005</td>
<td>LA PAZ CSO</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-006</td>
<td>LAKE HAVASU CITY PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-007</td>
<td>MARANA PD</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-008</td>
<td>PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,148,641.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Impaired Driving Enforcement Equipment Program

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system (See Table 3.3).

**Description:** GOHS provides funding for equipment that supports and enhances impaired driving enforcement efforts. The equipment purchased includes Portable Breath Testing Devices (PBT), phlebotomy supplies, PBT and Intoxilyzer mouthpieces, drug testing kits, urine and blood kits, and gas cylinders used to calibrate PBTs, Intoxilyzers, and Livescan Instruments. PBTs are handheld instruments used in the field by law enforcement officers to indicate the presence of alcohol in suspected impaired drivers and underage alcohol offenders. Livescan Instruments take electronic fingerprints, provide for immediate comparison to check DUI suspects for prior arrests, and assist officers in positive suspect identification. Eighteen enforcement agencies will receive funding for equipment under this program.

**Budget:** $248,693.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 1, Section 2.3 and improvements to accuracy and timeliness of traffic records data.
### Table 3.3  Impaired Driving Enforcement Equipment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-057</td>
<td>ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY PD</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-058</td>
<td>BUCKEYE PD</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-059</td>
<td>BULLHEAD CITY PD</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-060</td>
<td>CHANDLER PD</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-AL-061</td>
<td>COCHISE CSO</td>
<td>$7,108.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-062</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$34,372.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-AL-063</td>
<td>GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>$13,604.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-064</td>
<td>GILBERT PD</td>
<td>$26,033.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-AL-065</td>
<td>MESA PD</td>
<td>$84,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-066</td>
<td>ORO VALLEY PD</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-AL-067</td>
<td>PAYSON PD</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-068</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-AL-069</td>
<td>PIMA CSD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-070</td>
<td>SALT RIVER PIMA MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY</td>
<td>$7,165.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-071</td>
<td>SIERRA VISTA PD</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-072</td>
<td>YAVAPAI CSO</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-073</td>
<td>YUMA PD</td>
<td>$3,961.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-009</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PD</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>405d, 402-PT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  $248,693.00

**Project Title:** Impaired Driving Training Program

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system (See Table 3.4).

**Description:** GOHS devotes significant resources toward the training of officers in areas such as Standardized Field Sobriety Test (SFST), Drug Recognition Expert (DRE), Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus (HGN), DUI report writing and testimony, law enforcement phlebotomy, Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE), and Drug Impairment Training for Educational Professionals (DITEP). As a result, Arizona continues to be a national leader in the Drug Recognition Experts (DRE) program. Arizona’s robust DRE Certification Night program has proven to be successful, consequently Arizona provides training to law enforcement officials from other states and countries. Through FFY 2013, GOHS funded 75 DRE certification nights hosted by the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office for law enforcement officials from 13 other states, and are now hosting the return of DRE students from Canada. MCSO collected almost 1,100 training urine sample in its assistance of certifying over 700 DREs across the USA. MCSO has 102 DRE certification nights scheduled for
2014, and has filled the calendar in 2015 with over 100 scheduled certification nights. For 2016, 4 States have already committed and reserved dates.

During the last fiscal year, GOHS provided more than $160,000 in support of law enforcement training programs, including support for: travel reimbursement, training, books, materials and supplies, conference speakers in support of special training knowledge, and conference registration to provide necessary updates to the knowledge of Arizona’s DREs, as well as training for Law Enforcement Phlebotomists are all covered by GOHS.

The increase in drugged driving arrests is most likely due to the focus on DRE training for law enforcement. DUI drug arrests increased more than 550 percent since 2008. The majority of law enforcement training in drugged driving recognition is through the advanced roadside impaired driving enforcement (ARIDE) course. This course targets NHTSA SFST certified officers. Approximately 1,250 law enforcement officers in Arizona have received ARIDE training since 2010. Arizona takes drugged driving impairment seriously and to date all DPS officers are mandated to attend ARIDE training. GOHS also conducts training for prosecutors and judges on DUI law issues through the Arizona Prosecuting Attorney’s Advisory Council (“APAAC”) and the Arizona Supreme Court.

**Budget:** $321,900.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 1, Section 7.1

Table 3.4  Impaired Driving Training Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-074</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-074</td>
<td>SANTA CRUZ CSO</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-516</td>
<td>GOHS – Judges Conference</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-511</td>
<td>GOHS – Lifesavers Conference</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-500</td>
<td>GOHS – DRE/SFST Support/Training</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-501</td>
<td>GOHS – Phlebotomy</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-525</td>
<td>GOHS – 2015 DRE Conference</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$321,900.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor Program

**Project Number:** 2016-405d-010

**Description:** Arizona’s Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) is housed in the City of Phoenix Prosecutor’s Office. The TSRP assists prosecutors statewide in the adjudication of impaired driving cases. The TSRP focuses on two goals: 1) increase the visibility of traffic safety cases with prosecutors and prosecutors’
visibility with the traffic safety community and 2) increase the confidence of
prosecutors in the courtroom. Funding is provided for personnel services,
employee-related expenses, materials and supplies, and travel. (Note: Addi-
tional funding totaling $112,991 is provided by the Arizona DUI Abatement
Council.

**Budget:** $112,992.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 1, Section 3

**Table 3.5  Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-010</td>
<td>City of Phoenix Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>$112,992.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Impaired Driving Awareness Program

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to
provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system (See Table 3.6).

**Description:** The GOHS Director conducts press conferences and frequent
media interviews in English and Spanish throughout the year and during
Holiday enforcement campaigns. The event is widely covered by local TV, radio,
and print media. GOHS’ on-line DUI reporting system and press releases during
planned enforcement events are distributed daily to the media with updated
impaired driving statistics from the previous evening’s activity and prior events.
These releases provide constant news reports on DUI arrests and a plea to the
public to reduce these numbers. GOHS also conducts an annual survey to track
public perception and behavior with respect to impaired driving, occupant
protection, and speeding.

Earned media is supplemented by targeted paid media efforts. Targeted media
efforts include the following activities:

- Law enforcement agencies and fire departments conduct “Mock Crashes” to
  educate high school students about the risks associated with underage
  alcohol consumption;

- SADD implements programs to education high school students on the
dangers of impaired driving;

- MADD’s court monitoring programs informs GOHS, the TSRP, and others
  about prosecution and adjudication practices;

- GOHS develops, prints, and distributes public information and education
  materials to promote public awareness of and compliance with Arizona’s
  DUI laws;
- GOHS “Public Safety Days” at the Arizona State Fair provide the public with information and education about Arizona DUI laws, children, family and general traffic safety issues; and
- GOHS maintains a storage unit for DUI public information and education materials to ensure they are available when needed.

