



Evaluation of the National Impaired Driving High-Visibility Enforcement Campaign: 2003 - 2005

DOT HS 810 789

July 2007

Background

Impaired driving has proven to be a problem that is not easy to remediate. In the 1980s and early 1990s, the Presidential Commission Against Drunk Driving was convened, and Mothers Against Drunk Driving and other grassroots organizations were formed. These groups played a significant role in galvanizing public opinion about the carnage caused by impaired drivers. Also during this time, States strengthened their impaired driving laws, there was a significant increase in enforcement activities focused on impaired driving, and considerable media attention was paid to the problem.

As a result, alcohol-related traffic fatalities fell substantially, declining by more than 33%, from 26,173 in 1982 to 17,308 in 1994.

In the years that followed, however, progress stalled. In fact, there were over 200 more alcohol-related traffic deaths in 2002 than there had been in 1994. Similarly, the alcohol-related crash rate (per 100 million VMT) has declined only slightly since the early 1990s (see Figure 2).

Figure 1





Figure 2



This report describes a National program, initiated in 2003 and conducted through 2005, that focused on enhanced efforts to reduce impaired driving through the use of highly visible, well publicized impaired driving enforcement.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration initiated a National Impaired Driving Law Enforcement Crackdown program in 2003, in which the agency encouraged States to increase their use of high-visibility impaired driving enforcement, (i.e. sobriety checkpoints or saturation patrols), bolstered by a national paid and earned media campaign, and supported through technical assistance. Also, for the first time, in 2003 Congress appropriated funds for a national paid media campaign to combat impaired driving.

Rationale for NHTSA's High-Visibility Enforcement Impaired Driving Campaign


NHTSA's National Impaired Driving High-Visibility Enforcement program was based on previous research showing that well-publicized, high-visibility enforcement could reduce alcohol-related crashes, fatalities and injuries and was modeled on the success of the national program to increase seat belt use. The seat belt program, known as *Click It or Ticket* (CIOT), includes short-duration, intensive law enforcement, supported by paid and earned media that emphasizes heightened enforcement efforts and is a proven method

to raise seat belt use within a short period of time (Solomon, Ulmer, & Preusser, 2002). Although impaired driving is a complex problem with many factors other than enforcement that influence the number of alcohol-related crashes, high-visibility enforcement crackdowns are one strategy that NHTSA could readily implement to address this problem.

A high-visibility seat belt enforcement strategy was first tested in Elmira, New York, in 1985, and belt use increased by 28 percentage points after the program (Williams, Lund, Preusser, & Blomberg, 1987). Based on that approach, the *Click It or Ticket* campaign was developed in North Carolina in 1993, and belt use increased from 63% to 79% during the first wave of enforcement (Williams, Reinfurt, & Wells, 1996). Over a period of years, CIOT was expanded to additional States and regions of the country.

Eventually, and with the support of dedicated Federal funding from Congress under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), CIOT was adopted across the country, and seat belt use increased steadily, rising to 82%. The CIOT campaign took a number of years of slow and steady progress over a decade to get all States on board. The national CIOT campaign occurs each year around the Memorial Day holiday period.

The success of the CIOT campaign is associated with the steady increases in national seat belt use rates following widespread adoption of the program in the late 1990's.



Short History of Impaired Driving Enforcement Campaigns

High-visibility enforcement campaigns have been shown to be effective in also reducing impaired driving. Evidence for this comes as early as 1967, when the

British Road Safety Act established a BAC of .08 g/dL as illegal per se and authorized police to screen motorists suspected of having alcohol in their blood (Coding & Samson, 1974), and from crackdowns conducted in New Zealand (Hurst & Wright, 1980). In the United States, the effectiveness of well-publicized impaired driving enforcement was first demonstrated in some of the Alcohol Safety Action Projects of the 1970s (Levy et al., 1978).

