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

DOT HS 807 479 **September 1989**

Final Report

Evaluation of Child Safety Seat Enforcement Strategies

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear only because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
DOT HS 807 479		

4. Title and Subtitle	5. Report Date
Evaluation of Child Safety Seat Enforcement Strategies	September 1989
	6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s)	8. Performing Organization Report No.
The Prism Corporation	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)
The Prism Corporation 4400 Jenifer St., NW Suite 200 Washington, DC 20015	11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-87-C-07312
	13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report September 1987-July 1989
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address	14. Sponsoring Agency Code
U.S. Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 400 7th St., SW, Washington, DC 20590	NRD-41

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstract

Nine community programs designed to increase child safety seat (CSS) use through public information and education (PI&E) and enforcement were evaluated. Each community received a $5,000 incentive grant: Gulfport, FL, Provo, UT, Shreveport, LA, Charleston, WV, Columbus, IN, Des Moines, IA, Gilbert, AZ, Vineland, NJ, and Willimantic, CT. An administrative evaluation documented each site's PI&E and enforcement activities. Impact evaluations were conducted in Gulfport, Provo, and Shreveport, and consisted of observations of CSS use and correct use before and after grant activities. A total of 5,792 passenger vehicles were observed at intersections and at designated parking areas, usually shopping malls. The observational data indicated that the grant activities did not appear to increase overall use of child restraints. The percentage of older drivers who used child restraint devices increased, but the percentage of younger drivers who used such devices decreased almost an equal amount. The data indicated that the grant activities did increase the correct use of those devices being used.

17. Key Words	18. Distribution Statement
Child Safety Seats, Enforcement	Document is available to the public from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161

19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price
Unclassified	Unclassified		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), as part of efforts to determine the best strategies for increasing the use and correct use of child safety seats (CSS), sponsored an evaluation to assess the effectiveness of various enforcement and public information and education (PI&E) activities.

Nine communities each received a $5,000 incentive grant: Gulfport, FL, Provo, UT, Shreveport, LA, Charleston, WV, Columbus, IN, Des Moines, IA, Gilbert, AZ, Vineland, NJ, and Willimantic, CT. An administrative evaluation documented each site's PI&E and enforcement activities. Impact evaluations were conducted in Gulfport, Provo, and Shreveport, and consisted of observations of CSS use and correct use before and after grant activities.

The project was divided into four phases. In the first phase, the contractor, The Prism Corporation, provided support for an administrative evaluation of each grant program. The contractor advised sites on data collection procedures and forms; provided the sites with relevant information on operational activities and necessary resources; and identified and documented problems encountered during the grant period. During the second phase, the contractor collected information for the impact evaluation. The third phase consisted of a descriptive analysis of the data concerning each site's activities -- what was done during each of the campaigns, and to whom, and the resources to perform such activities. The final phase of the project entailed the development of recommended program procedures for enforcement agencies to use to increase the use and correct use of child safety devices. The results of the evaluation and other available information was used as the basis for the recommended guidelines.

Impact Evaluation

A total of 5,792 passenger vehicles were observed at intersections and at designated parking areas, usually shopping malls. The majority of vehicles (3,118) were observed at intersections. Altogether there were 4,402 children ages 12 and under observed in vehicles at intersections, with about the same number before (1,969) and after (2,076) the grant activities. There were 3,028 child restraint devices observed in vehicles at parking lots, with equal numbers of devices noted before (1,014) and after (1,002) the grants. About half of the children were between the ages of one and four, and about one in ten were younger than one year.

There were 3,028 child restraint devices observed in the three sites during the observational periods, with two thirds (2,016) observed in parking lots and the balance at intersections. The vast majority of the devices were toddler seats -- 68 percent from the parking lot and 58 percent from the intersection observations. More infant and fewer toddler seats were noted during the intersection observations, compared to the parking lot data. Some of these differences were attributed to difficulties in making correct observations of whether a child was sitting on a booster seat or something else.

No statistically significant differences were noted for CSS use between the before and after measurements. Between the two periods, there was an increase in the percentage of children using safety belts (5 percent), but a decrease in the percentage of children using CSS devices (6 percent). There was a decrease in the percentage of children riding on laps (4 percent) and a small decrease in the percentage of children using non-approved CSS devices. However, there was also an increase in the percentage of children not using a safety belt or a CSS device (5 percent).

Younger drivers (40 years of age or younger) tended to use restraint devices (safety belt or CSS) more often than older drivers (over 40). Overall, 46 percent of younger drivers used restraining devices, compared to 31 percent of the older drivers. However, older drivers who used CSS devices were more likely to use them correctly (83 percent, compared to 71 percent of younger drivers).

Both age groups showed improvement in correct use of CSS after the grant activities. There was also an improvement in the percentage of drivers who had correctly routed the safety belts when using toddler seats.

There seemed to be a shift in the type of child restraint devices used. There were more safety belts and fewer child safety seats being used in the observations conducted after the grants ended, compared to prior to grant activities. Some of the shift was attributed to the after observations having a larger proportion of older children who are more likely to use belts.

Administrative Evaluation

The administrative evaluation revealed that the grant sites conducted many types of public information and education activities, including news releases, television and radio public service announcements, school-based programs, and special events. Virtually all sites sponsored CSS loaner programs. Sites distributed a variety of print

materials, including coloring books, brochures and flyers as well as bumper stickers and balloons. Enforcement efforts ranged from special blitzes to enforcement timed to school opening and closing hours to integrated enforcement. The majority of programs included training for police officers in the correct use of child safety seats.

The majority of sites focused their attention on youngsters in pre- and elementary schools. Contests were held to encourage children to think about vehicle safety and to remember to buckle up when riding in a vehicle. Officers from the various Police Departments visited local schools to lecture about the importance of occupant restraint in vehicles and the use of child safety seats.

Recommended Guidelines for Child Safety Seat Enforcement

The Guidelines presents suggestions and examples for planning, developing, implementing and evaluating a local enforcement and public information and education (PI&E) program to increase the use and correct use of child safety seats. Guidance is given on the strategies and the necessary resources (time, money, people) to implement and conduct the associated activities, and any potential problems of which the communities and police should be aware. The guidelines are intended for use in planning and developing the most appropriate program for a particular community. However, the more effective programs include:

- Active enforcement.
- Integration of occupant protection enforcement into regular traffic safety enforcement -- an effective and efficient use of resources.
- Aggressive PI&E to create and increase awareness of the enforcement efforts and the benefits of occupant protection in the community.
- Training members of the Police Department on the benefits of using occupant protection and enforcing occupant protection laws.
- Police Department policy requiring the use of safety belts in police vehicles.
- Community support -- including schools and local businesses.

By incorporating these components into a program and following the suggestions provided in these guidelines, states and localities can increase the use of child safety seats. Available information indicates that the greatest success will come from a truly community-based occupant protection program that relies on the dissemination of information about the benefits of child safety seats and on enforcement.

INTRODUCTION

This section of the final report on the "Evaluation of Child Safety Seat Enforcement Strategies" describes the background of the study and the objectives. Also presented is a discussion of the key project activities.

BACKGROUND

Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death and serious injury to youngsters over one year of age. Among the more effective means of reducing deaths and injuries associated with motor vehicle crashes is the use of safety restraints. With the use of occupant restraints, the number of infant and child fatalities and injuries could be drastically reduced.

While Child Safety Seat laws (CSS) and other general safety restraint laws have been passed in cities and states across the United States, compliance is a major issue. Some communities have proven to be more diligent than others in their enforcement efforts.

Surveys conducted in various regions of the country in 1987 showed that 85 percent of toddlers (defined as those children approximately 1 to 4 years of age) were restrained by a safety device. The rate of use varied by region from a high of 94 percent to a low of 63 percent.

The violation of child restraint laws is a primary offense, yet many officers in many jurisdictions treat the violation as a secondary offense. A secondary offense is a violation that is not subject to issuance of citation unless the violator first commits a primary offense. For example, in many jurisdictions, if an individual is driving with a toddler who is not restrained, he or she is not issued a citation, unless he is stopped as a result of another infraction, such as speeding. If, at that time, he is observed to be violating a restraint law, then he is given a citation for that violation as well.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

To increase the use and correct use of child safety restraint devices, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) provided small incentive grants of $5,000 to nine communities throughout the United States. These grants were used to conduct an intensified program of public information and education (PI&E) and enforcement.

Following is a list of the nine sites selected for the grants. The first three served as impact evaluation sites (see further description in Section II of this report). All sites received an administrative impact evaluation.

- Gulfport, Florida
- Provo, Utah
- Shreveport, Louisiana
- Charleston, West Virginia
- Columbus, Indiana
- Des Moines, Iowa
- Gilbert, Arizona
- Vineland, New Jersey
- Willimantic, Connecticut

The Prism Corporation was selected by NHTSA as the contractor to perform the administrative and impact evaluations of the sites' activities. The company provided data collection, training and other assistance to the grant sites. The purpose of the evaluation was to gather data on the administration and impact of CSS education and enforcement strategies. NHTSA's main objective was to gather sufficient data to test the effectiveness and efficiency of CSS enforcement strategies. The Prism project team traveled to the three impact sites to collect data and observe enforcement procedures and CSS use. Assistance was provided to all sites in the development of an effective CSS promotion program, and in the coordination and management of various activities. Prism also compiled and analyzed data from each site, and prepared a set of guidelines for effective CSS promotion. These guidelines will be distributed to states and localities throughout the United States.

STUDY DESCRIPTION

The specific requirements for the evaluation were divided into four phases. The phases are described below.

Phase I

During Phase I, Prism provided support for an administrative evaluation of each grant program. The administrative evaluation documented the operational aspects of each site's activities to enforce the CSS law(s). Such documentation included the nature and type of enforcement efforts, the associated PI&E activities, and the resources (time, money, people) to initiate and perform the activities. Prism's assistance included advising sites on data collection procedures and forms; providing the sites with relevant information on operational activities and necessary resources; and identifying and documenting problems encountered by the sites during the grant period.

Phase II

During Phase II of the program, Prism collected information for an impact evaluation to determine if the grant program increased CSS use

in three of the grant sites. These sites were chosen on the basis of demographic characteristics as well as the perceived effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed programs. The three impact sites were determined to have typical demographic characteristics.

The impact evaluation measured and documented the results of each site's activities. The various enforcement strategies were assessed in terms of the number of contacts, ease of operations, necessary resources, and attitudes of the motoring public toward enforcement and associated activities.

Data were collected during a series of on-site visits, including observations to measure CSS use and correct use prior to any enforcement and/or educational activities, and again upon the completion of the program. Data collection forms and procedures were developed to monitor the behavior of each community thoroughly and accurately. (See Appendix A.)

Prior to the CSS observations, a training session for the observers was conducted. The project team used a NHTSA CSS training packet, "Guidelines for Observing Child Safety Seat Use," which describes each federally approved CSS device on the market, its mode of proper installation, and examples of incorrect installation. The three-person observation team studied these guidelines carefully, and, in addition, purchased a CSS device to familiarize themselves with the general operation of the device. The observers were then trained in an actual observation setting by the project manager (i.e., parking lot and intersection). The project manager instructed the team members on discreet and proper observation methods. He pointed out significant examples of correct and incorrect use of child safety seats. Each observer also participated in an oral practice test to ensure that the methods of observation were correct.

Two types of observations were conducted at each of the impact sites. The first type took place at designated parking areas, usually shopping mall parking lots. The purpose of these observations was to measure correct use of toddler seats and convertible seats in the toddler mode. Within each of the impact sites, three parking lots were chosen for observation. The choice of parking lots was determined by conditions favorable for observations, such as whether children are frequently at the location.

Another condition for selecting the parking lots was the location of a nearby signal controlled intersection where observations could be conducted. The data from the intersection observations included the estimated age of the driver, how many children were in each automobile, how many were restrained, if applicable, within each estimated age bracket (0-1; 1-4; 5-12), the type of CSS device used, if applicable, and if the child and device were correctly secured. (See Appendix B for the observation data forms.)

Phase III

During the third phase of the project, Prism organized and compiled the data and other pertinent information about the sites and their respective programs. Using these data, Prism evaluated each site's activities to increase the public's use and correct use of CSS restraint devices for youngsters traveling in a vehicle.

The analysis of the administrative evaluation data was primarily descriptive -- what was done during each of the campaigns, and to whom, and the resources to perform such activities. The impact analysis was developed from the results of the observations conducted by Prism at the three impact sites. In particular, the Prism project team observed the effectiveness of the site's activities to enhance the public's awareness and perceptions of enforcement as well as the effect of the site's activities to increase the use and correct use of CSS devices.

Phase IV

The final phase of the project entailed the development of a document "Child Safety Seat Enforcement Guidelines." The results of the administrative and impact evaluation analyses were used as the basis for the development of these guidelines.

The guidelines are designed for use by other jurisdictions to enhance their enforcement of CSS laws. The document provides information on the combination of strategies that seem to be the most effective for increasing the use of child safety restraint devices. Guidance is given on the strategies and the necessary resources (time, money, people) to implement and conduct the associated activities, and any potential problems of which the communities and police should be aware.

DESCRIPTION OF GRANT SITES

This section of the report presents an overview of the nine grant sites. The descriptions of each site cover the following topics:

- Community profile
- Enforcement profile
- Grant objectives
- Program description
- Media activities
- Special events
- Budget

The overview will begin with the impact sites.

Impact and Administrative Evaluation Sites

Three of the nine sites were selected for an impact evaluation in addition to an administrative evaluation. These sites were Gulfport, Provo, and Shreveport.

Gulfport

Community profile. Gulfport, Florida, is a small, suburban township of 2.8 square miles (approximately 53 street miles) located in Pinellas County. Adjacent communities are Tampa, St. Petersburg, Treasure Island, and Pasadena.

Due to the tourist season, the population of Gulfport fluctuates somewhat between the summer and winter months. During the summer months, Gulfport's population is approximately 11,555. During the winter months, the population rises to about 12,600.

The following statistics describe the winter population. The average family size is approximately two persons. The per capita income is $9,544, which reflects the large percentage of retired individuals. The proportion of the population by age of interest in this study is as follows:

ages 0-4	8%
5-12	2%

The employment rate in Gulfport is 32 percent, which reflects the large percentage of retired persons living in the community. Of that percentage, 31 percent are blue collar workers. The vast majority of Gulfport residents (98 percent) are white.

Safety belt use was felt to be about average by the Police Department. The belt rate, as well as the rate for child safety seats, was a concern to the Chief and to the entire police force. However, little had been done to encourage citizens to use restraints.

Enforcement profile. In 1982, a Florida state child restraint law was enacted. The law stated that only the parents and legal guardians of children aged 5 years or younger were responsible for providing some form of passenger restraint device when traveling with a child in an automobile. The law was amended in 1986. Presently, any operator of a vehicle, if traveling with a child 5 years or younger, must provide a federally approved child restraint device for that child. For children aged 3 years or younger, the restraint device must be a separate carrier (i.e., child safety seat device). For children aged 4-5 years, a separate carrier or safety belt may be used. This law also requires that all drivers and front-seat passengers wear a safety belt while in a moving vehicle.

In the past, the Gulfport Police Department had not emphasized CSS enforcement. Enforcement of occupant protection laws governing children and adults was incorporated directly into routine traffic patrol. Nonuse or incorrect use of restraint devices (i.e., safety belts and child safety restraint devices) was treated as a secondary offense.

Prior to the grant and since the enactment of the CSS law regarding child restraint requirements, no citations had been issued for nonuse of a child restraint. Only 11 citations were issued to drivers for nonuse of safety belts in 1987. There was no record of any previous public information and education materials regarding the use of child safety seats or general restraint devices.

Grant objectives. Upon receipt of the proposed grant information, the Gulfport Chief of Police applied for the grant program. The objectives for the Gulfport program were to conduct a PI&E campaign incorporating public service announcements (PSAs), brochures, and public speaking; to increase training of officers on CSS use; to increase CSS enforcement; and to ensure adequate administration of the program.

To supplement the grant of $5,000, the city of Gulfport provided an additional $5,500. In-kind donations were made by local businesses. Under the grant, the Police Department was reimbursed by NHTSA for personnel services, training, and publication and printing costs. To assist in the development and implementation of an effective and efficient program, a graduate student was hired.

Program description. The program in Gulfport began in January 1988, and continued through July 1988. The geographic scope of the program included Gulfport and the southern part of Pinellas County (some media reached a greater geographic area). The program's emphasis was on increasing awareness within the Police Department and throughout the community, and on strict and continued safety restraint enforcement. The Police Department was interested in promoting both the use of child safety restraint and general safety restraint for adults.

A special slogan and logo were developed to represent this dual emphasis. The slogan read "Buckle-up: Your child and You." The logo showed a child restrained in a safety seat surrounded by a heart. To achieve maximum recognition for the program, the logo and slogan were incorporated on most advertisements and promotional materials.

To prepare for the enforcement aspect of the program, the entire police force was trained in CSS enforcement. During these training sessions, a 15-minute videotape on general safety restraints, "Buckle-up America: America Clicks," was shown. The passenger safety restraint laws were discussed. All officers were reminded that using a safety belt is required when in an official police vehicle. In February, three officers attended a two-day training session on "The Investigation of Seat Belt/Child Restraint Injuries."

Beginning in April, an intensive six-week enforcement blitz was conducted. During May and June, follow-up enforcement took place whereby officers on patrol were assigned specifically to child restraint and safety belt patrol during the morning shift when children were most likely to be going to school. The police force was required to issue citations for CSS violations, thus few warnings were given.

The PI&E efforts were extensive. The Chief and the graduate student used the media (television, radio and print) in and surrounding the Gulfport community to present the positive aspects of safety belt and child restraint use. In addition to the mass media, the promotion of general safety restraint use was communicated through special activities, such as National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week (which began the intensive public information and education campaign), speaking engagements with school and adult groups, and the Senior Citizen's Fair. Specialty advertising items were produced (e.g., balloons, bumper stickers, coloring books, safety belt patrol certificates, and safety belt law reminder cards). The Gulfport slogan "Buckle-up: Your Child and You" was imprinted on each Gulfport water bill for the month of February.

The third aspect of the Gulfport campaign was the development and implementation of a child safety seat loaner program through the

Gulfport Police Department. All Gulfport residents and city employees had free access to a CSS device for up to one month.

The program began May 1, 1988, and was publicized throughout the Gulfport area on a local cable television station, and in the local weekly paper. Flyers were also distributed throughout the community to inform retired individuals, who are regularly visited by children, grandchildren and friends, or who are guardians of children, of the loaner program.

The loaner program consisted of three infant, three toddler and three booster seats loaned on a 30-day basis. Each borrower was required to sign a loan agreement form in the presence of police personnel and was advised on the correct use of the seat. One police dispatcher was trained on all technical details relating to safety belt use. Three police dispatchers were trained in the administrative details of the program.

Since the loaner program began, there has been a great demand for the toddler seats. The Police Department plans to purchase more seats.

Media activities. The media within the local Gulfport metropolitan area were, and continue to be, extremely supportive of the campaign. Television, radio, and print media accepted all promotion and informative material for publication or broadcast. Many of the radio and television stations (including the local cable channel) donated some or all air time to the Police Department in the form of PSAs or informational blurbs. Some of these stations plan to run the PSAs indefinitely or rerun them at a later date. At least 15,000 local residents were exposed to the television and radio broadcasts, and potentially 2 million television viewers outside the immediate area were reached (according to Nielsen and Arbitron viewer survey data).