**Budget**: $484,151.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness**: CTW, Chapter 1, Sections 3.3, 5.2, and 6.5

### Table 3.6  Impaired Driving Awareness Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-076</td>
<td>SADD</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-077</td>
<td>ARIZONA YOUTH PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>$11,955.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-078</td>
<td>MADD</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-079</td>
<td>MADD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-080</td>
<td>PHOENIX FIRE DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-081</td>
<td>SUPERIOR PD</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-II-013</td>
<td>CHANDLER PD</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-500</td>
<td>GOHS – Public Safety Days</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-504</td>
<td>GOHS – PI&amp;E</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-506</td>
<td>GOHS – Alcohol Survey</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-514</td>
<td>GOHS – Storage Unit</td>
<td>$5,196.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-518</td>
<td>GOHS – Law Enforcement Conference</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-523</td>
<td>GOHS – Mock Crash</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-524</td>
<td>GOHS – Paid Media</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$484,151.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.7  Impaired Driving Program Summary Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Enforcement Program</td>
<td>$2,148,641.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Enforcement Equipment Program</td>
<td>$248,693.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Training Program</td>
<td>$321,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor Program</td>
<td>$112,992.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Awareness Program</td>
<td>$484,151.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,316,377.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 OCCUPANT PROTECTION PROGRAM OVERVIEW

According to 2013 FARS data, unrestrained fatalities decreased 9.9 percent from 252 in 2012 to 227 in 2013. GOHS accomplishes its goal of improving safety belt and child safety seat use through strong, cohesive statewide enforcement and education campaigns under the banner of “Buckle Up Arizona…It’s the Law!” Arizona is a secondary safety belt violation state, but the law enforcement agencies implement a zero-tolerance policy when they encounter nonuse of safety belts coincidental to a stop for another traffic infraction. Occupant protection enforcement is a consistent component of all grant supported traffic safety projects. Enforcement is supported by extensive education and public awareness activities conducted by GOHS together with public and private sector partners. The activities include safety belt and child safety seat classes and inspections, media awareness campaigns, participation in the national high-visibility enforcement mobilization Click It or Ticket over the Memorial Day holiday period and other events.

Table 3.8 Performance Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions by 6.4 percent from 237 (2009-2013 average) to 222 by 2016</td>
<td>Number of unrestrained vehicle occupant fatalities in all seating positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants by 1.6 percentage points from 87.2 percent in 2014 to 88.8 percent by 2016</td>
<td>Percent of front seat vehicle occupants observed using safety belts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies

GOHS will implement six strategies for increasing the use of safety belts and child safety, including:
1. An annual safety belt and child safety seat use survey;
2. Rigorous law enforcement;
3. Equipment to support enforcement efforts;
4. Training and education;
5. Public awareness campaigns; and
6. Occupant Protections program management.

Programs and Projects

Project Title: Safety Belt and Child Safety Seat Survey
Project Number: 2016-OP-515
Description: GOHS will contract to provide an annual safety belt and child safety seat survey.
Budget: $58,800.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW Chapter 1, Section 1.2; Chapter 2, Section 2.1; Chapter 3, Section 3.2; Chapter 4, 4.1

Table 3.9  Safety Belt Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-515</td>
<td>GOHS Annual Safety Belt Survey</td>
<td>$58,800.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Occupant Protection Law Enforcement

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

**Description:** This task supports funding personnel services (overtime) and associated employee-related expenses for law enforcement agencies to enforce safety belt and child safety seat laws. Funding also is provided to fire departments to conduct child safety seat clinics within their jurisdictions.

The Arizona enforcement community actively participates in the *Buckle Up Arizona...It’s the Law/Click it or Ticket* (CIOT) and Child Passenger Safety campaigns and related events. Funding is provided to the top performing agencies as measured by the number of citations written during these periods in 2014. GOHS will determine these agencies in early January 2015. In 2014, twenty agencies received funding for occupant protection enforcement. One additional agency participated in an enforcement campaign using their own funding mechanism.

Budget: $348,000.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 2, Section 2.1, 5.1, and 7.3

Table 3.10  Occupant Protection Enforcement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-001</td>
<td>CHANDLER PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-002</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-003</td>
<td>GLENDALE PD</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-004</td>
<td>PHOENIX PD</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-005</td>
<td>PIMA CSD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-006</td>
<td>TEMPE PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-007</td>
<td>TUCSON PD</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-509</td>
<td>CLICK IT OR TICKET (CIOT) ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$348,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Title:** Equipment and Child Safety and Booster Seats

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

**Description:** This program provides equipment and child safety seats to support enforcement and child safety seat fitting stations to fifteen agencies through a competitive grant process which includes statistical review of agency enforcement activities and data analysis of regions non-use and misuse of CPS devices.

**Budget:** $204,529.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 2, Section 7.2

### Table 3.11 Occupant Protection Equipment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-008</td>
<td>APACHE COUNTY PHSD</td>
<td>$9,114.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-009</td>
<td>CHANDLER FIRE, HEALTH AND MEDICAL DEPT</td>
<td>$9,189.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-010</td>
<td>CHILD AND FAMILY RESOURCES – PINAL</td>
<td>$12,160.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-011</td>
<td>COCONINO COUNTY PHSD</td>
<td>$9,830.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-012</td>
<td>FLORENCE PD</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-013</td>
<td>SAFE KIDS – MARICOPA COUNTY</td>
<td>$33,044.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-015</td>
<td>MARICOPA INTEGRATED HEALTH SYSTEM</td>
<td>$13,513.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-016</td>
<td>MARICOPA PD</td>
<td>$8,876.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-017</td>
<td>NOGALES PD</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-018</td>
<td>PHOENIX CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL</td>
<td>$8,200.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-019</td>
<td>PHOENIX FIRE DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-020</td>
<td>RIO RICO FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$2,913.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-021</td>
<td>SANTA CRUZ CSO</td>
<td>$4,250.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-022</td>
<td>TUCSON MEDICAL CENTER HEALTH CARE</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-023</td>
<td>TUCSON PD</td>
<td>$4,378.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-024</td>
<td>VERDE VALLEY FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$7,962.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$204,529.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Occupant Protection Training and Education Program

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

Description: GOHS facilitates the statewide Children are Priceless Passengers (CAPP) program. The program is open to the general public, but is focused on child passenger safety law violators. It provides an opportunity for education on the proper installation and use of child safety seats. CAPP operates in 11 locations and is expanding to additional locations in FFY 2015. GOHS also sponsors child safety seat certification classes in three geographic areas across the State in proximity to individuals who want to become certified technicians.

GOHS supports “Public Safety Days” at the Arizona State Fair to provide the public information and education about Arizona occupant protection laws and general traffic safety issues. A storage unit is maintained to ensure materials are readily available when needed.

Budget: $102,500.00

Evidence of Effectiveness: CTW, Chapter 2, Sections 3.1, 3.2, 6.1, 6.2, and 7.2

Table 3.12 Occupant Protection Training and Education Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-501</td>
<td>GOHS – Public Safety Days</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-503</td>
<td>GOHS – CAPP Support</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-505</td>
<td>GOHS – PI&amp;E</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-507</td>
<td>GOHS – Storage Unit</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-510</td>
<td>Lifesavers Conference</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$102,500.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Title: Governor’s Office of Highway Safety Paid Media

Project Number: Two project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

Description: This task provides funding for the development and distribution of paid media campaigns (electronic, print, radio, and broadcast) to promote public awareness of and compliance with Arizona’s occupant protection, safety belt, and child safety seat laws. This task also will provide funding for paid media for the FFY 2015 Buckle Up Arizona…It’s the Law!/Click it or Ticket campaign.