In the 1980s, law enforcement agencies in various locales around the country began to use sobriety checkpoints as a tool for creating impaired driving general deterrence. Surveys of residents in areas where checkpoints were being conducted showed that they were highly visible undertakings (Williams & Lund, 1984). More recently, checkpoints along with enforcement-based media campaigns have been shown to be effective in reducing alcohol-related crashes at local (Wells, Preusser, & Williams, 1992) as well as statewide levels (Lacy, Jones, & Smith, 1999 and Zwicker, Chaudhary, Maloney, & Squeglia, 2007).

An excellent example of the high-visibility impaired driving enforcement approach is *Checkpoint Tennessee*, a program conducted on a statewide basis in 1994. *Checkpoint Tennessee* was a year-long heightened, impaired driving enforcement program in which checkpoints were conducted throughout the State every weekend of the year. There was a 20.4% reduction over the projected number of impaired driving fatal crashes that would have occurred with no intervention, and this effect remained present 21 months after the initial year had concluded (Lacey, Jones & Smith, 1999).

NHTSA's Impaired Driving Campaign in 2003-2005

In 2002, in light of the lack of progress in reducing alcohol related traffic deaths at that time, NHTSA sought to encourage States across the Nation to step up their impaired driving enforcement efforts, using a combined CIOT and *Checkpoint Tennessee* model.

The agency called it a National Impaired Driving Crackdown. The first National Crackdown, in 2003, centered around the July 4th holiday period. In 2004 and 2005, at the request of the States, a Labor Day Crackdown period replaced the 4th of July crackdown. The National Crackdowns continue to serve a central role in NHTSA's overall impaired driving program. This report focuses specifically on the crackdown efforts in 2003-2005.

This high-visibility impaired driving enforcement program encouraged law enforcement agencies across the country to conduct active, highly visible law

enforcement activities during the crackdown period and to sustain high-visibility enforcement throughout the year, especially during high-risk times.

Law enforcement agencies were encouraged to conduct their enforcement activities in a highly visible way, by using sobriety checkpoints where they are permitted, as well as saturation patrols, signage, and other activities that would be highly visible to the driving public.

Highly visible law enforcement was to occur on 18 consecutive nights during the holiday crackdown periods. In 2005, for example, intensive impaired driving enforcement began on August 19, and continued through Labor Day, September 5.

The impaired driving law enforcement efforts were supported with paid and earned media. The impaired driving campaign used the slogan *You Drink & Drive. You Lose*, which was designed to convey the message that law enforcement was cracking down on impaired driving.

Congress appropriated \$11 million for the paid media in 2003, and \$14 million for the media in both 2004 and 2005. The *You Drink & Drive. You Lose* paid media campaign aired during three weekends in June and July in 2003, and during the three weekends leading into the Labor Day holiday in 2004 and 2005. Paid ads were placed on national television and radio programs that were most likely to be seen by the target audience, 21- to 34-year-old males.

The primary purpose of the high-visibility enforcement National Impaired Driving Crackdown was not necessarily to increase the number of impaired driving arrests, but rather to create general deterrence by increasing the perception of the risk of being arrested if driving while impaired by alcohol.

Focus on High-Alcohol-Related-Fatality States

The NHTSA program focused especially on States with a worse than average alcohol fatality problem. In particular, NHTSA identified States with high numbers or rates of alcohol-related fatalities. To participate in the program, these States had to express a willingness to work closely with NHTSA and make a commitment to follow the CIOT and *Checkpoint Tennessee* model.

Initially, 13 States were selected to participate in the program, and were referred to as the Strategic Evaluation States (SES). They were Alaska, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and West Virginia.

Two additional States, Missouri and South Carolina, joined the program in 2005.

A portion of the funding that Congress appropriated for paid advertising was used to place ads in markets in the States participating in the SES program. Of the \$14 million in paid advertising in 2004, \$5 million was spent in the SES, while \$4 million of the \$14 million in 2005 was spent in the SES. In addition, Congress appropriated a small amount of additional funding in 2004 (\$2.75 million) and 2005 (\$6 million), to help these States enhance their law enforcement efforts. The States were expected to fund most of their impaired driving enforcement activities using State and other TEA-21 grant funds.