Two PSAs were developed and prepared for local television stations to air from January to June. One, with the Chief of Police, was locally produced in February by WTSP - Channel 10 and then distributed to Channels 8, 13 and 50. The other PSA, "The Only Secure Place," was obtained from NHTSA. Channel 28 prepared the tape and superimposed the Gulfport child safety seat insignia at the end. This PSA was also delivered to Channels 8, 13 and 50. Paragon Cable, a local Gulfport cable channel, filmed the Chief of Police for a spot. Channel 44 made a spot for its own use. Gulfport Cable periodically ran an informational blurb to remind residents about the importance of child safety restraint in vehicles.

News releases were sent to nine local radio stations. Approximately 125 messages were aired from January to June. Advertisements were placed in two of the local papers within the Gulfport area. Six ads were placed in the Gulfport Gabber, and three ads in Coastline News. On Mother's Day, one ad was printed in the St. Petersburg Times.

Between January and July, numerous articles were printed in local newspapers. The Gulfport Gabber carried seven articles, the Coastline News carried two, and the Barefoot Reporter and the Suncoast Reporter each carried one. Several articles were printed in more regional newspapers -- the St. Petersburg Times carried two articles, and the Tampa Tribune carried one. In addition to these newspaper articles, 1,000 brochures stressing the importance of child safety restraint devices and their proper installation in vehicles were distributed throughout the community.

Special events. At the beginning of the program, the Gulfport Police Department announced the availability of speakers on the use of safety belts and child safety restraint devices. The speaker would discuss the current laws on occupant restraints, display various types of car seats, show the correct installation procedures, and examine any currently used seats to be sure that they meet Federal guidelines. Elementary and junior high schools throughout the city were enthusiastic about providing proper safety education for the children, and arranged many speaking engagements for both children and adults through the Police Department. Many Gulfport police officers, including the Chief, visited the schools to give presentations on safety, and stressed the importance of using safety restraints.

The following is a list of the PI&E efforts undertaken and a breakdown of the costs that were incurred:

February - March	Ads in Gulfport Gabber and Coastline News	$333
February - July	TV and radio PSA's - WFTS	634
February	Water bills imprinted with "buckle-up" slogan	0
February 7-13	National Child Safety Awareness Week	0
February 12-14	"Buckle-up" stickers and balloons given away at McDonald's	40
March 5	Little League Parade - balloon giveaway	60
April 1	Began enforcement blitz	0
April 20	Senior Fair	35
May 1	Child Safety Seat Loaner Program began	230

May 8	Ad in St. Petersburg Times - Mother's Day	90
	Balloons distributed in McDonald's Happy Meals	42
	Vince and Larry coloring books	161
	1,000 printed brochures	145
	Total	$1,770

Many specialty advertising items, targeted specifically at the children of community residents, were developed to remind them to buckle up when riding in a car. These special promotion items were distributed at safety restraint presentations, and were also available in McDonald's Happy Meal boxes (for a limited time) and at the Gulfport Police Department and City Hall. Balloons with the "buckle-up" slogan and logo were distributed at the Little League Parade and at the elementary schools. Stickers and Vince and Larry coloring books were also distributed during these presentations. At the Senior Citizen's Fair, safety belt law reminder cards were distributed to remind grandparents that they should use safety restraints when traveling in an automobile with their grandchildren.

The Chief of the Gulfport Police Department is very pleased with the results of the grant. He intends to continue enforcement and certain PI&E activities through the Crime Prevention Unit. He hopes to increase further the awareness and correct use of CSS devices within the Gulfport community. According to him, the most effective means of CSS promotion in Gulfport seemed to be television PSA broadcasts and special promotional items for children as well as direct presentations on general safety measures to be taken while traveling in an automobile.

In spite of intensified education and enforcement, two major problems still exist in the enforcement of restraint laws by the Gulfport Police Department and other agencies. The first is the patrol officer's reluctance to issue citations since the violation of safety belt and child restraint laws is not considered a primary offense by officers. Second, even though parents and children are aware of the law, steps are not often taken by the parent/grandparent/driver to ensure the child remains seated and is properly restrained.

With continued enforcement and education, the public will be reminded and reinforced of the need for child restraints and safety belts. Several elements which began in the grant program, the coloring books, brochures, and car seat loaner program, will continue as part

of regular CSS promotion. Street signs have been placed at the six main thoroughfares into the city of Gulfport. The signs remind to vehicle operators coming into and leaving the city to "Buckle-up: Your Child and You."

GULFPORT CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

January 1, 1988 - August 17, 1988

	Federal		Local		
	Grant	Expended	Grant	Expended	
Personnel Services	$ 3,600	$ 3,600	$ 1,000	$ 726	
Training	700	654	500	500	
Enforcement/ Special Duty			500	575	
Secretarial			500	171	
Local Exhibits/ Presentations			1,000	155	
Evaluation			500		
Merchant in-kind Contributions			500	12,316	
Publications/ Print/TV	700	640	500	1,042	
Indirect Overhead			500		
Totals	$ 5,000	$ 4,894	$ 5,500	$ 15,486	$ 20,388

Provo

Community profile. Provo is a medium-sized urban area of 42 square miles (approximately 232 street miles) situated in the Utah Valley. Adjacent communities are Orem City (of the same metropolitan area) and Springville.

Provo's total population is 83,120 persons. The average family size is 3.7 persons. The average household income is $25,874 per year. The proportion of the population by age of interest is as follows:

ages 0-4	10%
5-12	8%

The employment rate in Provo is 93 percent. Half are white collar workers, and half are blue collar. The major employers in this area are high tech/education. The residents of Provo are characterized primarily as white individuals, affiliated with the Church of Latter Day Saints.

The Chief of Police in Provo expressed concern about the low safety belt and CSS use in the area. Since the residents of Provo tend to be very law abiding, he believed that CSS promotion would be accepted by the community.

Enforcement profile. In 1984, a Utah state law was enacted which stated that all children under age 5 must be properly restrained in a motor vehicle driven by a parent or legal guardian, if the individual is a resident of Utah. Specifically, children under age 2 must ride in an approved car safety seat, and children between the ages of 2 and 5 must ride in an approved car safety seat or safety belt. The law exempts authorized emergency vehicles, mopeds, campers, sleepers, motorcycles, motor homes, school buses, and such vehicles that offer transportation for hire. Violators will be subject to a fine of not more than $20, which shall be dismissed if the driver shows proof of acquiring a car safety seat or safety belt before or during any court appearance.

The CSS law also dictates that if the number of passengers in a vehicle exceeds the number of safety belts, or if all seating positions are otherwise occupied by other passengers, the child restraint law does not apply. Thus, if there are more children in the vehicle than there are spaces for CSS devices or safety belts, those children who are not restrained are exempt from the law. This loophole seems to create a problem in Provo because of the high birth rate among the residents. The cost and/or space required to put all children in safety seats or safety belts may be a significant problem.

Grant objectives. The Chief became aware of the NHTSA grant through the Utah County Health and Education Department. He felt Provo would be a useful site for conducting an evaluation for the following reasons:

(1) A member of the administrative staff of the Provo Police Department had been actively involved with the buckle-up

campaign held in Utah County and Provo City for the past two and a half years. This member could help with the design and implementation of the program.

(2) The Police Department was willing to donate officer enforcement overtime. A staff member, who regularly conducts education presentations to local schools, would also donate his time.

3) The Provo Police Department issued warnings during the first six months of the Utah Seat Belt Law, and then began to issue traffic citations for failure to comply with either the Seat Belt Law or the Child Passenger Safety Restraint Law. The Department intends to initiate a tracking system to report accurately the number of citations issued.

(4) All officers are required, when on duty, to comply with the Utah Seat Belt Law.

The main objectives of the grant were to inform and educate both the public and the officers about child restraints and the Child Restraint Law, and to conduct special enforcement in areas of the city where there is a high concentration of young people.

Provo was also chosen to be one of the impact sites for the evaluation of the grant program. To supplement the grant, $550 was donated in private funds. In addition to the Provo Police Department, other agencies supported and were involved with in implementation of the program. The Utah County Health and Education Department, Provo School District PTA, the City of Provo, the Utah County Chamber of Commerce, and several local businesses donated time and services equalling approximately $1,288.

Program description. The program in Provo began in September 1987 and continued through July 1988. The geographic scope of the program centered around Provo City. The program's emphasis was on increasing the awareness of and providing education on the use of child safety restraints both for Police officers and the community. The program also used special enforcement in areas of the city where there are high concentrations of young children. The goals were achieved through PI&E materials and increased enforcement within the city limits.

To prepare for increased enforcement during the program, 50 percent (30 officers) of the force was trained in CSS enforcement. All of these officers worked within the traffic detail department. The training sessions consisted of detailed coverage of the existing child restraint law and the importance of its application, a showing of the film "Child Restraints," a demonstration of proper child safety seat use and installation, and the NHTSA grant requirements.

A directive was handed down from the police administration to police personnel requiring the use of safety belts in official vehicles. The police force was not required to issue citations for CSS law violations, although the law is considered a primary offense. The issuance of citations was at the officer's discretion. The record shows that 163 citations were issued during the nine months of the program. Officers were also instructed to pass out literature to citizens.

The Provo program used a variety of PI&E efforts to ensure that all parts of the community were reached. In addition to extensive mass media promotion, the importance of general safety restraint was publicized through many special events, such as Child Passenger Awareness Week, periodic presentations to schools by Officer Friendly and McGruff the safety dog, safety restraint displays at several major community events, a safety display at a local mall, visits by McGruff to local grocery stores, and special promotion items (e.g., brochures, safety restraint reminder posters, bibs, t-shirts).

The Provo Police Department also conducted its own pre- and post-grant surveys. The first was an observational survey similar to the observations conducted by the evaluations contractor. Members of the PTA and students from Brigham Young University observed vehicle occupants at locations throughout the city. These surveys measured child restraint use before and after the program. The observations consisted of the use of CSS devices for children between the ages 0-5, the use of safety belt restraints for adults, and the possible correlation between adult use and restrained children.

The second was a telephone survey conducted by Department personnel on December 22, 1988. This survey measured the effect of the Provo Child Restraint Grant program. Participants were randomly selected from the Provo City telephone book. Fifty interviews were completed. (See a more complete description of these surveys and their results in the analyses section of this report).

Media activities. The mass media providers in Provo were generally cooperative during the program. Many newspaper articles and television and radio broadcasts should have succeeded in reaching a majority of the program's target audience, the parents of young children.

Media promotions began in September when local newspapers and television stations were invited for the kickoff program at the Provo City Center. Articles announcing this event and its significance were printed in The Daily Herald, a Utah County newspaper, The Daily Universe, a student newspaper at Brigham Young University, and The Provo Community Journal. KBYU, the Brigham Young University television station, also ran a small piece about the kickoff.

The local Provo television stations provided less coverage of the program than did the newspapers and radio stations. One interview was aired in January on KUTV, a station that reaches all areas in the intermountain region. The subject of this interview was the proper use and installation of CSS devices.

Several PSAs, based on material obtained from NHTSA and other health and safety organization, were developed for radio. These PSAs were modified to fit the needs and characteristics of the Provo community. An interview with Officer Friendly was aired in February on KMGR, a local radio station. During this interview, Officer Friendly informed the public about the Utah CSS law and spoke about the importance of proper child restraint.

Once the program was underway, newspaper articles in The Provo Community Journal and The Daily Herald reminded residents to "buckle-up for the holidays." These articles explained both the child restraint and safety belt laws, and provided information about where Provo residents could rent CSS restraint devices. They also informed the community of the increased enforcement of the CSS law. Most of the articles were initiated by the Provo Police Department, Utah County Health and Education Department, and local newspapers.

Later in the program, articles were published in local papers to address the various special events that were held in recognition of the CSS program. Three local newspapers ran articles informing the community of the buckle-up bibs that were distributed by the Utah Valley Regional Medical Center. An article based on a newsletter provided by NHTSA was published in recognition of "Buckle-up America Week."

Special events. The PI&E efforts associated with the Provo CSS program were enhanced through a vast number of special events that took place as a result of the NHTSA grant or in conjunction with the grant. These efforts began immediately with the kickoff program.

Participants in the kickoff program included the Mayor of Provo City, the Chief of Police, the Provo/Orem Chamber of Commerce Executive Director, and an emergency room physician from the Utah Valley Regional Medical Center. All city employees were invited to the kickoff event.

During this program, the Mayor stated his enthusiasm and support for the program. The Chamber's executive director pledged his support and encouraged businesses within the community to be supportive. The physician spoke about his experiences with crash victims who had used or not used safety belts. The Chief of Police, who organized and conducted the program, provided statistical information and introduced the NHTSA grant program.

Available at the kickoff was the "convincer," a simulator that recreates the impact of a crash at 8 miles per hour. Many residents, including the Mayor, rode the device and experienced the sudden jolt of the "convincer." A windshield with a head imprint was on display, along with t-shirts, mugs, posters, and literature concerning child restraint and safety belt use.

The school system immediately became involved with the program, in hopes of thoroughly educating the children about proper car safety behavior. "Officer Friendly" visited elementary and preschools to give presentations on the importance of child safety seat and safety belt restraints, and gave tours of the police station. For visual aids, he used Donald Duck buckle-up posters and the film "Otto the Auto," obtained from the Provo City Health Department, and a "Safety Bear" wearing a safety belt. Over 6,500 children were reached during the program.

During several special community events, the Police Department organized various PI&E activities to signify the importance of child safety restraint. In the Brigham Young University Homecoming Parade, McGruff used a safety belt, and a McGruff puppet was shown riding in a CSS restraint device. Two volunteer BYU students passed out CSS literature to parade spectators.

During the Christmas season, the Police Department was heavily enforcing the CSS law and reminding community residents about occupant protection, CSS restraint in particular, during the Christmas season. At the Provo City Christmas Parade, the Chief of Police dressed as McGruff and rode in one of the Police Department's mountain rescue snowmobiles using a safety belt. Accompanying him was his grandson, who was secured in a child safety seat. The snowmobile was pulled along the parade route by the mountain rescue truck, that had Donald Duck buckle-up posters attached to the windows. The majority of spectators along the parade route were young families with children.

The National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week (February 7-13) was an event of which the Police Department also took advantage. "You're My Valentine" coloring handouts were distributed by the Utah Seatbelt Coalition to pediatricians in various jurisdictions. Flyers with information on the CSS law and proper CSS use, and a CSS shopping guide were also supplied to pediatricians for distribution in the Provo area.

In February, the Provo Police Department worked with a local Boy Scout troop to promote general safety, from fire escape safety to child restraints. A booth was constructed at the Scout Expo '88, held at University Mall. The booth was viewed by approximately 1,500

people. A child restraint display was obtained from the Utah County Health Department. Pamphlets on safety belt and child restraints and Donald Duck posters were distributed. A film, "Vince and Larry - Safety Belt Habit," was shown periodically throughout the day.

The final special event, which occurred during March, was a series of visits by McGruff to various grocery store parking lots throughout the city. The purpose was to attract the attention of parents and kids, and to encourage them to "buckle-up." An accompanying officer gave t-shirts to kids who were restrained in an appropriate restraint device. Parents, whose children were observed to be unrestrained, were given information about child safety restraint.

The PI&E effort was enhanced by the distribution of many specialty promotion items. In January, buckle-up bibs were printed and distributed to mothers with newborn babies at the Utah Valley Regional Medical Center. In February, buckle-up t-shirts were handed out to children observed to be properly restrained by police officers on patrol. Buckle-up posters and stickers were available at no cost to residents throughout the program.

CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

September 1987 - July 1988

September:	Kickoff program, introduction of program in school system	
October:	"Buckle-up" bibs for distribution at UVRMC	$3,113
November:	Officer Friendly Program	
December:	Provo City Christmas Parade with Mc Gruff, the safety dog	
January:	Radio and television interviews taped	
February:	"Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week" - coloring handouts and CSS pamphlets handouts distributed to pediatricians	890
	Buckle-up t-shirts distributed	1,546
March:	Visits by McGruff to grocery stores	
	Donation from Utah Valley Regional Medical Center for Buckle-up bibs	500
	TOTAL	$5,000

The Chief of Police intends to continue with regular integrated enforcement techniques to insure the increase of CSS restraint use in

Provo. He believes the most effective way to promote safety restraint is to inform the public of the law, enforce the law as a primary offense at all times, and reward those community residents who continue to obey the law. He intends that police officers receive periodic reviews of the CSS law, and will have all new officers trained in CSS enforcement.

Shreveport

Community profile. Shreveport is a suburban community of 111 square miles (approximately 1,000 street miles) located in northwest Louisiana, 30 miles south of Arkansas and 15 miles east of Texas. With an estimated population of 216,429, Shreveport is the third largest city in Louisiana. The adjacent community is Bossier City.

The average family size is 3.32 persons. The average annual household income is $15,043. The proportion of children by age is as follows:

ages 0-4	8%
5-12	13%

The employment rate in Shreveport is approximately 90 percent. Of that percentage, 33 percent are blue collar, and 66 percent are white collar. The racial makeup of the population is approximately 58 percent white, 41 percent black, and 2 percent of other races.

The rates of safety belt and CSS use are very low. The City of Shreveport has vested responsibility for child passenger safety enforcement in the Selective Enforcement section of the Police Department. This section enforces traffic ordinances (speed limit, safety belt enforcement, DWI enforcement) on a city-wide basis. The section has been partially funded by Louisiana Highway Safety Commission grants for several years. However, funding has diminished in recent years.

Enforcement profile. In January 1985, a state law and a city law were enacted to prohibit the transport of a child in a vehicle without the use of a federally inspected child safety restraint device or safety belt. Both laws stated that every resident of the state (Louisiana) or city (Shreveport), who transports a child or children under the age of 5 years in a motor vehicle which is equipped with safety belts at the time of manufacture or assembly, shall have the child properly secured in a child passenger restraint system which meets the applicable federal motor vehicle safety standards.

A child between the ages 3-5 may be secured in a lap belt or safety belt in the rear seat of the vehicle if a CSS restraint system is not

available. When the number of children under the age of 5 years in the vehicle exceeds the number of CSS restraint systems and the available number of safety belts, the unrestrained children must be seated in the rear of the vehicle.

Prior to the enactment of the city law, an individual was only issued a warning citation when found in violation of the state law. Now an individual receives a citation and is fined upon conviction. If the violator can bring satisfactory proof to the court that he has acquired a CSS restraint system, the fine is waived, and the charges are dismissed.

Grant objectives. The Shreveport Police Safety Education Department applied for the NHTSA grant as a result of information sent to the Chief of Police. Despite the City's enforcement efforts, a recent study prior to the grant showed that only 54 percent of citizens obeyed the CSS restraint law. This finding indicated to the Department that a combination of intensified education and enforcement was necessary to increase use within the city. In addition, police officers needed to be trained in techniques to make enforcement activities more productive.

The City of Shreveport proposed the following project objectives:

(1) To provide an intensive campaign on the benefits of proper child passenger restraints via newspaper articles, brochures, and speaking engagements.

(2) To conduct a training program for police officers on the correct installation of the various child restraint system available on the market and the correct method of placing Children in the seats.