Budget: $70,000.00

Evidence of Effectiveness: CTW, Chapter 2, Sections 3.1, 3.2, 6.1, and 6.2
### Table 3.13  Occupant Protection Awareness Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-508</td>
<td>GOHS – CIOT Paid Media</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-517</td>
<td>GOHS – Media</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$70,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.14  Occupant Protection Program Summary Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOHS Annual Safety Belt Survey</td>
<td>$58,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection Law Enforcement</td>
<td>$348,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Child Safety Seats</td>
<td>$209,729.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection Training and Education Program</td>
<td>$102,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Office of Highway Safety Paid Media</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$789,029.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Speeding, Aggressive Driving, and Red Light Running Program Overview

Speeding is the number one contributing factor in the State’s fatal crashes. According to FARS data, in 2013, 290 speed-related fatalities occurred, which constitutes an almost 4 percent decrease from 2012. Speeding-related fatalities made up 34.1 percent of all traffic fatalities in 2013.

Throughout the year, the public hears about the number of persons arrested for impaired driving and wonders about the danger on our streets and highways posed by these dangerous drivers, but the public does not seem to perceive the danger posed by speeders. Countless tragedies are caused by excessive speed crashes, which injure and kill innocent people. Arizona’s wide thoroughfares are conducive to driving far in excess of the posted speed limit, changing lanes, tailgating, and passing dangerously on the daily commute. Some drivers ignore the most important rules of safe driving, which are common sense and courtesy.

Law enforcement officers are aided by strong statutes governing speeding and aggressive driving. Arizona has a “Double Fine” program to reduce persistent speeding and aggressive driving violations in construction zones. The program provides for a driver license suspension when eight or more points are accumulated within a 12-month period. The “Double Fine” program also applies to speeding in excess of the posted speed limit in construction zones when workers are present. Enforcement deters speeders, but adjudication by prosecutors and the courts also is essential. Posted speed limits are not a
suggestion; they are the law. Reasonable and prudent speeds require drivers to realize the dangers posed to themselves and others while speeding.

Arizona also aggressively prosecute and adjudicates red light violators. In addition to providing overtime for Selective Traffic Enforcement (STEP), GOHS funds laser and radar guns, speed trailers, and aggressive driving vehicles for law enforcement agencies.

**Table 3.15 Performance Goals and Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce speeding-related fatalities by 12.9 percent from 288 (2009-2013 average) to 251 by 2016</td>
<td>Number of speeding-related fatalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategies**

GOHS supports several strategies to reduce speeding, aggressive driving, and red light running. They include:

1. Law enforcement overtime;
2. Equipment purchases;
3. Materials and support for public information and media campaigns;
4. Training for project and program managers (Lifesavers Conference);
5. An annual public opinion survey; and
6. Program management support.

**Programs and Projects**

**Project Title:** Law Enforcement Overtime

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

**Description:** GOHS provides support for Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP), which are sustained traffic enforcement campaigns conducted by law enforcement agencies throughout the year. Participating law enforcement agencies enforce speed, aggressive driving, red light running, and DUI laws. Law enforcement funding is provided to: a) agencies with a proven track record of aggressively enforcing Arizona’s traffic laws; b) agencies with a high number of fatalities resulting from speeding or aggressive driving; and c) agencies implementing unique speed management and aggressive driving enforcement programs. This program provides support to 52 law enforcement agencies.

**Budget:** $821,232.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 3, Section 2.2
Table 3.16  Speeding, Aggressive Driving, and Red Light Running Enforcement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-001</td>
<td>APACHE JUNCTION PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-002</td>
<td>ASU PD</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-003</td>
<td>CAMP VERDE MO</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-004</td>
<td>CLARKDALE PD</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-005</td>
<td>CLIFTON PD</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-006</td>
<td>COCHISE CSO</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-007</td>
<td>COOLIDGE PD</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-008</td>
<td>COTTONWOOD PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-009</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-010</td>
<td>EL MIRAGE PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-011</td>
<td>FLORENCE PD</td>
<td>$10,270.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-012</td>
<td>GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY PD</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-013</td>
<td>GLENDALE PD</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-014</td>
<td>GLOBE PD</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-015</td>
<td>GREENLEE CSO</td>
<td>$18,653.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-016</td>
<td>JEROME PD</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-017</td>
<td>MARANA PD</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-018</td>
<td>MARICOPA CSO</td>
<td>$30,084.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-019</td>
<td>MARICOPA PD</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-020</td>
<td>MESA PD</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-021</td>
<td>NOGALES PD</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-022</td>
<td>PARKER PD</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-023</td>
<td>PAYSON PD</td>
<td>$7,980.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-024</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-025</td>
<td>PHOENIX PD</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-026</td>
<td>PIMA CSD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-027</td>
<td>PIMA PD</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-028</td>
<td>PINAL CSO</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-029</td>
<td>PINETOP-LAKESIDE PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-030</td>
<td>PRESCOTT PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-031</td>
<td>PRESCOTT VALLEY PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-032</td>
<td>QUARTZSITE PD</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-033</td>
<td>SAFFORD PD</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-034</td>
<td>SAHUARITA PD</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-035</td>
<td>SALT RIVER PIMA MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-036</td>
<td>SAN LUIS PD</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-037</td>
<td>SANTA CRUZ CSO</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-038</td>
<td>SEDONA PD</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-039</td>
<td>SNOWFLAKE-TAYLOR PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-040</td>
<td>SPRINGERVILLE PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-041</td>
<td>ST. JOHNS PD</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-042</td>
<td>TEMPE PD</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-043</td>
<td>THATCHER PD</td>
<td>$10,925.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-044</td>
<td>TUCSON PD</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-045</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PD</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-046</td>
<td>WELLTON PD</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-047</td>
<td>WICKENBURG PD</td>
<td>$4,750.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-048</td>
<td>WILCOX PD</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-049</td>
<td>WILLIAMS PD</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-050</td>
<td>YAVAPAI CSO</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-051</td>
<td>YUMA CSO</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-052</td>
<td>YUMA PD</td>
<td>$19,120.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$821,232.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Law Enforcement Equipment

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

**Description:** This task will fund equipment, such as police package motorcycles, speed trailers, LASER and Radar guns and tint meters to aide in the enforcement of Arizona traffic laws. Equipment is provided to 24 law enforcement agencies.

**Budget:** $401,579.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 3, Section 2.3
Table 3.17  Speeding, Aggressive Driving, and Red Light Running Equipment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-053</td>
<td>BULLHEAD CITY PD</td>
<td>$3,972.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-054</td>
<td>CHANDLER PD</td>
<td>$18,306.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-055</td>
<td>COCHISE CSO</td>
<td>$1,107.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-056</td>
<td>COLORADO CITY MD</td>
<td>$8,560.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-057</td>
<td>COOLIDGE PD</td>
<td>$4,157.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-058</td>
<td>COTTONWOOD PD</td>
<td>$8,525.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-059</td>
<td>DOUGLAS PD</td>
<td>$5,971.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-060</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$133,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-061</td>
<td>EL MIRAGE PD</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-062</td>
<td>FLAGSTAFF PD</td>
<td>$32,253.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-063</td>
<td>GLOBE PD</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-064</td>
<td>MARANA PD</td>
<td>$12,113.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-065</td>
<td>MARICOPA CSO</td>
<td>$29,916.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-066</td>
<td>NAVAJO CSO</td>
<td>$4,175.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-067</td>
<td>ORO VALLEY PD</td>
<td>$12,479.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-068</td>
<td>PAYSON PD</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-069</td>
<td>PIMA CSD</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-070</td>
<td>SAFFORD PD</td>
<td>$5,520.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-071</td>
<td>SALT RIVER PIMA MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY</td>
<td>$16,300.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-072</td>
<td>SCOTTSDALE PD</td>
<td>$24,100.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-073</td>
<td>SEDONA PD</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-074</td>
<td>SPRINGERVILLE PD</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-075</td>
<td>TUCSON PD</td>
<td>$17,925.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-076</td>
<td>YUMA CSO</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$401,579.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Title: Materials and Support for Public Information and Media Campaigns

Project Number: Three project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

Description: GOHS provides funding to organizations to reduce speeding and aggressive driving around commercial vehicles and to promote “Share the Road” programs with those vehicles.