In all three years covered by this report, NHTSA offered technical assistance to these States. Each State developed a year-long enforcement and communications plan, designed to cover either 85% of each State's population or geographic areas where 85% of the State's alcohol-related traffic fatalities occur. The enforcement plans outlined where and how often high-visibility sobriety checkpoints or saturation patrols were to take place. The communications plans outlined the State's plans to use the slogan *You Drink & Drive. You Lose* through State-funded paid media and earned media.

Each of the SES invested State or TEA-21 dollars for advertising in addition to the national airtime and targeted SES airtime that NHTSA purchased on broadcast TV, cable TV, and radio programs likely to reach the target audience. The SES spent approximately \$2 million on additional advertising in both 2004 and 2005. The paid ads ran from August 19 to September 5, 2005, and during comparable periods in 2003 and 2004. In 2005, for example, there were 5,319 spots on broadcast TV, 22,599 spots on cable TV, and 14,972 radio spots in the SES. These ads reached more than 92% of the target audience, for an average of 8 times each (a gross rating point of 968 across the Nation).


Young Adult Males Received the Media Message

Schulman, Ronca, and Bucuvalas, Inc., conducted national telephone surveys in the 15 SES (500 respondents per State, per survey wave), in three comparison States that did not employ State-funded media (500 respondents per wave in New York, North Carolina, and Wisconsin), and nationally (1,250 respondents per wave). They spoke to respondents who in the past year reported having driven and having consumed alcohol at least once.

The telephone surveys showed that the impaired driving message reached the general public, and especially

drivers 18 to 34 years old. Figure 3 shows that the national awareness of messages encouraging people to avoid drinking and driving increased after each crackdown, and that awareness about the message reached four out of five in this age group following each

Figure 3. Seen or Heard Messages in Past 30 Days Encouraging People to Avoid Drinking and Driving (Drivers 18 to 34)




campaign period. However, awareness did not seem to carry over from crackdown to crackdown. In fact, the awareness levels preceding each crackdown declined over the three-year period.

DWI Enforcement

SES reporting of law enforcement activity during the crackdowns, including DWI arrests and the number of checkpoints conducted, was incomplete and insufficient to permit an analysis, so an examination was conducted of estimated impaired driving arrests from the annual FBI Uniform Crime Reporting system. Analysis of the FBI data showed that the overall DWI arrest rate over the period 2001 to 2005 was quite stable in both the SES and the non-SES.

Figure 4. Seen or Heard of Any Special Effort by Police in Past 30 Days to Reduce Drunk Driving (Drivers 18 to 34)



As with awareness of the message, the national telephone surveys showed a significant increase after each crackdown in the number of drivers 18 to 34 who reported seeing or hearing about special efforts by police in the past 30 days to reduce drunk driving. Awareness

about enforcement reached one third of this age group following each period of enforcement (see Figure 4). The pre-crackdown level increased from July to December 2003, but declined in 2004 and 2005. A survey conducted at the Department of Motor Vehicles in six of the SES (Arizona, Florida, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Texas, and West Virginia) reported a significant increase in exposure to alcohol enforcement among male drivers (under age 40), based on having gone through a police checkpoint targeting alcohol impaired drivers in the past 30 days. The telephone survey showed an increase in 8 of the SES and in the National sample (from 24 to 32%) among the target group, but none of these increases was significant. There were no significant changes in self-reported drinking and driving behavior.

Drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes

Table 1 shows the number of alcohol-impaired drivers involved in fatal crashes, and the average number of fatal alcohol-impaired related crashes for two years prior to the beginning of the program (2001 and 2002) and two years after the implementation of the program (2004 and 2005). Specifically, this refers to the drivers of cars, pickup trucks, SUVs, and motorcycles with a BAC of .08 and higher, who were involved in fatal crashes. In 7 of the 13 SES (Alaska, Arizona, Louisiana, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas, and West Virginia), there was a decline in the average yearly number of crashes from the 2001-2002 time period to the 2004-2005 time period.