(3) To provide special enforcement efforts timed to reinforce the message portrayed during the public information process.

(4) To prepare the city's police officers to integrate child passenger safety law enforcement into other enforcement activities.

Shreveport was chosen as the third impact site. The majority of the program's funding was provided by the grant. Small donations were made by Shoney's Restaurant, Domino's Pizza, Louisiana Blood Center, 98 Rocks radio station, Brookshire's Bakery, and the Louisiana Child Passenger Safety Association.

Program description. The program in Shreveport was scheduled to begin in April 1988, with an intensified PI&E campaign and increased selective enforcement. The program was delayed because of lack of

manpower and time resulting from other enforcement duties requiring the reallocation of police resources. The actual program began September 1, 1988, and continued to September 23, 1988. The geographic scope of the program included only the city of Shreveport. The program's emphasis was on increasing the use of child restraints throughout the city.

To prepare for the enforcement aspect of the program, 11 percent (20 officers) of the force, traffic detail and departmental units combined, were trained in intensive CSS enforcement at an Occupant Protection Usage and Enforcement Seminar. These eight-hour training sessions educated the officers on CSS use, enforcement, proper installation of the devices, crash dynamics, and the existing safety belt and child safety restraint laws. A majority of the remaining officers were trained during an in-service roll call training session where a 12-minute film was shown. All officers were reminded that using a safety belt is required when operating an official police vehicle.

Increased special enforcement was scheduled to begin simultaneously with the PI&E activities. Due to confusion regarding the scheduled daily enforcement shifts, special CSS enforcement was delayed. The PI&E efforts lasted three weeks, while enforcement lasted only two weeks.

Throughout the time period allotted to develop, administer and complete the program (September 1987 to September 1988), the Shreveport Police officers were encouraged to be more observant of CSS law violators and to take action against them. The program relied almost entirely on special enforcement and media coverage.

The PI&E efforts consisted primarily of printed materials. Brochures and bumper stickers were distributed throughout the community during various speaking engagements and public appearances by police officers.

Media activities. Several television and radio PSAs were developed in addition to newspaper articles and news releases. These media channels had the potential to reach the entire population of Shreveport.

Local television stations, KTBS Channel 3, KTAL Channel 6, KSLA Channel 12, and KMSS 33, were contacted and asked to publicize the CSS program. The viewing audience is several million people. Cablevision of Shreveport also publicized the safety belt and child safety seat promotion on the "Sgt Safety Show."

The radio news media presented interviews in which "Sgt. Safety," a local police officer responsible for safety education, spoke about

CSS restraints. Four interviews were aired on KTAL 98 Rocks radio station during the period September 1-23.

Several PSAs were developed for radio, in which the Chief spoke about the importance of CSS devices, including proper installation. Five local radio stations, KRMD, KEEL-KITT, KTAL 98 Rocks, KVKI-KOKA, and KWKH, aired the PSAs a total of 90 times during the PI&E portion of the program, and were expected to continue to do so periodically.

Articles were published in the following papers to publicize the program, inform Shreveport residents about the importance of CSS use, and encourage compliance with both the safety belt and CSS laws to avoid issuance of a citation: The Shreveport Times, The Shreveport Journal, and The Shreveport Sun.

The Chief also approved a news release which was distributed to 15 local television and radio stations, and to the local newspapers. This news release announced the beginning of the program and informed residents of the increase in enforcement. The release also described the existing CSS law.

Special events. Several activities were sponsored to encourage citizens to protect themselves and their children by using passenger safety restraints in vehicles. The Louisiana Blood Center, Shoney's Restaurant, KTAL 98 Rocks, and Domino's Pizza all donated small gifts to the Police Department for an incentive program. Officers on parole were instructed to observe whether residents were complying with the child and adult passenger safety restraint laws. The officers recorded the license plates of vehicles in which occupants were observed to be complying with the laws. A drawing was held at the Police Department, and the winners received a prize and letter of congratulations for the effort. A total of 20 t-shirts from the Louisiana Blood Center, 20 "Free Meal" tickets from Shoney's Restaurant, several record albums from KTAL 98 Rocks, and 12 "Free Pizza" tickets from Domino's Pizza were awarded during the incentive grant.

There are 12 Brookshire's Bakeries in and around the Shreveport vicinity, each of which adopts a local school and provides year-round activities for the students. Each bakery held a slogan contest within the school district to emphasize passenger restraint use. Each class submitted one or more slogans to the bakery. The winning classes of each bakery received free cookies and punch as a reward.

"Sgt. Safety" visited local schools to give presentations to students regarding the importance of using passenger safety restraints. Brochures and bumper stickers were disseminated to the students at the presentations. Information for the brochures was obtained from the Louisiana Child Passenger Safety Association.

The Department distributed educational and promotional material received from other law enforcement agencies and the Louisiana Highway Safety Commission. Pamphlets were developed along with a bumper sticker stating "If You're Not Buckled Up, What's Holding You Back?" These items were distributed to police officers, other police agencies, and public and private agencies. "C.C. the Safety Clown," another safety education police officer in disguise, gave public demonstrations on the proper use of safety belts and child safety seats. He also appeared on Cablevision of Shreveport.

SHREVEPORT CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

September 1 - 23, 1988

Personal services - extra patrol	$ 2,465
Training costs	735
Printing costs - brochures, training booklets	1,800
Total	$ 5,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION SITES

The six remaining sites were given the same government funding as the impact sites. The sites organized and implemented CSS programs similar to those already discussed. The only difference between these six sites and the three impact sites was that no on-site observations were conducted by the evaluations contractor. The contractor did, however, keep in close contact with each site to coordinate and monitor the progress, and advise on the evaluation of the programs.

The following sites will be discussed in this section of the report:

- Charleston, West Virginia
- Columbus, Indiana
- Des Moines, Iowa
- Gilbert, Arizona
- Vineland, New Jersey
- Willimantic, Connecticut

Charleston

Community profile. Charleston, the capital city of West Virginia, is located in the southern part of the state in the County of Kanawha.

The city is 32 square miles (approximately 251 street miles). Adjacent communities are South Charleston, Dunbar, Nitro and St. Albans. The population in Charleston is 63,968 persons. Approximately 300,000 individuals use the city each day for employment, recreation, and shopping.

The average family size is 2.4 persons. The average income is approximately $30,000 per year. The figures for children by age are as follows:

ages 0-4	6%
5-17	17%

The employment rate in Charleston is 94 percent. Of that percentage, approximately 70 percent are white collar, and 20 percent are blue collar workers. Approximately 10 percent of the population is retired.

Safety belt and CSS restraint use is relatively low, according to the Police Department. There are no available records to show the exact number of injuries or deaths of unrestrained children in vehicles.

Enforcement profile. The state law requiring the use of child passenger safety devices in vehicles was enacted July 1981 and updated July 1986. The law states that every driver who transports a child under the age of 9 years in a passenger automobile, van or pickup truck other than one operated for hire must secure the child in a child passenger safety device system that meets applicable federal motor vehicle standards. If the child is between the ages 3-8, a vehicle safety belt is sufficient to meet the requirements of the law. Although the CSS law is a primary offense in Charleston, the driver is not subject to issuance of citation for unrestrained passengers if the number of passengers exceeds the number of safety belts in the vehicle.

No previous organized CSS enforcement efforts had been initiated by the Charleston Police Department. Minimal enforcement had been conducted by individual officers from the uniformed patrol and traffic divisions. Officers are required to use a safety belt when operating a departmental vehicle. The only previous PI&E effort was the presentation on the importance of safety restraints to a third grade school group by the WV Safety Belt Coalition.

Grant objectives. The Charleston Police Department was notified about the NHTSA project by the Highway Safety Office of West Virginia. The Police Department planned to use the grant funds to instruct officers to enforce the child safety device law and to publicize the importance of child restraint devices.

The Department's goals were as follows:

(1) To conduct an intensive campaign of the benefits of child and adult restraint devices.

(2) To publicize the enforcement of the Child Passenger Restraint Law.

(3) To use different media channels to inform and educate the public.

(4) To train officers in the correct methods of CSS device installation for different model types.

(5) To integrate enforcement of CSS devices with normal motor vehicle traffic enforcement.

The $5,000 grant from NHTSA was supplemented by $1,000 received from the State of West Virginia, $1,000 from the local government in Charleston, and $1,000 in private funding. Several community groups also supported the project by donating information and materials, including the Southern West Virginia Auto Club (AAA), Kanawha - Charleston Health Department (P.A.T.C.H.), and the WV Safety Belt Coalition.

Program description. The program in Charleston began in July 1987, and continued through July 1988. The geographic scope of the program covered residents of Charleston and the Kanawha Valley Area. The program's emphasis was on education and information, through presentations and distribution of literature, aimed at increasing the public's awareness of the child restraint law and the importance of correct use of CSS devices.

To prepare for the enforcement aspect of the project, 54 percent of the total police force, including the entire mobile traffic patrol unit (12 officers), participated in CSS training. Four officers received specialized training. Another 78 received general training during roll-call. The 25-minute roll-call training sessions consisted of an introduction to CSS law, a showing of videotapes obtained from state organizations, identification of the problem, and discussions about the various CSS models and methods of identifying and correcting improper usage. In August 1987, a corporal was sent to learn proper CSS enforcement training techniques at the "Occupant Protection Usage and Enforcement Workshop" instructor program at the Transportation Safety Institute in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Enforcement officers who were trained in the enforcement of CSS devices also participated in the public information program. This program was designed to inform the public of the need to use and

install properly the safety equipment required by law. These officers were directed to incorporate CSS law enforcement into routine patrol procedures of the officer's normal tasks (i.e., speed law enforcement, other road laws, DWI). The Police Department implemented a strategy whereby officers concentrated special enforcement in the areas where most violations occur, including malls, shopping centers, daycare centers and schools.

In November, representatives from each of the Patrol Division shifts and the Traffic Division were sent to an "Occupant Protection Usage and Enforcement Workshop" hosted by the WV Governor's Highway Safety Program. The workshop included coverage of CSS restraint systems. These individuals then trained Department members, using roll-call and extended training sessions.

The officer responsible for the organization and implementation of the program attended Lifesavers 6 Conference in Boston, Massachusetts, as a member of the WV Highway Safety Leaders. Literature about child occupant protection was obtained for distribution during the Charleston project.

The officer also contacted outside services to request support. In December, the CSS restraint program became an additional facet to the Kanawha - Charleston Health Department's "Planned Approach to Community Health" (P.A.T.C.H.). The emphasis of this program was on the development and implementation of a community-based co-op education effort on the correct use of restraint systems by adults and children.

In May, the Municipal Court Judge agreed to set a $50.00 fine for cited violations of the CSS law. The violator was given the choice, however, to pay the fine or attend a one-hour class on the necessity and importance of CSS restraint systems for children on proper installation. The class is held twice per month and approximately 12 residents attend each class.

Several PI&E efforts took place as a result of the NHTSA grant. The majority of the public education consisted of mass media efforts and the distribution of literature and visual videotapes obtained from the state. Several special events were designed to enhance the public's awareness of CSS restraints, including Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week (February 7-13) and Buckle-up America Week (May). Informational booths were displayed at various locations throughout the city.

Media activities. The local television stations and newspapers covered the major activities which involved the Police Department. A PSA, a news release, articles and paid advertisements conveyed the

importance of complying with the child restraint law, and ways to identify and correct misuse of CSS devices.

Several segments stressing the importance of child occupant protection in vehicles were aired on local television stations. Toward the end of the grant program a PSA was developed to stress that CSS restraint devices are the "perfect babysitter." This PSA was developed by the Public Information Officer of WV State Police and the West Virginia Safety Belt Coalition.

Three local television news programs covered a community event at a local parking lot. This event was designed to inform residents of the importance of using properly installed CSS devices. It was targeted at residents who own CSS restraint devices. A local radio station ran a live remote spot featuring the police officer responsible for the program.

A news release was distributed to inform Charleston residents that the mayor had presented fourteen CSS devices to three community health groups as part of the city of Charleston's continuous effort to educate the public about the child restraint law. The news conference was covered by three local television stations and two local radio stations.

Articles citing instances of death and injury among unrestrained children were published in several local Charleston newspapers, the Charleston Daily Mail and The Charleston Gazette. These articles were intended to "scare" residents into installing CSS devices to insure the safety of their children. Articles announcing a safety seat installation demonstration in the parking lot of a local restaurant were also published.

Special events. The PI&E events for this project were primarily aimed toward providing information and literature to Charleston residents through informational display booths. These displays were highlighted by posters and videotapes obtained from the WV Safety Belt Coalition. One such display, which occurred in conjunction with Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week (February 7-13), was set up at the Charleston Town Center. The pamphlets and brochures given to residents at no cost were developed by the Police Department or obtained from the State or WV Safety Belt Coalition. A display was also set up in the lobby of City Hall during that week.

The following informational display booths were set up for various community events:

- May - at the Rehabilitation Center Health Fair.
- June - at the Kanawha Mall as part of a safety program sponsored by the mall.

- o June - at the Sunrise Museum Parenting Conference as part of a series of workshops for parents and their children.
- o June - at the Women's and Children's Hospital during each of these programs: Expectant Parent's Day, Kid's Day, and Women's Day.

A request has been made to establish a permanent CSS restraint device display in the Labor Hall Area of the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Also in June, in conjunction with WV Safety Belt Coalition, McDonald's and a local radio station held a CSS restraint device inspection in the parking lot of a local McDonald's restaurant. CSS restraint information was distributed and police officers examined vehicles for correct CSS installation and use.

The Mayor of Charleston issued a proclamation that parents should obey the child restraint law. He also approved the city's providing CSS restraint devices to these community groups: WV Health Right (7 seats), Women's Health Center (4 seats), and Kanawha-Charleston Health Department (3 seats). In addition, three seats were retained by the Police Department for use by the Juvenile Bureau and to train officers in the administration of the law. The seats were obtained primarily to provide low-income families, who might not otherwise be able to afford the device, with proper protection for their children.

The Police Department took the responsibility for the distribution of information throughout the state of West Virginia, because of the need for grand-scale child restraint promotion. Samples of information were distributed to local physicians and pediatricians. These samples were also provided to all municipal and county law enforcement agencies within the state for their own distribution.

CHARLESTON CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

July 1987 - July 1988

Purchase and delivery of CSS restraint devices	$ 470
Literature developed for distribution	720
Posters highlighting CSS statute	144
Acquisition of five videotapes for CSS for officer training program and public displays	790

Cumulative overtime expenses for public events	695
Overtime expenses for enforcement	2,171
Space rental at Charleston Town Center	10
Total	$5,000

Columbus

The Administrative Evaluation was the main source by which information was gathered to describe each site and its activities. Columbus did not return the evaluation to The Prism Corporation, thus insufficient information was supplied for this portion of the Final Report. The majority of this information was gathered from the site's quarterly reports.

Community profile. Columbus, Indiana, is an urban community located in northern Bartholomew County about 45 miles south of Indianapolis and 70 miles north of Louisville, Kentucky. Adjacent communities are Bartholomew, Brown, Decatur, Jackson and Jennings. The population in Columbus is 35,000 persons. Children under 18 years of age represent 31 percent of the total population. The average family income is $22,500.

Grant objectives. The Columbus Police Department was notified of the grant program through the State of Indiana. The Department planned to use the funds to achieve one major goal: to produce a local videotape of area residents to help encourage "neighbors"

to restrain themselves and their children while riding in a vehicle. There are already two safety seat loaner programs in existence in Columbus, and the hospital provides infant safety seats for all discharged newborns. The Police Department felt that a videotape would provide the necessary motivation for residents to take advantage of the loaner programs or purchase their own CSS devices.

Program description. The program in Columbus began in July 1987, and continued through December 1987, until the completion of the video. However, frequent presentations of the video continued until the end of May 1988. The geographic scope of the program covered the City of Columbus.

Media activities. In February, a local cable television station aired the video. The local television station aired the video several times a day for one month in July, and will continue to show it periodically.

Special events. The video began to circulate throughout the school system in January, and eventually to Girl Scout and Boy Scout troops. A brochure, developed in February to publicize the broadcast of the video on local television, was distributed to Columbus citizens by these scout troops. The chairperson of the Automobile Safety Coalition in Columbus showed the video at a conference in Boston and viewers gave it a positive response.

The local mall presented a "Saturday Program" for child occupant restraint. The video was shown, and brochures were distributed. Approximately 30,000 persons were exposed to the video.

The police officer in charge of occupant safety visits local schools to speak with children about the importance of occupant safety. To accompany the presentations, the video is shown. Two copies of the video are available through the Police Department for community home-viewing. Various private organizations throughout Columbus have copies of the video for public viewing.

COLUMBUS CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

July 1987 - December 1987

Officer Enforcement Overtime	$2,113
Production of Videotape	$ 750
Administrative Overtime	$ 225
	$3,088

Des Moines

Community profile. Des Moines, Iowa, is an urban community of 66.5 square miles (approximately 797 street miles) located in Polk County. Adjacent communities are West Des Moines, Windsor Heights, Clive, Urbandale, Johnston, Ankeny, Altoona and Pleasant Hill. The population of Des Moines is 192,060. The metropolitan population is approximately 350,000 people. The metropolitan area is located at the junction between two major interstate highways, on which 75,000 to 100,000 vehicles pass daily.

The average family size in Des Moines is 3 persons. The median household income is $26,644 per year. The figures for children by the targeted age are as follows:

ages 0-4 7%
5-12 7%

The employment rate is about 95 percent. The population in Des Moines is approximately 90 percent white and 10 percent minority.

Compliance with the safety belt law is reported to be average by the Police Department. The Department felt, however, that a reduction of deaths and injuries would be achieved through a concerted effort of traffic law enforcement and greater public education and awareness of the positive benefits of child restraint and safety belt use.

Enforcement profile. In July 1986, a state law was passed prohibiting the transport of children under 6 years in a motor vehicle without a designated protection device. Children under the age of 3 must be secured during transit by a child restraint system which meets federal motor vehicle safety standards. Children between the ages 3-6 may be secured either by a CSS device, a safety belt, or harness of an approved type. Violation of this law is treated as a secondary offense by police officers.

Grant objectives. The Des Moines Police Department was advised by the State Seat Belt Coordinator to apply for the NHTSA grant. The following is a list of objectives for the program:

(1) To develop a roll-call training session to educate and motivate officers to enforce safety restraint and CSS laws.

(2) To increase public awareness of the importance of occupant restraint devices and their correct use through the mass media.

(3) To establish a program to educate youth groups on the importance of occupant restraint.

(4) To distribute educational materials to the general public, increase public personal contact, and speak at civic group and neighborhood meetings.

(5) To provide additional training to officers responsible for implementation and motivation for the program.

The Des Moines Police Department has a Serious Traffic Offender Program (S.T.O.P.), which was enhanced by the NHTSA grant. The program's operation concentrates on DWI and accident reduction efforts. With the addition of the $5,000 grant, S.T.O.P. was able to promote safety belt and CSS restraint use.

Program description. The program began January 1988 and continued through August 1988. The emphasis was on educating parents about CSS devices and children about the importance of using a safety belt. Enforcement was increased, and CSS devices were provided on a loan basis to low-income families.