Budget: $56,137.00

Evidence of Effectiveness: CTW, Chapter 3, Sections 2.2 and 4.1

Table 3.18 Speeding, Aggressive Driving, and Red Light Running Awareness Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-077</td>
<td>ARIZONA TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION FOUNDATION</td>
<td>$21,137.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-078</td>
<td>PIMA COUNTY DOT</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-519</td>
<td>GOHS PAID MEDIA</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,137.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Title: GOHS Annual Survey to Track Public Attitudes and Behaviors

Project Number: 2015-PT-502

Description: GOHS conducts an annual survey to track public attitudes and behaviors associated with red light running and speeding.

Budget: $12,000.00

Evidence of Effectiveness: CTW, Chapter 4, Sections 2.1

Table 3.19 Speeding, Aggressive Driving, and Red Light Running Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-502</td>
<td>GOHS Annual Survey</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.20 Speeding, Aggressive Driving, Red Light Running Program Summary Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Overtime</td>
<td>$821,232.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Equipment</td>
<td>$401,579.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4 Motorcycle Safety Program Overview

According to 2013 FARS data, motorcycle fatalities in Arizona rose from 141 in 2012 to 151 in 2013 – an increase of 7.1 percent. GOHS provides grant funding to support an annual motorcycle helmet survey, enforcement of legal motorcycle driving practices, training for safe motorcycle driving, and a motorcycle safety awareness campaign geared to the general motoring public.

In addition, GOHS works closely with the Arizona Motorcycle Safety Advisory Council (AMSAC) which is established by statute and composed of five members appointed by the Governor. AMSAC provides input on relevant motorcycle safety issues at each meeting, and links riders to statewide, specialized motorcycle training provided by highly qualified instructors. Peoria Police Department also offers a popular and comprehensive safe motorcycle driving program.

GOHS receives supplemental state funding derived from fees paid in conjunction with motorcycle registration. These additional dollars support paid media and other awareness campaigns and other awareness activities, safe motorcycle training, and the publication of safety materials.

#### Table 3.21 Performance Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce motorcyclist fatalities 2.3 percent from 128 (2009-2013 average) to 125 by 2016</td>
<td>Number of motorcycle fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities 7.4 percent from 68 (2009-2013 average) to 63 by 2016</td>
<td>Number of unhelmeted motorcycle fatalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategies

GOHS will address motorcycle safety through the use of three strategies:

1. Track helmet use to measure the effectiveness of public information programs.
2. Enforce the laws governing motorcycle riding.
3. Raise public awareness, especially among passenger vehicle drivers, with respect to motorcycle safety.

**Programs and Projects**

**Project Title:** Motorcycle Helmet Survey  
**Project Number:** 2015-MC-520  
**Description:** This task provides funding for GOHS’ annual survey measuring the use of motorcycle helmets. This survey is conducted as part of GOHS’ annual seatbelt survey.  
**Budget:** $11,200.00  
**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 2, Section, 3.1; Chapter 4, Sections 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-MC-520</td>
<td>GOHS Annual Motorcycle Helmet Survey</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Motorcycle Enforcement  
**Project Number:** 2015-MC-001  
**Description:** Conduct overtime enforcement patrols to ensure motorcyclists conform to the traffic laws. These agencies conduct targeted enforcement focusing on speeding, illegal lane changes, and licensing issues.  
**Budget:** $46,221.00  
**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 5, Section 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-MC-001</td>
<td>CHANDLER PD</td>
<td>$14,924.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-MC-002</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>$11,297.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405f-001</td>
<td>PHOENIX PD</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>405f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$46,221.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Motorcycle Safety Awareness Activities  
**Project Number:** Two project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.  
**Description:** GOHS will develop and implement paid and earned awareness and media campaigns to promote public awareness of motorcycles and the need to be alert and watch for them. The campaigns also promote motorcyclist
compliance with Arizona’s traffic laws. This project includes development of brochures and other collateral materials, as well as print, electronic, and radio and broadcast media to include “Look out for Motorcycles” and “Share the Road” messages.

**Budget:** $100,000.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW, Chapter 5, Sections 4.1 and 4.2

### Table 3.24  Motorcycle Training and Awareness Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-405f-521</td>
<td>GOHS Paid Media</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>405f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$100,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.25  Motorcycle Safety Program Summary Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOHS - Motorcycle Helmet Survey</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Enforcement Program</td>
<td>$46,221.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Safety Training and Awareness Activities</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$157,421.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arizona annually generates $205,000 in state funds from motorcycle registrations. This money is deposited into the GOHS/Arizona Motorcycle Safety Advisory Council account and spent on programs and paid awareness campaigns suggested and endorsed by AMSAC. The media buy is a comprehensive urban and rural plan proposed by GOHS to AMSAC and is geared to both traveling and leisure riders. Some outreach is geared to older adults in the heavy early winter and spring travel periods, but all Arizona’s motorcycle facilities are spread among all groups of riders including young students traveling at excessive speed on highways and streets.

GOHS also promotes the message of mutual respect in sharing the road and cautions all road users on the need to watch out for motorcycles. This message is included in awareness campaigns via paid media and other outreach efforts.

GOHS works in tandem with the Motorcycle Safety Foundation, AMSAC, Gold Wing Road Riders Association, and the Peoria Police Department to link new riders to specialized training conducted by qualified instructors. These efforts
provide motorcycle training, covering a wide range of skill levels from beginning rider to advanced, offered in communities across Arizona. GOHS hopes that linking more people to a wide variety of training options will lead to greater numbers of motorcyclists who will comply with licensing requirements, and practice safe driving to reduce injuries and fatalities. All funded law enforcement agencies throughout the state enforce motorcycle rider speeding, aggressive driving, and impaired riding.

### 3.5 Crash Investigation Program Overview

GOHS provides funding to support two strategies related to crash investigations and timely and accurate crash reconstruction of serious bodily injury and fatal motor vehicle crashes.

**Table 3.26 Performance Goals and Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of enforcement officers trained in the use of crash investigation procedures and equipment</td>
<td>Number of officers trained in crash and reconstruction techniques.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategies**

GOHS will address motorcycle safety through the use of two strategies:

1. Enforcement overtime; and
2. Equipment.

**Programs and Projects**

**Project Title:** Enforcement Overtime for Crash Investigations  
**Project Number:** 2016-AI-001  
**Description:** This project provides overtime funding to the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office, which serves over 65% of the population, for crash investigations of serious bodily injury and fatal crashes.  
**Budget:** $40,000.00  
**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW Chapter 1, Sections 2.5 and 6.2;  

**Enforcement Overtime**

**Table 3.27 Crash Investigation Enforcement Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-001</td>
<td>MARICOPA CSO</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Title:** Crash Investigation Equipment

**Project Number:** Four project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

**Description:** This project supports equipment purchases for crash investigation units, such as ARAS 360 HD Software, Sokkia, AIMS and Nikon Total Station units to assist in accurate and timely reconstruction of traffic accident investigations that may have involved an impaired driver. The new equipment will allow these agencies to perform crash investigation without having to rely on other agencies’ expertise and equipment.

