

# Characteristics of State Law Enforcement Liaison Programs: Survey Results



A Study  
Conducted  
Under NCREP —  
The National  
Cooperative  
Research and  
Evaluation  
Program



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



## **DISCLAIMER**

This publication is distributed by the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in the interest of information exchange. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department of Transportation or the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof. If trade or manufacturers' names or products are mentioned, it is because they are considered essential to the object of the publication and should not be construed as an endorsement. The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers.

Suggested APA Format Citation:

Decina, L. E., & Lococo, K. (2022, March). *Characteristics of state law enforcement liaison programs: Survey results* (Report No. DOT HS 813 259). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

## Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. DOT HS 813 259	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Characteristics of State Law Enforcement Liaison Programs: Survey Results	5. Report Date March 2022		6. Performing Organization Code
	8. Performing Organization Report No.		
7. Authors Lawrence E. Decina and Kathy Lococo	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)		
9. Performing Organization Name and Address TransAnalytics, LLC 336 West Broad Street Quakertown, PA 18951	11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-16-C-00016		
	13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Report		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, DC 20590	14. Sponsoring Agency Code NPD-320		
	15. Supplementary Notes Dr. Kelly Sheppard and Dr. Randolph Atkins were the Contracting Officer's Representatives.		
16. Abstract This study increased understanding of State Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) programs across the United States by providing information about their characteristics including duties, responsibilities, and activities. The study included an online survey of LELs and their State Highway Safety Office (SHSO) program managers to identify program characteristics and practices. A total of 105 LELs and 31 SHSO representatives completed the surveys. Close to 75% of the LELs responded that they were directly accountable to their SHSOs. Over 75% of the LELs focused on impaired driving, occupant protection, distracted driving, and speed management. Most LELs recruited grantees, provided information and training to Law Enforcement Agencies (LEAs), served as the point of contact between the SHSO and LEA community, and established relationships with LEAs, advocates, and stakeholders. Close to 75% of the LELs reported that their performance was evaluated. Frequently reported metrics included the number of in-person LEA visits and remote contacts, attendance at events and conferences, and the number of LEAs participating in mobilizations. Analyses using rates of LEA participation in grants and several LEL program characteristics did not uncover any patterns. Other unmeasured factors such as size of the State, types of LEAs, State traffic law differences, and enforcement culture may play parts in LEA grant procurements and participation in NHTSA highway safety campaigns. However, specific LEL characteristics, such as superior communication and interpersonal skills, knowledge of State traffic safety laws and general police methods, connections with LEAs, and high energy and charisma were identified as important factors for a productive program.			
17. Key Words law enforcement liaisons, law enforcement agencies, traffic safety grants		18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the public from the DOT, BTS, National Transportation Library, Repository & Open Science Access Portal, <a href="https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov">rosap.ntl.bts.gov</a> .	
19 Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21 No. of Pages 48	22. Price

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Reproduction of completed page authorized

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Survey Methodology</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Results: LEL Responses</b> .....	<b>6</b>
LEL Respondents by State and Region .....	6
General Overview of LEL Position .....	6
Background of LELs.....	9
LEL Duties and Responsibilities .....	10
Material and Resources Used by LELs.....	12
Training Received as an LEL .....	14
LEL Performance Evaluation .....	15
LEAs Within LELs’ Areas of Responsibility.....	16
How LELs Use Traffic Safety Performance Measures.....	19
Respondents’ State LEL Programs .....	19
<b>Results: LEA Participation by Select LEL Questions</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Results: SHSO Question-by-Question Responses</b> .....	<b>24</b>
Overview of the LEL Positions Under Sponsorship.....	24
How Sponsoring Agencies Assist and Communicate with LELs.....	27
How Sponsoring Agencies Evaluate Job Performance.....	28
LEA Recruitment and Funding for NHTSA Highway Safety Grants .....	29
How Sponsoring Agencies Use Performance Measures.....	32
<b>Discussion</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>Appendix A: Additional Survey Response Tables</b> .....	<b>A-1</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1. Participating States and LELs.....	6
Table 2. LEL Survey Respondents by NHTSA Regions.....	6
Table 3. Respondents' Position Titles .....	7
Table 4. Organization/Agency to Which LELs Are Accountable .....	7
Table 5. Coverage Area for LEL Responsibilities.....	8
Table 6. Highway Safety Program Areas of LEL Responsibility.....	8
Table 7. Work Experience Prior to LEL Position.....	9
Table 8. Highest Rank Achieved for LELs Previously in Law Enforcement.....	9
Table 9. LELs' Highest Educational Credentials .....	10
Table 10. Importance Ratings of Characteristics for Meeting LEL Responsibilities .....	11
Table 11. Information LELs Required to Maintain and Report to Their Supervisors.....	12
Table 12. Effectiveness Ratings for Modes of Communication with Prospective Grantees .....	12
Table 13. Frequency of Resources Used in Support of LEL Work .....	13
Table 14. LEL Use of Material Found on TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov.....	14
Table 15. LEL Training Program Attendance .....	15
Table 16. Frequency LELs Receive Job Performance Feedback .....	15
Table 17. Metrics Used by Supervisors Evaluating LEL Job Performance .....	16
Table 18. Grant Funding for Participating LEAs.....	16
Table 19. LEA Participation Rate Across All Respondents and All LEA Types.....	17
Table 20. Number of LEAs Recruited in 2018 for Grant Activity, by Program Area.....	17
Table 21. LEA Types Hesitant or Reluctant to Participate in Traffic Safety Programs.....	18
Table 22. Reasons Provided by LEAs for Non-Participation in Traffic Safety Programs .....	19
Table 23. Items Included in Respondents' LEL Program Budget.....	20
Table 24. Number of LEL Respondents and States by LEA Participation Rate Category.....	22
Table 25. LEA Participation by Work Status .....	22
Table 26. LEA Participation by Whether LEL Work Performance Evaluated.....	23
Table 27. LEA Participation by LEA Grant Funding.....	23
Table 28. LEA Participation by Use of Benchmarks to Evaluate LEA Enforcement Activity .....	23
Table 29. SHSO Survey Respondents by NHTSA Region.....	24
Table 30. Organization/Agency that Sponsors the LELs in Respondents' States .....	24
Table 31. SHSO Importance Ratings of Characteristics for Meeting LEL Job Responsibilities .....	25
Table 32. Percent of SHSO Respondents Indicating LEL Coverage by Program Area .....	26
Table 33. Information SHSOs Require from Their LELs to Document Performance .....	26
Table 34. Effectiveness Ratings for Modes of SHSO LEL Communications.....	27
Table 35. Frequency with which Supervisors Provide Job Performance Feedback to LELs.....	28
Table 36. Metrics Used by Sponsoring Agency to Evaluate LEL Job Performance.....	29
Table 37. Number of LEAs Recruited in 2018 for Grant Activity, by Program Area.....	30

Table 38. Reasons Selected by LEAs for Non-Participation in NHTSA Traffic Safety Programs .....	31
Table 39. SHSO Survey Response to Items Included in Respondents' LEL Program Budget .....	33

## Executive Summary

This study increased our understanding of State Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) programs across the United States. LELs from State LEL programs and State Highway Safety Offices (SHSOs) that manage these programs completed online surveys developed to identify program characteristics and practices. The Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA), the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's regional offices, and SHSOs provided contact information for all State LELs and their managers. The researchers provided the survey link to 179 LELs and 59 SHSO managers; the naïve response rates were 59% (n=105) and 53% (n=31), respectively.

Findings revealed a diverse set of State LEL program characteristics based on organizational structure, program coverage, grant-specific responsibilities, and other general duties. Results also revealed substantial similarities across LELs since they were generally tasked with the primary responsibilities of recruiting LEAs to participate in NHTSA highway safety grants, assisting LEAs in carrying out their grant responsibilities by providing information and training, and serving as a point of contact between the SHSO and the law enforcement community. The highway safety grants reflect participation in a variety of NHTSA's countermeasure programs such as high visibility enforcement/mobilizations and public media and outreach programs.

Over three-quarters of LELs indicated responsibilities in impaired driving, occupant protection, distracted driving, and speed management. While over one-half (54%) of the LELs reported that they were full-time, 46% reported being part-time. About half (55%) of the LELs were active law enforcement officers before becoming LELs, but most of the others (39%) were retired law enforcement. Most of the LELs with law enforcement experience had ranking positions.

Most LELs strictly performed LEL duties for their sponsoring agencies. LELs generally reported information about LEA site visits, contacts, grantees, and non-grantee participants; attendance at local and regional events and conferences; and training programs to their supervisors. LELs reported that the most effective means of communicating with prospective grantees were personal meetings, telephone calls, and emails.

Almost all LELs reported having a written job description, and about three-quarters reported that their performance was evaluated. They were primarily evaluated on the number of in-person LEA visits as well as remote contacts, attendance at events and conferences, and the number of LEAs participating in mobilizations. LELs reported that law enforcement leaders did not participate in traffic safety programs because of insufficient staffing, lack of interest by chief or sheriff, competing overtime opportunities, and political concerns.

The SHSO responses were like those from the LELs. SHSOs attached high importance to LEA site visits, tracking grantee enforcement activity, providing crash data and other traffic safety information, and promoting programs. SHSOs also felt in-person meetings with LEAs were best for program effectiveness.

This study looked at factors that may influence LEA grant involvement rates. Analyses using reported rates of LEA participation in grants and several LEL program characteristics uncovered no patterns. Other unmeasured factors such as size of the State, types of LEAs, State traffic law differences, enforcement culture, and officers' morale may play a part in achieving LEA grant procurements and participation in NHTSA highway safety campaigns. The study did not examine outcomes associated with participation such as enforcement measures. However,

specific LEL characteristics, such as superior communication and interpersonal skills, knowledge of State traffic safety laws and general police methods, connections with LEAs, and high energy and charisma were identified as important factors for a productive program.



## **Introduction**

The LEL program began in 1990 as part of the national 70 x '92 seat belt campaign. NHTSA began a grant program to the States to fund a team of law enforcement officers to recruit LEAs to participate in seat belt enforcement programs. Today, NHTSA distributes millions of dollars each year to States to fund a variety of traffic safety programs and initiatives. Within the States, LELs support these efforts through interactions with LEAs. They work to increase the number of LEAs and government leaders involved in traffic safety programs. They also provide program management, technical assistance, training, and marketing material for NHTSA's traffic safety programs.

LEL programs may vary in characteristics such as administrative and supervisory structures, network reach, communication between grant administrators and grantees, levels of accountability, grant topics, traffic safety outcomes, mobilization of enforcement agencies, and levels of funding and accountability for grantees. Anecdotally, LELs have reported many challenges in motivating LEAs to participate in NHTSA mobilizations and trainings. Their motivating techniques have included direct funding, incentives, challenges, and competitions. However, formal obstacles often hinder these motivation strategies, especially those dealing with State traffic safety laws, political issues, funding, competing LEA priorities, and delays in reimbursement.

This study aimed to improve understanding of State LEL programs across the U.S. It included distribution of an online survey to LELs from State programs and another survey to SHSO representatives to identify program characteristics and practices. The research was conducted under the National Cooperative Research and Evaluation Program (NCREP), which was established in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act. NCREP is a cooperative program between NHTSA and GHSA to research and evaluate State highway safety countermeasures and highway safety topics identified by State agencies as important to their programs. NCREP is administered by NHTSA and is jointly managed with GHSA.

## Survey Methodology

The researchers identified survey topic areas and questions through a review of the request for proposals, prior NHTSA research about LEL programs, and discussions with retired LEL coordinators. The project kickoff meeting with NHTSA also provided content for survey development. The researchers developed instructions to prospective LEL survey respondents, survey question content, questionnaires, invitations to participate in the survey, and follow-up reminders for survey completion.

