



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration**



DOT HS 813 392

March 2023

Characteristics of State Law Enforcement Liaison Programs: Case Studies

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., Alonge, M., & Quiñones, T. (2023, March). *Characteristics of state law enforcement liaison programs: Case studies* (Report No. DOT HS 813 392). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. DOT HS 813 392	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Characteristics of State Law Enforcement Liaison Programs: Case Studies	5. Report Date March 2023		6. Performing Organization Code
	7. Author Lawrence E. Decina, Mark Alonge, and Tatiana Quiñones		
9. Performing Organization Name and Address TransAnalytics, LLC 336 West Broad Street Quakertown, PA 18951	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)		
	11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH2216D00016/001, Optional Task 1		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, DC 20590	13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report		
	14. Sponsoring Agency Code NPD-320		
15. Supplementary Notes Jordan Blenner, PhD, JD, was NHTSA's contracting officer's representative on this project.			
16. Abstract <p>This project conducted follow-up case studies after a recent survey examining law enforcement liaison (LEL) program characteristics across the Nation. The survey identified the most important attributes that aid LELs in reaching their work goals. The project included the development of an interview guide, site selection, identifying LELs, discussions with the LELs, data collection, and analysis. The discussions involved seven topic areas: sponsoring organization involvement, staff and resource allocation, roles and responsibilities, performance measures, outreach, communication, and the COVID pandemic. According to the LEL interviewees, performance for meeting their States' highway safety goals depends on a variety of attributes. Maintaining State Highway Safety Office interactions is important for assisting with grant administration, technical support, public outreach, and overall grant support. Personal interaction was used to grow grantee recruitment and to maintain grants. LELs recognized that having the autonomy to coordinate strategic enforcement activities and to plan law enforcement agency (LEA) training, outreach, and performance evaluation with LEAs and/or other grantees was effective. Additionally, LELs recognized the importance of maintaining frequent outreach, facilitating technical assistance for LEAs, building relationships with LEAs, and keeping LEAs focused on traffic safety. LELs keep contact with LEAs through personal visits and by phone, email, social media, local and regional LEA conferences and other law enforcement meetings. LELs can—but do not commonly—use social media to increase awareness of grantee public outreach activities. LELs noted it was important to recognize and be aware of how the current state of traffic enforcement culture affects their program goals and activities.</p>			
17. Key Words law enforcement liaisons, law enforcement agencies, interviews, grantees		18. Distribution Statement This document is available to the public from the DOT, BTS, National Transportation Library, Repository & Open Science Access Portal, rosap.ntl.bts.gov	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 48	22. Price

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction and Project Objectives	3
Methodology	4
Interview Guide.....	4
Site Selection.....	4
Identifying Candidate LEL Sites.....	4
Preparing Notices to NHTSA Regions, SHSOs, and Other Sponsoring Agencies.....	5
Contacting the LELs.....	5
Reaching Agreements With LELs.....	5
Data Collection Plan.....	5
Data Analysis	5
Results	7
3.1 Topic 1: Sponsoring Organization Involvement.....	7
3.2 Topic 2: Staff and Resource Allocation	8
3.3 Topic 3: Roles and Responsibilities	8
3.4 Topic 4: Performance Measures.....	10
3.5 Topic 5: Outreach.....	11
3.6 Topic 6: Communication.....	11
3.7 Topic 7: COVID Pandemic	12
Discussion.....	13
Conclusion.....	15
References	16
Appendix A: Response Tables	A-1
Appendix B: LEL Interview Guide	B-1