To prepare for the enforcement component of the program, 66 percent (216 officers) of the police force were trained in CSS enforcement. The entire traffic detail department was involved in the training. The two-hour training sessions consisted of an explanation of the existing CSS and safety belt laws, and a discussion about the observation of CSS restraint systems. A roll-call training session was provided later in the program to all departmental personnel by an instructor from the S.T.O.P. Squad, Traffic Unit and Special Operations Section. The use of safety belts is required by all departmental personnel.

The Department concentrated on integrated enforcement rather than enforcement blitzes. There was a steady increase in enforcement throughout the program. The citation statistics do not distinguish between violation of the CSS and safety belt laws. During the program period, however, 4,623 citations were issued for failure to comply with the laws. At one point during the program, a spot check by the police of vehicles showed 100 percent compliance with the CSS law by Des Moines residents.

The PI&E efforts were targeted primarily toward younger children. The message focused on the need for children to be secured in a CSS device or safety belt while riding in a vehicle in order to be properly protected. Child safety in vehicles was also publicized through seminars and special presentations to elementary school children by the Crime Prevention Unit of the Police Department and through special advertising items (e.g., coloring books, decals).

Media activities. The mass media in Des Moines played an important part in promoting the program and its primary objectives. The children were the primary target audience throughout the program period. All forms of visual and audio publication were targeted at this segment of the community.

A PSA was prepared at no cost by the Police Department and the Director of Public Affairs at WOI-TV, a local station. The PSA was distributed to four local television stations. The stations ran the PSA during the hours of the day when children were most likely to be watching television (i.e., weekdays, before and after school hours, and Saturday). PSAs were also developed for television and radio to inform the community about a loaner program for CSS restraint devices.

Articles were printed in The Des Moines Register to increase awareness amongst community residents that parents should protect their children and secure them in a properly installed CSS restraint system or safety belt, or be subject to a citation for violation of this law.

Special events. A successful PI&E element of the program was the publication of a coloring book entitled, Seatbelts "N" Dinosaurs. This book was developed in January by the Des Moines Police Department and a local wildlife artist. Initially, 5,000 copies of the book were printed for distribution by the Uniform Patrol Division. The books were available through the Police Department and were distributed at school presentations by officers of the Uniform Patrol Division.

The coloring book was so popular that the first printing was distributed within the first month. There was a great demand within the community for more books. Funds were provided by the Independent Insurance Agents of Iowa for the publication of 10,000 additional copies. These, too, were distributed by the Uniform Patrol Division.

The Police Department was also responsible for the institution of a CSS loaner program for low-income families. The Department purchased 50 seats to be donated to the Iowa Lutheran Medical Center. Decals for the seats were printed with the Des Moines Police Department insignia. The loaner program was begun by the Medical Center in May. After the first few months, the Center sent a request to the Police Department for additional seats.

A puppet was developed by the Crime Prevention Unit to use during special safety presentations at elementary schools. The puppet, Ti the Triceratops, was based on the narrative character in the coloring book. The Crime Prevention Unit continues to be available for educational seminars on safety belt and CSS device use.

DES MOINES CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

January - August 1988

Production and printing of coloring book	$1,983
Artist's fee	500
Purchase of CSS restraint devices (50)	2,085
Decals for loaner seats	210
Total	$4,778

The effort to increase occupant restraint use in Des Moines has continued since the end of the contract. The officer responsible for continued enforcement attended a 40-hour course on occupant restraint

use and enforcement. The officer also spent eight months working with the Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau, Iowa Traffic Safety Now, local school officials, insurance companies, other city departments and other law enforcement agencies to coordinate a massive public awareness campaign that took place on February 14, 1989, Valentine's Day. The campaign was entitled "Click With Love."

The Police Department erected an information booth on occupant restraints at a local 3-day car show. The booth was well-received by those attending the car show.

Finally, the officer prepared an 8-hour course of instruction that has been presented to recruit officers of the Police Department during their academy training on occupant restraint use and enforcement. This will continue to be a part of academy training for future recruits.

Gilbert

The Administrative Evaluation was the main source by which information was gathered to describe each site and its activities. Gilbert did not return the evaluation to The Prism Corporation, thus insufficient information was supplied for this portion of the Final Report. The majority of this information was gathered from the site's monthly reports and routine telephone calls.

Community profile. Gilbert, Arizona, is a rural town just south of Mesa and east of Chandler. The population in Gilbert is 16,000 and is expected to double within the next two years.

Enforcement profile. In 1985, a State law was passed prohibiting the transport of children under 4 years of age in non-commercial motor vehicles without a designated Federally approved passenger restraint system. Children over 4 years of age are not required to be restrained at all. The law became a primary offense in 1987, but is still treated as a secondary offense. Police officers are encouraged to use safety belts when riding in a department automobile.

Grant objectives. The Chief of Police was eager to apply for the grant after reading literature supplied by NHTSA. Very safety-conscious, he was interested in greatly increasing the voluntary use of CSS devices.

Program description. The program began in February 1988 with the first draft of the script for a Child Safety Seat information videotape. The Director of the Gilbert Department of Public Safety developed and distributed a training bulletin to inform police officers of the current CSS laws in Gilbert, the importance of child

safety restraints, and the strict enforcement. No promotional activities were expected to occur during the program due to time constraints set by the program coordinator. NHTSA granted the Gilbert Police Department a 90-day extension period due to complications in the production of the videotape.

Media activities. The Director also developed a Public Safety Bulletin to inform residents of the importance of CSS use to protect children riding in a vehicle. Copies of the bulletin were distributed to a local daycare center and the local newspaper, The Gilbert Independent.

Special events. The CSS information videotape was completed in December 1988. Twenty copies of the tape were to be distributed to local video rental stores and nursery schools.

The Police Department was also responsible for the implementation of a loaner program. Forty child safety seat restraints were purchased and donated to the maternity wards of Desert Samaritan Hospital and Maricopa County Medical Center. These seats will be loaned to the families of new-born children until they are able to obtain an adequate child passenger restraint system. The Police Department will keep two of the CSS devices in case an officer has reason to transport a child in a patrol vehicle.

GILBERT CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

February - December 1988

Production of videotape	$1,293
Purchase of 40 CSS devices	2,347
Overtime, Program Coordinator/Director	1,004
	$4,644

Vineland

Community profile. Vineland, New Jersey, is a suburban community of 69 square miles (approximately 378 street miles) situated in Cumberland County. Vineland's population is 59,000 persons. The average family size is estimated at 4 persons. The average household income is $18,136 per year. The figures for children by age are as follows:

ages 0-4 5%
5-12 10%

The employment rate in this city is 37 percent; of that percentage, 37 percent are white collar, 61 percent are blue collar, and 2 percent work within the agriculture industry. Vineland is comprised of a mixed population of white, black and Puerto Rican residents.

There was major non-compliance with the safety belt law among Vineland residents. Ignorance or outright disregard of the law also resulted in non-compliance with the child restraint law. Misuse of CSS devices or compliance without the proper equipment appeared to be rampant in Vineland. The Police Department felt that proper education and instruction would help citizens to understand the importance of the child restraint law and be encouraged to comply.

Enforcement profile. In April 1983, a State Law was enacted which requires that children under 5 years of age be secured by a federally approved child restraint system or a safety belt when riding in a moving vehicle. Children under 18 months of age must be in a child restraint device, and children between the ages 18 months and 5 years must be secured in a CSS device when riding in the front seat, or in a safety belt when riding in the rear seat. Violation of this law is categorized as a primary offense.

Grant objectives. A representative of the New Jersey Office of Highway Safety informed the Vineland Police Department of the NHTSA grant. The Department felt that there was potential for improvement in proper compliance with the child restraint law and applied for the grant with these objectives:

(1) To develop and implement a public information and education program on proper CSS use.

(2) To conduct an enforcement program to be initiated with both a warning program and public awareness program, prior to a citation enforcement effort.

(3) To establish a training program to educate law enforcement officers in the proper use and enforcement of CSS devices.

(4) To implement CSS loaner program services sponsored by Newcomb Medical Center and other community service organizations.

Vineland was considered for participation as an impact evaluation site. The city's climate conditions (i.e., snow, cold winds, rain, etc.) during the winter months would have been made CSS observations extremely difficult. Thus, Vineland was not chosen as one of the impact sites.

Program description. The program began in October 1987, with an enforcement blitz, and continued through until December 1987. The PI&E promotions continued, however, until July 1988. The idea was to begin the campaign with increased special enforcement and then follow up with an extensive PI&E campaign.

The campaign did not, however, continue as planned. The Captain originally responsible for the CSS program was replaced by another officer. This resulted in the program not being extensively thought out and executed.

To prepare for the special enforcement blitz, 80 percent (80 officers) of the Police Force was trained in CSS enforcement. All three officers of the Traffic Detail Department were trained in this area. The training sessions were two hours in length and concentrated on child restraint laws and enforcement, and the explanation of proper CSS restraint device installation. Officers were reminded that the law requires them to wear their safety belts when riding in an official vehicle.

Beginning in October 1987, an intensive ten-week enforcement blitz took place. Overtime officers patrolled solely for CSS enforcement for four hours each day. During this period a total of 230 vehicles were stopped by the officers, who issued a total of 150 warning citations and 97 passenger restraint law citations. When each car was stopped, the driver received literature pertaining to safety belt and child restraint laws. Each driver was also advised of the infant and toddler seat loaner program, which was instituted in July 1988.

The PI&E effort centered primarily around education targeted for students (pre-school through eighth grade) within the community. The Vineland School System showed a great interest in the promotion of safety education. Information was also distributed in the form of pamphlets, obtained from the State of New Jersey Highway Safety Department, to schools and service groups. The special events that occurred as a result of the CSS program were also centered within the school district or targeted to the younger students within the community.

Media activities. The local mass media channels did not appear to support the CSS program to any great extent. Three local radio stations and two local newspapers have been reported to have participated in program publicity. A captain at the Police Department made several radio station appearances to promote safety belt and child restraint usage.

Special events. In preparation for the Christmas Parade, student safety patrols and police officers built a safety float to be presented at the parade. The float was adorned with banners that

read "Belt Someone for X-mas" and "Buckle-up." "McGruff" the crime/safety dog also rode the float. Approximately 15,000 citizens saw the float.

During the school year, from September 1987 to June 1988, the Safety Education Division visited seven elementary schools, four intermediate schools and four private schools. The presentations focused on informing students of the importance of safety in vehicles. The messages portrayed in these presentations were reinforced through films and pamphlets acquired from the State of New Jersey Highway Safety Department.

Several contests, with regard to the CSS program, were held for students. Approximately 350 fourth grade students viewed a film entitled "Do You Buckle-up?" and 145 posters were submitted based on the theme "Safety Belts and Child Restraints." One winner was selected from each of the nine schools addressed as well as a Grand Prize winner. The winners were selected based on originality, slogan, color and design.

The Safety Education Division held a presentation, in which a group of eighth graders viewed a film entitled "Ride of Your Life." The students could enter an essay contest based on the theme "Seat Belt Safety Pros and Cons." Of the 200 students present at the lecture, 180 submitted essays. The Grand Prize winner received an academic award presented by the Cumberland News, a local newspaper.

A banner was purchased with monies from another grant and is displayed above the most traveled street in the city. The banner states, "Care Enough To Buckle Up," and shows a heart wearing a safety belt and harness. Stickers were printed and distributed in the schools and at the local mall.

In February, a safety belt/child safety restraint lecture was given to the Vineland Board of Education Administrators. The film "Ride of Your Life" was presented. Approximately 30 persons were in attendance.

In May, the Police Department held its annual Open House in conjunction with National Police Week. Approximately 1,000 students and adults attended. A number of safety precautions and procedures were on display. Also present was the "convincer," a simulator that demonstrates the force received in a 5-10 mph traffic accident.

A CSS loaner program was instituted in July. There was some initial difficulty in the approval of the loaner program for potential liability reasons. If a seat were defective, or incorrectly secured into a vehicle by an officer, the Police Department might be sued for liability. The company, from which the seats were purchased, provides $5,000,000 worth of liability insurance at no cost.

Once the approval was given for the program, the Police Department purchased 85 CSS restraint devices (50 infant seats and 35 toddler seats). An additional 10 toddler seats were donated to the program by the State of New Jersey.

The loaner program was targeted at families who could not readily afford the cost of a proper CSS restraint device. A deposit of $15.00 is required for the loan of an infant seat, and $25.00 for a toddler seat. The rental period is a maximum of three months. If the borrower desires to keep the seat for a longer period of time, the seat must be brought in for inspection, and a new loaner agreement must be signed. The seat must be properly installed in the vehicle by a trained designated member of the program staff, and the borrower must be instructed on proper installation. However, a CSS restraint device may not be loaned to anyone who does not bring his or her car for installation (otherwise the liability insurance would be null and void).

VINELAND CHILD SAFETY SEAT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

October 1987 - July 1988

Enforcement blitz	$2,600
CSS restraint device loaner program	2,400
Total	$5,000

Willimantic

Community profile. Willimantic, Connecticut, is a rural township of 28 square miles (approximately 85 street miles) located in the Town of Windham. Adjacent counties are Norwich, Plainfield and Waterford.

The estimated population in Willimantic is 21,340 persons. The average family size is 3.22. The median household income is $17,316 per year. The figures for children by age are as follows:

ages 0-4 8%
5-12 13%

Half the population is employed, and 17 percent is retired. Of those individuals who are employed, 46 percent are white collar, 54 percent are blue collar, and 2.5 percent work within the agriculture industry.

Safety belt use rate is average, according to the Windham County Traffic Safety Program. The rate is increasing due to a recent campaign, separate from the NHTSA grant, to promote occupant restraints.

Enforcement profile. On January 1, 1986, a state law was enacted which requires that drivers and front-seat passengers must wear a safety belt. Children under age 4 must be properly protected in an approved car seat. As an option, children ages 1-4 may be secured by a vehicle lap belt in the rear seat only. The law also states that the driver is responsible for all passengers under age 16. Vehicles such as public buses, emergency vehicles, postal carriers, newspaper delivery vehicles, vehicles manufactured before safety belts were required, and vehicles equipped with airbags are all exempt from this law. Violation of this law is a primary offense.

Previous safety restraint enforcement and activities were extensive in this city. In 1984, violators of the child safety restraint laws were issued a warning ticket allowing the violator a 10 percent discount toward the purchase of a CSS device. The Police Department hosted the Eastern Connecticut Seat Belt Enforcement Workshop. The Department also launched and secured a fund raiser, which raised $22,000 to purchase "Officer WILLI," the "safety robot."

A massive campaign in the Town of Windham to promote occupant restraints had caused use rates to increase dramatically from Fall 1983 to Spring 1986. Due to educational efforts, the infant restraint usage rate increased from 74.7 percent to 93.4 percent, the toddler restraint usage rate from 13.1 percent to 66.9 percent, and the subteen and teen restraint groups from 4.9 percent to 54.2 percent. The adult restraint usage rate increased from 8.6 percent to 75.2 percent.

Grant objectives. The Willimantic Police Department applied for the grant through the Eastern Connecticut Highway Safety Program, an agency with which the Department worked to develop and implement the program.

The enforcement grant supplemented the on-going traffic campaign already in existence. With the additional funds, the Department and the Eastern Connecticut Highway Safety Program intended to achieve the following objectives:

(1) To conduct an on-going town-wide public information campaign to reach 75 percent of Windham's population by using various aspects of the mass media, the distribution of specialty advertising materials and items, and setting up safety displays throughout the town.

(2) To design and implement a mandatory Department training session to focus on educational and enforcement procedures.

(3) To implement special enforcement procedures during high-peak traffic hours and when children are most often riding in vehicles.

(4) To record the number of written infractions and the administrative duties necessary to complete the program.

Program description. The program in Willimantic began in August 1987 and continued until August 1988. The geographic scope of the program encompassed the Town of Windham, which includes the Willimantic Service District. The program's emphasis was on continuing an enforcement effort that had already been established with a state grant for general occupant restraints. The additional funds allowed the Police Department to address child/occupant safety restraint enforcement as a priority.

To prepare for the enforcement effort, 95 percent of the police force was trained in how to observe CSS violations and to determine correct installation. The training sessions were 3.5 hours long and included 1.5 hours in the classroom and 2.0 hours in actual educational enforcement. The training consisted of brief comments on the restraint law, a videotape presentation of a successful New York enforcement campaign, "Officers Need to Buckle Up," and a discussion of ways the officers can counteract common myths and excuses. The officers also viewed "Children in Crashes."

The message presented throughout the program was "Don't risk a ticket -- Click it!" This message was presented through the media and special community events.

Beginning in October, The Police Department focused attention on education and enforcement by giving school presentations and closely observing the restraint behaviors of the community. In November, police officers conducted a Thanksgiving road block to observe the use of CSS devices and general restraint and to issue citations. Special events and the mass media were incorporated to aid in promotion of the program from January to May.

Media activities. Articles were placed in the local and surrounding area newspapers, the Chronicle (4), The Norwich Bulletin (6), and The New London Day (3). During the December holiday season, radio announcements, news interviews, and PSAs promoting occupant restraint use were aired on local and surrounding television and radio stations. The radio PSAs were donated periodically by WILI radio station.

Special Events. The program began with educational events. In October, a local high school sponsored a Seat Belt Safety Day to enhance occupant restraint education within the school system. Also in October, the Police Department sponsored a booth promoting child restraint and occupant restraint use at a Senior Citizen Expo. The Town of Windham launched a car seat loaner program during the same month.

Throughout the program, "Officer WILLI," the "safety robot," made special appearances at mall presentations, elementary schools, and libraries.

Between September 1987 and January 1988, 11 school safety presentations were given by the Willimantic Youth Officer. The Eastern Connecticut Highway Safety Program provided supplemental materials for distribution (i.e., pens, pencils, coloring books and pamphlets). These presentations stressed general safety procedures, particularly the use of safety restraints.

Grant monies were used to purchase 1,000 "Weebles Buckle-Bear" stick-ons. Approximately 250 "Buckle-Bears" were distributed at elementary school presentations during January.

A brochure was developed by the Willimantic Police Department's Youth Services Unit featuring "Officer WILLI." The brochure described the robot in detail, including its history, distinguishing characteristics, uses within the Police Department, and the breakdown of donations used to buy it. The brochure was designed to be distributed through the mail.

WILLIMANTIC CHILD SAFETY SEAT GRANT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

August 1987 - August 1988

Officer enforcement overtime	$2,141.00
PI&E incentive - "Weebles Buckle-Bear" stick-ons	485.00
	$2,626.00

Because of the success of the Willimantic CSS enforcement campaign, the State of Connecticut will begin its own child safety seat restraint program. Several Police Departments throughout the state (including Willimantic) will receive funding to develop and implement CSS campaigns. The Willimantic Police Department will consider this funding an extension of the current program.

PROGRAM IMPACT ON CHILD SAFETY RESTRAINT DEVICE USE

This section of the report represents the results of analyses to determine whether activities stemming from the grants had any influence on the use and correct use of child restraint devices. Three sites were selected to determine this impact - Gulfport, Provo, and Shreveport. Data for the impact analyses were collected at the sites during observations of occupants whose vehicles were stopped at intersections and from observations in parking lots of vehicles that had child restraint devices.

For Gulfport and Provo, observations were done before grant program activities were initiated and immediately after the end of the grants. For Shreveport, the same observation periods were supplemented with observations during the grant period. The overall results will be presented first, followed by the individual results of each site.