**Budget:** $37,680.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW Chapter 1, Sections 2.5 and 6.2

### Table 3.28 Crash Investigation Equipment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-002</td>
<td>PAGE PD</td>
<td>$8,185.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-003</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>$6,547.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-004</td>
<td>SURPRISE PD</td>
<td>$11,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-005</td>
<td>YAVAPAI CSO</td>
<td>$11,448.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$37,680.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.29 Crash Investigation Program Summary Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Overtime for Crash Investigations</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Investigation Equipment</td>
<td>$37,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,680.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 **EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

GOHS provides funding predominately to rural fire departments and fire districts throughout Arizona.

### Table 3.30 Performance Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of fire departments/districts receiving</td>
<td>Number of new fire departments/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies

The strategies utilized are twofold:

1. Crash extrication equipment purchases; and
2. Training on use of the equipment and training.

Programs and Projects

Project Title: Crash Extraction Equipment Purchases

Project Number: Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

Description: This project provides funding for crash extraction equipment purchases, including Spreaders, Cutters, Struts and Hydraulic Pumps. Equipment will improve the timeliness of critical response care provided to seriously injured occupants of crashes to improve their chances of survival and reduce long term injuries.

Budget: $198,887.00


Table 3.31 Crash Extrication Equipment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-001</td>
<td>AVRA VALLEY FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$28,368.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-002</td>
<td>BLACK CANYON FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-003</td>
<td>BLUE RIDGE FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-004</td>
<td>CASA GRANDE FIRE DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>$4,694.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-005</td>
<td>CLARKDALE FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$11,070.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-006</td>
<td>DREXEL HEIGHTS FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$17,993.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-007</td>
<td>HEBER-OVERGAARD FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-008</td>
<td>MOUNTAIN VISTA FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$27,647.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-009</td>
<td>PINAL RURAL FIRE RESCUE</td>
<td>$34,400.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-010</td>
<td>PINewood FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$5,380.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 **PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE SAFETY PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

GOHS provides support for a program to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

**Table 3.33 Performance Goals and Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce pedestrian fatalities by 0.8 percent from 137 (2009-2013 average) to 136 by 2016</td>
<td>Number of pedestrian fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce bicyclist fatalities 4.4 percent from 23 (2009-2013 average) to 22 by 2016</td>
<td>Number of bicycle fatalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategies**

The four strategies supporting this program include:

1. Enforcement;
2. Equipment;
3. Education and awareness services; and
4. Signage to protect pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Programs and Projects**

**Project Title:** Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Enforcement Program

**Project Number:** Five project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

**Description:** GOHS provides overtime funding for selected agencies representing cities with identified problems, such as speeding through school zones and crashes involving motor vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles. These
agencies participate in “Wolf Pack” enforcement details within their communities to aggressively enforce school zone and pedestrian traffic laws.

Since April 14, 2014 the Phoenix Police Department in conjunction with the Governor’s Office of Highway Safety have been improving the overall safety for the pedestrians who frequent the light rail public transit system. The goal of this Pedestrian Safety Program is to reduce the number of pedestrians who illegally cross the light rail tracks/guideway. This will be accomplished by specifically targeting pedestrians illegally crossing the light rail tracks through education and enforcement.

Since the start of this program officers have issued 1,458 citations, of these citations 1,281 have been issued for pedestrians crossing the light rail tracks illegally. The remaining citations were issued for 63 other light rail violations, 50 hazardous/moving violations, and 64 non-hazardous/non-moving traffic violations. This program has also resulted in 22 arrests, 5 departmental reports, and 257 quality service opportunities/educational contacts.

**Budget:** $165,005.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW Chapter 8, Sections 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4; Chapter 9, Sections 3.3 and 3.4

### Table 3.34 Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Enforcement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-001</td>
<td>GILBERT PD</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-002</td>
<td>PHOENIX PD</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-003</td>
<td>SOUTH TUCSON PD</td>
<td>$6,600.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-004</td>
<td>TUCSON PD</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-005</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PD</td>
<td>$8,405.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$165,005.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Pedestrian and Bicycle Community Education and Awareness.

**Project Number:** Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

**Description:** GOHS supports the purchase of bicycle helmets, bicycles, print and electronic media, and other materials for bicycle and pedestrian safety events throughout the state.
such as bicycle rodeos. This project also provides funding to GOHS for the development of public education and awareness materials relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety.

**Budget:** $110,292.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW Chapter 8 Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3; Chapter 9 Sections 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 3.2 and 4.2.

### Table 3.35 Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Awareness Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-006</td>
<td>COCONINO COUNTY PHSD</td>
<td>$2,052.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-007</td>
<td>FLAGSTAFF PD</td>
<td>$8,636.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-008</td>
<td>MARICOPA INTEGRATED HEALTH SYSTEM</td>
<td>$5,033.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-009</td>
<td>MARICOPA PD</td>
<td>$6,978.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-010</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>$19,469.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-011</td>
<td>PHOENIX CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-012</td>
<td>PHOENIX FIRE DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>$32,706.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-013</td>
<td>PHOENIX STREET TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-014</td>
<td>PONDEROSA FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$1,280.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-015</td>
<td>QUARTZSITE PD</td>
<td>$2,138.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-016</td>
<td>YAVAPAI CSO</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-518</td>
<td>GOHS – PI&amp;E</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$110,292.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** School Zone and School Bus Operations Enforcement  
**Project Number:** 2015-SB-001

**Description:** GOHS provides overtime funding to Pima County Sheriff’s Department for school zone and school bus operations enforcement. “Operation BUS" was designed to target enforcement in school zones as well as violators who pass school buses while loading and unloading children.

**Budget:** $27,480.00

**Evidence of Effectiveness:** CTW Chapter 8 Sections 2.2, 2.3, 4.1 and 4.4.

### Table 3.36 School Bus Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-SB-001</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>$7,480.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.8 TRAFFIC RECORDS PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The goal of Arizona’s Traffic Records program is to ensure GOHS, ADOT, and law enforcement communities are able to access accurate and complete data. The data are critical for identifying problem areas in need of attention by GOHS and its partners.

ADOT’s Motor Vehicle Division (MVD) collects, manages, and analyzes traffic records data for GOHS. With funding from GOHS, MVD, and the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) maintain the database on motor vehicle fatalities and injuries. Arizona made great strides in data processing improvement including the redesign of the Crash Report Form and the implementation of AZ TrACS (Traffic and Criminal Software) for data collection. The TRCC, at the direction of GOHS and ADOT, continue to work on a number of projects to enhance data collection.

No projects have been approved under the traffic records program at the time of publication. Projects that meet the strategies and goals of this program area will be evaluated as needed throughout the fiscal year.

#### Table 3.38 Performance Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the timeliness and accessibility of traffic records</td>
<td>Timeliness and accessibility of traffic records.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategies**

The strategies Arizona uses to address the traffic records program area include:

1. Equipment and materials purchases; and
2. Program management costs.
Programs and Projects
No projects are currently approved under the traffic records program at the time of publication.