List of Tables

Table 1. Selected Sites.....	4
Table A-1. How much guidance from your sponsoring organization is helpful? (Q.1)	A-1
Table A-2. How do LELs, your sponsoring agency (SA), and the SHSO communicate? (Q.2)	A-1
Table A-3. What is the frequency of contact with your sponsoring agency (SA) and the SHSO? (Q.3)	A-1
Table A-4. What specific guidance does your sponsoring agency provide to support your program activities? (Q.4).....	A-2
Table A-5. What specific guidance from your sponsoring organization is not helpful? (Q.5)...	A-2
Table A-6. What are the key attributes the sponsoring agency provides? (Q.6)	A-3
Table A-7. Are you involved in the strategic planning of the LEL program? (Q.7)	A-3
Table A-8. What specific planning activities are your responsibilities? (Q.8)	A-4
Table A-9. What specific planning activities do you believe are essential for the LEL program to control? (Q.9).....	A-4
Table A-10. Who is responsible in determining the number of LELs in your State? (Q.1)	A-5
Table A-11. How was the number of LELs in your State determined? (Q.2)	A-5
Table A-12. Would you increase, decrease, or keep the same number of LELs in your State? (Q.3)	A-5
Table A-13. What determined your part-time or full-time LEL status? (Q.4)	A-5
Table A-14. Who is responsible to administrate LEL time and resources? (Q.5)	A-6
Table A-15. How are LEL responsibilities divided? Identify percentages by activity? (Q.6) ...	A-6
Table A-16. If you are an officer with a LEA, how do you manage your LEL responsibilities? (Q.7)	A-6
Table A-17. How are crash data used to establish LEL priorities? (Q.1).....	A-7
Table A-18. What is the most important LEL responsibility? (Q.2)	A-7
Table A-19. What role does an LEL have in selecting LEAs? (Q.3)	A-8
Table A-20. What role does the LEL have in establishing budgets for LEAs? (Q.4)	A-8
Table A-21. What is the level of assistance you give LEAs in supporting their grant program or applications for grants? (Q.5).....	A-9
Table A-22. What are the most important activities that increase LEA grant applications or participation? (Q.6).....	A-9
Table A-23. What are the key strategies LELs use to convince the “hard-to-reach” LEAs to participate in grant programs? (Q.7).....	A-10
Table A-24. What resources and data improve the LEL’s ability to keep existing grantees and recruit new grantees? (Q.8).....	A-10
Table A-25. What are your most significant challenges with getting non-participating LEAs to apply for grants? (Q.9)	A-11
Table A-26. Do LELs complete financial audits on funded LEAs? (Q.10)	A-11
Table A-27. What role does the LEL have in the financial audits of LEA grantees? (Q.11) ...	A-11
Table A-28. How much responsibility do LELs have in LEA grantees reaching their goals? (Q.1)	A-12

Table A-29. How important are traffic safety outcome measures to the LELs? (Q.2)	A-12
Table A-30. How important are traffic safety outcome measures to the SHSOs? (Q.3)	A-12
Table A-31. Who establishes the traffic safety outcome measures? (Q.4).....	A-12
Table A-32. Who reviews and assesses outcome measures? (Q.5)	A-13
Table A-33. How do you review and assess LEA performance and activities? (Q.6)	A-13
Table A-34. What is the procedure if a LEA does not reach performance measurements? (Q.7)	A-13
Table A-35. How are the results of the traffic safety performance measures (TSPMs) used to improve the effectiveness of grantee activities? (Q.8)	A-14
Table A-36. Is your LEL program required to complete performance assessment for your sponsoring agency or SHSO? (Q.9).....	A-14
Table A-37. Who are your prime contacts when visiting LEAs? (Q.1)	A-14
Table A-38. How often do you visit LEAs per year? (Q.2).....	A-15
Table A-39. Describe the methods you use to contact and interact with your LEAs. (Q.3)	A-15
Table A-40. What are your key training activities to encourage LEA participation in grant programs? (Q.4)	A-16
Table A-41. What methods do not work to attract new grantees or mobilize LEAs? (Q.5).....	A-16
Table A-42. Other than working with LEAs describe your other important outreach activities (Q.6).....	A-17
Table A-43. What are the most important outreach methods LELs use to get community involvement in supporting traffic safety activities? (Q.7)	A-17
Table A-44. How does your program document and measure the performance and success of outreach activities? (Q.8).....	A-18
Table A-45. What is the LEL's role in interacting with the communities' non-LEA partners and stakeholders? (Q.1)	A-18
Table A-46. Describe the information communication technology your LEL program uses to communicate with partners and stakeholders. And what is the percentage of use? (Q.2).....	A-18
Table A-47. What is the LEL's role in (when) interacting with the media? (Q.3)	A-19
Table A-48. How do you interact with the media? (Q.4)	A-19
Table A-49. What type of messaging and information do you put on social media? (Q.5)	A-19
Table A-50. Who do you target with your social media messaging? (Q.6).....	A-20
Table A-51. What social media sites do you use and follow?	A-20
Table A-52. Have you noticed a difference in performance measures this year following the start of the COVID pandemic (c. March 2020)? (Q.1)	A-20
Table A-53. Has there been a difference in willingness by law enforcement agencies in wanting to participate in highway safety grants since the beginning of the COVID pandemic?(Q.2).....	A-20
Table A-54. Have you come up with any strategies to gain back grantees who have dropped out of highway safety programs this year? (Q.3).....	A-21

List of Acronyms

ARIDE	Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement
CPS	child passenger safety
DDACTS	Data-Driven Approach to Crime and Traffic Safety
DRE	drug recognition expert
LEA	law enforcement agency
LEL	law enforcement liaison
MADD	Mothers Against Drunk Driving
TOPS	Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies
SFST	standardized field sobriety test/testing
SHSO	State Highway Safety Office

Executive Summary

This project conducted follow-up case studies after a recent survey examining law enforcement liaison program characteristics across the nation. The survey identified the most important attributes that aid LELs in reaching their work goals. The project included the development of an interview guide, site selection, identifying LELs, discussions with the LELs, data collection, and analysis. The interview guide contained seven topic areas (i.e., sponsoring organization involvement, staff and resource allocation, roles and responsibilities, performance measures, outreach, communication, and COVID pandemic) and respective questions for each topic. Software recorded and transcribed the discussions. Two team members conducted separate analyses of the transcript data and recorded thematic responses for each question. Each member compared recordings and formulated consensus on their differences. Findings showed that the involvement of the LELs with a State Highway Safety Office (SHSO) was very important. For those LELs who worked for other sponsoring agencies, they still maintained regular contact with SHSOs. SHSOs provided program direction, grant processing, crash data acquisition, and other program activity assistance. SHSO support in providing crash data was key for LELs in promoting the grant programs to law enforcement agencies. LELs also relied on SHSOs for public outreach of highway safety campaigns.