OVERALL RESULTS

A total of 5,792 passenger vehicles were observed in the three sites during the observational periods. Tables 1 and 2 display the number of vehicles observed at intersections and in parking lots for the various observation periods. More vehicles were observed at intersections than in the parking lots. There were approximately equal numbers of vehicles observed in the before and after observation periods for parking lots. There were differences in the number of vehicles observed for intersections for Gulfport and for all three observation periods for Shreveport. There also were differences in the total numbers of vehicles observed in each site for both the parking lot and intersection observations.

Table 1: Number of Vehicles Observed in Parking Lots

Observation	Before	During	After	Total
Gulfport	286	N/A	265	551
Provo	388	N/A	384	772
Shreveport	308	289	291	888
Total	982	289	940	2,211

Table 2: Number of Vehicles Observed at Intersections

Observation	Before	During	After	Total
Gulfport	461	N/A	357	818
Provo	568	N/A	562	1,130
Shreveport	569	463	601	1,633
Total	1,598	463	1,520	3,581

The following analyses use data from only the before and after observation periods. The data collected from observations during the grant period in Shreveport are presented in that site's analysis.

There were 4,042 children observed in 3,118 vehicles at intersections during the before and after observation periods. An average of 1.23 children per vehicle was observed for the before observation period, and a slightly higher average of 1.37 children per vehicle was observed in the after observation period. When there were more children in a vehicle, the observer experienced difficulty in obtaining accurate information on all of them.

The distribution of the estimated ages of children observed in vehicles at intersections in shown in Table 3. The age distribution is important because younger children tend to be restrained more often than older children, all other factors being equal. There were almost twice as many children under 5 years of age as there were 5-12 years of age (2,612 to 1,434, respectively). The numbers of children observed during the two observation periods were similar (1,969 to

Table 3: Distribution of Children's Ages

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Age					
Less than 1 year	236	12%	158	8%	-4%
1 - 4	1,017	52%	1,201	58%	6%
5 - 12	716	36%	717	36%	0
Total	1,969		2,076		

2,076). The distributions of ages for the two observational periods were slightly different. The percentage of infants was greater in the before observation period than in the after period (12 and 8 percent, respectively). The percentage of toddlers was less in the before observation period than in the after period (52 and 58 percent, respectively).

There were 3,028 child restraint devices observed in the three sites during the observational periods. 2,016 were observed in parking lots, and 1,012 of this total, at intersections (Tables 4 and 5). For parking lot observations, equal numbers of devices were noted

Table 4: Numbers and Proportions of Child Restraint Devices Observed in Parking Lots

	Observation Period					
	Before		After		Total	
CSS Devices						
Toddler	654	64%	710	71%	1,364	68%
Infant	106	10%	102	10%	208	10%
Convertible	75	7%	63	6%	138	7%
Booster	179	18%	127	13%	306	15%
Total	1,014		1,002		2,016	

Table 5: Numbers and Proportions of Child Restraint Devices Observed at Intersections

	Observation Period					
	Before		After		Total	
CSS Devices						
Infant	181	32%	165	38%	346	34%
Toddler	356	62%	236	54%	592	58%
Booster	36	6%	38	9%	74	8%
Total	573		439		1,012	

between the two observation periods (1,014 and 1,002). There were more devices observed in the before period at intersections (573 and 439).

The vast majority of the child restraint devices observed were toddler seats, 68 percent from the parking lot and 58 percent from the intersection observations. The distribution of child restraint devices noted in the intersection observations was different than that of parking lot observations. More infant seats and fewer toddler and booster seats were noted during the intersection observations. Some of these differences may be caused by the difficulty in determining the type of child restraint device when the child is seated in it. For example, determining if a child is sitting in a booster seat or on something else is sometimes difficult.

Table 6 shows the number of children who were or were not restrained by a CSS or safety belt for the two observation periods. There were no statistically significant differences between the percentage of children using restraint devices for the two observation periods. Two out of five children (43 percent) were observed to be restrained in safety belts or CSS in the period prior to the grants. A similar proportion (42 percent) were observed to be restrained after the grants ended.

Table 6: Restraint Use at Intersections

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Restraints					
Safety belt	286	15%	417	20%	5%
CSS	551	28%	447	22%	-6%
None	959	49%	1,125	54%	5%
On lap	163	8%	86	4%	-4%
Unsafe seat	7	0	1	0	-1%
Total	1,966		2,076		

Between the two periods, there was an increase in the percentage of children using safety belts (5 percent), but a decrease in the percent of children using CSS devices (6 percent). There was a decrease in the percentage of children riding on laps (4 percent) and a small decrease in the percentage of children using non-approved CSS devices. However, there was also an increase in the percentage of children not using a safety belt or a CSS device (5 percent).

Table 7 shows the overall restraint use by driver's age for intersection observations. Younger drivers (40 years of age or younger) tended to use restraint devices (safety belt or CSS) more often than older drivers (over 40). Overall, 46 percent of younger drivers used restraining devices, compared to 31 percent of the older drivers.

Table 7: Child Restraint Device Use by Driver's Age at Intersections

	Observation Period							
	Before				After			
	Age							
Restraint	≤ 40		≥ 40		≤ 40		≥ 40	
Safety belt	155	16%	32	12%	291	18%	125	26%
Child seat	328	33%	36	13%	409	26%	36	8%
None	511	51%	204	75%	895	56%	315	66%
Total	994*		272*		1,595		476	

* These numbers do not include data collected in Provo because the variable "driver's age" was not addressed during Provo's pre-grant observations.

When the two observation periods were compared, the percentage of younger drivers who used restraining devices decreased (5 percent). The percentage of older drivers who used child restraint devices increased (8 percent). When a younger driver used a child restraint

device, it was more often a CSS device (62 percent). When an older driver used a child restraint device, it was more often a safety belt (69 percent). In addition, overall, when older drivers did use CSS devices, they used them correctly more often than did the younger drivers (Table 8). The vast majority of the older drivers who used CSS devices (83 percent) did so correctly, compared to 71 percent of the younger drivers who used the devices.

Table 8: Status of Child Seats by Driver's at Intersections

	Observation Period							
	Before				After			
	Age							
	≤ 40		≥ 40		≤ 40		≥ 40	
Use								
Correct Use	230	67%	27	82%	302	75%	31	84%
Incorrect Use/ Unused Seat	115	33%	6	18%	100	25%	6	16%
Total	345*		33*		402		37	

* These numbers do not include data gathered in Provo because the variable "driver's age" was not addressed during Provo's pre-grant observations.

Both age groups showed improvement in correct use of CSS devices, with the younger drivers more so than the older drivers. The percentage of younger drivers correctly using CSS devices improved from 67 percent to 75 percent. Table 9 shows that, overall, the percentage of drivers who correctly used the devices increased from the before to the after observation period (6 percent). There also was an improvement in the percentage of drivers who had correctly routed the safety belts when using toddler seats (Table 10).

Table 9: Status of Child Seats at Intersections

Use	Observation Period: Before		After		%Change
Correct	397	70%	333	76%	6%
Incorrect	134	23%	81	18%	-5%
Unused seat	42	7%	25	6%	-1%
Total	573		439		

Table 10: Status of Toddler Seat Use in Parking Lots

Use	Observation Period: Before		After		%Change
Correct belt route	395	64%	426	70%	6%
Incorrect belt route	143	23%	113	19%	-4%
No belt	76	12%	71	12%	0
Total	614		610		

INDIVIDUAL SITE ANALYSES

Gulfport

A total of 1,369 passenger vehicles were observed in Gulfport (Table 11). A larger number of vehicles was observed in the before period than in the after period (747 and 622). There were more vehicles observed at intersections than in parking lots (818 and 551, respectively).

Table 11: Number of Vehicles Observed in Gulfport

Observation	Before	After	Total
Parking lot	286	265	551
Intersection	461	357	818
Total	747	622	1,369

The distribution of the ages of children observed at intersections is shown in Table 12. There were two times as many children observed who were under 5 years of age as 5-12 years of age (712 to 351, respectively). About the same number of children were observed in

Table 12: Distribution of Children's Ages in Gulfport

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Age					
Less than 1 year	74	13%	35	7%	-6
1 - 4	290	52%	313	62%	10
5 - 12	194	35%	156	31%	-4
Total	558		504		

the two observation periods (558 and 504). The distributions of the ages for the two observation periods were somewhat different. The percentage of infants and children 5-12 years of age who were observed was greater in the after period. The percentage of children 1-4 years of age who were observed was less for the before period than for the after period.

There were 593 child restraint devices observed in parking lots -- 305 before the grant program was initiated and 288 after the grant ended (Table 13). The vast majority of devices observed were toddler seats (71 percent).

Table 13: Observed Child Restraint Devices in Gulfport Parking Lots

	Observation Period					
	Before		After		Total	
CSS Device						
Toddler	211	69%	209	73%	420	71%
Infant	25	8%	14	5%	39	7%
Convertible	16	5%	19	7%	35	6%
Booster	53	17%	46	16%	99	17%
Total	305		288		593	

The remaining devices observed were booster seats (17 percent), infant seats (7 percent), and convertible seats (6 percent). There was little difference between the distributions of the devices for the before and after observation periods.

There were twice as many child restraint device observed in parking lots than at intersections (593 and 285). The distribution of child restraint devices observed at intersections was different from that of child restraint devices observed in parking lots (Table 14).

Table 14: Child Restraint Devices Observed at Gulfport Intersections

	Observation Period					
	Before		After		Total	
CSS Device						
Infant	57	33%	27	24%	84	29%
Toddler	108	62%	78	70%	186	65%
Booster	8	5%	7	6%	15	6%
Total	173		112		285	

Toddler seats made up 65 percent of devices observed at intersections, and 71 percent of devices observed at parking lots. Infant seats represented 29 percent of the devices observed at intersections, and 13 percent of devices (infant + convertible) observed in parking lots. Booster seats accounted for 6 percent of the devices observed at intersections, and 17 percent of the devices observed in parking lots.

There also were some differences in the distributions of the devices observed at intersections for the before and after periods. There were more infant seats and fewer toddler seats observed in the before period than in the after period.

Of the 1,063 children observed in vehicles at intersections, 559 were observed prior to the grant program's initiation and 504 in the period immediately after the grant ended. Table 15 shows the number of children who were or were not restrained by a CSS or safety belt.

There was no difference in the percentage of children using restraint devices between the two observation periods. Two out of five children (44 percent) were restrained in both periods. Between the two periods, there was an increase in the percentage of children who were using safety belts (8 percent), but there was also a similar decrease in the percentage of children who were using CSS devices (7 percent). There was a decrease in the percentage of children who were riding on laps (4 percent). However, there also was a similar increase in the percentage of children who were not using a safety belt or restraint device.

Table 15: Restraint Use at Gulfport Intersections

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Restraint					
Safety belt	80	14%	112	22%	8%
CSS	167	30%	115	23%	-7%
None	264	47%	259	51%	4%
On lap	46	8%	18	4%	-4%
Unsafe seat	2	0	0	0	0
Total	559		504		

Table 16 shows the overall child restraint device use by driver's age for intersection observations. Younger drivers (40 years of age or younger) tended to use restraint devices (safety belt or CSS) more often than older drivers (over 40). Overall, 48 percent of the younger drivers used child restraint devices, compared to 32 percent of the older drivers.

Table 16: Child Restraint Use by Driver's Age at Gulfport Intersections

	Observation Period							
	Before				After			
	Age				Age			
	≤ 40		≥ 40		≤ 40		≥ 40	
Restraint								
Safety belt	64	14%	16	14%	90	22%	22	25%
Child seat	150	34%	17	15%	104	25%	9	10%
None	230	52%	79	71%	219	53%	57	65%
Total	444		112		413		88	

In the before observation period, 48 percent of the younger drivers used restraining devices while 29 percent of the older drivers did so. In the after observation period, 47 percent of the younger drivers used restraining devices, while 31 percent of the older drivers did. There was much more use of safety belts and less use of child safety seats by both groups of drivers in the after observation period than in the before period.

Overall, when a younger driver used a child restraint device, it more often was a CSS (62 percent). When an older driver used a child restraint device, it more often was a safety belt (59 percent). However, when older drivers did use CSS devices, they used them correctly more often than did the younger drivers (Table 17). The vast majority of older drivers who used CSS devices (85 percent) used them correctly, compared to 71 percent of the younger drivers who used the devices. The percentage of drivers in both age groups who used CSS devices correctly increased from the before observation period.

Table 17: Status of Child Seats by Driver's Age at Gulfport Intersections

	Observation Period			
	Before		After	
	Age			
Use	≤ 40	≥ 40	≤ 40	≥ 40
Correct use	100 64%	13 76%	84 82%	9 100%
Incorrect use/ unused seat	56 36%	4 24%	19 18%	0 0
Totals	156	17	103	9

Overall, the percentage of drivers who correctly used child restraint devices increased (18 percent) between the two observation periods (Table 18). There also was an increase (9 percent) in the percentage of drivers who had correctly routed the safety belt when using toddler seats (Table 19).

Table 18: Status of Child Seats at Gulfport Intersections

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Use					
Correct	113	65%	93	83%	18%
Incorrect	47	27%	19	17%	-10%
Unused seat	13	8%	0	0	-8%
Totals	173		112		

Table 19: Status of Toddler Seats in Gulfport Parking Lots

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Use					
Correct belt route	127	65%	140	74%	9%
Incorrect belt route	50	26%	36	19%	-7%
No belt	19	10%	12	6%	-4%
Total	196		188		

Provo

A total of 1,902 passenger vehicles were observed in Provo, with about equal numbers observed in the two data collection periods (Table 20). There were more vehicles observed at intersections than parking lots (1,130 and 772, respectively).

Table 20: Number of Vehicles Observed in Provo

Observation	Before	After	Total
Parking lot	388	384	772
Intersection	568	562	1,130
Total	956	946	1,902

The distribution of ages of children observed at intersections is shown in Table 21. There were 3 times as many children under 5 years of age who were observed than 5-12 years of age (1,128 to 371, respectively). The number of children who were observed in the before observation period was less than the number observed in the after period.

The distributions of ages for the two observational periods were quite different. The before observation period had a much larger percentage of children 5-12 years of age than the after period (33 and 18 percent), and a smaller percentage of children 1-4 years of age than the after period (55 and 71 percent, respectively).

Table 21: Distribution of Children's Ages in Provo

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Age					
Less than 1 Year	87	13%	90	11%	-2%
1 - 4	380	55%	571	71%	16%
5 - 12	230	33%	141	18%	-15%
Total	697		802		

There were 798 child restraint devices observed in parking lots. Approximately equal numbers were observed in the two observation periods (Table 22). The vast majority of devices observed were

toddler seats (66 percent). The remaining were booster seats (13 percent), infant seats (14 percent), and convertible seats (7 percent).

Table 22: Child Restraints Observed in Provo Parking Lots

	Observation Period					
	Before		After		Total	
Device						
Toddler	255	65%	270	67%	525	66%
Infant	53	13%	61	15%	114	14%
Convertible	30	8%	26	7%	56	7%
Booster	57	14%	46	11%	103	13%
Total	395		403		798	

There were 409 child restraint devices observed at intersections. Approximately equal numbers were observed in the two observation periods (Table 23). Toddler seats made up 51 percent of the devices observed. The remaining were infant seats (44 percent) and booster seats (5 percent). Almost twice as many child restraint devices were observed in the parking lots as at intersections.

Table 23: Child Restraints Observed at Provo Intersections

	Observation Period					
	Before		After		Total	
Device						
Infant	61	31%	119	56%	180	44%
Toddler	125	64%	84	39%	209	51%
Booster	9	5%	11	5%	20	5%
Total	195		214		409	

There were large differences between the distributions of devices observed in parking lots and in intersections. Toddler seats represented 51 percent of the devices observed at intersections, and 66 percent of those observed in parking lots. Infant seats comprised 44 percent of the devices observed at intersections, and 21 percent of those (infant + convertible) observed in parking lots. Booster seats accounted for 6 percent of devices observed at intersections and 13 percent of those observed in parking lots. More infant seats and fewer toddler seats were noted at intersections than in the parking lots.

There were 1,496 children observed in vehicles at intersections (Table 24). There were fewer children observed in the before period than in the after period (696 to 800).

Table 24: Restraint Use at Provo Intersections

	Observation Period				
	Before		After		%Change
Restraint					
Safety belt	99	14%	78	10%	-4%
CSS	187	27%	215	27%	0
None	345	50%	473	59%	9%
On lap	62	9%	33	4%	-5%
Unsafe seat	3	0	1	0	0
Total	696		800		

There was little difference between the overall restraint use rate for children prior to the grant and immediately after the grant ended. Two out of five children (41 percent) were observed to be restrained in the period prior to the grant, and 37 percent were observed to be restrained after the grant ended. Between the two periods there was a decrease in the percentage of children using safety belts (4 percent), and no change in children using CSS devices for the after observations. There was a decrease in the percentage of children who were observed riding on laps (5 percent). However, there also was an increase in the percentage of children who were observed not using a safety belt or a CSS device (9 percent).

Table 25 shows the overall child restraint device use by driver's age. Driver's age was not obtained for the before period observations. In the after period observations, younger drivers (40 years of age or younger) tended to use child restraint devices more often than did older drivers (over 40). Two out of five younger drivers (40 percent) used child restraint devices, compared to 21 percent of the older drivers.

Table 25: Child Restraint Use by Driver's Age at Provo Intersections

	Observation Period					
	Before*		After			
	Age					
Restraint	≤ 40	≥ 40	≤ 40		≥ 40	
Safety belt	-	-	61	9%	17	13%
Child seat	-	-	204	31%	11	8%
None	-	-	401	60%	106	79%
Total	-	-	666		134	

* No data was collected during the pre-grant observations for the variable "driver's age."

When a younger driver used a child restraint device, it more often was a CSS device (77 percent). When an older driver used one, it was more often a safety belt (61 percent). However, when older drivers did use CSS devices, they used them correctly more often than younger drivers (Table 26). The vast majority of older drivers who used CSS devices (82 percent) used them correctly, compared to 72 percent of the younger drivers who used the devices.

Table 26: Status of Child Seats by Driver's Age at Provo Intersections

	Observation Period			
	Before*		After	
	Age			
Use	< 40	> 40	< 40	> 40
Correct Use	-	-	147 72%	9 82%
Incorrect Use/ Unused Seat	-	-	56 28%	2 18%
Total	-	-	203	11

* No data was collected during the pre-grant observations for the variable "Driver's age."

There was no change between the two observation periods in correct use of child safety seats (72 and 73 percent, respectively) (Table 27). Slightly more seats were used in the after observation period, but they were used incorrectly. There was an increase (7 percent) in the percentage of toddler seats observed to have correct belt routing (Table 28).