A similar trend was observed for the non-SES. In 23 of the 36 non-SES, there was a decline in the average yearly number of alcohol-impaired drivers involved in fatal crashes from the 2001 and 2002 time period to the 2004 and 2005 time period.

Table 2 shows the number of alcohol-impaired (BAC = .08 and higher) male drivers of cars, pickup trucks, SUVs, and motorcycles 18 to 34 years old involved in fatal crashes. This table also includes the average yearly number of fatal alcohol-impaired related crashes for two years prior to the beginning of the program (2001 and 2002) and two years after the implementation of the program (2004 and 2005). There was a decline in the average yearly number of crashes from the 2001-2002 time period to the 2004-2005 time period in 8 of the 13 SES (Alaska, Arizona, Louisiana, New Mexico, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and West Virginia).

Table 1. Alcohol-Impaired Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes: 2001-2005

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	01/02 Average	04/05 Average	Change between 01/02 and 04/05
SES								
Alaska	34	24	21	21	22	29	21	-8
Arizona	300	301	292	285	253	301	269	-32
California	941	954	983	1,044	1,082	948	1,063	115
Florida	772	785	808	791	875	779	833	55
Georgia	354	320	308	344	369	337	357	20
Louisiana	308	297	300	280	276	302	278	-24
Mississippi	209	246	249	279	268	228	273	46
Montana	79	83	100	85	88	81	86	5
New Mexico	129	136	121	117	116	132	117	-16
Ohio	434	431	333	353	359	433	356	-77
Pennsylvania	464	466	441	471	492	465	481	17
Texas	1,289	1,307	1,236	1,202	1,101	1,298	1,151	-146
West Virginia	99	141	97	97	90	120	93	-26
Total Original SES	5,412	5,491	5,290	5,368	5,390	5,452	5,379	-73
New SES States - 2005								
Missouri	362	366	365	335	350	364	343	-21
South Carolina	408	407	361	329	310	407	320	-88
Total All SES	6,181	6,265	6,015	6,033	6,051	6,223	6,042	-182
NON-SES								
Alabama	281	302	295	326	310	291	318	26
Arkansas	125	165	163	172	170	145	171	26
Colorado	216	224	187	177	184	220	181	-39
Connecticut	116	101	103	107	84	108	96	-13
Delaware	44	33	48	35	45	39	40	1
District of Columbia	21	21	22	12	15	21	13	-7
Hawaii	41	35	40	38	47	38	42	4
Idaho	61	54	72	70	67	57	68	11
Illinois	410	435	427	415	385	422	400	-23
Indiana	228	191	175	205	223	210	214	5
Iowa	98	96	96	78	90	97	84	-13
Kansas	134	167	144	98	109	151	103	-47
Kentucky	177	206	195	218	215	192	216	25
Maine	46	35	55	48	43	41	45	5
Maryland	168	169	165	185	144	168	164	-4
Massachusetts	165	167	147	163	125	166	144	-23
Michigan	353	324	294	294	271	338	282	-56
Minnesota	150	179	189	140	145	165	142	-22
Nebraska	66	81	87	69	68	73	69	-5
Nevada	84	100	107	107	106	92	107	15
New Hampshire	42	37	29	50	45	39	47	8

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	01/02 Average	04/05 Average	Change between 01/02 and 04/05
New Jersey	186	173	161	171	160	180	165	-14
New York	297	293	334	383	316	295	349	55
North Carolina	346	403	345	373	371	374	372	-2
North Dakota	41	35	41	32	42	38	37	-1
Oklahoma	181	172	187	189	202	176	195	19
Oregon	107	116	125	121	111	111	116	4
Rhode Island	35	36	46	35	27	36	31	-5
South Dakota	58	66	68	53	59	62	56	-6
Tennessee	385	340	329	379	339	363	359	-3
Utah	45	53	28	58	32	49	45	-5
Vermont	24	21	17	18	25	23	21	-1
Virginia	246	265	250	247	239	256	243	-13
Washington	183	211	178	176	201	197	189	-8
Wisconsin	274	277	300	268	275	276	272	-4
Wyoming	55	50	37	47	52	53	49	-3
Total Non-SES	5,488	5,631	5,484	5,551	5,339	5,559	5,445	-114