The determination of the number of LELs and type of full or part time position was a decision made by the SHSOs. Contributing factors to these decisions are based on the size of grants, grant topic specialization (e.g., driving under the influence, seat belt), geographic coverage, and the number of law enforcement jurisdictions. LELs identified the importance of law enforcement experience. Their past law enforcement experience as chiefs, sheriffs, or other ranking officer positions, especially in the traffic unit, provided the credibility necessary to reach out to LEAs and gain their trust and willingness to apply for highway safety grants. The LELs used several approaches for recruitment of LEAs. In-person interaction with LEAs was the most optimal grantee recruiting strategy for the LELs. The best recruiting approach included the following: (1) review of crash data from their jurisdictions, (2) promoting importance of traffic enforcement, (3) offering equipment incentives, and (4) giving recognition awards for performance.

Sponsoring agencies evaluated LEL performance through personal interactions and reviews of progress reports, which included information on site visits, number of grantees, number of newly recruited grantees, conference and meeting attendance and participation, and training activities. Most LELs did not work directly with the media but relied on their SHSOs for public outreach. They followed their LEA grantees on social media, but, for the most part, did not use social media to spread highway safety messages or report on their LEA campaigns. The LELs revealed that the COVID pandemic affected their grantees traffic enforcement activity. States did not see a significant loss in the number of LEA grantees participating in grant activities, but LEA grantees made command decisions to reduce traffic enforcement and stops. However, by early 2021 the grantees resumed normal traffic enforcement activities.

From these interviews with 9 LELs across the NHTSA Regions, several LEL program characteristics emerged that were important for optimizing their support to their States in meeting grant funding and other highway safety goals. The characteristics included:

- Maintaining interactions with SHSOs to take advantage of grant administration support and other assistance in customized crash data, public outreach, and grantee program direction;
- Having a law enforcement background in a ranking position, especially in traffic enforcement;
- Maintaining a high level of autonomy for involvement with all grantees and keeping up with grantee recruitment responsibilities;
- Keeping an open communication path with all LEA grantees and prospective grantees;
- Being aware of obstacles presented by LEAs to understand why many departments do not wish to participate in highway safety grant programs; and provide support and dialog to these prospective grantees to minimize their reluctance to participate;
- Maintaining awareness of their grantees' public outreach and social media activity; and
- Identifying current traffic enforcement culture (i.e., involving the COVID pandemic) and determining how LEL programs need to adapt, if at all, to continue recruiting and maintaining current and prospective grantees.

Both the survey and the case studies were conducted before Executive Order 13985, *Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government*, (2021) and its subsequent expansion that was published in February 2023. These orders require Federal agencies to incorporate considerations of equity in the administration of their policies and programs. NHTSA is engaged in many actions in this area and future work, including studies interviewing LELs, will incorporate considerations of equity in their development, data collection, and analysis.

Introduction and Project Objectives

LELs promote national and State priorities through their States' highway safety programs. LELs encourage law enforcement officers and leaders to support the enforcement of traffic safety laws through the highway safety grants and other LEL program activities. The LEL programs focus on numerous traffic safety laws, particularly those involving impaired driving, occupant protection, distracted driving, and speed management. LELs also collaborate with other highway safety partners and stakeholders. The goal of this project was to conduct follow-up case studies after a recently completed survey examining the LEL program characteristics across the nation (Decina & Lococo, 2022; National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2022). These in-depth examinations of LEL program operations provided guidance on the most important attributes that aid LELs in reaching their work objectives, as well as their State Highway Safety Offices (SHSOs) or other sponsoring organizations' highway safety goals.

Methodology

Interview Guide

The researchers developed the interview guide by, first, creating a topic list, then writing a list of questions intended to gain information about LEL program operations. Topics covered a general list of the common characteristics of the LEL programs, followed by more in-depth factors identifying the best attributes of LEL programs that would support SHSO grant program and traffic safety outcome goals. Some of these in-depth factors were shared with those of the original survey (Decina & Lococo, 2022), but some others focused more specifically on the day-to-day activities of LELs. The following topics were identified for the interview guide: (1) Sponsoring Organization Involvement, (2) Staff and Resource Allocation, (3) Roles and Responsibilities, (4) Performance Measures, (5) Outreach, (6) Communication, and (7) COVID Pandemic Effects.