The researchers provided NHTSA staff with drafts for comment on readability and relevance. Following NHTSA staff review, the researchers prepared a revised draft of both surveys for placement on a secure website for additional testing with a group of NHTSA staff, the GHSA LEL Coordinator, and four retired LELs. Seven reviewers provided technical and editing comments. They also provided information about computer-related glitches, such as screens freezing or inability to click on response boxes. NHTSA submitted the survey instruments and methodology to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval, which was obtained in June 2019 (OMB Control Number 2127-0739).<sup>1</sup> Advarra Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects Research in Columbia, Maryland, reviewed the plan and survey material and determined that the research project was exempt from IRB oversight.

GHSA provided the researchers with their current LEL directory, including mailing addresses, email addresses, and telephone numbers. The researchers cross-checked agency addresses using the internet, conducted searches for incomplete or missing mailing addresses, and provided the updated list to NHTSA. In turn, NHTSA emailed the updated LEL contact information for each State to its respective Regional LEL with a request to the Regional LEL to share the lists with their State contacts for updating. Most of the 10 NHTSA Regions sent updated information about LEL contacts. The researchers updated the directory to incorporate State revisions. The revised directory included 179 LELs. However, four States had no LELs listed in the directory (Arizona, Michigan, North Dakota, and Nebraska).

GHSA also provided the researchers with its most current SHSO directory, including mailing addresses, email addresses, and telephone numbers. The researchers proceeded with address verification and administered the SHSO survey in the same manner as the LEL Survey. The process identified 59 SHSO supervisors or managers.

NHTSA provided its Regional Offices and GHSA with two-week advanced notification of the mailing of the invitation letter. In September 2019, the researchers mailed the invitation letters to the LELs describing the purpose of the research and the survey. NHTSA's Acting Director of the Office of Behavioral Safety Research and GHSA's Executive Director signed the letter. The SHSO supervisors/managers received their letters of invitation in November 2019.

In November 2019 the website manager sent an email to each LEL that referenced the invitation letter and included a link to the online survey, a username, and a password. The data collection period spanned four months. From December 2019 to February 2020 the website manager sent three reminder emails with their survey link, username, and password to LELs who had not responded. Toward the mid-survey period, the GHSA LEL Coordinator sent a reminder notice to

---

<sup>1</sup> The approved survey instruments are available on [www.reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov) and at [https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewICR?ref\\_nbr=201811-2127-004](https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewICR?ref_nbr=201811-2127-004) under IC List.

LELs who had not completed the survey. The website manager sent a final email reminder two weeks before the end of the data collection period in March 2020.

The SHSO representatives received their survey link in December 2019. The SHSO survey response period closed in April 2020. Due to the public health emergency, the last month of SHSO respondent data collection was limited. An additional month of collection in September 2020 was added for SHSO respondents. Eighteen SHSO representatives responded in the first wave, and an additional 13 responded in September for a total of 31 respondents. SHSO survey candidates were only sent the second invitation to complete the survey in September and were not sent reminders during either data collection period.

## Results: LEL Responses

As described in the Methodology section, the survey went to 179 LELs across 46 States. While 128 LELs started the survey, only 105 completed the survey in its entirety and are included in the analysis. The naïve response rate, which does not adjust for various types of non-response, is 59%. The analyst prepared data summary tables for each survey question. Open-ended “other” and “comments” fields were tabulated. However, only key summary tables and findings of the open-ended responses are presented.

### LEL Respondents by State and Region

As shown in Table 1, the 105 respondents were from 40 States. There were three or fewer LELs responding from most reporting States (33 of 40), but one State had 11 and another 12 LEL responses. Note that the statistics in this report reflect the LELs who responded, and as such, the analysis gives more statistical weight to States with more responding LELs. In fact, the two States with the most reporting LELs account for 22% of the total responses. At the same time, this fact likely reflects the fact that these States employ more LELs. Table 2 presents the number of LEL respondents by NHTSA region.

*Table 1. Participating States and LELs*

LEL Responses from State	Number of States	Number of LEL Respondents
1	14	14
2	12	24
3	7	21
4	3	12
5	1	5
6	1	6
11	1	11
12	1	12
Total	40	105

*Table 2. LEL Survey Respondents by NHTSA Regions*

NHTSA Region	Number of Respondents
1	6
2	16
3	15
4	10
5	14
6	15
7	7
8	5
9	0
10	17
Total	105

### General Overview of LEL Position

The following section describes the responses providing a general overview of the LEL position. As seen in Table 3, over 90% of the respondents indicated that the title of their position was Law

Enforcement Liaison. As such, the respondents to the LEL survey are referred to as LELs throughout this report.

*Table 3. Respondents' Position Titles*

<b>LEL Q1. Respondent Position Title</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	92% (97)
Program Coordinator or Manager	5% (5)
Other	3% (3)
Total	100% (105)

As seen in Table 4, half the respondents reported that they were solely accountable to their SHSO. Twenty-one LELs indicated accountability to more than one entity with 20 indicating two organizations and one indicating three organizations. Among the 21 respondents who indicated they were accountable to several organizations, the responses included the SHSO (20), an LEA (12), a non-profit (6), and others (5). When including more than one response, 69% of respondents (72) reported some accountability to the SHSO, 21% (22) reported some accountability to an LEA, and 19% (20) reported some accountability to a non-profit.

*Table 4. Organization/Agency to Which LELs Are Accountable*

<b>LEL Q2. Organization/Agency to Which LELs are Accountable</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
State Highway Safety Office Alone	50% (52)
Non-Profit Organization/Association Alone	13% (14)
Law Enforcement Agency Alone	9% (10)
Other Alone	8% (8)
Several Organizations	20% (21)
Total	100% (105)

Slightly more than half of respondents reported that their LEL position was full-time (54%) and the remaining 46% reported part-time. The reported number of hours worked per week ranged from 1 to 90 and averaged 31.3 hours (SD=15.5,  $n=104$ ). For part-time LELs, the average number of hours per week was 18.4 hours, which compared to 42.5 for those reporting full time LEL duties.

Regarding the locations and associated proportions of time spent in performance of LEL duties, approximately 30% of LELs (29 of 100 responses) reported spending more than half their time on travel or performing out-of-office activities and another approximately 40% (39 of 100) reporting spending 26 to 50% of their time out of the office.

Regarding whether they performed additional non-LEL-related tasks for their sponsoring agencies, 40% replied in the affirmative (41 of 103). Non-LEL-specific duties mentioned included the following:

- administrative assistant/general office
- child passenger safety technician
- crash data analyst
- crash investigator
- detective

- drug recognition expert State coordinator and program manager
- driving under the influence (DUI) task force representative
- emergency responder
- grant manager
- high-visibility enforcement (HVE) program coordinator
- law enforcement officer
- law enforcement resource for program manager
- press release developer
- report preparation
- rural roads program coordinator
- special events coordinator/assistant
- trainer
- victim impact panel coordinator
- youth coordinator

While not specifically LEL duties, most of the above activities relate to highway safety programs. As such, they offer indirect benefits to State highway safety programs and may support States’ overall safety programs.

As seen in Table 5, just over half of the LELs were responsible for a specific region in their States, and just under a quarter were responsible for entire States. None of the respondents indicated coverage areas based on LEA type or highway safety topic.

*Table 5. Coverage Area for LEL Responsibilities*

<b>LEL Q8. Coverage Area</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Specific region of the State	54% (57)
Entire State	23% (24)
Specific county or counties	19% (20)
Other	4% (4)
Total	100% (105)

Table 6 indicates the percentage of LELs with highway safety program areas in their realms of responsibility ranked by frequency of mention. The top four areas were impaired driving, occupant protection, distracted driving, and speed management, which were all mentioned by over three-quarters of LELs.

*Table 6. Highway Safety Program Areas of LEL Responsibility*

<b>LEL Q9. Highway Safety Program Areas in Area of Responsibility</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents Indicating Responsibility (n=105)</b>
Impaired Driving	86% (90)
Occupant Protection	82% (86)
Distracted Driving	82% (86)
Speed Management	77% (81)

<b>LEL Q9. Highway Safety Program Areas in Area of Responsibility</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents Indicating Responsibility (n=105)</b>
Traffic Safety Related Training	65% (68)
Unsafe (Aggressive Driving)	63% (66)
General Traffic Enforcement	62% (65)
Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety	58% (61)
Motorcycle Safety	54% (57)
Teen Drivers	54% (57)
Officer Safety	49% (51)
School Bus Safety	34% (36)
Improvement of Traffic Records	23% (24)
Enhancement of Emergency Services	16% (17)
Other (e.g., rural road safety)	11% (11)

### **Background of LELs**

The following section summarizes the responses describing the LELs' backgrounds. Years of experience as an LEL ranged from 1 to 21 years, averaging 6.4 years (SD=4.9). Tables 7 and 8 describe LELs' previous work experience and highest rank in previous position. Just over half of the LELs indicated they were involved in active law enforcement prior to their position, while nearly 40% indicated they were retired law enforcement prior to becoming a LEL. Twenty-six percent of LELs held a highest rank of sergeant, 21% lieutenant, and 16% chief/police commissioner/superintendent/sheriff. Only 3% of LELs did not have any law enforcement background.

*Table 7. Work Experience Prior to LEL Position*

<b>LEL Q.11 Work Experience Prior to Becoming a LEL</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Active Law Enforcement	55% (57)
Retired Law Enforcement	39% (41)
Other	6% (6)
Total	100% (104)

*Table 8. Highest Rank Achieved for LELs Previously in Law Enforcement*

<b>LEL Q12. Highest Rank</b>	<b>Percent of Valid Respondents</b>
Sergeant	26% (26)
Lieutenant	21% (21)
Chief of Police/Police Commissioner/Superintendent/Sheriff	16% (16)
Captain	10% (10)
Officer/Deputy	7% (7)
Deputy or Assistant Chief/Commissioner/Superintendent, Chief Deputy, Undersheriff	6% (6)
Corporal	5% (5)
Other responses	9% (9)
Total	100% (100)

Table 9 shows the LELs' highest formal education level. About one-third of LELs held bachelor's degrees, and another 30% held associate degrees. In addition, 95% of LELs graduated from a State-certified or accredited police academy.

Table 9. LELs' Highest Educational Credentials

LEL Q13. Highest Educational Credential	Percent of Respondents
Bachelor's degree (BA, BS)	32% (33)
Associate degree (AA)	29% (30)
High school diploma	22% (22)
Master's degree (MA, MS)	11% (11)
Other responses	6% (6)
Total	100% (102)

### LEL Duties and Responsibilities

The following section describes the LEL's duties and responsibilities. LELs listed their instructor training qualifications. Six left this question blank, and 17 entered "none." For the remaining 82 LELs, trainings listed by several LELs and the number of mentions is presented below:

- SFST (Standardized Field Sobriety Test): 18
- Below 100 (Seat Belts, Bullet Proof Vests, Speed): 11
- DRE (Drug Recognition Expert): 10
- Basic Instructor: 9
- Firearms Instructor: 8
- Driving Instructor: 7
- Emergency Vehicle Operations Instructor: 7
- ARIDE (Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement): 3
- TOPS (Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies): 3
- TIMS (Traffic Incident Management): 3

LELs indicated the types of activities in which they participated as part of their work from a list. Table A-1 in the Appendix lists the complete results. In summary, most LELs (80% or more) reported participating in the following activities:

- Acting as point of contact between the law enforcement community and SHSO
- Building relationships with LEA partners, advocates, stakeholders, and non-LEA partners
- LEA recruitment (both face-to-face and electronic)
- Training for professional development
- Providing data and information to LEAs

LELs indicated how many in-person LEA site visits they made per month. Reported monthly visits ranged from 0 to 70 and averaged 14 (SD=14, n=102). LELs also indicated how many site visits were to LEAs that did not participate in NHTSA's highway safety grant-funded activities. The percent of site visits to non-participating LEAs ranged from 0% to 87% with an average of 22% (SD=23%, n=79). (Eighteen LELs did not know how many visits were to non-participating LEAs.) Most LELs (80%) indicated they were responsible for providing services to all LEAs in



their area of responsibility, and 20% indicated they were responsible for providing services only to grantees.