**Table 2. Alcohol-Impaired Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes:
Males 18 to 34 Years Old, 2001-2005**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	01/02 Average	04/05 Average	Change between 01/02 and 04/05
SES								
Alaska	15	15	3	6	11	15	9	-6
Arizona	149	129	125	130	119	139	124	-15
California	433	485	457	496	530	459	513	54
Florida	331	326	335	335	384	328	360	31
Georgia	160	135	142	151	161	148	156	9
Louisiana	145	143	125	114	123	144	119	-25
Mississippi	93	95	103	114	104	94	109	15
Montana	31	32	43	34	36	31	35	4
New Mexico	59	63	57	59	46	61	53	-8
Ohio	192	184	144	166	151	188	158	-30
Pennsylvania	233	213	189	204	220	223	212	-11
Texas	582	646	596	566	508	614	537	-77
West Virginia	47	63	47	44	38	55	41	-14
Total Original SES	2,470	2,527	2,365	2,418	2,431	2,498	2,424	-74
New SES States - 2005								
Missouri	155	165	166	144	152	160	148	-12
South Carolina	197	188	144	139	146	192	142	-50
Total All SES	2,822	2,879	2,675	2,701	2,729	2,851	2,715	-136
NON-SES								
Alabama	121	145	116	147	131	133	139	6

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	01/02 Average	04/05 Average	Change between 01/02 and 04/05
Arkansas	56	76	64	79	73	66	76	11
Colorado	103	108	84	83	87	105	85	-20
Connecticut	53	46	44	46	46	50	46	-4
Delaware	19	19	23	19	18	19	18	-1
District of Columbia	10	11	12	7	8	11	7	-3
Hawaii	18	23	25	22	20	20	21	1
Idaho	25	23	31	38	29	24	33	9
Illinois	198	244	225	194	178	221	186	-35
Indiana	98	87	72	100	99	93	99	7
Iowa	44	46	37	33	42	45	38	-7
Kansas	56	71	66	39	45	64	42	-22
Kentucky	68	88	78	91	94	78	93	15
Maine	16	16	23	23	20	16	21	5
Maryland	71	80	79	88	70	76	79	3
Massachusetts	75	78	71	70	61	77	66	-11
Michigan	161	149	119	125	122	155	123	-32
Minnesota	76	79	92	65	62	77	63	-14
Nebraska	27	41	37	31	30	34	30	-3
Nevada	34	41	44	41	53	38	47	10
New Hampshire	15	20	11	22	19	18	20	3
New Jersey	98	80	80	81	72	89	76	-12
New York	141	143	153	192	154	142	173	32
North Carolina	168	191	179	186	183	180	185	5
North Dakota	17	13	21	10	19	15	14	0
Oklahoma	78	75	84	84	86	76	85	9
Oregon	44	42	47	58	38	43	48	5
Rhode Island	19	20	23	15	13	20	14	-6
South Dakota	26	19	29	19	26	22	23	0
Tennessee	176	153	131	169	143	165	156	-9
Utah	23	25	12	25	9	24	17	-7
Vermont	12	10	3	9	14	11	12	0
Virginia	97	131	100	110	99	114	104	-10
Washington	94	104	76	89	111	99	100	1
Wisconsin	127	120	149	114	111	123	113	-11
Wyoming	22	21	15	14	26	22	20	-1
Total Non-SES	2,484	2,636	2,456	2,539	2,408	2,560	2,474	-86

A similar trend is observed for the non-SES. There was a decline in the average yearly number of alcohol-impaired male drivers 18 to 34 years old involved in fatal crashes between 2001 to 2002 and 2004 to 2005 in 18 of the 36 non-SES.

The total declines in yearly average of fatal crashes for alcohol-impaired drivers from 2002 to 2005 were slightly greater for the non-SES, as compared with the SES (a 5% drop in non-SES compared to a 2% decline in SES). In the target group of 18- to 34-year-old male drivers, there was also a greater decline in non-SES compared to SES (8.7% in non-SES and 3.8% in SES).