3.9 PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Program Planning and Administration (PA) program areas include those activities and costs necessary for the overall management and operations of the Arizona GOHS. The Director of GOHS is responsible for Arizona’s Highway Safety Program and serves as the Governor’s Highway Safety Representative.

Table 3.39 Performance Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiently and effectively manage Arizona’s Highway Safety Program</td>
<td>Required program and financial deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a risk assessment for every subgrantee</td>
<td>Risk assessments completed and documented before contracts signed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies
GOHS personnel will administer and manage all 402 and 405 programs. Functions include writing, managing, and monitoring grants and contracts. GOHS personnel coordinate the activities outlined in the Highway Safety Plan and provide status reports and updates on project activity to the GOHS Director and other parties as required. GOHS personnel monitor project activity, ensure project expenditures are allowable, reasonable, and compliant with regulations, prepare and maintain project documentation and evaluate task accomplishments for their grant portfolio. Personnel also coordinate training as well as fiscally manage and audit funds. Funding will support personnel services, employee-related expenses, and other operating expenses for GOHS fiscal and project coordinators.

The GOHS embraces a Grants for Performance philosophy. Risk assessments are completed and documented for every subgrantee before contracts are signed and grant funds are awarded. Our monitoring process is designed to fulfill our commitment to the public we serve and ensure State and Federal compliance with statutes, rules, and guidelines and achievement of performance goals.
Programs and Projects

Project Title: Planning and Administration

Project Number: Multiple project numbers are included under this strategy to provide consistency with GTS and the Arizona accounting system.

Description: This task funds salaries, materials, supplies, etc. to support overall administration of GOHS and the Highway Safety Plan.

Budget: $948,000.00

Table 3.42 shows the cost summary for GOHS program administration.

Table 3.40  Program Administration Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-PA-300</td>
<td>Planning and Administration</td>
<td>$533,000.00</td>
<td>402-PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-300</td>
<td>Accident Investigation</td>
<td>$6,700.00</td>
<td>402-AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-300</td>
<td>Impaired Driving</td>
<td>$118,000.00</td>
<td>402-AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-300</td>
<td>Impaired Driving and Arizona Impaired Driving Coordinator</td>
<td>$87,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-300</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>$19,700.00</td>
<td>402-EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-300</td>
<td>Occupant Protection</td>
<td>$60,500.00</td>
<td>402-OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PS-300</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>402-PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-300</td>
<td>Police Traffic Services</td>
<td>$113,000.00</td>
<td>402-PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$948,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NHTSA Equipment Approval

GOHS provides funding for equipment to support and enhance highway safety programs. The following tables list equipment purchases exceeding $5,000.00 from 405d and 402 funds. As equipment needs become apparent throughout a fiscal year, GOHS will request NHTSA’s approval for the purchases.

Table 3.41  Equipment Program in Excess of $5,000.00 for NHTSA Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-002</td>
<td>PAGE PD</td>
<td>Sokkia Data Collector and Accessories</td>
<td>$8,185.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-003</td>
<td>PEORIA PD</td>
<td>One (1) AI Light</td>
<td>$6,547.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-004</td>
<td>SURPRISE PD</td>
<td>Bosch Crash Data Retrieval</td>
<td>$11,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AI-005</td>
<td>YAVAPAI CSO</td>
<td>Crash Data Retrieval System</td>
<td>$11,448.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-AL-061</td>
<td>COCHISE CSO</td>
<td>One (1) Intoxilyzer 8000</td>
<td>$7,108.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-062</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>PBTs and One (1) Calibration Station</td>
<td>$34,372.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-063</td>
<td>GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>One (1) Intoxilyzer 8000 and 10 PBTs</td>
<td>$13,604.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-064</td>
<td>GILBERT PD</td>
<td>DUI Van Refurbish</td>
<td>$26,033.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-AL-065</td>
<td>MESA PD</td>
<td>One Half (1/2) of a Gas Chromatograph</td>
<td>$84,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-AL-070</td>
<td>SALTO RIVER PIMA MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY</td>
<td>One (1) Drager 5000</td>
<td>$7,165.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-001</td>
<td>AVRA VALLEY FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>Extrication Equipment</td>
<td>$28,368.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-002</td>
<td>BLACK CANYON FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>Extrication Equipment</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-003</td>
<td>BLUE RIDGE FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>Extrication Equipment</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-005</td>
<td>CLARKDALE FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>Extrication Equipment</td>
<td>$11,070.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-006</td>
<td>DREXEL HEIGHTS FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>Extrication Equipment</td>
<td>$17,993.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-008</td>
<td>MOUNTAIN VISTA FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>Extrication Equipment</td>
<td>$27,647.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-009</td>
<td>PINAL RURAL FIRE RESCUE</td>
<td>Extrication Equipment</td>
<td>$34,400.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-010</td>
<td>PINEDOW FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>One (1) Thermal Imager</td>
<td>$5,380.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-EM-011</td>
<td>PONDEROSA FIRE DISTRICT</td>
<td>Air Bags and Cribbing</td>
<td>$8,085.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-056</td>
<td>COLORADO CITY MD</td>
<td>One (1) Speed Trailer</td>
<td>$8,560.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-058</td>
<td>COTTONWOOD PD</td>
<td>One (1) Multimessage Sign</td>
<td>$8,525.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-060</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>Speed Enforcement Equipment</td>
<td>$133,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-061</td>
<td>EL MIRAGE PD</td>
<td>One (1) Lidar</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-062</td>
<td>FLAGSTAFF PD</td>
<td>Ten (10) Radar and One (1) Message Board</td>
<td>$32,253.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-063</td>
<td>GLOBE PD</td>
<td>Speed Enforcement Equipment</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-065</td>
<td>MARICOPA CSO</td>
<td>Ten (10) Radar and Four (4) Lidar</td>
<td>$29,916.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-069</td>
<td>PIMA CSD</td>
<td>Speed Detection Devices</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-PT-071</td>
<td>SALT RIVER PIMA MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY</td>
<td>One (1) Speed Trailer</td>
<td>$16,300.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-RS-002</td>
<td>PIMA COUNTY DOT</td>
<td>Speed Display Signs</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-009</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PD</td>
<td>One (1) DUI Motorcycle</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>405d, 402-PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$717,459.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11 **PAID ADVERTISING**

GOHS captures a large amount of earned media through the distribution of public service announcements, media interviews, press conferences, and media alerts. Arizona also uses paid media to support the national mobilizations in impaired driving and occupant protection. In addition, GOHS provides funding for paid media in the speeding and aggressive driving and motorcycle safety program areas. The following table shows the amount and distribution of these funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-405d-524</td>
<td>GOHS Paid Media</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>405d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-OP-508</td>
<td>GOHS CIOT</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-405f-521</td>
<td>GOHS Paid Media</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>405f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$340,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Agency measures the effectiveness of these activities through a consultant service that tracks the number of commercial images produced by a campaign and reports on Gross Rating Points which show the frequency and value associated with individual radio and television station activity.
4.0 Performance Report