LELs reported how many presentations they made at local, regional, or national highway safety conferences in the past 12 months. The range of the 100 responses was 0 to 80, with an average of 5.6, a median of 2, and an SD of 12.2. The distribution indicated that 70% of LELs reported making at least one presentation.

LELs provided importance ratings of various knowledge, skills, and abilities for meeting their responsibilities: (1) Not Important at All, (2) Slightly Important, (3) Moderately Important, (4) Very Important, and (5) Absolutely Essential. Table 10 provides the average and standard deviation of ratings across the 105 responses. The higher the average rating, the greater the level of perceived importance. Six characteristics had average importance ratings of 4.5 or higher. These six characteristics are education and experience as a law enforcement officer, understanding of State traffic safety laws, connections with LEAs in the jurisdiction, strong interpersonal skills, and good oral communication skills. The relative low rating for “Specific jurisdictional crash data knowledge” is also important to note given that crash data collection starts with the police report, which in turn affects NHTSA data systems such as the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS).

*Table 10. Importance Ratings of Characteristics for Meeting LEL Responsibilities*

<b>LEL Q20. Characteristics for Meeting LEL Job Responsibilities</b>	<b>Average (SD)</b>
20a. Graduation from an accredited law enforcement agency (e.g., a “peace officer” certification)	4.5 (0.8)
20f. Knowledge of general police methods, practices, and procedures	4.5 (0.7)
20k. Connections with LEAs in jurisdiction	4.5 (0.7)
20d. Demonstrated knowledge, understanding, and application of State traffic safety laws	4.5 (0.6)
20q. Strong interpersonal skills	4.5 (0.6)
20n. Good oral communications skills	4.5 (0.5)
20e. Traffic law enforcement experience	4.3 (0.9)
20s. Ability to manage several, concurrent tasks/relationships	4.3 (0.7)
20o. Good written communications skills	4.3 (0.6)
20g. Knowledge of State highway safety grant programs and administration	4.1 (0.8)
20r. Facilitation and leadership experience	4.0 (0.8)
20j. Understanding of traffic safety data, trends and analysis	3.9 (0.8)
20m. Participation in continuing education training	3.8 (0.9)
20t. Project management, administrative process and procedure, and management abilities	3.8 (0.9)
20p. Computer proficiency	3.8 (0.7)
20i. Specific jurisdictional crash data knowledge	3.7 (0.9)
20h. Prior experience in your assigned highway safety program areas	3.6 (1.0)
20l. Experience training others	3.6 (0.9)
20c. Law enforcement supervisory, administrative, and/or command level position and experience	3.4 (1.2)
20u. Developing or acquiring promotional material/equipment	3.4 (1.0)
20b. Bachelor’s degree from an accredited college/university	2.1 (1.1)

LELs reported what information their supervisors or managers required them to maintain and report in performance of their responsibilities (see Table 11). Five respondents did not check any of the nine items. The “other” responses provided by 15 LELs included weekly reports, grant-related equipment distribution, monthly progress reports, community and school visits, presentations (e.g., awards, other recognitions), and HVE events with grantees.

*Table 11. Information LELs Required to Maintain and Report to Their Supervisors*

<b>LEL Q21. Information Required to Maintain or Report to Supervisor in Performance of LEL Duties</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents (n=100)</b>
Number of LEA contacts made remotely (not in-person)	69%
Number of in-person LEA visits/meetings	84%
Number of grantees	43%
Number of participating LEAs (full and mini mobilizations)	58%
Number of training sessions conducted	58%
Number of officers trained	43%
Quantity of public outreach material distributed to LEAs and their programs	35%
Attendance at local highway safety events and regional conferences	91%
Other	15%

LELs indicated how frequently they interacted with a list of entities when performing their work. LELs most frequently (at least monthly) interacted with their supervisors and others in the SHSO, line level law enforcement officers, LEA supervisors and managers, other LELs within their States, and grantee and non-grantee LEAs. LELs least frequently interacted with prosecutors, judicial officials or staff, traffic engineers, the NHTSA Region offices, GHSA, and NHTSA program managers. (Table A-2 in the Appendix contains the complete results.)

LELs rated the effectiveness of various ways they could communicate with prospective grantees. Table 12 presents the number of LELs selecting each effectiveness rating and the average rating. It shows that the most effective perceived means of communication were in-person (face-to-face) meetings, law enforcement organizational meetings, and conversations and presentations at conferences. The least effective means were fax and mailings.

*Table 12. Effectiveness Ratings for Modes of Communication with Prospective Grantees*

<b>LEL Q23. Communication Mode</b>	<b>Total Respondents with Rating</b>	<b>Average Rating (SD)</b>
23k. In-person (face-to-face) meetings	102	4.8 (0.5)
23l. Law enforcement organizational meetings (i.e., chiefs, FOP, advisory board, etc.)	100	4.4 (0.9)
23m. Conversation/presentations at local/regional conferences/banquets/special events	101	4.3 (0.8)
23b. Email - personal messages	103	4.0 (0.8)
23a. Telephone and/or conference calls	104	3.9 (0.9)
23i. LEL Traffic Stop	89	3.6 (1.0)
23j. LEL newsletter	85	3.5 (1.0)
23h. LEL webinars	93	3.3 (1.1)
23c. Email – eblasts	98	3.3 (1.0)
23d. Website	86	3.1 (1.0)
23e. Social media (Facebook/Twitter posts)	78	3.1 (1.0)
23g. Mailings	71	2.6 (1.2)
23f. Fax	66	2.0 (1.1)

### **Material and Resources Used by LELs**

LELs indicated the frequency with which they used various resources in support of their work. As shown in Table 13, the most frequently used resources (at least monthly) included the weekly LEL email (Traffic Stop), the LEL webinar Series, local LEL electronic networks, and the

NHTSA website. Resources that were likely to be used once or twice a year included established training criteria, grants management manuals, State Highway Safety Plans, and Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act legislation. The NLELP podcasts and the NLELP Twitter and Facebook postings were the resources that had the largest number of LELs who reported never using them.

*Table 13. Frequency of Resources Used in Support of LEL Work*

<b>LEL Q 24. Frequency of Access to Support LEL Work Resources</b>	<b>Daily</b>	<b>Weekly</b>	<b>Monthly</b>	<b>Quarterly</b>	<b>Twice a year</b>	<b>Once a year</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
24a. Established training criteria (e.g., Traffic Safety Institute (TSI) training material)	3	6	25	17	16	15	19	4	105
24b. Grants management manuals/guidance (e.g., funding policy, OMB cost principles, performance measures)	2	8	14	14	14	19	28	5	104
24c. State Highway Safety Plans	2	5	22	26	18	21	10	1	105
24d. FAST Act legislation (e.g., legislation, factsheets, guidance, and regulations)	0	5	12	14	9	24	40	1	105
24e. NHTSA Website	1	14	37	27	8	10	5	3	105
24f. TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov	1	9	23	21	5	5	38	1	103
24g. NHTSA Region Web Page	0	3	20	21	11	10	34	5	104
24h. Data Sites (e.g., NHTSA, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), for crash data)	2	12	35	25	15	6	4	4	103
24i. LEL webinar Series	0	2	57	19	6	6	13	2	105
24j. Internal policy manuals	5	7	17	20	9	17	24	6	105
24k. NLELP website	1	5	28	14	5	7	43	1	104
24l. NLELP podcasts	0	1	19	8	12	2	62	0	104
24m. Twitter and Facebook postings of NLELP	6	7	15	4	3	1	66	1	103
24n. Local/in-State LEL electronic networks	12	23	18	10	2	1	36	1	103
24o. LEL list serve	1	16	31	9	2	10	27	7	103
24p. Weekly LEL email (Traffic Stop)	0	74	16	3	0	1	10	0	104
24q. Quarterly LEL newsletter (The LEL)	0	5	11	76	1	1	10	0	104

LELs reported whether they were aware of TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov. Of the 103 responses, 58% indicated “Yes.” Of the 60 respondents who indicated awareness, 77% indicated that they used the material. LELs who reported not using the material mentioned using their own material, referring LEAs to the site, letting the public information officer handle resource needs, and feeling an indifference towards the content. Less than half (44%) of the respondents were aware of and used TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov. The 46 LELs who used the material were asked to specify which material they used. Table 14 presents the results. It shows that just over three-quarters of those who use TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov use the Fact Sheets and about half use PEAK and images/logos. Flyers, forms, and radio ads were among the material used by the fewest LELs.

Table 14. LEL Use of Material Found on TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov

TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov Material	Percent of Respondents Using Material (n=46)
Products for Enforcement Action Kits (PEAK)	52% (24)
Posters	35% (16)
Banners	28% (13)
Images or logos	50% (23)
Fact sheets	76% (35)
Press releases	52% (24)
Flyers	46% (21)
Radio ads	13% (6)
TV ads	11% (5)
Forms	7% (3)
Tool kits	39% (18)
Other (links, converted files, and NHTSA calendar)	7% (3)

LELs rated the usefulness of the material found on TrafficSafetyMarketing.gov on a scale of 1 (not useful at all) to 5 (extremely useful). The plurality of respondents (45% or 21 of 46) indicated the material were “3 - moderately useful” followed by 30% selecting “4 - very useful,” 20% selecting “5 - extremely useful,” and 5% selecting “2 - slightly useful.” There were no ratings of “1 - not at all useful.” Some LELs provided reasons for their ratings. LELs who rated the material “slightly useful” mentioned difficulty for agencies to use and a lack of local information. LELs who rated the material “moderately useful” mentioned file formats not conducive for downloads, outdated material, a need for other languages, a need for better graphics, and video ads being useful. LELs who rated the material “very useful” mentioned accessibility, wide variety of resources, high quality of images/graphics, useful information, useful sample press releases and fact sheets, and an inability to move through site easily. LELs who rated the material as “extremely useful” mentioned very useful material, very useful logos and images for social media, and the website needing updating and not being user friendly.

### Training Received as an LEL

LELs indicated from a list of training programs whether they had attended them. As shown in Table 15, nearly 80% of respondents attended SFST training, and nearly three-fourths attended LEL Professional Development. Two other training courses were attended by at least half of the LELs: Instructor Development and Data Driven Approaches to Highway Safety Planning. Nearly half of LELs attended ARIDE Classroom Training. Programs with low responses were Aging Road User Program Management (12%) and Communication Skills for the Highway Safety Professional (15%). LELs were asked whether they had participated in formal training other than the programs listed. Of the 104 LELs, 43 (41%) indicated “Yes,” and 39 listed the courses. These courses included Accident Investigation, Below 100, Blue Courage, CarFit, Child Passenger Safety, Crash Recognition, Drug Abuse Resistance Education or DARE, and Heavy-Truck Enforcement.