Site Selection

Site selection involved identifying candidate LEL sites, preparing notices to NHTSA regional offices and State sponsoring agencies; contacting the LEL sites; and reaching agreements with these LELs to conduct interviews.

Identifying Candidate LEL Sites

The results from LEL and SHSO surveys (see Decina & Lococo, 2020) as well as additional analysis of survey data informed the selection of LEL interview sites. Findings from the study showed that there were differences in States' LEL organizational structures, number of engaged LELs, coverage areas, work experience, key responsibilities, job performance measures, percentage of grantees in their State, and percentage of participating LEAs. However, no specific combination of LEL program characteristics appeared to show a distinct pattern related to the study's outcome measures (such as, number of participating LEA grantees and participating LEA non-grantees). Site selection focused on meeting the following criteria: the site selected represented a single NHTSA region. Among the sites, several differences were noted as to the type of State sponsor, full or part time LEL employment status, and State population density.

Table 1. Identifies the selected sites. An alternate list of sites developed for back-up site selections was not needed.

Table 1. Selected Sites

State	NHTSA Region	Sponsoring Organization	Employment Status for All LELs	Population Density*
Maine	1	SHSO	FT	Rural
Pennsylvania	2	NPO	FT	Urban
Delaware	3	SHSO	PT	Urban
South Carolina	4	LEA	FT	Urban
Illinois	5	Academic	FT/PT	Urban
Louisiana	6	SHSO	FT/PT	Urban

State	NHTSA Region	Sponsoring Organization	Employment Status for All LELs	Population Density*
Arkansas	7	SHSO	PT	Rural
Colorado	8	SHSO	PT	Rural
Idaho	10	LEA	PT	Rural

Key: Sponsoring Organizations (SHSO – State Highway Safety Office; NPO – Nonprofit Organization; LEA – Law Enforcement Agency; Academic); Employment Status (FT – Full Time, PT – Part Time); and Population Density (Rural, Urban) (defined as population divided by land area). Resident population is from the United States Census Bureau estimates for July 1, 2015, (for the 50 States, DC, and Puerto Rico) and from the 2015 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs for territories besides Puerto Rico.

Preparing Notices to NHTSA Regions, SHSOs, and Other Sponsoring Agencies

The researchers sent a notification to NHTSA regional offices, the SHSOs or other sponsoring agencies, and the Governors Highway Safety Association, which described the project and made a request for a candidate LEL to participate in the study.

Contacting the LELs

Researchers contacted LELs who were invited via email to discuss the project and the interview topics. These initial communications provided a brief explanation of the project, with the option to continue contact via phone or virtual set-up.

Reaching Agreements With LELs

Researchers asked the LELs by email if they would be interested in participating in the project. Upon LEL agreement to participate, researchers set a discussion date. There was a 100% response rate.

Data Collection Plan

The researchers set up virtual sessions for all 9 LEL participants. The participants were informed that the session would be recorded and then transcribed through a verbal transcription software for data analysis purposes. Researchers recorded race, gender, and age of the 9 LELs by observation. The sample comprised of 8 White and 1 Black LEL; 8 males and 1 female; and 5 over the age of 50 and 4 in their 40s. Discussions were held from February 18 to April 7, 2021. A moderator (former LEL program manager) led the discussion sessions. The principal investigator listened in on each session.

Data Analysis

The researchers used a manual content analysis to capture and summarize the key points and themes from the transcripts. The PI and the moderator conducted independent analyses of each discussion and then made a comparison of their differences. The content analysis process started with creating a data coding form in Excel. The form listed each discussion question, organized by topic, as well as anticipated response categories. From the PI and moderator's review, the researchers highlighted key content points and then checked the response category boxes where the data point fit into the anticipated response categories. If a given response did not fit into any

of the categories, the researchers added a new response category. The researchers then compared their spreadsheet summaries and discussed differences. Upon agreement of spreadsheet content, investigators produced a summary of each response category. Researchers then assembled, organized, and displayed the data to facilitate evaluation.

Results

A summary of the findings from the interviews is presented by each topic. Appendix A provides the tabulated data by response options for each discussion question. Appendix B lists the informal discussion questions.

3.1 Topic 1: Sponsoring Organization Involvement

As found in the previous survey (Decina & Lococo, 2022), LELs varied in their type of sponsoring agency. The sponsoring agency for five of the 9 LELs was their SHSO. Two of the LELs worked for law enforcement agencies. One LEL worked for a nonprofit, and one was sponsored by an academic organization. LELs who were managed by sponsoring agencies other than SHSOs still relied on them for support in many program areas.

SHSO grant managers have the most regular interaction with LELs and work together to coordinate duties and responsibilities with the LELs. SHSOs provide direct support to LELs funded through their offices and other sponsoring agencies including providing crash data and analysis, identifying potential LEA grant applicants, processing grant applications, providing instruction for campaign planning, and evaluating grantee performance and grantee budgets. LELs working through SHSO offices have daily interactions with them. LELs at other locations have at least weekly interactions with their sponsoring organizations.