Table 27: Status of Child Safety Seats at Provo Intersections

	Observation Period		
	Before	After	%Change
Use			
Correct	140 72%	156 73%	1%
Incorrect	36 18%	48 22%	4%
Unused seat	19 10%	10 5%	-5%
Total	195	214	

Table 28: Status of Toddler Seats in Provo Parking Lots

Use	Observational Period: Before		After		%Change
Correct belt route	150	63%	165	70%	7%
Incorrect belt route	57	24%	40	17%	-7%
No belt	33	14%	31	13%	-1%
Total	240		236		

Observations conducted by the Provo Police Department measured child restraint use before and after the program (see Table 29). Both the

Table 29: Observations By Provo Police Department

	1987	1988
INFANTS (0 to 2 years)		
Restrained	43%	46%
Not restrained	42%	36%
Improperly restrained	15%	15%
TODDLERS (2 to 5 years)		
Restrained	26%	32%
Not restrained	65%	62%
Improperly restrained	9%	6%
OVERALL USE (both age groups)		
Restrained	32%	37%
Not restrained	57%	53%
Improperly restrained	11%	10%
ADULT DRIVER		
Males restrained	22%	-
Females restrained	41%	-
Overall	35%	35%

use of CSS devices for children between the ages 0-5 and safety belt restraints for adults were observed. The analysis addressed the possible correlation between adult use and restrained children.

The telephone survey, conducted on December 22, 1988, measured the effect of the Provo Child Restraint Grant Program. Participants were randomly selected from the Provo City telephone book. The questions used in the survey were designed to measure any changes in CSS and safety belt use. The questions also measured the respondents' awareness of the child restraint laws, the attitudes about the importance of the laws, and awareness of the program. Fifty surveys were completed.

Survey Results

Of individuals surveyed, 36 percent had children or dependents under the age of 5 years. Of that group, 64 percent had been in at least one traffic crash.

The response to safety belt use showed that 52 percent always use safety belts, 40 percent occasionally use them, 6 percent seldom do, and 2 percent never use safety belts.

The response to CSS use showed that 66 percent of individuals with children under 5 years restrain their children, and 33 percent occasionally restrain their children.

Almost all respondents (92 percent) believed that safety belt prevent injury and/or death. Very few (2 percent) believed safety belts do not prevent injury and/or death, and 6 percent claimed they did not know.

Of the individuals surveyed, 86 percent were aware of Utah's Child Restraint Law. Nearly all (98 percent) were in favor of the law, and 2 percent were opposed. Those in favor of the law stated that children need protection and restraint from free movement in the car, which could be hazardous.

Of surveyed individuals, 12 percent were aware of the grant program, 88 percent were not. Of those aware of the program, 33 percent were informed through newspapers. The same proportion was informed through radio, and 33 percent became aware by word-of-mouth.

Survey Summary

The majority of respondents who have children under the age of 5 years always or occasionally restrained their children. The majority also indicated that they use safety belts themselves.

Only 12 percent of surveyed individuals were aware of the Child Restraint Program. More public information and education appears to be necessary to publicize the program and its objectives.

Shreveport

A total of 2,521 passenger vehicles were observed in Shreveport, 877 before the grant began, 752 midway through the grant period, and 892 after the end of the program (Table 30).

Table 30: Vehicles Observed in Shreveport

Observation	Before	During	After	Total
Parking Lot	308	289	291	888
Intersection	569	463	601	1,633
Total	877	752	892	2,521

The numbers of vehicles observed in parking lots for each of the observation periods were basically the same (308, 289, and 291). There were differences in the numbers of vehicles observed at intersections for the three periods (569, 463, and 601). There were twice as many vehicles observed at intersections than in parking lots.

The distribution of ages of children observed at intersections is shown in Table 31. There were slightly more children under 5 years of age as 5-12 years of age (772 to 712, respectively). The numbers of children observed for the three observation periods were somewhat different (714, 672 and 770). The distributions of ages for the three observational periods also were different. The before observation period had a similar percentage of children 1-4 years of age, and a larger percentage of infants and children 5-12 years of age than the during observation period. The before observation period had a smaller percentage of children 5-12 years of age and a larger percentage of infants and children 1-4 years of age than the after observation period.

Table 31: Distribution of Children's Ages in Shreveport

Age	Observation Period							
	Before		During		%Change	After		%Change
Less than 1 Year	75	11%	39	6%	-5	33	4%	-2
1 - 4	347	49%	374	56%	7	317	41%	-15
5 - 12	292	41%	259	39%	-2	420	55%	16
Total	714		672			770		

There were 937 child restraint devices observed in parking lots (Table 32). The distributions of devices were somewhat similar across the three observation periods. There was a lower percentage of toddler seats observed in the before period than for the following two observational periods (60, 72 and 74 percent), and a higher percentage of booster seats (22, 15 and 11 percent).

Table 32: Child Restraints Observed in Shreveport Parking Lots

Device	Observation Period							
	Before		During		After		Total	
Toddler	188	60%	224	72%	231	74%	643	69%
Infant	28	9%	29	9%	27	9%	84	9%
Convertible	29	9%	12	4%	18	6%	59	6%
Booster	69	22%	47	15%	35	11%	151	16%
Total	314		312		311		937	

Table 33 displays the distributions of child restraint devices recorded at the intersections during the three observation periods. The distributions were very different. Infant seats accounted for 31 percent of devices observed in the before period, 71 percent for the during period, and 17 percent of the devices observed in the after period. Toddler seats were 60 percent of the before period distribution, 23 percent of the during period distribution, and 65 percent of the after period. Booster seats represented 9 percent of devices in the before observation, 7 percent of the during observation, and 18 percent of the after observation.

Table 33: Child Restraint Devices Observed at Shreveport Intersections

	Observation Period							
	Before		During		After		Total	
Device								
Infant	63	31%	75	71%	19	17%	157	26%
Toddler	123	60%	24	23%	74	65%	221	62%
Booster	19	9%	7	7%	20	18%	46	12%
Total	205		106		113		424	

More than twice as many child restraint devices were observed in parking lots than at intersections. The majority of devices observed were toddler seats (69 percent for parking lot and 62 percent for intersections). The overall distribution of CSS devices observed at intersections was different from the CSS devices observed in parking lots. More infant seats and fewer toddler and booster seats were noted at intersections than in the parking lots.

There were 2,155 children observed in vehicles at intersections. The numbers of children observed for the three observation periods were somewhat different. There were 711 children observed in the before period, 672 observed in the during observation, and 772 in the after period (Table 34).

Table 34: Restraint Use at Shreveport Intersections

Restraint	Observation Period							
	Before		During		%Change	After		%Change
Safety belt	107	15%	101	15%	0	226	29%	14%
CSS	197	28%	101	15%	-13%	117	15%	0
None	350	49%	424	63%	14%	392	51%	-12%
On lap	55	8%	44	7%	-1%	35	5%	-2%
Unsafe seat	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
Total	711		672			772		

There was no difference between the before and after period observations in the overall percentage of children restrained (43 and 44 percent, respectively). There was an increase (14 percent) in the percentage of children using safety belts, but a decrease (13 percent) in the percentage of children using CSS devices in the after period, compared to the before period. The percentage of children restrained in the during observation period (30 percent) was less than for either the before or after periods. Between the three periods, there was a slight decrease in the percentage of children riding on laps (3 percent, overall).

Table 35 shows the overall child restraint device use by driver's age. Younger drivers (40 years of age or younger) tended to use safety belts or CSS devices more often than older drivers (over 40). Overall, 42 percent of the younger drivers were observed using child restraint devices, compared to 30 percent of the older drivers.

In the before observation period, 49 percent of the younger drivers used child restraint devices while 22 percent of the older drivers did. In the during observation period, 30 percent of the younger drivers used child restraint devices while 29 percent of the older drivers did. In the after observation period, 47 percent of the younger drivers used child restraint devices, while 40 percent of the older drivers did.

Table 35: Child Restraint Use by Driver's Age at Shreveport Intersections

	Observation Period					
	Before		During		After	
	Age					
Restraint	≤ 40	≥ 40	≤ 40	≥ 40	≤ 40	≥ 40
Safety belt	91 17%	16 10%	66 13%	35 20%	140 27%	86 34%
Child seat	178 32%	19 12%	85 17%	16 9%	101 20%	16 6%
None	281 51%	125 78%	342 69%	126 71%	275 53%	152 60%
Total	550	160	493	177	516	254

When a younger driver used a child restraint device, it more often was a CSS (55 percent). When an older driver used a child restraint devices, it more often was a safety belt (76 percent). However, overall, when older drivers did use CSS devices, they used them correctly more often than did the younger drivers (Table 36).

Table 36: Status of Child Seats by Driver's Age at Shreveport Intersections

	Observation Period					
	Before		During		After	
	Age					
Restraint	≤ 40	≥ 40	≤ 40	≥ 40	≤ 40	≥ 40
Correct use	130 69%	14 88%	66 70%	8 67%	71 74%	13 76%
Incorrect use/ unused seat	59 31%	2 13%	28 30%	4 33%	25 26%	4 24%
Total	189	16	94	12	96	17

The majority of older drivers who used CSS devices (78 percent) used them correctly, compared to 70 percent of the younger drivers. Overall, there was a slight increase in the percentage of drivers who correctly used CSS devices (Table 37). There was no change in the percentage of drivers who correctly routed the safety belt when using toddler seats (Table 38).

Table 37: Status of Safety Seats at Shreveport Intersections

	Observation Period					
	Before		During	%Change	After	%Change
Use						
Correct	144	70%	74 70%	0	84 74%	4%
Incorrect	51	25%	19 18%	-7%	14 12%	-6%
Unused seat	10	5%	13 12%	7%	15 13%	1%
Total	205		106		113	

Table 38: Status of Toddler Seats in Shreveport Parking Lots

	Observation Period					
	Before		During	%Change	After	%Change
Use						
Correct belt route	118	66%	144 70%	4%	121 65%	-5%
Incorrect belt route	36	20%	38 19%	-1%	37 20%	1%
No belt	24	13%	22 11%	-2%	28 15%	4%
Total	178		204		186	

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Data for the impact analyses were collected at three of the nine grant sites -- Gulfport, Provo and Shreveport. Data were collected during observations of occupants whose vehicles were stopped at intersections and from observations in parking lots. For Gulfport and Provo, observations were made before grant program activities were initiated and then immediately after the end of the grant. For Shreveport, the same two observation periods were supplemented with observations during the grant program.

There were inconsistencies in the data between the different observation periods and between the intersections and parking lots. The distributions between the numbers and types of child restraint devices observed were different, as were the distributions of the children's ages. The observation sites were not chosen on a random basis but rather for convenience. Such convenience sampling can result in the data showing such differences, but the analysis cannot determine what the true distributions may be.

The results were basically the same for all three impact sites. The analysis of observation data indicated that the grant activities did not appear to increase overall use of child restraints. The percentage of older drivers who used child restraint devices increased, but the percentage of younger drivers who used restraining devices decreased almost an equal amount.

The data seemed to indicate that the grant activities did increase the correct use of those devices being used. There was a greater percentage of both child safety seats and boosters being used correctly after the grants ended. There also seemed to be a shift in the type of child restraint devices used. There were more safety belts and fewer child safety seats being used in the observations conducted after the grants ended, compared to prior to grant activities. This shift may possibly be a result of the after observations having a larger percentage of older children than the before observations. Safety belts are more likely to be used with older children.

The assessment of driver's age by child restraint use showed that drivers under 40 years of age appeared to use these devices more frequently than did drivers over 40 years of age. Younger drivers tended to use child safety seats more often that older drivers, while older drivers tended to use safety belts more often. Younger drivers may be more likely to be parents and older drivers more likely to be

grandparents; parents may be more likely to own child safety seats. When older drivers did use child safety seats, they tended to use them correctly more often than did young drivers.

ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYSIS

To further enhance the increased enforcement of CSS restraint devices, the majority of the grant sites incorporated public education and information (PI&E) activities. These activities included radio and television PSAs, news releases, a videotape for community-wide distribution, school-based programs, special events, and CSS loaner programs.

Each Police Department publicized its program through news releases to print and broadcast media. Radio and television stations provided news coverage and airtime for PSAs. The majority of the grant activities were covered by local and regional newspapers.

Several local television and radio stations felt the program was so important that they developed, produced and aired their own PSAs and informational blurbs on behalf of the Police Department.

A CSS restraint information videotape was developed by one site, and featured the lieutenant in charge of occupant safety accompanied by a large number of community children. The video was circulated around the community, and is available through the Police Department for household viewing.

Special information activities were also successfully conducted to increase awareness of certain audiences. The majority of the sites focused their primary attention on youngsters in pre- and elementary schools, and a few junior high schools. Contests were held to encourage children to think about vehicle safety and to remember to buckle up when riding in a vehicle. Officers from the various Police Departments visited local schools to lecture about the importance of occupant restraint in vehicles and the use of child safety seats, in particular.

A few of the Police Departments scheduled PI&E activities to occur during special community events, such as parades, conferences, and presentations, to promote the importance of child safety restraint. Similarly, several of the Police Departments organized PI&E events in conjunction with Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week (February 7-13).

Several sites used the grant funds to create special promotion items for the children in the community, including coloring books about the importance of buckling up. Some of the sites printed bumper stickers and balloons with a safety slogan and/or logo for distribution

throughout the community. Brochures, flyers and pamphlets were used to publicize the programs and inform the communities of CSS restraint devices and the importance of their use.

One important component was CSS loaner programs. Virtually every site developed its own loaner program to aid in the distribution of CSS devices to low-income families.

APPENDIX A

FINAL 4/18/88

CSS ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

The Prism Corporation is working on a project for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. DOT, to evaluate local activities that could increase the use of child safety seats in motor vehicles.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS OF CSS PROGRAM

CITY:_____

TELEPHONE #:_____

LEAD CONTACT:_____

PERSON CONTACTED:_____

LEAD AGENCY FOR IMPLEMENTING PROGRAM:_____

OTHER AGENCIES INVOLVED:_____

PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY GROUP SUPPORT:_____

_____

FUNDING: FEDERAL $_____ STATE $_____ LOCAL $_____ PRIVATE $_____

STAFF RESOURCES#:_____ AVERAGE HOURS/WEEK:_____

3. DEMOGRAPHICS OF COMMUNITY

POPULATION(total):_____ INFANTS(under 1):_____

TODDLERS(1-4):_____ CHILDREN(5-12):_____

AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE:_____ %EMPLOYED:_____

% RETIRED:_____ % BLUE COLLAR_____

% WHITE COLLAR:_____ % AGRICULTURAL_____

RACIAL/RELIGIOUS CHARACTERISTICS:_____

MAJOR INDUSTRIES:_____ AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD INCOME:_____

SQUARE MILES:_____ STREET MILES:_____

COUNTY:_____ SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES (get town name, contact at police department, and telephone number):_____

_____

_____

_____

SIZE OF POLICE FORCE:_____ SIZE OF TRAFFIC DETAIL_____

CRIME RATE:	Low	Medium	High	AUTO OWNERSHIP: Low	Medium	High
COMMUNITY TYPE:	Rural	Suburban	Urban	SEAT BELT USE: Low	Medium	High
MASS TRANSIT USE:	Low	Medium	High			

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAM

What are state CSS laws: _____ Date Enacted _____

What are local CSS laws: _____ Date Enacted _____

What are general safety restraint regulations: _____

_____

What are the laws pertaining to legal vehicle occupancy: _____

_____

What is the Police Department's seat belt policy: _____

_____

PREVIOUS CSS ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

Characterize previous CSS enforcement, if any: _____

_____

_____

_____

ENFORCEMENT TYPE: Primary Secondary ENFORCEMENT STRATEGY: Integrated Blitz

WARNINGS ISSUED: _____ # CITATIONS ISSUED: _____

PREVIOUS SAFETY RESTRAINT ENFORCEMENT

Characterize previous safety restraint enforcement, if any: _____

_____

_____

_____

ENFORCEMENT TYPE: Primary Secondary ENFORCEMENT STRATEGY: Integrated Blitz

WARNINGS ISSUED: _____ # CITATIONS ISSUED: _____

PREVIOUS CSS PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Characterize previous CSS education efforts, if any: _____

_____

_____

TARGET AUDIENCE: _____ # PEOPLE REACHED: _____

TYPE OF ACTIVITIES: _____

_____

MEDIA UTILIZED: _____

_____

PREVIOUS SAFETY RESTRAINT PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Characterize previous safety restraint education efforts, if any: _____

_____

_____

TARGET AUDIENCE: _____ # PEOPLE REACHED: _____

TYPE OF ACTIVITIES: _____

_____

MEDIA UTILIZED: _____

_____

Comment on any other CSS or safety restraint efforts: _____

_____

_____

5. ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

How did you happen to apply for the mini-grant: _____

When did your mini-grant program begin: _____

When will your program end: _____

How would you characterize your program: _____

_____

Geographic Scope: _____

Program Emphasis: _____

List all major activities, the milestone dates, and break down of expenses:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Comment on the nature of community involvement:_____

_____

Media Cooperation	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
School Involvement	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
Business Sector	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
Civic Group Involvement	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW

6. **ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS**

What are the internal policies on CSS enforcement:_____

_____

What types of enforcement are being used in conjunction with the mini-grant program_____

_____

_____

_____

ENFORCEMENT TYPE: Primary Secondary ENFORCEMENT STRATEGY: Integrated Blitz

WARNINGS ISSUED:_____ # CITATIONS ISSUED:_____

How many officers have been trained in CSS enforcement:_____

What percentage of the force was trained:_____

How many of the officers trained are in the traffic detail:_____

What percentage of the traffic detail was trained:_____

How long were the training sessions:_____

Describe the components of the CSS training:_____

_____

_____

7. **PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION EFFORTS**

What type of education efforts have been made:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Who has been the primary target audience_____

How many people have been reached:_____

What types of media have been used:_____

What is the message portrayed in the PI&E:_____

_____

Please list all PSA's and printed materials used in conjunction with with this program, the dates (and times if applicable), where the material was distributed, where it was obtained from, who was the target audience, how many people were reached and the cost:

What other education efforts have taken place (ie. lectures, promotions). Please describe the event, the date, the target audience, and the number of people reached, and the cost:

note: Prism would like a copy of all PSA's and logs if possible

8. **DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS**

Describe any previous studies done on CSS or safety restraint use in your community:

Describe any studies of CSS use done in conjunction with the mini-grant:

Describe any type of records kept in conjunction with the mini-grant:

note: Please have any and all data collected sent to Prism

9. ACTIVITIES IN SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES AND OTHER AGENCIES

What other agencies/communities are in the area which effect the citizens of your community:

_____

_____

_____

Do any of these entities currently have a CSS or automobile safety program or public information and education campaign in effect:_____

_____

_____

_____

Who should we contact in these communities/agencies to obtain more information:_____

_____

Describe any major activities held in or around your community which may have affected safety restraint use in your community (ie. Child Passenger Safety Week):

_____

_____

_____

_____

Describe any major events (such as serious auto accidents) which may have affected CSS or restraint use in your community:_____

_____

note: Prism should contact the individuals in surrounding communities/agencies

10. PERCEPTIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

What do you feel is the most effective method of CSS promotion:_____

_____

How has this been altered by your experience with the mini-grant program:_____

_____

What type of program would you recommend to another community attempting to increase CSS usage:_____

_____

_____

What types of activities which were begun as part of the mini-grant program will you continue utilizing:_____

What types of training do you feel are still needed for your officers to enforce and promote CSS and/or restraint use effectively:_____

_____

How will the officers who were trained be utilized after the program ends:_____

_____

What are your current CSS and/or safety restraint activities:_____

_____

What CSS and/or safety restraint activities are planned for the future:_____

_____

May we utilize your name in connection with these comments:_____

_____

Would it be possible to speak with troopers who worked on the CSS program:_____

_____

note: Prism guarantees the anonymity of all comments if requested

11. COMMENTS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

note: attach extra paper for additional comments if necessary. Be sure to indicate the section.