Table 15. LEL Training Program Attendance

LEL Q26. Training Program Attendance	Percent of Respondents (n)	
	Yes	Total
26a. Law Enforcement Liaison Professional Development	72% (75)	104
26b. Instructor Development	60% (61)	101
26c. Communication Skills for the Highway Safety Professional	15% (15)	100
26d. Managing Highway Safety Programs	34% (34)	101
26e. Managing NHTSA Grant Funds	32% (32)	101
26f. Data Driven Approaches to Highway Safety Planning	58% (60)	104
26g. Speed Program Management	29% (28)	97
26h. Impaired Driving Program Management	29% (29)	99
26i. Aging Road User Program Management	12% (11)	96
26j. Motorcycle Safety Program Management Virtual Live	14% (14)	97
26k. Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies	37% (36)	98
26l. History of Occupant Protection E-Learning	16% (16)	98
26m. Occupant Protection Program Management	22% (21)	94
26n. Intro. to Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Program Management Virtual Live	10% (10)	98
26o. Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Program Management Workshop	11% (11)	98
26p. Distracted Driving Enforcement Strategies	37% (36)	98
26q. History of Speed Program Management E-learning	12% (12)	98
26r. Educating Law Enforcement Officers on Older Driver Issues	22% (22)	98
26s. ARIDE (Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement) Online Training	12% (12)	98
26t. ARIDE Classroom Training	47% (46)	98
26u. DRE (Drug Recognition Expert)	24% (23)	96
26v. SFST (Standardized Field Sobriety test)	78% (79)	101
26w. Impaired Driving Leadership Summit	18% (18)	98
26x. Milestones of Highway Safety Program Development E-learning	15% (14)	96

### LEL Performance Evaluation

LELs reported whether their work performance was evaluated. Of the 104 who responded, 72% indicated “Yes.” Those who responded in the affirmative were asked to describe how they were evaluated. Most stated annual review, guidelines of LEL duties, meeting established goals, number of contacts, and number of grantees. LELs reported how often they received feedback from their supervisor regarding their job performance. As shown in Table 16, the plurality of respondents indicated receiving feedback annually (32%), followed by weekly and monthly by approximately one-fifth of respondents each.

Table 16. Frequency LELs Receive Job Performance Feedback

LEL Q28b. Frequency of Feedback from Supervisor Regarding LEL Job Performance	Percent of Respondents
Daily	5% (4)
Weekly	22% (16)
Monthly	20% (15)
Every-Other-Month (Bi-Monthly)	3% (2)
Every Three Months (Quarterly)	3% (2)
Every 6 Months (Semi-Annually)	8% (6)
Once a Year (Annually)	32% (24)
Other (e.g., after programs, sporadic)	7% (5)
Total	100% (74)

LELs identified, from a list, the metrics their supervisors used to evaluate their work. As shown in Table 17, most respondents indicated that job performance evaluations were based on the number of in-person LEA visits (78%). Traffic safety outcomes in their area of responsibility was mentioned by the smallest proportion of respondents (27%). Nine of the 20 who indicated traffic safety outcomes provided the following specific metrics: crash data, arrests and citations, reduction in fatalities or serious crashes, and increase in seat belt use. The “other” metrics listed by 15 respondents included timeliness, completeness, and low error rate of crash reports, making sure programs, enforcement, and grant information is given to all participating and non-participating LEAs, communications with agencies, problem solving, keeping LEAs on grant tasks, and adhering to performance measures of the grant manager. One result to note is that almost half of the LELs indicated supervisors evaluated them based in part upon “Performance of grantees in your area of responsibility,” which could lead to higher levels of LEA participation.

*Table 17. Metrics Used by Supervisors Evaluating LEL Job Performance*

<b>LEL Q28c. Metrics Supervisors Use to Evaluate LELs Job Performance</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents (n=73)</b>
Number of LEA contacts made remotely (not in-person)	63% (46)
Number of in-person LEA visits/meetings	78% (57)
Number of grantees	37% (27)
Number of participating LEAs (full and mini mobilizations)	60% (44)
Number of training sessions conducted	47% (34)
Number of officers trained	33% (24)
Quantity of public outreach material distributed to LEAs and their programs	30% (22)
Attendance at local highway safety events and regional conferences	69% (50)
Performance of grantees in your area of responsibility (their seat belt and speeding citation and impaired-driving arrest activity during grant-funded enforcement)	47% (34)
Traffic safety outcomes in your area of responsibility (e.g., reductions in fatalities or serious injuries in traffic crashes)	27% (20)
Other (specify)	20% (15)

### **LEAs Within LELs’ Areas of Responsibility**

LELs reported whether participating LEAs in their areas of responsibility received highway safety grant funding. As shown in Table 18, most LELs indicated that some, but not all, of their participating LEAs received grant funding. Just over one-quarter reported that all participating LEAs received grant funding.

*Table 18. Grant Funding for Participating LEAs*

<b>LEL Q29. Do Participating LEAs in Your Area of Responsibility Receive Highway Safety Grant Funding</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Yes, all participating LEAs receive grant funding	27% (27)
Some, but not all, participating LEAs receive grant funding	67% (69)
No, none of the participating LEAs receive grant funding	1% (1)
Don't know	5% (5)
Total	100% (102)

LELs provided (a) the number of LEAs in their area of responsibility, and of this count, (b) the number participating in highway safety programs in 2018. The survey asked for these counts by LEA type and for the totals across all LEA types. The analyst used the totals across LEA types and calculated the percentage of LEA participation by LEL. Excluded from this summary are 19 LELs who indicated that they had no LEAs in their coverage, which appears to have resulted from skipping the question rather than representing an actual zero. Table 19 presents summary statistics across the remaining 86 respondents, and it shows that the LEA participation rates ranged from 0% to 100% and averaged 58%.

*Table 19. LEA Participation Rate Across All Respondents and All LEA Types*

<b>Summary Statistics for LEL Q30. Across All LEA Types</b>	<b>Total Number of LEAs in Your Area of Responsibility</b>	<b>Number of LEAs in Your Area of Responsibility Who Participated</b>	<b>% Participation</b>
Number of Respondents	86	86	86
Range	3 – 643	0 – 564	0% - 100%
Average	134.4	66.9	58%
SD	146.7	93.2	32%

LELs reported the number of LEAs recruited in 2018 for grant activity across several program areas. Fifty-three LEL skipped the question, leaving responses for 52 LELs. Table 20 shows that there was wide variation in the recruitment counts across the 52 respondents. However, the areas with the highest average LEA recruitment counts were in the areas of occupant protection, impaired driving, and speed management.

*Table 20. Number of LEAs Recruited in 2018 for Grant Activity, by Program Area*

<b>LEL Q 31. Highway Safety Program Area</b>	<b>Number of LEAs Recruited in 2018 (n=52 Respondents)</b>			
	<b>Range</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>
31a. Impaired Driving	0 - 180	16.8	32.8	4.5
31b. Occupant Protection	0 – 180	23.1	36.6	8
31c. Distracted Driving	0 - 117	11.8	25.1	1.5
31d. Unsafe (Aggressive) Driving Behavior	0 - 117	12.7	25.7	0
31e. Speed Management	0 - 180	15.4	34.2	2
31f. Motorcycle Safety	0 - 100	8.2	21.9	0
31g. Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety	0 - 87	6.5	17.1	0
31h. School Bus Safety	0 - 100	6.2	20.1	0
31i. Teen Drivers	0 - 117	10.0	25.8	0
31j. Improvement of Traffic Records	0 - 280	13.0	50.5	0
31k. Enhancement of Emergency Services	0 - 10	0.2	1.4	0

LELs reported whether they used crash data to help recruit LEAs to participate in NHTSA’s highway safety programs. Most LEL (84%) answered in the affirmative. LELs also reported whether they participated in the evaluation of grant applications. Slightly more than half (53%) answered in the affirmative. Fifty of the 56 who evaluated grant applications provided descriptions of the criteria and processes used to select LEA grantees. These criteria were primarily crash injury and fatality data, traffic outcome measure data, and enforcement activity.

LELs identified whether they used unique approaches to encourage more LEAs to participate in grants and other highway safety activities. Of the 100 LELs who responded, 26 indicated using unique approaches (e.g., community partnerships, crash matrix, crash report commitments, lunch

meetings (quarterly), media posts, personal meetings, and using nearby participating LEA examples). Some highlighted approaches included:

- Establish a relationship with non-participating LEAs at seminars, trainings, and conferences,
- Show jurisdictions the advantages of having more officers on the road,
- Stress the Data-Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS) approach to LEAs (e.g., criminal benefit of making a traffic stop), and
- Stress to LEAs to focus on all the “traffic problem areas” when they are on overtime details.

LELs indicated whether they encountered LEAs who refused or were hesitant to participate in traffic safety and enforcement programs. Most LELs (82%) indicated they did. Those who answered “Yes,” were asked to identify the LEA types (see Table 21). Nearly 90% of LELs identified municipal police departments and nearly 80% identified sheriffs’ offices as the LEA types that pose the greatest recruitment challenges. LELs who answered “Yes” also were asked how they responded upon encountering an agency that is hesitant or refuses to participate. Most LELs (80%) continued to encourage participation through contact on a regular basis and try not to disengage with LEAs.

*Table 21. LEA Types Hesitant or Reluctant to Participate in Traffic Safety Programs*

<b>LEL Q35a. LEA Types Who Refuse or Are Hesitant to Participate</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents (n=86)</b>
Municipal police departments (city, town, borough, township, etc.)	90% (77)
State police organizations	7% (6)
Sheriffs’ offices	79% (68)
University LEAs	26% (22)
Tribal LE	12% (10)

LELs estimated the percentage of LEAs who were eligible for highway safety grant funding but did not elect to participate in the funded programs. Percentages ranged from 0% to 100% for the 85 LELs who provided a response, with an average of 32% (SD=31%) and a median of 20%. LELs identified reasons that LEAs and law enforcement leaders provided for not participating in funded traffic safety programs. As Table 22 shows, the most frequent responses were insufficient staffing (90%), lack of interest by chief/sheriff (75%), and competing overtime opportunities (67%). Twenty-four of the 47 respondents who indicated “political permission” provided descriptions, which largely included concerns about reelection, reluctance to ticket “voters,” and lack of prosecutorial support. “Other” reasons provided by 25 respondents related to disinterest with paperwork and SHSO scrutiny, preferring equipment instead of overtime for officers, needing disengagement (e.g., Ferguson Factor), no jurisdictional support, not enough incentives (e.g., equipment), avoiding overtime expenses for traffic court hearings, and “it’s unconstitutional” (for seat belt law enforcement).



Table 22. Reasons Provided by LEAs for Non-Participation in Traffic Safety Programs

LEL Q37. Reasons for Non-Participation by LEAs in Funded Traffic Safety Programs	Percent of Respondents (n=99)
Competing priorities	58% (57)
Insufficient staffing	90% (89)
Insufficient resources (e.g., funding equipment)	41% (41)
Lack of required training	9% (9)
Political permission	48% (47)
Lack of understanding of grant application process	12% (12)
No highway safety champion in the LEA	28% (28)
Prefer to operate independently without grant funding	30% (30)
Require overtime funding for traffic enforcement	15% (15)
Not interested in traffic enforcement	44% (44)
"Program fatigue"	19% (19)
No perceived traffic safety problem	21% (21)
Data do not support the traffic safety efforts	14% (14)
Minimal traffic volume with few to no crashes occurring	23% (23)
Lack of interest by chief/sheriff	75% (74)
Lack of interest with officers/deputies	60% (59)
Competing overtime opportunities	67% (66)
Legal challenges to enforcing current State highway safety laws (e.g., prohibitions for using checkpoints; no primary belt laws; specific legislative conditions such as prohibition on the use of speed measuring devices)	11% (11)
Disagree with premise of traffic laws	12% (12)
Concern for officer safety during traffic stops	3% (3)
Technical challenges to enforcement exist (e.g., ability to monitor drivers for distraction, observing nighttime seat belt use, etc.)	5% (5)
Other (specify)	13% (13)

### How LELs Use Traffic Safety Performance Measures

LELs reported whether they used traffic safety performance measures to determine the effectiveness of program activities. Of the 103 who responded, 70 (68%) indicated “Yes,” four (4%) indicated “No,” and 29 (28%) indicated they did not know. For those who responded “Yes,” injury and fatality crash data, enforcement activity, seat belt use, traffic arrest and violation data, and other traffic safety outcome measures were the main traffic performance measures. LELs identified who defined the goals: LEL, SHSO, a collaboration, or another entity. Of the 69 respondents, the plurality (32 or 46%) indicated the SHSO (or sponsoring agency), followed by 26 (38%) who indicated the goals were set as a collaboration between the LEL and SHSO, and one LEL indicated that each LEL defines their own goals. Ten respondents (15%) indicated that an “other” entity set the goals for the outcome measures: SHSOs, Traffic Safety Commissions, GHSA, NHTSA region in collaboration with SHSOs, and LEAs.