Table 4.1 shows Arizona’s progress in meeting the national core performance measures identified in the FFY 2015 HSP. The end date for each performance target, which is December 31, 2015, has been omitted from the figure below for conciseness of presentation.
### Figure 4.1  Progress in Meeting FFY 2015 Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Performance Measured</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Performance Targets</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>5-Year Average a</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>Decrease 1.9% from 844 in 2013 to 828 in 2015</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Traffic Injuries a</td>
<td>Decrease 3.4% from 4,305 in 2013 to 4,159 in 2015</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>4,371</td>
<td>4,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities/100M VMT</td>
<td>Decrease 1.5% from 1.39 in 2013 to 1.35 in 2015</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities</td>
<td>Decrease 13.4% from 299 in 2013 to 259 in 2015</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Impaired Driving Fatalities (BAC = 0.08%+)</td>
<td>Decrease 9.2% from 262 in 2013 to 238 in 2015</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding-Related Fatalities</td>
<td>Decrease 2.6% from 266 in 2013 to 259 in 2015</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Motorcycle Fatalities</td>
<td>Decrease 7.4% from 149 in 2013 to 138 in 2015</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhelmeted Motorcycle Fatalities</td>
<td>Decrease 1.4% from 72 in 2013 to 71 in 2015</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Age 20 or Younger in Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>Decrease 6.8% from 118 in 2013 to 110 in 2015</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fatalities</td>
<td>Decrease 6.3% from 158 in 2013 to 148 in 2015</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Fatalities</td>
<td>Decrease 13.3% from 30 in 2013 to 26 in 2015</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Observed Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles</td>
<td>Increase 0.4% from 84.7 percent in 2013 to 85.0 percent in 2016</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Seat Belt Citations Issued</td>
<td>Target not required</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>5,439</td>
<td>21,828</td>
<td>29,710</td>
<td>27,840</td>
<td>24,848</td>
<td>21,933</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Impaired Driving Arrests Made</td>
<td>Target not required</td>
<td>14,154</td>
<td>19,482</td>
<td>31,561</td>
<td>32,171</td>
<td>31,905</td>
<td>29,250</td>
<td>28,874</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Other Citations (including speed) Issued b</td>
<td>Target not required</td>
<td>73,600</td>
<td>101,848</td>
<td>331,269</td>
<td>377,992</td>
<td>482,190</td>
<td>565,827</td>
<td>371,825</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (all 2010 through 2013 data except serious injuries, citations and arrests); ADOT for serious traffic injury data and all 2014 data; GOHS Reporting System for citation and arrest data.

Notes:  
- a Five-Year Averages of fatalities are for 2009 through 2013, the most recent five years of FARS data. Averages for Serious Traffic Injuries, Percent Observed Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles, Seat Belt Citations, Impaired Driving Arrests and Other Citations are for 2010 through 2014.
- b In 2014 there were 565,827 citations issued for speed and aggressive driving which includes, speed not reasonable or prudent, excessive speed, speed not right for conditions, and reckless driving while speeding or other citations issued for other moving violations like red light running. Arizona is continually improving the capture of citation data recorded in our tracking system.
# 5.0 Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Approved Program Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Previous Bal</th>
<th>Incr/(Decr)</th>
<th>Current Balance</th>
<th>Share to Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA 402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Administration</td>
<td>FF-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Planning and Administration Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$160,291.52</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$160,291.52</td>
<td>$160,291.52</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>AL-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Alcohol Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$233,245.12</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$233,245.12</td>
<td>$353,000.00</td>
<td>$687,754.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>EM-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Services Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$221,972.29</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$221,972.29</td>
<td>$221,972.29</td>
<td>$221,972.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Safety</td>
<td>MC-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Motorcycle Safety Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupant Protection</td>
<td>OP-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Occupant Protection Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety</td>
<td>PS-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Traffic Services</td>
<td>FT-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Police Traffic Services Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Investigation</td>
<td>AI-2016-00-00</td>
<td>Accident Investigation</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
<td>$37,832.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## U.S. Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

### Highway Safety Plan Cost Summary

#### 2010 HSP-1

**Posted: 06/10/2015**

**Report Date: 08/10/2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Approved Program Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Previous Bal.</th>
<th>Incre/(Decr)</th>
<th>Current Balance</th>
<th>Share to Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Safety</strong></td>
<td>R-2016-00-00-00</td>
<td>Roadway Safety Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$9,867.87</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$9,867.87</td>
<td>$9,867.87</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil Transportation Safety</strong></td>
<td>D-2016-00-00-00</td>
<td>Pupil Transportation Safety Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP 21 405d Impaired Driving Mid</strong></td>
<td>MAP 21 405d Impaired Driving Mid Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$239,999.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$239,999.00</td>
<td>$239,999.00</td>
<td>$239,999.00</td>
<td>$2,050,450.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>405d Int Court Support</strong></td>
<td>MICS-2016-00-00-00</td>
<td>405d Int Court Support Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$2,050,450.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP 21 405d Impaired Driving Int</strong></td>
<td>MAP 21 405d Impaired Driving Int Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$2,050,450.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP 21 405f Motorcycle Programs</strong></td>
<td>MAP 21 405f Motorcycle Programs Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$2,050,450.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP 21 405f Motorcycle Programs</strong></td>
<td>MAP 21 405f Motorcycle Programs Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$2,050,450.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State: Arizona

**Highway Safety Plan Cost Summary**

**2016 HSP-1**

**Posted: 06/10/2016**

**Report Date: 08/10/2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Approved Program Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Previous Bal.</th>
<th>Incre/(Decr)</th>
<th>Current Balance</th>
<th>Share to Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,060,517.19</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7,081,119.00</td>
<td>$7,081,119.00</td>
<td>$2,050,450.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 State Certifications and Assurances

The State Certifications and Assurances, which is signed by Arizona’s Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety, will be sent separately to NHTSA.
7.0 Section 405 Grant Application

For FFY 2016, Arizona is applying for the following 405 incentive grants programs:

- Part 2 – State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements (23 CFR 1200.22);
- Part 3 – Impaired Driving Countermeasures (23 CFR 1200.23); and
- Part 5 – Motorcyclist Safety (23 CFR 1200.25).

The 405 application, which is signed by Arizona’s Governor’s Representative for Highway Safety and includes the completed sections of the Appendix D to Part 1200 – Certification and Assurances for National Priority Safety Program Grants and the accompanying documentation, will be sent separately to NHTSA.
A. Appendix: Arizona DUI Abatement Council (State Funds)

The Oversight Council on Driving or Operating Under the Influence Abatement (DUI Abatement Council) was established by the Arizona Legislature in 1996 and became effective on October 1, 1997. GOHS was one of the agencies that created and staffed the council twice before and began staffing it for the third time in June 2011 to the present. The funds are derived from a $250 assessment or fine on every Extreme or Aggravated DUI Conviction in Arizona. These funds are used for DUI Enforcement overtime and equipment and for Innovative programs as approved by the Council. The GOHS Director, Alberto Gutier, is a statutory member of the council and also a voting member as he represents the Arizona Speaker of the House of Representatives since 1998. ARS-28-1401-1402.