APPENDIX B

CHILD SAFETY SEAT OBSERVATION FORM #1

Observer: _____

City: _____ Date: _____

Shopping Center: _____

Start Time: _____ End Time: _____

Car No.	Type Seat 1. Toddler 2. Infant Only* 3. Convertible-Inft. mode* 4. Booster Seat*	Toddler Seats All Toddler Seats 1. Car Belt Routing Correct 2. Car Belt Routing Not Correct 3. No Car Belt 4. 5. 6. Cannot Determine	Tether Type Only 1. 2. 3. 4. Tether Attached 5. Tether Not Attached
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			

* No Installation Data To Be Collected On These Seats

CHILD SAFETY SEAT OBSERVATION FORM #2

Observer _____

City _____ Date _____

Shopping Center - name _____

- intersection _____

Start Time _____ End Time _____

Car No	Child Age 1 -1 2. 1-4 3 5-12	Driver Age 1. -21 2. 21-40 3. 41-60 4. +60	Restraint Use 1. Seat Belt 2. Child Seat 3. None 4. On Lap 5. Unsafe Seat	Infant/Convertible Seat 1. Correct 2. No Harness and/or No Car Belt 3. Wrong Direction 4. 5. Unused Seat	Toddler Seat 1. Correct 2. No Harness 3. 4. 5. Unused Seat	Booster Seat Shield Type 1. Correct 2. Shield Not Belted 3. 4. 5. Unused Seat	Booster Seat Old Type 1. Correct 2. No Harness Lap Belt On 3. No Harness No Lap Belt 4. 5. Unused Seat
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							

APPENDIX C

RECOMMENDED CHILD SAFETY SEAT ENFORCEMENT GUIDELINES

Overview

This document presents suggestions and examples for planning, developing, implementing and evaluating a local enforcement and public information and education (PI&E) program to increase the use of child safety seats. The guidelines represent the culling of activities used by communities to increase the use of safety belts and child safety seats. Much of the information and data resulted from an evaluation by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of child safety seat programs conducted by nine local enforcement agencies nationwide. For additional information on the evaluation of these nine programs, please see the final report, "Evaluation of Child Safety Seat Enforcement Strategies."

The guidelines are intended for use in planning and developing the most appropriate program for a particular community. However, the more effective programs include:

- Active enforcement.
- Integration of occupant protection enforcement into regular traffic safety enforcement -- an effective and efficient use of resources.
- Aggressive PI&E to create and increase awareness of the enforcement efforts and the benefits of occupant protection in the community.
- Training members of the Police Department on the benefits of using occupant protection and enforcing occupant protection laws.
- Police Department policy requiring the use of safety belts in police vehicles.
- Community support -- including schools and local businesses.

By incorporating these components into a program and following the suggestions provided in these guidelines, states and localities can increase the use of child safety seats.

The guidelines cover the following elements needed for a successful program:

I. Identifying Problems and Opportunities

II. Developing Action Plans

- A. Objectives
- B. Activities needed to accomplish the objectives
- C. Persons responsible for activities
- D. Persons and organizations providing resources
- E. Target audience(s)
- F. Materials
- G. Special Events
- H. Schedule
- I. Budget

III. Measuring and Evaluating Program Results

In addition, a listing of contacts for additional information and assistance is provided (see Attachment I).

I. IDENTIFYING PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The first step in developing an effective CSS enforcement program is to determine what specific problems the community faces and what opportunities can be capitalized on to help solve these problems. By identifying problems and opportunities, potential solutions can be determined, including the activities and resources the community will need for a program.

Examples of problem identification and opportunities are:

- o The collection of accident data from the community or local area, especially if children who were not using CSS devices were involved. This data can be used to identify the need for a program, demonstrate the consequences of not using safety seats, and will form part of the data base used in evaluating program effects.

- In a community with a lower socioeconomic profile, parents may not be using child safety seats because of the cost of acquiring such equipment. A CSS loaner program could be instituted.

- For a community with a large older population, informational messages and materials encouraging grandparents to use child safety seats when their grandchildren visit would be appropriate.

- Members of the police force may not be knowledgeable about child safety seats and their correct installation and use. Offering occupant protection training for officers could be an effective activity.

Problem identification requires the program developer to know and understand the occupant protection law(s), the community, current use patterns, resources available for conducting enforcement and PI&E campaigns, and the likely results. For example, if patrol officers are not required to use safety belts on duty, then a policy should be instituted. Under such a policy, the enforcement program has greater credibility with the general public. Or, if the community has not focused on child safety seat use previously, there is usually a good opportunity to conduct an awareness campaign. By taking advantage of circumstances and opportunities, communities can greatly increase the changes of a program being effective.

II. DEVELOPING ACTION PLANS

The second major step in establishing an effective program is to develop Action Plans. An action plan should be developed for each major component of the program. The plan will identify who is doing what, for what reason, and how they are doing it. Each action plan should include the following information:

- Objective(s)

- Activities needed to accomplish the objectives

- Persons responsible for the activities

- Persons and organizations providing resources (people, money, materials, etc.)

- Target audience(s)

- Materials

- Special events
- Schedule
- Budget

A. Objectives

Successful programs start with clearly stated objectives. Objectives help determine the program direction, activities, target audience, period of time for the activities, and the expected results. Objectives also identify what is to be measured to assure that the objectives have been met.

The objectives also can help identify slogans and titles that can be useful to the program. For example, the slogan "Buckle up. Your child and you." helps support a campaign targeted primarily to parents. The slogan "Don't risk it -- Click it!" helps communicate a dual message about enforcement and safety.

Example objectives for PI&E and enforcement components of a program are provided in the following subsections.

Public Information and Education Component. Public information and education with regard to occupant protection can take many forms. This includes public service advertisements (PSAs) for radio, television and print media, exhibits at public events such as parades and county fairs, speaking engagements at organizational and school meetings, and the distribution of booklets, pamphlets, and fact sheets.

The PI&E should be initiated before the start of the increased enforcement and continued on a periodic basis throughout the program. Important topics to be included are; a detailed description of the occupant protection restraint laws being enforced, the benefits of using occupant protection restraints correctly, the possibility of tragic results when unrestrained occupants are involved in a crash, and a description of the city's occupant safety promotion program and the person(s) involved.

Because safety belts and child safety seats are relevant to many audiences, the use of mass media is appropriate for community programs. Mass media approaches usually involve public service advertisements (PSAs), editorials, fact sheets (such as death/injury statistics), feature stories and articles, talk shows, and news releases (whether occupant protection devices were used in a traffic crash and the consequences). Materials should be prepared for both the printed media (daily and weekly newspapers, magazines) and for the broadcast media (radio and television, including cable television).

Many stations will air supportive messages such as "remember to buckle up" after a traffic report. Although most programs use only public service or "free" advertising, budgets can contain funds (local or community) for paid advertising.

PI&E also can be developed for special audiences. For example, grandparents can be targeted to receive messages about the importance of keeping their visiting grandchildren safe in motor vehicles. Lower socioeconomic families can be targeted to receive information on CSS loaner programs.

Community programs often include one or more news conferences to announce the launching of a program, continuance of a program, or a program's success. Community leaders should be encouraged to publicly support the program, the efforts of the police, and those of others who have played major roles in the program. Local broadcast stations often are willing to produce PSAs using local officials. They also will use PSAs produced by national organizations and government agencies, especially if local tags can be used. Many stations will even provide local tagging services.

Examples of PI&E objectives are:

- Increase community awareness about the benefits of using occupant protection devices and that the law(s) are being enforced (e.g., 30% to 60% in six months).
- Educate the public about the benefits of correct use of child safety seats.
- Inform the public about a specific enforcement effort or blitz, including results (e.g., number of citations).
- Inform the public about a child safety seat loaner program.
- Run community-oriented education activities whereby patrol officers visit schools and speak about occupant protection and other traffic safety topics (e.g., reach 2,000 children over 12 months).
- Use of police spokespersons for mass media activities, including interview shows and PSAs.
- Encourage local employers, including government agencies, to establish and enforce occupant protection policies for employees while in company vehicles, and encourage the use of occupant protection devices while in their private vehicles (e.g., get three major employers to cooperate).

- Encourage employers to disseminate materials about occupant protection, including child safety seats (e.g., get 10 major employers to cooperate).

- Establish a child safety seat loaner program (e.g., 50 seats on loan). Many communities have found a CSS loaner program to have two benefits -- as a way to create awareness about CSS in general and as a means of encouraging lower income families to use CSS.

Enforcement Component. A program to encourage the use of child safety seats and safety belts would incorporate an enforcement component. This component includes the training of police officers in the benefits of using occupant protection, required use policies, and strategies to use in actually enforcing the law(s). One available training program that covers these issues was developed by the International Association of Chiefs of Police and NHTSA - "Occupant Protection Usage and Enforcement."

Training can include the showing of a film or videotape and may be presented in special sessions or as part of ongoing, in-service training. More effective training-oriented programs include a follow-up or refresher program and are given to as many members of the police department as possible. Even if the program planner uses an existing occupant protection training course, they still must plan on how to train all members of the department, the form(s) of training (in-service, workshops presented by the department, or seminars conducted by other organizations), and the particular procedures to use in the initial and follow-up training (videotapes, role playing, discussions, demonstrations, etc.).

The enforcement component also should encompass ways to recognize police personnel. For example, a "Saved by the Belt" club can be formed for officers who have been saved by using a safety belt. Letters of citation and appreciation can be sent to officers who support and/or participate in the program. Internal communication activities, including bulletins, paycheck stuffers and role calls, can help emphasize the importance of police support and participation in a CSS enforcement program.

There are several important enforcement strategies that should be used by the police. Incorporation of occupant protection law enforcement into regular traffic safety enforcement duties and as a part of other special enforcement efforts (e.g., DWI, speed control, roadblocks) is the most important. However, special occupant protection enforcement activities also can be conducted. Special enforcement should be based on the target audience so that enforcement activities are focused on the places and times of day when the greatest impact will be realized. For example, CSS enforcement can be concentrated during the hours when children are mostly likely to be in vehicles (opening and

closing hours of school) and where these vehicles are mostly likely to be (schools, shopping centers).

Examples of enforcement objectives are:

- Increase use of child safety seats (e.g., from 40% to 60% in 12 months).
- Increase correct use of child safety seats (e.g., from 60% to 80% in 12 months).
- Increase general compliance with occupant protection laws.
- Increase the number of citations and warnings for violation of occupant protection laws (e.g., from 2 per week to 10 per week).
- Establish a Departmental policy requiring officers to use safety belts in official vehicles.
- Provide a statement of support for the Departmental Policy and increased enforcement of the occupant protection laws by the Chief, Superintendent, or Sheriff.
- Establish training programs to educate patrol officers about the law, agency use policies, and the use and correct use of safety belts and child restraints.
- Incorporation of occupant protection law enforcement into regular traffic duties and combined with other special enforcement efforts (DUI, speed).
- Special occupant protection enforcement activities.
- Provide training for neighboring Police Departments.
- Have officers hand out an occupant protection fact sheet at traffic stops.

C. Persons Responsible for the Activities

A specific person should be charged with responsibility for the program. This person should be part of the police department, but if they are not, they must establish a strong cooperative working relationship with the police. If funding permits, administrative support should be obtained. The program manager should be responsible for involving others, setting objectives, developing action plans, implementing the plans, monitoring activities, and evaluating the program's effectiveness.

Although one person should be in charge of the overall program and should serve as the major spokesperson for the program, many people are needed to accomplish the various specific objectives and activities. For example, patrol officers to enforce the law(s), present occupant protection information to the public; teachers or other volunteers to distribute guidelines for poster/essay contests; students to conduct observational studies; volunteers to staff informational exhibits; even people to dress up in Vince and Larry costumes or in a McGruff the safety dog outfit.

D. Persons and Organizations Providing Resources

The plan should specify the resources to be used throughout the program, including people, materials, in-kind contributions, money, etc. The human resources should be defined in terms of technical and administrative responsibilities as well as paid and volunteer positions. Also, an important part of many programs is specifying what work is to be performed on a overtime or donated basis. Overtime hours for police officials, for example, should be accounted for in the budget.

The most successful programs represent team efforts. There are many organizations with a common interest in the safety of a community's children. The following are examples of organizations that could provide support and resources.

- Child safety seat and safety belt coalitions and organizations
- Schools and school-related groups
- Hospitals, other doctor, nurse, and EMS technician groups, and other health-related organizations and associations
- Commercial retailers, especially those that cater to families with young children (fast-food restaurants)
- Volunteer organizations involved in traffic safety
- Insurance companies
- Local government
- Other community groups such as local Chamber of Commerce

These organizations and groups can provide direct and indirect support, including funding, materials, and personnel. Examples are:

- Businesses can give incentives such as meal coupons to be used as rewards and distribute materials.

- Other consumer-oriented organizations such as the American Automobile Association can provide materials.
- State and national organizations can supply publications and specialty items.
- Local radio and television stations can produce PSAs for distribution to others.
- Child safety seat and safety belt coalitions can provide funding and materials.
- PTA, Chambers of Commerce, even city governments can provide funding, facilities, materials, and personnel.
- Special groups and associations can reprint materials or provide other support for the program.
- Students can conduct observations of CSS and safety belt use before and after the program as part of the evaluation effort.
- Volunteers can dress up as safety characters for exhibits and parades.
- Volunteers can distribute information at special events and activities.
- Utilities can incorporate occupant protection messages in monthly bills.
- Youth organizations such as the Scouts can sponsor activities, provide volunteers, and require their members be buckled up when going on official trips.
- Hospitals and medical clinics can have displays and distribute information, request that all children be in occupant protection device when leaving, offer occupant protection education programs to staff, and soon-to-be and new parents.

E. Target Audiences

An important element in carrying out a successful program is delivering the appropriate message(s) to the appropriate audience(s). Thus, a good action plan specifies the target audiences. A program can seek to reach one or more audiences, depending on the resources available. Once an audience is targeted, decisions can be made about the appropriate media channel(s) and times for delivering the

message. For example, programs targeted to children can include developing PSAs for radio and TV programs airing during the hours when more children are likely to be listening/viewing. To reach grandparents, informational materials and programs can be given at senior citizen and retirements centers.

Audiences can include:

- o General public
- o Licensed drivers
- o Parents/grandparents
- o Children
- o Enforcement community
- o School personnel
- o Organizations serving children (PTA, Boy Scouts)
- o Medical personnel and institutions (pediatricians, hospitals)

F. Materials

An important part of a program is information presented in print and audiovisual form. Most programs involve the distribution of fact sheets, flyers, posters, brochures and other information in print form. Educational programs, especially those directed to schools and enforcement personnel, also use films and videotapes. Many times, usable materials are available from state, regional and national resources.

Materials can include a wide variety of specialty items. Some examples are; bumper stickers, buttons, coloring books, certificates (for safety belt use), reminder cards, bibs, t-shirts, and coffee mugs.

G. Special Events

Because the programs are planned and carried out at the local level, there are many opportunities for special events and activities. These efforts can be directly related to the program or incorporated into other scheduled community events. They can be local or tied to national efforts. They can range from a speaker's bureau where Officer Friendly talks with school children to essay contests to

costumed Vince and Larry characters. Special events and activities include the following:

- Use of characters such as McGruff the safety dog, Vince and Larry, Officer Friendly, Sgt. Safety.
- Tie in with national events such as National Child Passenger Safety Awareness Week and Buckle Up America Week or with local, state or regional activities such as "Safety Day."
- Seasonal events such as county fairs, holiday parades.
- Program messages incorporated into mass mailings such as water bills.
- Exhibits/informational booths/displays at events drawing large numbers of people (Senior Citizen's Fair, County Fair), or at local shopping malls.
- Essay, slogan and poster contests (especially if prizes are donated).
- Participation in parades, using the costumed characters, distributing materials, displaying the message/slogan. (Parades and fairs are good places for using specialty items such as buttons and balloons.)
- Establishment of a "Saved by the Belt" club to recognize people who have been saved by using a belt.

H. Schedule

Every action plan should have a schedule. Program start and end dates should be identified along with dates and timetables for all major activities associated with the program. The program should be conducted over extended time periods (12 months) to maximize its effectiveness. With planning, the program can become integrated into a community's on-going activities.

I. Budget

The budget for any program, at a minimum, should include funding sources and a listing of all major expenses. Examples of budget items includes: personnel services (project manager), training, enforcement and/or special duty, secretarial, local exhibits and presentations, materials, specialty items, publications and printing (decals, balloons, posters, brochures, booklets, coloring books), videotapes,

CSS devices (loaner program), and program evaluation. Many of the programs from which these guidelines were devised were conducted with small amounts of money. For example, funding included $5,000 grants from NHTSA, direct financial support from other government and private sector organizations, and in-kind contributions of people, facilities, and materials.

III. MEASURING AND EVALUATING PROGRAM RESULTS

The final component of any program should be a provision for measuring and evaluating results. Ideally there would be an observational survey to determine how many children and adults were using occupant protection devices, and using them correctly, before the program is started and then again after the program ends. If the program is to run for an extended period (12 months or more), observations also should be done one or more times during the program to determine how well the program is doing. There are other measures that also should be used to determine the result of a program, including:

- Number of officers trained
- Number of occupant protection citations and convictions
- Number of child safety seats loaned
- Number of presentations
- Number of informational materials distributed
- Number of newspaper articles published
- Amount of TV and radio airtime
- Number of target audience members reached
- Change in awareness and knowledge about occupant protection laws and issues (obtained through surveys)
- Change in injuries resulting from traffic crashes

SOURCES OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

This document has presented suggestions for planning, developing, implementing and evaluating child safety seat enforcement programs. There are many additional sources of information about child safety seat (and occupant protection) programs and related topics. Some state and national sources are listed in Attachment I. Many of these contacts also can provide resources for your program.