### Respondents’ State LEL Programs

LELs reported the number of LEL-type positions (including both full-time and part-time) in their States. Within the 40 States represented, six had only one LEL, 15 States had two to five LELs, 16 States had six to 10 LELs, and three States had more than 10 LELs.

LELs reported whether the State had a standardized process to identify LEAs to be funded versus those who would voluntarily participate. Of the 101 respondents, just over half (54%) indicated

standardized process. Of those who indicated the State used a standardized process, 42 provided a description of their process, and practically all responses referenced data-driven approaches based on crash injuries and fatalities.

LELs reported whether their State used benchmarks to evaluate the level of enforcement activity of each LEA grantee. Of the 98 respondents, 66% replied in the affirmative. Of those who responded in the affirmative, 51 provided a description, and most mentioned (traffic enforcement) contacts per hour benchmarks.

LELs identified items their States included in the LEL program budget from a list. Table 23 provides the number and percent of LELs selecting each item for the 100 who responded. The eight “Other” responses mentioned training program support and travel to attend conferences.

*Table 23. Items Included in Respondents’ LEL Program Budget*

<b>LEL Q42. Items Included in LEL Program Budget</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents (n=100)</b>
LEL salaries	91%
Travel costs (e.g., mileage)	89%
State vehicle	19%
Public outreach material	39%
Signs, message boards, equipment, etc.	34%
Training supplies and equipment	50%
Conference fees	86%
Meals, motel lodging, other incidentals	91%
Recognition material (e.g., ribbons, coins, etc.)	24%

LELs provided additional information they believed would be helpful in enhancing the understanding of how they apply their skills and use highway safety resources to reduce motor-vehicle-related injuries and fatalities. Thirty-four LELs provided comments. Most of the comments related to the following:

- Need for more involvement in grant process
- Promotion of highway campaigns all year
- Provision for overtime funding
- Provision for equipment in grants
- Provision of flexibility with funding amounts in grants
- Need for a higher level of grant oversight
- Need for more face-to-face meetings with LEAs
- Importance of LEL experience in law enforcement for instant credibility
- Ability to develop interpersonal relationships and friendships with agency representatives
- Success in enlisting new mobilization participants
- Need for higher quality of crash reporting

LELs provided suggestions for how the LEL position or LEL program could be improved. Comments from the 39 LELs related to the following: provide website for LELs covering news

of their efforts across States, promote full-time positions, promote higher ranking law enforcement candidates for LEL positions, provide more training opportunities for LEAs, provide more traffic enforcement equipment (e.g., passive breath testers, radars, lasers, duty bags), recognize differences in each State's traffic safety issues and traffic enforcement culture, have an up-to-date LEL directory, and allow more flexibility in funding resources.

## Results: LEA Participation by Select LEL Questions

An important LEL program characteristic is its success in encouraging LEAs to participate in NHTSA-sponsored traffic safety programs. The survey included a question that could be used as an outcome measure to analyze LEL success in encouraging LEAs to participate in NHTSA-sponsored programs. Each LEL reported the number of LEAs in their area of responsibility, and of those, the number that participated in NHTSA's highway safety programs in 2018. The analyst calculated the participation rate for each respondent and binned the percentages into quartiles.

Table 24 reports the number of LELs and associated States across the four participation quartiles. The 19 LELs who indicated that they had no LEAs in their coverage area and recruited no LEAs in 2018 are not included in the analyses in this section. As described earlier, it is likely that most of the LELs with zeroes in these columns had skipped the question. The remaining 86 LELs provided responses across all four quartiles. In fact, 20% of the LELs reported the lowest quartile of participation (0% to 25%), and 31% reported the highest quartile (76% to 100%).

*Table 24. Number of LEL Respondents and States by LEA Participation Rate Category*

<b>% of LEA Participation</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Number of States</b>	<b>Number of LEAs in Coverage Area (Range and Median)</b>
0% to 25%	17	13	7 to 300 (median: 131)
26% to 50%	15	8	20 to 513 (median: 165)
51% to 75%	27	19	9 to 568 (median: 105)
76% to 100%	27	15	3 to 643 (median: 27)
Total	86		

Table 25 examines the relationship between the LEL duty status (full-time versus part-time) and the participation rate. While it appears that the part-time LELs tended to have higher participation rates, a chi-squared test did not indicate statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level.

*Table 25. LEA Participation by Work Status*

<b>% of LEA Participation</b>	<b>Full-time LELs (Column %)</b>	<b>Part-time LELs (Column %)</b>	<b># Respondents</b>
0% to 25%	25%	14%	17
26% to 50%	21%	14%	15
51% to 75%	33%	30%	27
76% to 100%	21%	43%	26
Total	100% (48)	100% (37)	85

Note: Chi-squared = 5.53, d.f. = 3, p = 0.14

A separate analysis compared the average LEA participation rate for the 45 LELs who participated in evaluating grant applications to the 41 LELs who did not. The averages were almost identical (59% versus 58%), and a t-test found no statistically significant difference in the averages.

Table 26 examines the relationship between LEL work performance evaluation and the participation rate. While it appears that LELs whose work was not evaluated tended to have higher participation rates, a chi-squared test did not indicate statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level. A separate analysis compared the average LEA participation rate for those whose

performance was evaluated to those whose performance was not evaluated. A t-test of the difference (56% versus 66%) found it was not statistically significant.

*Table 26. LEA Participation by Whether LEL Work Performance Evaluated*

<b>% of LEA Participation</b>	<b>Yes (Column %)</b>	<b>No (Column %)</b>	<b>Total</b>
0% to 25%	24%	9%	17
26% to 50%	19%	13%	15
51% to 75%	27%	43%	27
76% to 100%	30%	35%	27
<b>Total</b>	<b>100% (63)</b>	<b>100% (23)</b>	<b>86</b>

Note: Chi-squared = 3.87, d.f. = 3, p = 0.28

Table 27 examines the relationship between grant funding and the participation rate. The column percentages do not indicate a substantial difference in participation rates between the 23 respondents who indicated that all agencies received grant funding versus the 60 who indicated some (but not all) or none of their LEAs received grant funding. (Note that only one respondent indicated “no, none.”) A separate analysis compared the average LEA participation rate between the two groups. A t-test of the difference (64% versus 57%) found it was not statistically significant.

*Table 27. LEA Participation by LEA Grant Funding*

<b>% of LEA participation</b>	<b>Yes, all participating LEAs receive grant funding (Column %)</b>	<b>Some, but not all participating LEAs receive grant funding OR No, None (Column %)</b>	<b>Total</b>
0% to 25%	17%	18%	15
26% to 50%	13%	20%	15
51% to 75%	35%	32%	27
76% to 100%	35%	30%	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>100% (23)</b>	<b>100% (60)</b>	<b>83</b>

Note: Chi-squared = 0.62, d.f. = 3, p = 0.89

Table 28 examines the relationship between use of benchmarks for evaluating LEA enforcement activity and the participation rate. LELs whose States did not use benchmarks tended to have higher participation rates than those who did, and a chi-squared test indicated statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level. A separate analysis compared the average participation rate for the respondents who indicated that their States used benchmarks to those who indicated their States did not use benchmarks. A t-test found a statistically significant difference in average participation rates (54% versus 72%) as a function of use of benchmarks at the 0.05 level. However, it is not clear why States that use benchmarks would tend to have less participation than those who did not use benchmarks.

*Table 28. LEA Participation by Use of Benchmarks to Evaluate LEA Enforcement Activity*

<b>% of LEA participation</b>	<b>Yes, State uses benchmarks (Column %)</b>	<b>No, State does not use benchmarks (Column %)</b>	<b>Total</b>
0% to 25%	18%	15%	14
26% to 50%	24%	8%	15
51% to 75%	36%	23%	26
76% to 100%	22%	54%	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>100% (55)</b>	<b>100% (26)</b>	<b>81</b>

Note: Chi-squared = 9.12, d.f. = 3, p = 0.03

## Results: SHSO Question-by-Question Responses

This section presents results from the SHSO survey questions. As described in the Methodology section, the survey went to 59 SHSOs managers and supervisors, which resulted in 31 responses. The naïve response rate, which does not adjust for various types of non-response, is 53%. A subset of the SHSO questions were the same as those presented to the LELs to permit comparisons between the LELs and their managers. While there was one SHSO respondent per State, there were often several LEL respondents per State. Agreement between LEL and SHSO responses is described for this subset of questions, using phrases like “all LELs within a State,” or “at least one LEL within a State,” to describe the degree of agreement. As shown in Table 29, the SHSOs represented all 10 NHTSA Regions.

*Table 29. SHSO Survey Respondents by NHTSA Region*

NHTSA Region	Number of Respondents (SHSOs)
1	4
2	3
3	2
4	5
5	4
6	2
7	3
8	5
9	1
10	2
Total	31

### Overview of the LEL Positions Under Sponsorship

Like the responses from State LELs, nearly three-fourths (23) of the 31 SHSOs indicated that the title of the position of their State’s intermediaries between the SHSO and LEAs who promote and support traffic safety was “Law Enforcement Liaison.” Another 13% (4) indicated program manager or coordinator, and the remaining 13% (4) provided other responses.

SHSOs most frequently reported that they sponsored the LELs in their States (see Table 30). Other organizations either alone or in combination were law enforcement agencies, non-profit organizations, and academic institutions.

*Table 30. Organization/Agency that Sponsors the LELs in Respondents’ States*

SHSO Q2. Organization/Agency that Sponsors LELs	Percent of Respondents
State Highway Safety Office alone	55% (17)
Other alone	19% (6)
Several organizations	26% (8)
Total	100% (31)

SHSOs reported the number of LEL-type positions in their States, how many were full-time versus part-time, and the average number of hours per week the LELs performed their duties. Among the 31 SHSOs, 49% (15) indicated that all LELs in their States were full-time, 19% (6) indicated that they were part-time, and 32% (10) indicated a mix. SHSOs with full-time LELs reported that the work week averaged 39 hours (range 20 to 50 hours), whereas the average was 17 hours per week for the part-time LELs (range 5 to 30 hours).

SHSOs reported whether there was a written position description for the LELs in their States, and if so, whether the LEL Model Position Description was used as a guide. Most SHSOs (90%) indicated there was a written position description, and 55% indicated use of the LEL Model Position Description.

SHSOs rated the importance of various characteristics that may enable LELs to meet their responsibilities. Table 31 below provides the average and standard deviation of ratings. (Table A-3 in the Appendix contains the frequencies with which each rating of 1 through 5 was assigned.) The higher the average rating, the greater the perceived level of importance. The five highest rated characteristics focused on knowledge of police methods, understanding State traffic safety laws, connections with LEAs in the jurisdiction, strong interpersonal skills, and good oral communication skills. These five areas were also the highest ranked by LELs (see Table 10).