A two-way analysis of variance compared the effect of State Status (SES/non-SES) and Enforcement Period (Pre Crackdown/Crackdown) on alcohol-related fatality rates (i.e. fatalities/100k licensed drivers). The alcohol-related fatality rate by month for the years 2001 and 2002 was used as pre-program measure, whereas alcohol-related fatality rate by month for years 2004 and 2005 was used as the crackdown period measure (the year 2003 was excluded because the crackdown started midway and covered a different period than in the years 2004 and 2005). The analysis revealed that the number of alcohol-related fatalities declined from the pre-crackdown period to the post-crackdown period. The SES and the non-SES did not differ in their rates of decline. Figure 5 shows a decline across 2001-2005 in the SES, with wide variations from year to year. A similar decline, but with slightly less variation from year to year, can be observed in alcohol-related fatalities in the non-SES (Figure 6). The analysis of variance excluded Missouri and South Carolina, since they only joined the SES in 2005.

Figure 5. SES Alcohol-Related Fatalities from 2001-2005 (13 States)





Figure 6. Non-SES Alcohol-Related Fatalities from 2001-2005 (36 States)



Summary

Between 2003 and 2005, the National Impaired Driving Crackdown Program demonstrated that a high-visibility impaired driving law enforcement program, supported by a paid and earned media campaign stressing law enforcement messages can reach the general public. In particular, efforts to reach young adult males who are at higher risk of being involved in alcohol-related crashes were successful.

Significant increases in exposure to impaired driving law enforcement were reported in some States. Overall, there were increases in the number of motorists who were aware of special efforts by police to reduce drunk driving nationally and in the SES.

While there were no significant changes in self-reported drinking and driving behaviors, declines in alcohol-related fatalities were seen over the three-year period. The number of alcohol impaired drivers involved in fatal crashes declined from 2001-2002 to 2004-2005 in 30 States (7 of the 13 SES and 23 of the 36 non-SES). Of the five years shown, the 2005 totals were the lowest in 13 States (5 of the SES and 8 of the non-SES), as well as for non-SES combined.

The results were similar for drivers 18 to 34 years old. The number of alcohol-impaired male drivers 18 to 34 involved in fatal crashes declined from 2001-2002 to 2004-2005 in 26 States (8 of the 13 SES and 18 of the 36 non-SES). Of the five years shown, the 2005 totals were the lowest in 14 States (4 of the SES and 10 of the non-SES), as well as for the non-SES combined.

A two-way analysis of variance using the factors of enforcement and state grouping (SES/non-SES) confirmed that alcohol-related fatalities declined from 2001-2002 to 2004-2005 and that this decrease did not differ across SES and non-SES.

Lessons Learned

Following four years of increases in alcohol-related traffic fatalities from 1998 to 2002, the National Impaired Driving Crackdown program was initiated in an effort to reverse this trend. The program was designed to engage the Nation in the use of high-visibility enforcement coupled with enforcement-oriented media to create general deterrence.

NHTSA sought to involve all States in the crackdown, but focused on a number of States with especially high numbers or rates of alcohol-related traffic fatalities. The agency provided these States with technical assistance, a small amount of additional paid advertising, and funds to enhance the law enforcement efforts.

During the three-year period when the program was being conducted, the trend in alcohol-related fatalities declined in both SES and non-SES, and the declines were more pronounced for male drivers 18 to 34. While the declines in the SES were not significant, they could be considered promising, since they are directionally correct and follow immediately after a period of increased alcohol-related fatalities.

The congressionally funded national media campaign appears to have been successful in reaching the target audience with the enforcement-oriented message. However, to make significant changes in driver behavior, it may be necessary for the driving public to perceive that the risk of detection for driving impaired has been increased significantly.

While directionally correct, experience in Checkpoint Tennessee suggests that more substantial benefits will require a much higher level of law enforcement intensity than was present between 2003 and 2005 among the SES or the non-SES.