28-1304. Driving under the influence abatement fund
A. The driving under the influence abatement fund is established consisting of monies deposited pursuant to section 4-213, subsection J, section 5-396, subsection I, paragraph 2, section 5-397, subsection D, paragraph 3 and subsection F, paragraph 3, section 28-1382, subsection D paragraph 3 and subsection E paragraph 3 and section 28-1383, subsection J, paragraph 2.
B. The oversight council on driving or operating under the influence abatement established by section 28-1303 shall administer the fund.
C. Twenty-five per cent of the monies deposited in the fund shall be used for grants for innovative programs pursuant to section 28-1303, subsection H, paragraph 2 and seventy per cent of the monies in the fund shall be used for grants to political subdivisions and tribal governments pursuant to section 28-1303, subsection H, paragraph 1.
D. Not more than five per cent of the monies deposited in the fund shall be used for both of the following:
1. Administrative purposes of the oversight council on driving or operating under the influence abatement.
### Table A.1  Arizona DUI Abatement Council (State Funds) Grant Awards as of July 1, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Title/Purpose</th>
<th>Executed (Start)</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona DPS</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-051</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>11/21/2014</td>
<td>10/31/2015</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-062</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-061</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-064</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-I-016</td>
<td>Know Your Limit</td>
<td>12/29/2014</td>
<td>10/31/2015</td>
<td>$40,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-055</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marana PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-056</td>
<td>DUI Warrant Detail</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa CSO</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-063</td>
<td>DUI Multi-Task</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-I-019</td>
<td>Headspace Gas Chromatograph/MS</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$84,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-052</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>12/31/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2015</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-058</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-I-021</td>
<td>Know Your Limit</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>DUIAC-I-015</td>
<td>TSRP Program</td>
<td>9/22/2014</td>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>$112,991.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima CSD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-060</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima CSD</td>
<td>DUIAC-I-020</td>
<td>DUI Designated Driver Program</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$3,476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinetop-Lakeside PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-I-017</td>
<td>DUI Education &amp; Awareness</td>
<td>12/02/2014</td>
<td>10/31/2015</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Low PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-057</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$8,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-053</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>12/02/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2015</td>
<td>$133,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-054</td>
<td>DUI Testimony Training</td>
<td>12/02/2015</td>
<td>12/31/2015</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson PD</td>
<td>DUIAC-I-018</td>
<td>Know Your Limit</td>
<td>12/02/2015</td>
<td>12/31/2015</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma CSO</td>
<td>DUIAC-E-059</td>
<td>DUI Enforcement &amp; Overtime</td>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Awarded        | 21         | $1,142,317.00          |
B. Appendix: Supporting Information

Figure B.1  Arizona Statewide Roadway Fatalities Trend


Retrieved June 2015
Figure B.2  Arizona Motor Vehicle Traffic Fatalities by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>7,747</td>
<td>5,977</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fatality Rate** is the number of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled.

---

**Arizona Crash History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL CRASHES</th>
<th>FATAL CRASHES</th>
<th>TOTAL FATALITIES</th>
<th>INJURY CRASHES</th>
<th>TOTAL INJURIES</th>
<th>PDO CRASHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>149,574</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>45,626</td>
<td>71,063</td>
<td>93,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>142,240</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>45,365</td>
<td>70,073</td>
<td>95,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>141,186</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>43,589</td>
<td>68,662</td>
<td>96,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>120,557</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>37,515</td>
<td>52,539</td>
<td>62,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>107,148</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>33,506</td>
<td>50,609</td>
<td>72,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>106,856</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>33,416</td>
<td>50,459</td>
<td>72,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>103,945</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>33,219</td>
<td>49,648</td>
<td>69,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>103,914</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>33,219</td>
<td>49,648</td>
<td>69,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>107,477</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>34,106</td>
<td>50,389</td>
<td>72,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>105,554</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>34,451</td>
<td>50,890</td>
<td>74,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population, Vehicle Registration, Licensed Drivers, and VMT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LICENSED DRIVERS*</th>
<th>REGISTERED VEHICLES*</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION**</th>
<th>VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,985,005</td>
<td>4,559,446</td>
<td>6,644,650</td>
<td>55,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,081,768</td>
<td>4,748,397</td>
<td>6,239,482</td>
<td>62,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4,218,363</td>
<td>4,849,182</td>
<td>6,332,529</td>
<td>68,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,330,711</td>
<td>4,642,188</td>
<td>6,533,654</td>
<td>71,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,343,719</td>
<td>4,707,350</td>
<td>6,595,775</td>
<td>75,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,537,665</td>
<td>4,805,014</td>
<td>6,392,017</td>
<td>60,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,634,607</td>
<td>4,895,014</td>
<td>6,438,178</td>
<td>59,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,730,517</td>
<td>4,958,020</td>
<td>6,404,571</td>
<td>60,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,826,903</td>
<td>5,130,730</td>
<td>6,581,654</td>
<td>60,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source for licensed drivers and registered vehicles: ADOT - Motor Vehicle Division
**Source for population data: Arizona DHHS
***Source for vehicle miles traveled: ADOT MVD - Data Bureau
Figure B.3  Arizona Traffic Fatalities

Monthly Trend

Note: The numbers provided are preliminary and subject to change at any time. Fatal crash information is still being received. Data most recently updated June 1, 2015.
Figure B.4  Arizona DUI Enforcement Statistics for Calendar Year 2014

Arizona DUI Enforcement Statistics
Entered by Statewide Agencies on the GOHS Reporting System.

Yearly Data from Calendar Year 2005 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacts (Traffic Stops)</td>
<td>49230</td>
<td>72057</td>
<td>112555</td>
<td>96243</td>
<td>148063</td>
<td>228146</td>
<td>702921</td>
<td>877617</td>
<td>839268</td>
<td>1130222</td>
<td>363100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Designated Drivers Contacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>9692</td>
<td>6790</td>
<td>6641</td>
<td>6759</td>
<td>14487</td>
<td>4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DUI Arrests</td>
<td>6501</td>
<td>6847</td>
<td>10133</td>
<td>10409</td>
<td>14154</td>
<td>19482</td>
<td>31561</td>
<td>32174</td>
<td>31905</td>
<td>29250</td>
<td>8995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Aggravated</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3473</td>
<td>3698</td>
<td>3645</td>
<td>3525</td>
<td>1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Misdemeanor</td>
<td>6066</td>
<td>6305</td>
<td>9227</td>
<td>9415</td>
<td>12725</td>
<td>17475</td>
<td>28088</td>
<td>28476</td>
<td>28260</td>
<td>25725</td>
<td>7723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Extreme (.15 or above)</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>3302</td>
<td>4369</td>
<td>5943</td>
<td>9466</td>
<td>9002</td>
<td>8217</td>
<td>8414</td>
<td>2516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21 DUI Arrests</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average BAC</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Belt Citations</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>3323</td>
<td>5439</td>
<td>21828</td>
<td>29710</td>
<td>27840</td>
<td>24848</td>
<td>8883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Restraint Citations</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>3671</td>
<td>4476</td>
<td>4755</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Consumption / Possession Citations</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>7708</td>
<td>7988</td>
<td>8585</td>
<td>7493</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Drug Arrests</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>3579</td>
<td>4511</td>
<td>4520</td>
<td>4190</td>
<td>1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Speed Citations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Driving Citations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Speed Citations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Citations *</td>
<td>28789</td>
<td>28095</td>
<td>38348</td>
<td>43846</td>
<td>73600</td>
<td>101848</td>
<td>331269</td>
<td>379010</td>
<td>406144</td>
<td>324240</td>
<td>102592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Officer/Deputies (Cumulative)</td>
<td>6081</td>
<td>6522</td>
<td>11483</td>
<td>10225</td>
<td>15809</td>
<td>34300</td>
<td>47927</td>
<td>51654</td>
<td>46210</td>
<td>53867</td>
<td>17383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2005 - 2012 'Other Citations' statistics include Speed
**Preliminary (As of 6/30/2015)