*Table 31. SHSO Importance Ratings of Characteristics for Meeting LEL Job Responsibilities*

<b>SHSO Q7. Characteristics for Meeting LEL Job Responsibilities</b>	<b>Average (SD)</b>
7q. Strong interpersonal skills	4.7 (0.6)
7n. Good oral communications skills	4.7 (0.5)
7d. Demonstrated knowledge, understanding, and application of State traffic safety laws	4.7 (0.5)
7k. Connections with LEAs in jurisdiction	4.5 (0.7)
7f. Knowledge of general police methods, practices and procedures	4.5 (0.7)
7e. Traffic law enforcement experience	4.5 (0.7)
7o. Good written communications skills	4.4 (0.7)
7a. Graduation from an accredited law enforcement agency	4.2 (1.0)
7s. Ability to manage several, concurrent tasks/relationships	4.1 (0.8)
7j. Understanding of traffic safety data, trends and analysis	4.1 (0.6)
7g. Knowledge of State highway safety grant programs and administration	4.0 (1.0)
7r. Facilitation and leadership experience	4.0 (0.7)
7p. Computer proficiency	3.9 (0.7)
7l. Experience training others	3.9 (0.7)
7t. Project management, administrative process and procedure, and management abilities	3.8 (0.9)
7m. Participation in continuing education training	3.7 (1.1)
7i. Specific jurisdictional crash data knowledge	3.7 (0.9)
7c. Law enforcement supervisory, administrative, and/or command level position and experience	3.3 (1.0)
7u. Developing or acquiring promotional material/equipment	3.3 (0.9)
7h. Prior experience in your assigned highway safety program areas	2.8 (1.1)
7b. Bachelor's degree from an accredited college/university	2.8 (1.0)

Note: n=31 except 7b and 7f, n=30

SHSOs reported whether LELs performed non-LEL-related tasks for the sponsoring agency in addition to their LEL responsibilities, and if so, identified them. Of the 31 respondents, 32% (10) responded “Yes.” This percentage compares to 40% of LELs who answered “Yes.” The non-LEL related activities identified by the SHSOs were training coordinators, traffic safety task force leadership, assisting FARS analysts, child passenger class instructor, media release writing assistance to LEAs, grant review assistance, seat belt use observations, organizing media and public education events, and maintaining website and social media accounts.

SHSOs reported how the sponsors’ LEL responsibilities were determined or assigned. Most SHSOs indicated LEL responsibilities were assigned to a specific region of the State (17 or 55%), followed by the entire State (11 or 35%). One SHSO indicated that State police assigned the LEL coverage area. One SHSO indicated LELs were assigned to specific municipalities, and

one indicated LEL assignments varied based on the safety topic. There were 26 States with responses to both surveys. There was agreement within 24 States with all respondents agreeing in 14 States.

Table 32 summarizes SHSO responses concerning LEL coverage by program area in their States. The results are like the responses from LELs in Table 6.

*Table 32. Percent of SHSO Respondents Indicating LEL Coverage by Program Area*

<b>Highway Safety Program Area</b>	<b>Percent of States With at Least 1 LEL that Covers the Program Area (n=31)</b>
Impaired Driving	87% (27)
Occupant Protection	77% (24)
Speed Management	77% (24)
General Traffic Enforcement	77% (24)
Distracted Driving	74% (23)
Traffic Safety Related Training	74% (23)
Unsafe (Aggressive) Driving Behavior	68% (21)
Motorcycle Safety	68% (21)
Officer Safety	68% (21)
Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety	65% (20)
Teen Drivers	61% (19)
Improvement of Traffic Records	52% (16)
School Bus Safety	48% (15)
Enhancement of Emergency Services	29% (9)

SHSOs reported whether the LELs in their States were responsible for providing services to all LEAs in their area of responsibility or only to highway safety program grantees. Of the 31 respondents, 25 (81%) indicated all LEAs, and 6 (19%) said only to grantees. These proportions are like the LEL responses (80% all versus 20% only to grantees). However, of the 26 States with responses to both surveys, there was some disagreement in 10 States.

SHSOs reported what information LELs were required to maintain and report to their supervisors or managers in performance of their responsibilities. As seen in Table 33, 31 SHSOs responded. Proportions were higher for SHSOs than for the LELs for all but attendance at local highway safety events (see Table 11).

*Table 33. Information SHSOs Require from Their LELs to Document Performance*

<b>SHSO Q12. Reporting Information Required from LELs to Document Performance of their LEL Responsibilities</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents (n=31)</b>
Number of LEA contacts made remotely (not in-person)	77% (24)
Number of in-person LEA visits/meetings	90% (28)
Number of grantees	48% (15)
Number of participating LEAs (full and mini mobilizations)	68% (21)
Number of training sessions conducted	68% (21)
Number of officers trained	52% (16)
Quantity of public outreach material distributed to LEAs and their programs	39% (12)
Attendance at local highway safety events and regional conferences	87% (27)
Other (status reports, database reviews, monitoring grant compliance, managing alcohol/drug test results requested/obtained)	7% (2)



## How Sponsoring Agencies Assist and Communicate with LELs

SHSOs reported how many staff (including the respondent) manage or supervise the LELs in their States. The number ranged from one to four and averaged 2.1 (SD=0.87). The most frequent response was two managers (14 respondents), followed by one manager (eight respondents). Six SHSOs indicated their States had three LEL managers, and two indicated there were four LEL managers.

SHSOs identified the ways sponsoring agencies assist LELs in carrying out their responsibilities. Table A-4 in the Appendix presents the number and percent of SHSOs who identified each listed activity. The percentage of SHSOs who identified each activity was generally higher than that of LELs. Most SHSOs (80% or more) participated in the following activities: LEA recruitment (both face-to-face and electronically), tracking grantee enforcement activity (hours, citations) and public outreach, observing enforcement activity during program implementation, providing data and information to LEAs, attending/presenting/display booth at local highway safety events, attending officer recognition ceremonies, promoting highway safety campaign calendar, building relationships with LEA partners, advocates, stakeholders, and non-LEA partners, and providing links and acting as a point of contact between law enforcement community and SHSO. Activities in which fewer than half of SHSO survey respondents participate were developing and maintaining close working relationships with traffic courts and determining equipment needs for mobilizations.

SHSOs reported how frequently sponsoring agencies communicate with their LELs. The most frequent responses were daily and weekly (15 or 48% each). One SHSO indicated monthly. For comparison, the most frequent LEL response was weekly (34%), followed by daily (25%). Among the 26 States with responses to both surveys, there was agreement in 15 States with at least one of the LELs.

SHSOs rated the perceived effectiveness of various ways of communicating with LELs. Table 34 below shows that the perceived most effective means of communication were in-person (face-to-face) meetings, personal email messages, telephone and conference calls, and law enforcement organizational meetings. The least effective were fax and mailings. (Table A-5 in the Appendix presents the number selecting each effectiveness rating.)

*Table 34. Effectiveness Ratings for Modes of SHSO LEL Communications*

<b>SHSO Q16. Communication Mode</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Average Rating (SD)</b>
16a. Telephone and/or conference calls	29	4.48 (0.74)
16b. Email - personal messages	29	4.41 (0.68)
16c. Email – eblasts	24	3.42 (1.02)
16d. Website	23	3.26 (0.92)
16e. Social media (Facebook/Twitter)	22	3.27 (1.08)
16f. Fax	17	1.53 (0.72)
16g. Mailings	19	2.11 (0.88)
16h. In-person (face-to-face) meetings	26	4.96 (0.20)
16i. Law enforcement organizational meetings	23	4.43 (0.84)

## How Sponsoring Agencies Evaluate Job Performance

SHSOs reported whether someone within the sponsoring agency evaluated LEL work performance. Of the 31 SHSOs, 27 indicated “Yes” (87%), and four said, “No” (13%). Among the 26 States with responses to both surveys, there was disagreement in 11 States with at least one of the responding State LELs.

SHSOs who responded in the affirmative reported whether they were the individual within the agency that performed the evaluations. Of the 27 SHSOs, 18 indicated “Yes” (67%), and nine indicated “No” (33%). SHSOs reported whether the sponsoring agency provided information to the LELs about how they would be evaluated at the start of the evaluation period. Twenty-two (81%) indicated “Yes,” and five (19%) indicated “No.” SHSOs who responded in the affirmative primarily mentioned reviewing employee performance measurement plans, site visits and enforcement activity goals and expectations, goals aligned with grants, participation in mobilizations, and training sessions.

SHSOs reported how often the sponsoring agency provided performance feedback to LELs. Weekly was the most common response (26%) followed by twice a year (18%).

*Table 35. Frequency with which Supervisors Provide Job Performance Feedback to LELs*

<b>SHSO 17c. Frequency of Supervisor Feedback to LELs Regarding Job Performance</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Daily	11%
Weekly	26%
Monthly	11%
Every-other-month (bi-monthly)	4%
Every three months (quarterly)	4%
Every 6 months (semi-annually)	18%
Once a year (annually)	15%
Other (as needed and never)	11%
Total	100% (27)

SHSOs identified from a list what metrics the sponsoring agencies used to evaluate LELs. As shown in Table 36, most SHSOs indicated job performance evaluations were based on the number of in-person LEA visits (81%), followed closely by number of participating LEAs (77%). Traffic safety outcomes in their area of responsibility were mentioned by the smallest proportion of respondents (19%). LELs most frequently and least frequently selected these two metrics, respectively. The “other” metrics were completion of “Other Duties as Assigned,” DRE evaluations, and monitoring for compliance and accuracy.

Table 36. Metrics Used by Sponsoring Agency to Evaluate LEL Job Performance

SHSO Q17d. Metrics Supervisors Use to Evaluate LELs	Percent of Respondents (n=31)
Number of LEA contacts made remotely (not in-person)	55% (17)
Number of in-person LEA visits/meetings	81% (25)
Number of grantees	48% (15)
Number of participating LEAs (full and mini mobilizations)	77% (24)
Number of training sessions conducted	61% (19)
Number of officers trained	45% (14)
Quantity of public outreach material distributed to LEAs and their programs	39% (12)
Attendance at local highway safety events and regional conferences	65% (20)
Performance of grantees in your area of responsibility (their seat belt and speeding citation and impaired-driving arrest activity during grant-funded enforcement)	38% (12)
Traffic safety outcomes in your area of responsibility (e.g., reductions in fatalities or serious injuries in traffic crashes)	19% (6)
Other (specify)	10% (3)

### LEA Recruitment and Funding for NHTSA Highway Safety Grants

SHSOs reported the degree to which participating LEAs in their States received highway safety grant funding. Of the 31 responses, most (19 or 61%) indicated that some but not all participating LEAs received grant funding, and 11 (36%) indicated that all participating LEAs received funding. One SHSO indicated that no participating LEAs received grant funding. Among the 26 States with responses to both surveys, there was complete agreement in 7 States (all LELs agreed with the SHSO). For the remainder, disagreement occurred where the SHSO reported more LEAs receiving grants than the LEL respondent (11 cases of disagreement) and where the SHSO reported fewer LEAs receiving grants (8 cases of disagreement).

SHSOs reported who was responsible for evaluating the grant applications submitted by the LEAs. Of the 31 respondents, 15 (48%) indicated the sponsoring agency alone, 13 (42%) indicated the sponsoring agency in collaboration with the LELs, and three (10%) provided other responses.

SHSOs reported whether they participated in the evaluation of grant applications or provided input into the grantee selection process. Of the 31 respondents, 25 (81%) indicated that they participated. Those who answered in the affirmative were asked to describe the selection criteria and process, and 12 SHSOs reported that their evaluations were based on problem identification and past performance, crash data, alignment with highway safety targets, and agency risk assessment, built-in scoring and risk system in an electronic grant system, data-driven analysis of various criteria, grant review worksheets and scoring tools, problem ID model, and federal eligibility requirements.

SHSOs reported the number of LEAs that received grants in 2018 by program area. Most SHSOs provided counts. However, one left the program areas blank and reported more than 300 grants in the “other” category. Table 37 summarizes the responses provided by the SHSOs and shows that there was wide variation in the reported number of grantees. However, the areas with the most LEA grants were unsafe/aggressive driving, pupil transportation safety, motorcyclist safety, impaired driving, and occupant protection. The program areas with the fewest grants were enhancement of emergency services (where there were no grantees), traffic records improvement, and pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

Table 37. Number of LEAs Recruited in 2018 for Grant Activity, by Program Area

SHSO Q 21. Highway Safety Program Area	Number of LEAs that Received Grants in 2018 (n=14)			
	Range	Average	SD	Median
21a. Impaired Driving	18-300	97.4	85.2	57.5
21b. Occupant Protection	2-300	93.6	92.1	56
21c. Distracted Driving	1-300	82.1	97.9	32
21d. Unsafe (Aggressive) Driving Behavior	10-300	129	133	30
21e. Speed Management	5-300	72.4	90.2	39
21f. Motorcycle Safety	1-300	113.1	135.3	14
21g. Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety	1-250	29.8	62.9	9
21h. School Bus Safety	2-250	126	175.4	126
21i. Teen Drivers	1-250	69	115.3	1
21j. Improvement of Traffic Records	1-26	12.2	11.53	10
21k. Enhancement of Emergency Services	0-0	0	0	0

SHSOs reported whether the sponsoring agencies used crash data to help recruit LEAs to participate in NHTSA’s highway safety programs. Of the 31 respondents, 30 (97%) answered in the affirmative. This statistic corresponds to 84% for the LELs.