ATTACHMENT I

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE
1110 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201
phone (703) 243-6500

NATIONAL SHERIFF'S ASSOCIATION
1450 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-3490
phone: (703) 836-7827

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION
Regional Offices

Region I
Transporation Systems Center
Kendal Square-Code 903
Cambridge, MA 02142
Phone (617) 494-3427

Region II
222 Mamaroneck Ave., Suite 204
White Plains, NY 10605
Phone (914) 683-9690

Region III
BWI Commerce Park
7526 Connelley Drive, Suite L
Hanover, Maryland 21076-1699
Phone (301) 768-7111

Region IV
1720 Peachtree Road, N.W.
Suite 501
Atlanta, GA 30309
Phone (404) 347-4537

Region V
18209 Dixie Highway, Suite A
Homewood, IL 60430
Phone (312) 799-6067

Region VI
819 Taylor Street, Room 8A38
Fort Worth, TX 76102-6177
Phone (817) 334-3653

Region VII
P.O. Box 412515
Kansas City, MO 64141
Phone (816) 926-7887

Region VIII
555 Zang Street, Fourth Floor
Denver, CO 80228
Phone (303) 236-3444

Region IX
211 Main Street, Suite 1000
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone (415) 974-9840

Region X
3140 Jackson Federal Building
915 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98174
Phone (206) 442-5934

Revised 8/10/89

GOVERNORS' HIGHWAY SAFETY REPRESENTATIVES AND COORDINATORS

Representative	Coordinator
ALABAMA -- Governor Guy Hunt	
Fred O. Braswell, Director Department of Economic and Community Affairs 3465 Norman Bridge Road P.O. Box 2939 (Mail address) Montgomery, Alabama 36105-0939 Phone: (205) 261-3572	Charles Swindall, Chief Highway & Traffic Safety Law Enforcement & Planning Division 3465 Norman Bridge Road Department of Economic & Community Affairs P.O. Box 2939 (Mail address) Montgomery, Alabama 36105-0939 Phone: (205) 261-5897
ALASKA -- Governor Steve Cowper	
Mr. T. Michael Lewis, Director Alaska Highway Safety Planning Agency Department of Public Safety P.O. Box N Juneau, Alaska 99811 Phone: (907) 465-4371	SAME
ARIZONA -- Governor Rose Moford	
Ms. Sarah L. Wuertz Governor's Highway Safety Representative Office of Highway Safety 3010 N. Second Street, Suite 105 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Phone: (602) 255-3216	SAME
ARKANSAS -- Governor Bill Clinton	
Maurice Smith, Director Highways and Transportation Arkansas State Highway and Transportation P.O. Box 2261 Little Rock, Arkansas 72203 Phone: (501) 569-2211	Frank Vozel Assistant Division Head Traffic Division Arkansas State Highway and Transportation P.O. Box 2261 Little Rock, Arkansas 72203 Phone: (501-569-2231
CALIFORNIA -- Governor George Deukmejian	
Mr. Peter O'Rourke Director, Office of Traffic Safety Business, Transportation and Housing Agency 7000 Franklin Boulevard - Suite 330 Sacramento, California 95823 Phone: (916) 445-0527	SAME

Representative	Coordinator
COLORADO -- Governor Roy Romer	
Mr. John Conger Director, Division of Highway Safety 4201 East Arkansas Avenue Denver, Colorado 80222 (303) 757-9201	Philip Weiser, Administrator Highway Safety Program Division of Highway Safety 4201 East Arkansas Avenue Denver, Colorado 80222 (303) 757-9438
CONNECTICUT -- Governor William A. O'Neill	
Mr. Norman C. Booth Governor's Representative Department of Transportation Bureau of Highways 24 Wolcott Hill Road Wethersfield, Connecticut 06109 Phone: (203) 566-4248	SAME
DELAWARE -- Governor Michael N. Castle	
Mr. Daniel L. Simpson Director, Office of Highway Safety Robbins Building 802 Silver Lake Boulevard Dover, Delaware 19901 Phone: (302) 736-5613	SAME
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA -- Mayor Marion S. Barry	
John E. Touchstone, Director Department of Public Works Frank D. Reeves Center 2000-14th Street, NW, 6th Floor Washington, D.C. 20009 Phone: (202) 939-8000	Ms. Carole Lewis Highway Safety Program Coordinator DPW, Transportation Safety Branch 2000-14th Street, NW, 6th floor Washington, D.C. 20009 Phone: (202) 939-8018
FLORIDA -- Governor Robert Martinez	
Mr. Thomas G. Pelham Director, Department of Community Affairs Governor's Highway Safety Representative 2740 Center View Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32399 Phone: (904) 488-6001	John Lenaert, Chief Bureau of Public Safety Management Department of Community Affairs 2740 Center View Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32399 Phone: (904) 488-5454
GEORGIA -- Governor Joe F. Harris	
Minuard C. McGuire, Director Governor's Office of Highway Safety The Equitable Building 100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2000 Atlanta, Georgia 30303 Phone: (404) 656-6996	SAME

Representative	Coordinator
HAWAII -- Governor John Waihee	
Edward Y. Hirata, Director Governor's Highway Safety Representative Department of Transportation 869 Punchbowl Street Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Phone: (808) 548-4655	Lawrence Hao, Director Motor Vehicle Safety Office State Department of Transportation 79 South Nimitz Highway Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Phone: (808) 548-5755
IDAHO --Governor Cecil Andrus	
Melvin Morgan, Director Idaho Transportation Department Box 7129 Boise, Idaho 83707 Phone: (208) 334-8101	SAME
ILLINOIS -- Governor James R. Thompson, Jr.	
S. Rowan Woolfolk, Director Division of Transportation Safety 319 Administration Building 2300 South Dirksen Parkway Springfield, Illinois 62764 Phone: (217) 782-4972	Larry Wort, Chief Bureau of Safety Programs Illinois Dept. of Transportation 2300 South Dirksen Parkway Springfield, Illinois 62764 Phone: (217) 782-4974
INDIANA --Governor Evan Bayh	
Jeffrey Modisett Governor's Representative for Highway Safety State Capitol - Room 210 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 Phone: (317) 232-4579	David W. Johnston, Director Division of Traffic Safety 801 State Office Building, Rm. 801 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 Phone: (317) 232-1299
IOWA -- Governor Terry E. Branstad	
Gene W. Shepard, Commissioner Iowa Department of Public Safety Wallace State Office Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Phone: (515) 281-5261	J. Michael Laski, Director Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau Iowa Department of Public Safety Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Phone: (515) 281-5524
KANSAS -- Governor Mike Hayden	
Mr. Horace Edwards Secretary of Kansas Department of Transportation State Office Building Topeka, Kansas 66612 Phone: (913) 296-3461	Mr. Dwight Robinson Transportation Safety Administrator Kansas Department of Transportation 8th Floor, State Office Building Topeka, Kansas 66612 Phone: (913) 296-3756

Representative	Coordinator
KENTUCKY -- Governor Wallace G. Wilkerson	
W. Michael Troop, Secretary Department of Justice and Acting Commissioner Kentucky State Police Headquarters 919 Versailles Road Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-9980 Phone: (502) 695-6300	Mr. David H. Salyers Highway Safety Standards Branch Kentucky State Police Headquarters 919 Versailles Road Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-9980 Phone: (502) 695-6356
LOUSIANA -- Governor Buddy Roemer	
Ms. Bette Theis Executive Director Louisiana Highway Safety Commission P.O. Box 66336 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70896 Phone: (504) 925-6991	Sue Dixon, Assistant Director Louisiana Highway Safety Commission P.O. Box 66366 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70896 Phone: (504) 925-6846
MAINE -- Governor John McKernan	
Richard Perkins Official Highway Safety Representative Department of Public Safety Northern Avenue Gardner, ME 04345 Phone: (207) 582-8776	SAME
MARYLAND -- Governor William Donald Schaefer	
Richard H. Trainor Secretary of Transportation P.O. Box 8755 Baltimore-Washington International Airport Baltimore, Maryland 21240-0755 Phone: (301) 859-7397	Clyde Pyers, Director Division of Transportation Safety Department of Transportation P.O. Box 8755 Baltimore-Washington International Airport Baltimore, Maryland 21240-0755 Phone: (301) 859-7157
MASSACHUSETTS -- Governor Michael S. Dukakis	
Terrance D. Schiavone, Director Governor's Highway Safety Bureau 100 Cambridge Street, Room 2104 Boston, Massachusetts 02202 Phone: (617) 727-5074	SAME
MICHIGAN -- Governor James J. Blanchard	
Ms. Karen R. Tarrant Executive Director Office of Highway Safety Planning 300 South Washington Square, Suite 300 Lansing, Michigan 48913 Phone: (517) 334-7900	SAME

Representative	Coordinator
MINNESOTA -- Governor Rudolph G. Perpich	
Paul J. Tschida, Commissioner Department of Public Safety Transportation Building, Rm. 207 St. Paul, Minnesota 55155 Phone: (612) 296-6642	Mr. Thomas A. Boerner Director of Traffic Safety Department of Public Safety Transportation Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55155 Phone: (612) 296-3804
MISSISSIPPI -- Governor Raymond Mabus	
Roy Thigpen Governor's Representative for Highway Safety 301 West Pearl Street Jackson, Mississippi 39203-3085 Phone: (601) 949-2225	SAME
MISSOURI -- Governor John D. Ashcroft	
Nathan Walker, Director Department of Public Safety P.O. Box 1406 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-1406 Phone: (314) 751-4161	SAME
MONTANA -- Governor Stan Stephens	
Albert E. Goke, Administrator Highway Traffic Safety Division Department of Justice 303 North Roberts Helena, Montana 59620 Phone: (406) 444-3412	SAME
NEBRASKA -- Governor Kay Orr	
Ms. Margaret Higgins Director, Department of Motor Vehicles State Office Building State House Station 94789 Lincoln, Nebraska 68509 Phone: (402) 471-2281	Fred E. Zwonechek, Administrator Nebraska Hwy. Safety Program Office State House Station 94612 Lincoln, Nebraska 68509 Phone: (402) 471-2515
NEVADA -- Acting Governor Robert Miller	
Wayne Teglia, Director Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety Governor's Highway Safety Representative 555 Wright Way Carson City, Nevada 89711-0999 Phone: (702) 885-5375	Mrs. Mary Lynne Allison Highway Safety Coordinator Traffic Safety Division Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety 555 Wright Way Carson City, Nevada 89711-0999 Phone: (702) 885-5720

Representative	Coordinator
NEW HAMPSHIRE -- Governor Judd Greggs	
John B. McDuffee, Coordinator New Hampshire Highway Safety Agency Pine Inn Plaza 117 Manchester Street Concord, New Hampshire 03301 Phone: (603) 271-2131	SAME
NEW JERSEY -- Governor Thomas H. Kean	
William T. Taylor, Director Governor's Representative Division of Highway Traffic Safety Quakerbridge Plaza, Bldg. #5, CN-048 Trenton, New Jersey 08625 Phone: (609) 588-3750	SAME
NEW MEXICO -- Governor Garrey Carruthers	
Mr. Dewey Lonsberry Secretary of Highways and Transportation Department P.O. Box 1149 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-1149 Phone: (505) 827-5110	Mr. John D. Fenner Chief, Traffic Safety Bureau 901 W. Cordova Road, P.O. Box 1149 Joseph M. Montoya Building, Room 3102 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-1149 Phone: (505) 827-0427
NEW YORK -- Governor Mario M. Cuomo	
Patricia B. Adduci, Commissioner New York Dept. of Motor Vehicles Empire State Plaza - Swan Street Bldg. Albany, New York 12228 Phone: (518) 474-0841	Mr. William G. Rourke Executive Director, Traffic Safety Committee Empire State Plaza - Swan Street Building Albany, New York 12228 Phone: (518) 474-5777
NORTH CAROLINA -- Governor James G. Martin	
Paul B. Jones, Director Governor's Highway Safety Program 215 East Lane Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27601 Phone: (919) 733-3083	SAME
NORTH DAKOTA -- Governor George A. Sinner	
Mr. Richard J. Backes Highway Commissioner North Dakota Highway Department 600 East Boulevard Avenue Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0178 Phone: (701) 224-2581	Bob Evans, Program Manager Driver License and Traffic Safety North Dakota Highway Department 600 East Boulevard Avenue Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0178 Phone: (701) 224-2600

Representative	Coordinator
OHIO -- Governor Richard F. Celeste	
William Denihan, Director Department of Highway Safety P.O. Box 7167 Columbus, Ohio 43205 Phone: (614) 466-2550 or 3383	Ms. Sandra J. Usher, Administrator Office of Governor's Highway Safety Representative P.O. Box 7167 Columbus, Ohio 43205 Phone: (614) 466-3250
OKLAHOMA -- Governor Henry Bellmon	
Neal A. McCaleb, P.E. Secretary Oklahoma Dept. of Transportation 200 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105 -3204 Phone: (405) 521-2631	Michael E. Mayberry Highway Safety Division Manager Oklahoma Dept. of Transportation 200 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105 Phone: (405) 521-6000
OREGON -- Governor Neil Goldschmidt	
Mr. Gil W. Bellamy Governor's Representative Oregon Traffic Safety Commission State Library Building-4th Floor Salem, Oregon 97310 Phone: (503) 378-3670 378-3669	SAME
PENNSYLVANIA -- Governor Robert P.Casey	
John J. Zogby, Deputy Secretary for Safety Administration Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 1200 Transportation & Safety Building Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120 Phone: (717) 787-3928	Thomas E. Bryer, P.E., Director Center for Highway Safety 215 Transportation & Safety Building Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120 Phone: (717) 787-7350
PUERTO RICO -- Governor Raphael Hernandez Colon	
Mr. Hermenegildo Ortiz Secretary of Transportation and Public Works Box 41269, Minillas Station Santurce, Puerto Rico, 00940 Phone: (809) 726-6670	Ms. Lenidas Ramirez-Pineiro Executive Director Traffic Safety Commission P.O. Box 41289 Santurce, Puerto Rico 00940 Phone: (809) 726-5290 (809) 726-5150, Ext. 3550
RHODE ISLAND -- Governor Edward D. DiPrete	
Matthew J. Gill, Director Department of Transportation Governor's Highway Safety Representative State Office Bldg. - Smith Street Providence, Rhode Island 02903 Phone: (401) 277-2481	Edward J. Walsh, Coordinator Governor's Office of Highway Safety 345 Harris Avenue Providence, Rhode Island 02909 Phone: (401) 277-3024

Representative	Coordinator
SOUTH CAROLINA -- Governor Carroll Campbell	
Perry Brown, Deputy Director Office of Highway Safety Programs Edgar A. Brown State Office Bldg. 1205 Pendleton Street, Room 453 Columbia, South Carolina 29201 Phone: (803) 734-0421	SAME
SOUTH DAKOTA -- Governor George Mickelson	
Mr. Jeff Stingley, Secretary Department of Commerce & Regulation 910 East Sioux Avenue Pierre, South Dakota 57501 Phone: (605) 773-3178	Mike Kumm, Director Highway Safety Office 118 West Capitol Avenue Pierre, South Dakota 57501 Phone: (605) 773-3675
TENNESSEE -- Governor Ned McWherter	
James Evans, Commissioner Department of Transportation James K. Polk State Office Bldg. 505 Deaderick Street, Suite 700 Nashville, Tennessee 37219 Phone: (615) 741-2848	Larry M. Ellis, Coordinator Governor's Highway Safety Program James K. Polk State Office Bldg. 505 Deaderick Street, Suite 600 Nashville, Tennessee 37219 Phone: (615) 741-2589
TEXAS -- Governor Bill Clements	
Mr. Raymond E. Stotzer, Jr. Governor's Representative State Department of Highways and Public Transportation 11th and Brazos Austin, Texas 78701 Phone: (512) 463-8616	Gary Trietsch, Admininstrator Traffic Safety Section (D-18-TS) State Department of Highways and Public Transportation 11th and Brazos Austin, Texas 78701 Phone: (512) 465-6751
UTAH -- Governor Norman H. Bangerter	
D. Douglas Bodrero, Commissioner Department of Public Safety 4501 South 2700 West Salt Lake City, Utah 84119 Phone: (801) 965-4461	Richard Howard, Program Director Office of Highway Safety Department of Public Safety 4501 South 2700 West Salt Lake City, Utah 84119 Phone: (801) 965-4409
VERMONT -- Governor Madeleine M. Kunin	
The Honorable Paul Philbrook Secretary of Transportation 133 State Street Montpelier, Vermont 05602 Phone: (802) 828-2657	Deborah Mongeon Coordinator, Highway Safety Program Agency of Transportation 133 State Street Montpelier, Vermont 05602 Phone: (802) 828-2665

Representative	Coordinator

VIRGINIA -- Governor Gerald L. Baliles

Donald E. Williams, Commissioner
Department of Motor Vehicles
P.O. Box 27412
Richmond, Virginia 23269
Phone: (804) 367-6602

Mr. John T. Hanna
Deputy Commissioner for
Transportation Safety
P.O.Box 27412
Richmond, Virginia 23269
Phone: (804) 367-6624

WASHINGTON -- Governor W. Booth Gardner

Eugene Peterson, Director
Washington Traffic Safety Commission
1000 S. Cherry Street, MS/PD-11
Olympia, Washington 98504
Phone: (206) 753-6197

Julie M. Peterson, Asst. Director
Wash. Traffic Safety Commission
1000 S. Cherry Street, MS/PD-11
Olympia, Washington 98504
Phone: (206) 753-6197

WEST VIRGINIA -- Governor Gaston Caperton III

Mr. James M. Albert, Manager
Criminal Justice and Highway Safety Office
5790-A MacCorkle Avenue
Charleston, West Virginia 25304
Phone: (304) 348-8814

Mr. James Grate
Criminal Justice and Highway
and highway Safety Office
5790-A MacCorkle Avenue
Charleston, West Virginia 25304
Phone: (304) 348-8814

WISCONSIN -- Governor Tommy G. Thompson

Ronald R. Fiedler, P.E.
Secretary, Wisconsin Department
of Transportation
P.O. Box 7910
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53707
Phone: (608) 266-1113

Ms. Mila Plosky
Director for Highway Safety
Wisconsin Department of
Transportation
P.O. Box 7910
4802 Sheboygan Ave., Rm. 933
Madison, Wisconsin 53707
Phone: (608) 266-0421

WYOMING -- Governor Mike Sullivan

Mr. Richard V. Uthoff, P.E.
State Highway Safety Engineer
Wyoming Highway Safety Department
Highway Safety Branch
P.O. Box 1708
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002-9019
Phone: (307) 777-7296

Mr. Donald Pruter
Highway Safety Analysis Engineer
Wyoming Highway Safety Department
Highway Safety Branch
P.O. Box 1708
Cheyenne Wyoming 82002-9019
Phone: (307) 777-4198

VIRGIN ISLANDS -- Governor Alexander Farrelly

Mr. Enrique Richards
Governor's Representative
Virgin Island Office of Highway Safety
P.O. Box 1847
Fredricksted, St. Croix
Virgin Islands 00840
Phone: (809) 772-3025
772-2946

SAME

Representative	Coordinator
AMERICAN SAMOA -- Governor Peter T. Coleman	
Mr. Tuilefano Vaela'a Director of Public Safety Governor's Representative P.O. Box 1086 Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799 Phone: 684-633-1111 (Through International Operator)	Mr. Po'Oai Ripley Highway Safety Coordinator Office of Highway Safety Government of American Samoa Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799 Phone: 684-699-9199 (Through International Operator)
GUAM -- Governor Honorable Joseph F. Ada	
Mr. Benigno M. Palomo Governor's Highway Safety Representative Department of Public Works P.O. Box 2950 Agana, Guam 96910 Phone:(617) 646-8643 (Through International Operator)	Ms. Teresita B. Santos Acting Highway Safety Coordinator Office of Highway Safety Government of Guam P.O. Box 2950 Agana, Guam 96910 Phone: (617) 646-4353 (Through International Operator)
INDIAN TRIBES	
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs - Operations U.S. Department of Interior 1951 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20245	Charles Jaynes, Bur. Safety Manager U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs Divison of Safety Management P.O. Box 2186 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103 FTS: 8-474-2863 Commerical (505) 766-2863
NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS -- Governor Honorable Pedro P. Tenorio	
Mr. Gregorio M. Camacho, Acting Director Department of Public Safety Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands 96950 Phone: 670-234-6333 or 6431 (Through International Operator)	Mr. Thomas Rabago Highway Safety Coordinator Office of Highway Safety Department of Public Safety Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Saipan, Northern Mariana 96950 Phone: 670-234-6021 (Through International Operator)