More than one half (56%) of the LELs appreciated help and guidance from their sponsoring organizations. The LELs preferred guidance with administrative and information technical (IT) support. Administrative support included help with timesheets, travel expenses, other reimbursements, and office management. IT support included computer and software instructions and office management assistance. LELs also mentioned the importance of sponsoring agencies providing feedback on project status (56%), securing project resources (33%), supporting enforcement activities (33%), handling political obstacles (33%), and overall grant management (33%).

The sponsoring agencies identified the prospective LEA grantees, but the LELs were responsible for all recruitment and assisting the LEAs with preparing their grant applications. LELs guide the grantees in enforcement strategies, campaigns, and documentation for grant proposals and grant reimbursement. The majority (67%) of LELs were also involved in coordinating grantee enforcement and public outreach activities with their State-level highway safety campaigns. Only 33 percent of the LELs were involved with coordinating or giving training to their grantee or prospective grantee officers.

In terms of specific planning activities that LELs believe are essential for them to control, it was found that the most important were LEA outreach (56%) and LEA performance evaluation (44%). Outreach involves the LELs contacting and visiting prospective and existing grantees to pitch the grant programs, maintain relationships, and provide technical or administrative support; performance evaluation involves LELs assessing program effectiveness through crash rates, seat belt use, and other LEA data. These findings potentially differ from those of the original survey, which found that among LELs who used traffic safety measures to evaluate program effectiveness (68% of all LELs), a majority (61%) reported that SHSOs or another entity set specific goals for such measures (Decina & Lococo, 2022, pp. 19). Several LELs also mentioned or emphasized their involvement in other planning activities, such as coordinating training sessions and providing the instruction for them.

The LELs reported the extent to which they communicated with their sponsoring agencies. Most of the LELs communicated with their sponsoring agencies through telephone or email correspondence daily (66%) or almost daily (22%). All LELs reported personal meetings with their sponsoring agencies. Three of the interviewed LELs are in the same office as their sponsoring agency. The five LELs who are SHSO employees or sponsored by the SHSO have in-person meetings daily. Not all sponsoring agencies communicate with the SHSO, but they allow their LELs to interact with the SHSO, usually through State grant managers, when the need arises.

3.2 Topic 2: Staff and Resource Allocation

All LELs indicated that their SHSOs were directly responsible for determining the number of LELs in their State. The LELs reported a variety of reasons for their SHSO's determining the number of LELs. Some LELs (33%) did not know the reason. Other LELs reported the number of LEAs (33%), number of counties or regions (33%), and geographic location of office (33%).

In most cases (78%), the SHSOs determined whether the LEL positions were full-time or part-time. Two of the SHSOs left this decision to the LEL Coordinator (22%). Two-thirds of LELs did not believe there was an adequate amount of LELs for their state; however, only a third of LELs reported that they would increase the number of LELs.

Generally, the SHSOs or the sponsors' agency (67%) determined who was responsible for the LEL's program time and resources. The LEL coordinator was also responsible for five of the 9 LELs interviewed.

In terms of responsibilities, the LELs primarily focused on outreach to the law enforcement agencies (56%), followed by technical assistance (e.g., grant application process, enforcement strategies) (33%), grant activities (e.g., coordinating grantee events) (33%), and equipment management (e.g., inspections, collecting equipment) (33%). In terms of crash data, most LELs (89%) used data to determine how much time and resources could be devoted to each program area (e.g., focusing on alcohol-impaired driving versus focusing on aggressive driving). The SHSOs provided crash data to the LELs. The LELs would ask for customized analyses for the LEA grantee sites. LELs used the data to establish priorities and to justify LEA grant programs and activities. LELs also used crash data to identify and determine LEA site recruitment (78%), program areas (67%), type of enforcement strategies (67%), enforcement locations (56%), and time and resources dedicated to each grantee (44%).

3.3 Topic 3: Roles and Responsibilities

Reflecting the importance placed on good communication skills from respondents in the original survey, LEL interviewees reported open communication with LEAs to promote professionalism and trust (67%) as the most important LEL responsibility. Open communication began with telephone and email contact to identify the purpose of the call, followed by requesting a visit to discuss the grant program and instructions for grant applications. Grantees would be contacted regularly through telephone and emails to discuss the status of grant activities.

Another important responsibility described by some of the interviewees was assistance to SHSOs and LEAs (44%). Almost all (78%) of the LEAs provide input to the SHSOs on selecting grantees. The LELs who were involved in the selection process (for grantees) coordinated with their SHSO and reviewed performance and compliance data to adjust or eliminate budgets, make

budget recommendations to the SHSO, and assess LEA resources to utilize funding. All the LELs mentioned their willingness to support their LEA grantees throughout the program period. However, many of the LELs only provided support when requested.