SHSOs reported whether their States’ LELs had developed unique approaches to encourage more LEAs to participate in grants, and if so, to describe them. Eleven of the 31 respondents (35%) answered “Yes” and provided law enforcement summits, town halls with LEAs, events in each of their districts such as 100 Deadliest Days, personal contacts with police chiefs and sheriffs, providing agency assistance such as taking their motor units to a specific jurisdiction to help with enforcement, taking the Highway Safety Manager with them on visits, one-on-one meetings with LEA command staff to review data and "sell" the benefits of an effective traffic safety focus, presenting at city councils and county board meetings, constantly traveling around the State for site visits to encourage participation, obtaining crash data for individual agencies to show specific long term trends, creating personalized LEA activity sheets for the agency to track data, accommodating the schedules of LEA grantee project directors, providing templates for organizing multi-jurisdictional enforcement efforts using tracking programs, online survey tools, media promotion, and area briefings coordinated by the LEL.

SHSOs reported whether their States had a specialized process to identify LEAs to be funded versus those who would voluntarily participate in NHTSA’s highway safety programs, and if so, to provide a description. Of the 31 respondents, 17 (55%) said “Yes,” and 10 provided descriptions of data-driven processes including traffic safety problem identification, review of data, risk assessment, past financial and performance measure reporting, electronic sign up system for participation in mobilizations and other grant activities, submission of formal proposal to be eligible for funding, priority based on fatal and serious injuries and prior year performance, scoring matrix including fatal and injury crashes, past grantee performance, reporting and claim accuracy, and LEL and grant administrator recommendations.

The percent of SHSOs who responded in the affirmative (55%) was higher than for LELs (47%). Of the 26 States with responses to both surveys, there was agreement among 12, complete disagreement between five, and disagreement with at least one of the responding LELs for nine. There was no discernable pattern among “yes” and “no” responses when SHSOs and LELs disagreed.

SHSOs reported the percentage of their LEAs eligible for highway safety grant funding but did not elect to participate. Percentages ranged from 0% to 75% for the 21 SHSOs who responded, with an average of 29% (SD = 25.5%) and a median of 20%.

SHSOs identified the reasons (from a list) that LEAs and law enforcement leaders provided for not participating in funded traffic safety programs. As Table 38 shows, the most frequent responses were insufficient staffing (97%), competing priorities (81%), and lack of interest by chiefs and sheriffs (74%). These reasons were also the top three provided by LEL survey respondents.

*Table 38. Reasons Selected by LEAs for Non-Participation in NHTSA Traffic Safety Programs*

<b>SHSO Q26. Reasons for Non-Participation by LEAs in Funded Traffic Safety Programs</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents (n=31)</b>
Competing priorities	81% (25)
Insufficient staffing	97% (30)
Insufficient resources (e.g., funding equipment)	42% (13)
Lack of required training	65% (2)
Political permission	45% (14)
Lack of understanding of grant application process	13% (4)
No highway safety champion in the LEA	36% (11)
Prefer to operate independently without grant funding	23% (7)
Require overtime funding for traffic enforcement	19% (6)
Not interested in traffic enforcement	52% (16)
"Program fatigue"	19% (6)
No perceived traffic safety problem	23% (7)
Data do not support the traffic safety efforts	10% (3)
Minimal traffic volume with few to no crashes occurring	10% (3)
Lack of interest by chief/sheriff	74% (23)
Lack of interest with officers/deputies	42% (13)
Competing overtime opportunities	65% (20)
Legal challenges to enforcing current State highway safety laws (e.g., prohibitions for using checkpoints; no primary belt laws; specific legislative conditions such as prohibition on the use of speed measuring devices)	7% (2)
Disagree with premise of traffic laws	3% (1)
Concern for office safety during traffic stops	3% (1)
Technical challenges to enforcement exist (e.g., ability to monitor drivers for distraction, observing nighttime seat belt use, etc.)	3% (1)
Other (specify)	13% (4)

The three who indicated “Other” provided the following reasons: a general reluctance to have an active traffic safety and enforcement program, too much paperwork required for reimbursement (2), lack of personnel and funding to pay for costs upfront and be reimbursed. Those who indicated political reasons provided the following explanations: avoid interaction with federal government, LEAs do not want to be proactive, traffic enforcement not a priority, sobriety checkpoints prohibited in State, roadside checkpoints not approved by city council, spotters for seat belt checks not approved, elected county sheriffs prefer warnings for voting residents, and local government officials getting seat belt or DUI ticket creates issues.

SHSOs were asked whether there were strategies for overcoming any of the barriers. Of the 19 respondents, 13 SHSOs provided strategies that included: (1) collaborating with the SHSO to develop strategies, (2) hosting regional meetings with chiefs and sheriffs, (3) reach out to

specific LEAs who could benefit, (4) use of data to show the effectiveness of mobilizations, (5) in-person meetings and providing examples of sheriffs who have taken a strong enforcement stance and were not voted out, (6) in-person meetings with chiefs of police and village managers to discuss any concerns they have, provide crash data, established protocols and reasoning and effectiveness for the type of enforcement, (7) use of hypothetical situations to help officials get a different perspective in the event a tragic crash should occur in their jurisdiction and traffic safety grant funds were turned down, (8) making statistics unrestrained crashes, impaired crashes, injuries and fatalities public, (9) asking State police to cover the areas that refuse to participate, (10) looking for when new LEA leadership comes on board, (11) emphasis of the positives of well-managed and supervised traffic enforcement projects, noting that “good traffic enforcement is good law enforcement,” protects the community, and provides an opportunity to educate and engage with citizens, (12) constant (relentless) meetings with LEAs, (13) more dedicated law enforcement funding, (14) providing examples of successes, especially sheriffs’ offices who have taken a strong enforcement stance (and were not voted out), and (15) interacting with the financial staff of the LEAs.

### **How Sponsoring Agencies Use Performance Measures**

SHSOs reported whether the sponsors’ highway safety programs used traffic safety performance measures to determine the effectiveness of program activities. Twenty-eight of 31 SHSOs (90%) replied in the affirmative. This percentage compares to 68% of the LEL survey respondents. SHSOs described their traffic safety performance measures and goals. Of the 28 who responded in the affirmative about using performance measures, 22 SHSOs provided descriptions:

- Aspirational targets for its performance measures, using a measured approach to reaching ‘zero’ within a 20-year timeline
- Citations, stops, and arrests
- Data-based performance measures and productivity measures (e.g. - contacts/hour)
- Impaired driving crashes, fatal crashes in a specified county, reduce all crashes in a specified county
- Number of arrests, citations, traffic contacts, education, etc.
- Reduction in serious injury and fatal crashes related to specific priority areas
- Reductions in targeted behavior areas
- State’s SHSO Plan

SHSOs reported who defines the goals for the outcome measures. Of the 28 SHSOs who indicated use of traffic safety performance measures, 18 (64%) indicated that the SHSO (or other sponsoring agency) set the goals, seven respondents (25%) indicated that goal setting was a collaboration between the LEL and SHSO, two respondents (7%) indicated that the LEA and the SHSO, in collaboration with their State Department of Public Health and Environment, defined the goals for the outcome measures, and one respondent (4%) indicated that the LEL defined the goals for their area of responsibility.

SHSOs reported whether their States used benchmarks to evaluate the level of enforcement activity of each LEA grantee. Of the 31 SHSOs, 21 (67%) responded in the affirmative. This

percentage is like the 66% of the State LELs who indicated use of benchmarks. There were 24 States with both SHSO and LEL responses. Of these States, there were five States with matched responses on both surveys for all responding LELs. There were 19 States with at least one of the LELs in a State responding differently than the SHSO.

Elaboration provided by SHSOs included the following:

- Contacts per hour
- Number of arrests/summons and written or verbal warnings
- Number of officers worked
- Crashes/fatalities in each overtime program area
- Number of citations/contacts
- Number of officers worked, number of hours worked, number of citations or warnings issued
- Stops per hour benchmark (minimum level) has been in place for many years

SHSOs identified, from a list, which items their program budget included. Table 39 provides the number and percent of SHSOs selecting each item. The two “other” responses included travel, survey equipment, conference fees, fees for websites, fringe benefits, and indirect costs.

*Table 39. SHSO Survey Response to Items Included in Respondents’ LEL Program Budget*

<b>SHSO Q29. Items Included in LEL Program Budget</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents (n=31)</b>
LEL salaries	97% (30)
Travel costs (e.g., mileage)	97% (30)
Meals, motel lodging, other incidentals	90% (28)
Conference fees	84% (26)
Training supplies and equipment	61% (19)
Public outreach material	45% (14)
Recognition materials (e.g., ribbons, coins, etc.)	36% (11)
Signs, message boards, equipment, etc.	32% (10)
State vehicle	23% (7)
Other (specify)	7% (2)

Several SHSOs provided additional information that they felt would be helpful to the project team’s understanding of how the LEL program works in their States. Responses from several of the SHSOs identified high rank in law enforcement, which usually comes with good communication and people skills, experience in traffic enforcement, and involvement in police training, as key. LELs with full-time positions in the States’ police academies bring credibility to the LEL position, as the visits and training are certified and count toward continuing education.

Only two SHSOs provided additional information about how the sponsoring agency manages and supports the LELs. They mentioned that the LEL position is based on SHSO support and recognizing the LEL position is never self-serving, that their base goals are to save lives and recognize law enforcement safety and priorities. The SHSO supports continuing education in highway safety.

SHSOs provided a profile of the LEL business model used in their States. Several SHSOs provided comments, including: (1) LELs represent the SHSO's ombudsman to LEAs, and their role is to encourage law enforcement leaders and officers to support the enforcement of traffic safety laws with a particular focus on NHTSA's key topics, (2) LELs need to have law enforcement experience, especially in traffic safety, (3) keep LELs in a working relationship with LEAs, but remove the program management task with grantees, (4) LELs need to establish relationships with community stakeholders (e.g., healthcare systems) to help promote the grantee programs, and (5) LELs need to continue being involved in update and instructor training, especially in Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) and Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST).



## Discussion

The LEL and SHSO survey responses showed that LELs focused on several key tasks to complete their mission of recruiting LEAs to participate in NHTSA's highway safety enforcement grants as well as helping LEAs maintain an overall mindset to promote enforcement of traffic laws in their communities. It was evident that LELs felt maintaining personal contact with LEAs, as well as with the stakeholders in the community, was important in achieving participation in grant programs. Also rated as important were opportunities for LELs to make their contacts and reinforce dialog from past site visits in an informal setting, such as at local and regional law enforcement conferences, luncheons, and other special events.

LEL comments often indicated that those with good communication skills, high energy, charisma, and organizational skills can achieve a high level of success in LEA recruitment for highway safety grants. LEL characteristics such as a high-ranking law enforcement background or experience operating traffic safety units assist in LEA recruiting efforts.

LELs with training in job-related topics, as well as those holding instructor credentials, appear to have an edge in reaching the interest and attention of their supervisors and LEAs. Many LEAs are interested in enforcement programs with training provided in the grant.

Practically all LELs reported that there is a written description for their position. While most reported that they strictly performed LEL duties for their sponsoring agency, 40% of the LELs reported performing duties other than those related to their LEL work. These included patrol and traffic duties, investigating crashes, instructing at trainings, conducting seat belt observations, inspecting car seats at check-up events, and assisting in emergency operations. In fact, 46% of respondents reported that their LEL position was part-time.