In addition, conducting a coordinated National Crackdown just once each year may not have been sufficient to build momentum. Awareness about both enforcement activities and media messages increased following each crackdown, but did not carry over from campaign to campaign. Conducting more frequent waves of enforcement and publicity might be more successful in building a cumulative effect.

Next Steps

NHTSA will continue to make every effort to apply the lessons learned from the 2003–2005 impaired driving campaign to its program in 2006 and beyond.

Congress appropriated additional funding to support the national paid media campaign in 2006, which enabled

NHTSA to purchase paid advertising for two impaired driving crackdowns during the Labor Day holiday in August/September and Drunk and Drugged Driving (3D) Prevention Month in December. NHTSA hopes to do the same in 2007 and in future years.

In addition, in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), Congress required that all States sign assurances that they will conduct high-visibility law enforcement during crackdown periods and on a sustained basis throughout the year. Congress also quadrupled the level of funding available to States to combat impaired driving through the Section 410 Incentive Grant program, and provided that a portion of these funds be available exclusively to States with the biggest challenges (the 10 States with the highest alcohol fatality rates). Moreover, SAFETEA-LU provided that at least half of those funds must be spent on high-visibility enforcement.

SAFETEA-LU was passed more than four years after the SES program was established. New criteria for Section 410 grants require States to develop year-long enforcement plans that cover 65% of the State. This newer requirement supersedes the original SES program requirement.

Using these resources, NHTSA is continuing to work with the States to enhance their well-publicized, high-visibility enforcement efforts.

References

- Coding, P.J., & Samson, P. (1974) Blood-Alcohol in Road Fatalities Before and After the Road Safety Act, 1967. Crowthorne, Berkshire, England: Transport and Road Research Laboratory, Supplementary Report 45UC.
- Hurst, P., & Wright, R. (1980) Deterrence at Last: The Ministry of Transport's Alcohol Blitzes. Paper presented to the Eighth International Conference of Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Lacy, J.H., Jones, R.K., & Smith, R.G. An Evaluation of Checkpoint Tennessee: Tennessee's Statewide Sobriety Checkpoint Program. DOT HS 808 841. January 1999. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Levy, M., Compton, R., & Dienstfrey, S. Public Perceptions of the July 2003 You Drink & Drive. You Lose Crackdown: Telephone Surveys Show the Media Campaign Reaches Target Audience. 2004. DOT HS 809 708 Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Levy, P., Voas, R., Johnson, P., & Klein, T.M. An Evaluation of the Department of Transportation's Alcohol Safety Action Projects. 1978. *Journal of Safety Research*, 10, 162-176.

Solomon, M., Ulmer, R.G., & Preusser, D.F. Evaluation of Click It or Ticket Model Programs. 2002. DOT HS 809 498. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Wells, J.K., Preusser, D.K., & Williams, A.F. Enforcing alcohol-impaired driving and seat belt use laws. 1992. Binghamton, NY: *Journal of Safety Research* 23, 63-71.

Williams, A.F., & Lund, A.K. Deterrent Effects of Roadblocks on Drinking and Driving. 1984. *Traffic Safety Evaluation and Research Review*, 3, 7-18.

Williams, A.F., Lund, A.K., Preusser, D.F., & Blomberg, R.D. Results of a seat belt law enforcement and publicity campaign in Elmira, New York. 1987. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 19, 243-249.

Williams, A.F., Preusser, D.F., Blomberg, R.D., & Lund, A.K. Seat belt use law enforcement and publicity in Elmira, New York: A reminder campaign. 1987. *American Journal of Public Health*, 77(11), 1450-51.

Williams, A.F., Reinfurt, D., & Wells, J.K. Increasing seat belt use in North Carolina. 1996. *Journal of Safety Research*, 27, 33-41

Zwicker, T.J., Chaudhary, N.K., Maloney, S., & Squeglia, R. Connecticut's Impaired Driving Publicity and Enforcement Campaign. 2007. DOT HS 810 689. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.