Over half (56%) of the LELs had no role in deciding the amount of grant funds given to LEA grantees. However, many mentioned assessing prospective grantee resources (44%). For example, the LEAs would identify the prospective grantee's staff commitment to the grant responsibilities. A third of the LELs stated that they help their SHSOs in establishing prospective grantee budgets and adjusting budgets of current grantees based on their grant performance evaluations.

Most of the LELs (78%) mentioned that they provide technical assistance to prospective and current grantees on filling out applications for grants, and most LELs (67%) reported giving LEAs support throughout the grant periods. On the topic of maintaining current grantees, two-thirds of the LELs reported that providing current and accurate crash data and providing technical assistance to these grantees was important. One-third of the LELs also mentioned providing equipment (e.g., portable speed radar boards) to these grantees was important.

To convince the "hard-to-reach" LEAs to participate in the grant programs, the LELs mentioned the importance of personal visits and reaching the decision makers. The LELs felt that having a background in law enforcement, especially holding a rank, was important in gaining trust with these LEAs, and all grantees. Nearly 70 percent of the LELs found that using crash data (e.g., high level of unrestrained motorists in fatal crashes) to demonstrate the need for traffic enforcement is important. Assisting prospective grantees with the application process also contributed to LEA willingness to participate.

There are several challenges involved in recruiting non-participating LEAs to apply for grants. Matching the findings of the original survey, the majority of LELs (67%) reported that the most significant challenge in getting non-participating LEAs to apply for grants was convincing the chief or administrative staff of the importance of traffic enforcement. Another significant challenge, reported by 56 percent of LEL interviewees, was department staff limitations. Many LEAs cannot provide staff to participate in these grant activities because of patrol duties in their jurisdictions. In many cases, there is also officer unwillingness to work extra shifts. While the type of grant programs available by SHSOs does not always involve the need for overtime enforcement, LELs found LEAs unresponsive unless States included funding or equipment in the grant package.

The LELs reported they would often review responsibilities of their LEAs. Slightly more than half the LELs (56%) completed financial audits on their funded LEAs. The LELs who did not complete financial audits were asked by the SHSO to monitor grantee performance, equipment, and grant compliance. In addition to financial reviews, LELs reviewed office time, enforcement compliance (e.g., anticipated number of contacts and seat belt citations compared to actual number of contacts and seat belt citations), equipment inventory, and agency and officer performance. Most of the LELs (78%) stated that they assisted the SHSO in audits.

The LELs mentioned using training programs—such as those provided by NHTSA, SHSOs, and other national and international law enforcement institutions—to support officers' traffic enforcement skills and improve grantee enforcement activity results. The LELs helped law enforcement agencies with registration, scheduling, and travel expenses. The LELs mentioned that these training programs cover topics pertaining to enforcement strategies and protocols for

impaired driving, seat belt use, aggressive driving, speeding, and other highway safety issues addressed in grant programs. All LELs were involved with standardized field sobriety testing (SFST), and most were involved with drug recognition experts (DRE) (78%) and checkpoint training (67%). More than half of LELs were involved with “Below 100” (56%).¹ Only a few LELs were involved with Data-Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS) (33%) and Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies (TOPS) (22%) programs. These findings suggest LEL interviewees are more involved in training than the respondents of the original survey, for which half or fewer reported their LEAs as offering such types of training or reported having provided such types of training themselves (Table A-1, A-4; Decina & Lococo, 2022).

3.4 Topic 4: Performance Measures

Like the survey, the participating LELs were asked questions on how they monitor and measure LEA grant program performance. The LELs were also asked how their own personal work performance is measured by their SHSOs or other sponsoring agencies.

The amount of responsibility LELs had in helping their LEAs reach performance goals varied. Most LELs (55%) had some responsibility in helping the LEA grantees reach their performance goals. Three LELs indicated they had no responsibility (33%) at all in helping their LEAs reach their performance goals.

Almost all the interviewed LELs (89%) stated that traffic safety outcome measures were very important for their goals and SHSO goals. These grant-related measures (e.g., contacts, officer hours, citations, distribution of safety message material) provided the information necessary to monitor and check that grantees were reaching their grant goals. Eight LELs stated that traffic safety outcome measures were primarily established by their SHSOs. The majority of the LELs were responsible for reviewing and assessing LEA performance, usually after specific enforcement details or at the end of highway safety campaigns.

The LELs had varieties of methods they used for monitoring and ensuring LEA performance. If LEAs did not reach performance measures, the LELs (89%) would follow-up with informal emails or telephone calls. Many LELs (67%) would conduct personal meetings. Four LELs mentioned that if enforcement activity levels did not increase then they would re-assess data and goals, while only two stated they would do a budget reduction. Two LELs specifically mentioned that they would work with the LEAs to change enforcement strategies to see if that would make a difference in reaching enforcement activity goals.

The participating LELs used traffic safety performance measures to assess and improve the effectiveness of their grantees’ programs by using the information to improve enforcement strategies (e.g., change of locations, checkpoints instead of saturation patrols) (56%), better evaluate enforcement details (e.g. need for more spotters) (44%), adjust or defund budgets (33%), and provide additional training (22%).