LEAs frequently inform LELs that they do not participate in grant programs due to insufficient staffing, lack of interest by chief or sheriff, competing overtime opportunities, and citizen complaints. Several LEL respondents offered that they present data showing the effectiveness of these mobilizations and success stories from other jurisdictions as strategies for overcoming barriers to participation. NHTSA used such an approach to share ideas in the NHTSA report, *High-Visibility Enforcement: Assessing Change and Identifying Opportunities* (Byrne, Petrella, & Masucci, 2021).

SHSO responses validated most of the LELs' descriptions. SHSOs also recognized the importance of site visits, the number of grantees, tracking grantee enforcement activity, providing crash data and other information, and promoting programs. However, SHSOs did not tend to place a high metric on grantee traffic safety outcomes as an evaluation measure of LEL job performance.

This study looked at factors that may influence LEA grant involvement rates. Analyses using rates of LEA participation in grants as a dependent variable and several LEL program characteristics as independent variables uncovered no patterns. Other factors not examined that may play a part in achieving LEA grant procurements and participation in NHTSA Highway Safety campaigns include:

- Size of the State (i.e., area, population, motor vehicle miles traveled),
- Types of LEAs (e.g., sheriff's offices, police departments),
- State traffic law differences (e.g., secondary versus primary seat belt laws),

- Enforcement culture (e.g., interest level of LEAs or local government to enforce traffic laws), and
- Officers' morale.

One limitation of the study, which may have affected the analysis of grant participation rates, is the response rate. It is unknown whether the 41% of the LELs who were invited to participate but chose not to do so are significantly different from the group who responded. In other words, the results indicated in this report could change if more LELs responded.

However, despite these challenges, specific LEL characteristics, such as superior communication and interpersonal skills, knowledge of State traffic safety laws and general police methods, connections with LEAs, and high energy and charisma were identified as important factors for a productive program.

## Appendix A: Additional Survey Response Tables

Table A-1. Participation in LEL-Related Activities

LEL Q 16. In which of the following activities do you participate, as part of your LEL work? (Check all that apply)	Percent of LELs (n=105)
<b>Grant-Related Activities</b>	
Site visit recruitment (face-to-face) of LEAs to participate	91% (95)
Email, telephone contact recruitment of LEAs to participate	89% (93)
Manage programs receiving grant funding	56% (59)
Track grantee enforcement activity (hours, citations)	63% (66)
Track grantee public outreach activity	37% (39)
Create and monitor enforcement budgets	31% (33)
Observe enforcement activity of participating LEAs during implementation	71% (74)
Conduct program audits	36% (38)
Prepare periodic activity reports	54% (57)
Prepare other reporting requirements	23% (24)
<b>Training</b>	
Participate in train-the-trainer classes or training in data collection methods	48% (50)
Participate in professional development training	80% (84)
Train LEAs with various training programs (check all that apply)	49% (51)
ARIDE (Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement)	15% (16)
DRE (Drug Recognition Expert)	14% (15)
SFST (Standardized Field Sobriety Test)	17% (18)
Speed management	10% (10)
TOPS (Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies)	8% (8)
Below 100	16% (17)
Large truck and bus	11% (11)
Motorcycle enforcement	11% (12)
Seat belt observations	17% (18)
School education	10% (10)
Use of data for high-visibility enforcement (HVE) programs	14% (15)
Child passenger safety	18% (19)
Other	14% (15)
<b>Providing Resources/Technical Support</b>	
Provide data and information to LEAs	88% (92)
Determine equipment needs for mobilizations	47% (49)
Plan/develop mobilizations/programs	58% (61)
Plan/develop border to border activities	56% (59)
Coordinate earned media efforts	42% (44)
Provide guidance and technical support to improve the effectiveness of enforcement strategies	71% (74)
Develop officer award/recognition programs	40% (42)
<b>Conferences/Meetings</b>	
Attend/present/display booth at local highway safety events	75% (79)
Attend/present/display booth at regional highway safety meetings	68% (71)
Attend officer recognition ceremonies	78% (82)
Present programs to the community	49% (51)
<b>Promote Programs</b>	
Promote highway safety campaign calendar	73% (77)
Provide link and act as point of contact between law enforcement community and SHSO	85% (89)
Develop and maintain close working relationships with traffic courts	14% (15)
Build relationships with SHSO staff and State Departments of Transportation (DOTs)/Departments of Motor Vehicles (DMVs)	64% (67)
Build relationships with law enforcement partners, advocates, stakeholders, and other partners	92% (97)
<b>Other Responsibilities</b>	16% (17)

Table A-2. LEL Interactions During the Performance of Their Work

LEL Q22. Individuals You Interact with in Performance of Your LEL work	Frequency of Communications (number of respondents)							Total	
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Twice a year	Once a year	Never		Other
22a. Line level law enforcement officers	44	29	16	7	2	2	3	2	105
22b. LE supervisors/managers	30	47	17	7	2	1	0	1	105
22c. LE executives (chiefs, sheriffs, State police executives)	14	36	28	14	6	5	0	2	105
22d. LELs within your State	32	30	22	7	4	2	3	4	104
22e. LELs outside your State	3	2	14	19	20	22	18	7	105
22f. Your LEA grantees	19	36	19	17	1	3	2	8	105
22g. Your non-grantee LEAs	6	29	23	16	7	9	7	8	105
22h. Prosecutors	1	13	15	11	11	14	32	8	105
22i. Judiciary	1	1	9	18	6	15	47	7	104
22j. Traffic engineers	1	5	15	25	12	10	34	3	105
22k. NHTSA Regional Office	0	4	15	16	19	21	22	7	104
22l. GHSA NLELP manager	0	6	7	10	7	16	51	6	103
22m. NHTSA headquarters: LEL or other program managers	2	7	15	18	15	17	26	3	103
22n. Your supervisors from the SHSO or sponsoring agency	26	36	22	12	2	2	3	2	105
22o. Highway Safety Office: other than your supervisor's	21	25	23	20	1	5	6	4	105

Table A-3. Importance Ratings of Characteristics for Meeting LEL Job Responsibilities

LEL Q20. Characteristics for Meeting LEL Job Responsibilities	Number of Respondents (N=105)				
	<i>1 Not Important at All</i>	<i>2 Slightly Important</i>	<i>3 Moderately Important</i>	<i>4 Very Important</i>	<i>5 Absolutely Essential</i>
20a. Graduation from an accredited law enforcement agency (e.g., a “peace officer” certification, in some States)	2	2	6	29	66
20b. Bachelor’s degree from an accredited college/university	40	25	27	12	1
20c. Law enforcement supervisory, administrative, and/or command level position and experience	13	9	26	39	18
20d. Demonstrated knowledge, understanding, and application of State traffic safety laws	0	1	4	37	63
20e. Traffic law enforcement experience	0	6	8	36	55
20f. Knowledge of general police methods, practices, and procedures	0	1	6	40	58
20g. Knowledge of State highway safety grant programs and administration	0	2	19	50	34
20h. Prior experience in your assigned highway safety program areas	4	9	34	38	20
20i. Specific jurisdictional crash data knowledge	1	10	27	46	21
20j. Understanding of traffic safety data, trends and analysis	0	6	17	60	21
20k. Connections with LEAs in jurisdiction	0	1	10	29	65
20l. Experience training others	2	11	35	40	17
20m. Participation in continuing education training	1	7	31	43	23
20n. Good oral communications skills	0	0	2	49	54
20o. Good written communications skills	0	0	5	61	39
20p. Computer proficiency	0	1	31	56	17
20q. Strong interpersonal skills	0	1	2	46	55
20r. Facilitation and leadership experience	1	6	13	58	27
20s. Ability to manage several, concurrent tasks/relationships	0	1	10	47	47
20t. Project management, administrative process and procedure, and management abilities	1	4	29	46	23
20u. Developing or acquiring promotional material/equipment	3	15	40	35	12

Table A-4. Ways SHSOs Assist State LELs in Carrying Out Responsibilities

SHSO Q 14. In what ways does your agency assist the LELs in carrying out their responsibilities? (Check all that apply)	Percent of Respondents (n=31)
<b>Grant-Related Activities</b>	
Site visit recruitment (face to face) of law enforcement agencies	87% (27)
Email, telephone contact recruitment of law enforcement agencies	94% (29)
Manage programs receiving grant funding	77% (24)
Track grantee enforcement activity (hours, citations)	87% (27)
Track grantee public outreach activity	77% (24)
Create and monitor enforcement budgets	68% (21)
Observe enforcement activity of participating LEAs during implementation	90% (28)
Conduct program audits	71% (22)
Prepare periodic activity reports	74% (23)
Prepare other reporting requirements	13% (4)
<b>Training</b>	
Participate in train-the-trainer classes or training in data collection methods	61% (19)
Participate in professional development training	81% (24)
Train LEAs with various training programs (check all that apply)	65% (20)
ARIDE (Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement)	45% (14)
DRE (Drug Recognition Expert)	48% (15)
SFST (Standardized Field Sobriety Test)	45% (14)
Speed management	29% (9)
TOPS (Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies)	13% (4)
Below 100 (seat belts, bullet-proof vests, speeding)	32% (10)
Large truck and bus	10% (3)
Motorcycle enforcement	19% (6)
Seat belt observations	32% (10)
School education	29% (9)
Use of data for high-volume enforcement programs	39% (12)
Child passenger safety	42% (13)
Other	19% (6)
<b>Providing Resources/Technical Support</b>	
Provide data and information to LEAs	100% (31)
Determine equipment needs for mobilizations	48% (15)
Plan/develop mobilizations/programs	83% (26)
Plan/develop border to border activities	77% (24)
Coordinate earned media efforts	77% (24)
Provide guidance and technical support to improve the effectiveness of enforcement strategies	81% (25)
Develop officer award/recognition programs	71% (22)
<b>Conferences/Meetings</b>	
Attend/present/display booth at local highway safety events	87% (27)
Attend/present/display booth at regional highway safety meetings	84% (26)
Attend officer recognition ceremonies	84% (26)
Present programs to the community (e.g., schools, EMTs, and businesses)	74% (23)
<b>Promote Programs</b>	
Promote highway safety campaign calendar	94% (29)
Provide link and act as point of contact between law enforcement community and SHSO	87% (27)
Develop and maintain close working relationships with traffic courts	32% (10)
Build relationships with SHSO staff and State DOTs/DMVs	81% (25)
Build relationships with LE partners, advocates, stakeholders, and non-LE partners	90% (28)

Table A-5. Effectiveness Ratings for Modes of SHSO LEL Communications

<b>SHSO Q16. Communication Mode (n=29)</b>	<b><i>1 Not Effective at All</i></b>	<b><i>2 Slightly Effective</i></b>	<b><i>3 Moderately Effective</i></b>	<b><i>4 Very Effective</i></b>	<b><i>5 Extremely Effective</i></b>	<b><i>N/A Have never used</i></b>	<b><i>Average Rating (SD)</i></b>
16a. Telephone and/or conference calls	0	0	4	7	18	0	4.48 (0.74)
16b. Email - personal messages	0	0	3	11	15	0	4.41 (0.68)
16c. Email – eblasts	0	4	11	4	5	5	3.42 (1.02)
16d. Website	0	4	12	4	3	6	3.26 (0.92)
16e. Social media (Facebook/Twitter)	0	6	8	4	4	7	3.27 (1.08)
16f. Fax	10	5	2	0	0	12	1.53 (0.72)
16g. Mailings	5	8	5	1	0	10	2.11 (0.88)
16h. In-person (face-to-face) meetings	0	0	0	1	25	3	4.96 (0.20)
16i. Law enforcement organizational meetings	0	1	2	6	14	6	4.43 (0.84)

DOT HS 813 259  
March 2022



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