¹ A law enforcement officer safety program focused on reduction of the number of law enforcement related deaths to below 100 per year; a number that has not been reached since 1943. Below 100 has a vision to permanently eliminate line-of-duty deaths and injuries “through innovative training and awareness” and a mission “to influence law enforcement culture by providing innovative training and awareness, through presentations, social media, and webinars on identifying the leading causes and current trends in preventable line of duty death and injuries.” More information on Below 100 appears at the following website: www.iadlest.org/training/below100

SHSOs and other sponsoring agencies also evaluated the LELs. Two-thirds of the LELs identified that SHSOs evaluate their program activities annually. Evaluations tended to use standard assessment and quarterly reporting forms to assess performance. Typical performance measures included number of prospective LEA contacts, number of site visits to current and prospective grantees, number of new grantees, attendance at local and regional law enforcement conferences, and training events.

3.5 Topic 5: Outreach

The LELs worked with different people within LEAs, met with their LEA contacts a varied amount, and engaged in several forms of outreach. The LEL's prime contacts with prospective grantees were with chiefs or sheriffs and project coordinators (67%). When asked the frequency of LEAs contacts, 22 percent of the LELs stated they visited their LEAs more than five times per year, one-third of the LELs visited their LEAs three to five times per year, and one-third of the LELs contacted their LEAs one to two times per year. All interviewed LELs used telephone and emails as their primary outreach methods, and, in addition, all LELs reported the need to make a minimum of one or two in-person visits to each grantee. The LELs also used social media, group meetings, conferences, and training instruction to interact with LEAs.

All interviewed LELs mentioned the need to be very diplomatic and tactful in reaching out to and maintaining professional relationships with prospective and current grantees. Through experiences in losing prospective grantees, many have learned not to conduct surprise or uninvited visits to LEAs. They also identify who the appropriate contact should be in requesting a visit. Circumventing the top chain of command was also counterproductive in gaining trust for a prospective grantee. Several LELs mentioned their programs did not offer enforcement funding nor equipment, which can present challenges in the recruitment process.

Other than working with LEAs or grantees, LELs described other outreach opportunities. Many worked with other highway safety partners (e.g., State Highway Safety Offices, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Operation Lifesavers); and other groups such as schools, social groups, and health care institutions. The purpose of working with these groups was to promote community support to the grantees' programs and complement these programs with additional highway safety message outreach. More than half (56%) of LELs stated they list their community outreach in their quarterly reports to their SHSOs and other sponsoring agencies. Not all LELs are required to list their community activities.

3.6 Topic 6: Communication

The LEL role in interacting with community groups (e.g., Safe Kids Worldwide chapters, rotary clubs, Students Against Destructive Decisions) varied. Many LELs (44%) do not interact with these groups. Some LELs (22%) have only very little interaction with community groups. Most of the LELs would interact with these groups if invited by their LEAs. The primary purpose of their communication with these groups was to facilitate public outreach activities in the grantee jurisdictions. Nearly all LELs (89%) reported they do not work with the media, leaving media outreach to the SHSO or the State's media specialists. However, LELs do participate or attend media events such as interviews, press events, or coordinated media activities behind the scenes. The LELs mentioned that they do not often, if at all, submit press releases, public service announcements, editorials, or articles to community media. Some LELs used social media to post enforcement campaigns, crash stats, or campaign materials. Nearly half of LELs would share

messages or posts, especially on topics relating to the national and statewide campaigns. The LELs targeted the public with social media messages but at times included messages targeted toward LEAs and grantees. There was a mixed response to the use of social media by the 9 LELs involved in the project. More than half (56%) of LELs interviewed do not post messages or even use social media. Only some (33%) LELs reported using social media.

3.7 Topic 7: COVID Pandemic

LELs documented significant changes in grantee activities following the start of the COVID pandemic. Nearly all LELs reported decreases in enforcement contacts, citations, and arrests and reductions in traffic unit enforcement hours. Most of LELs (78%) noted there were decreases in the willingness of LEAs to participate in highway safety grants during the height of the initial pandemic period (spring and summer 2020). Almost half of LELs stated that by the fall of 2020 enforcement performance had recovered to near pre-pandemic numbers.

Although only one LEL (11%) reported LEAs dropping out of highway safety programs entirely during the COVID pandemic in 2020, nearly all saw reductions in enforcement activities. Most LELs created strategies to re-engage LEAs and increase enforcement participation. The described strategies most often included reestablishing contact with LEA grantees, carrying over funding to them, and continuing to send crash data (e.g., crash location, status of occupant restraint use, violations) to help the LEA grantees identify enforcement locations. Some other strategies mentioned were showing flexibility with enforcement timelines, education on the importance of traffic enforcement, monitoring returning LEAs, and arranging meetings that met all social distancing requirements recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Discussion

From interviews with the 9 LELs across the United States, several LEL program characteristics and modes of operation appear to allow LELs to optimize their work tasks in meeting State grant funding goals and other highway safety initiatives.

In the interviews the LELs emphasized the importance of a good relationship with their sponsors. Frequent communication between LELs and their sponsoring agencies, especially their SHSOs, was seen as important. In addition to frequent communication, SHSOs provide support to LEL programs in many ways: (a) determining LEL staff levels and hours; (b) guiding the scope of LEL work tasks; (c) processing grant applications; (d) determining grant budgets; (e) providing crash data; (f) coordinating regional conferences; and (g) providing public outreach on national and State highway safety campaigns.

The interviewed LELs mentioned the need for establishing their own schedules to guide interactions with prospective grantees and ongoing grantees. This need for autonomy was important as LELs get involved with many activities, including LEA site visits, conference attendance, training session participation, and public outreach event participation.

The interviewed LELs emphasized the importance of personal interaction with prospective grantees and existing grantees. Initial contact with LEAs started with identifying appropriate contacts at the police departments and sheriffs' offices and gaining permission from top command to make site visits and schedule appointments. Although most initial meetings start with introductions with the chiefs, sheriffs, or command staff, the meetings often center around designated project coordinators, who are usually traffic unit supervisors.

The LELs indicated their primary responsibility was to establish and maintain open communication with LEAs, both grant-funded and unfunded. A common theme was that "keeping LEAs focused on traffic safety" was viewed as one of their most important responsibilities. Providing LEAs with crash data and other traffic safety measure information created entry points for discussion. The LELs noted they suggest enforcement strategies, staffing requirements, enforcement locations, and use of signs and other equipment to motivate the LEAs in either grant performance or encourage prospective grantees to participate in the programs.

In terms of communication, most interviewed LELs preferred meeting with their grantees at least three times per year and many over five times per year. The LELs stressed going to these meetings with clear purpose for the visit. They also mentioned they connect with their grantees and prospective grantees at local and regional conferences.

The LELs indicated that reaching the reluctant non-participating LEAs can be improved with LEL site visits, reaching decision makers, using crash data to show how improvements can be achieved, convincing the LEAs of the importance of traffic enforcement, and providing grant application assistance. LEAs often cite staffing issues, officer unwillingness to work extra shifts, and need for funding or equipment as obstacles for their participation.

In addition to providing information through open communication, LELs assist with grant applications, other administrative issues, and training programs and instruction. While LELs are not responsible for grantees reaching their goals, they do provide technical assistance in program strategies to help LEAs meet grant obligations and maintain their funding resources.

The participating LELs are involved in coordinating training programs and providing the actual instruction to officers to improve their traffic enforcement skills, which in turn can improve grantee enforcement activity results.

Regarding outreach, LELs varied as to whom and how they engaged with different people and groups. The LELs interacted with community partners, highway safety advocates, and other stakeholders to gain their support for their grantee programs and complement the grantee programs with additional highway safety messaging. The LELs mentioned they will occasionally follow their grantee social media sites to monitor enforcement activities and their public outreach events. But for the most part they do not use social media to support their program efforts. These LELs relied on their SHSOs or their grantees to initiate media contacts, create mass public awareness content, and promote the outreach. If invited or requested, the LELs do attend scheduled media events, respond to media questions, or provide campaign information.

Finally, the LELs recognized the effects of the COVID pandemic on grantee enforcement activities. LELs saw a reduction in traffic safety activities during the COVID pandemic in 2020. However, the LELs mentioned that most of their grantees returned to grant-level enforcement activities by the end of 2020 or in early 2021.

There are limitations regarding these results. This case study project was a follow-up to a more extensive online survey of 105 LELs from 40 States and 31 SHSO representatives with a 59 percent response rate conducted in 2020 (Decina & Lococo, 2022). The current project held discussions with 9 LELs each representing a different NHTSA Region (out of 10 regions overall). SHSOs recommended the LELs for interviews to the project leaders. Accordingly, under the approach taken, the project may not represent opinions from a nationally representative population of LELs, thereby limiting the degree to which these results can be generalized to the larger LEL population.

Conclusion

This study provided an in-depth look at how LELs conduct their programs by interviewing 9 State LELs. The researchers looked at how the LELs interact with their SHSOs and sponsoring agencies, as well as how they interact with LEAs who are prospective or ongoing grant recipients using a topical discussion guide. The interviews identified several key points regarding what makes a good LEL program. According to the LELs interviewed, it is important for them to consistently interact with their SHSOs to take advantage of grant administration support, access to resources (e.g., crash data), public information and education outreach, and overall program assistance. The LELs articulated that a certain level of autonomy in their work activities is important. The ability to engage in multiple activities at once—from making site visits to conducting training coordination and instruction—is important as well. An open communication path with all LEA grantees and prospective grantees is critical for LEL programs. According to the interviewees, personal visits are very important to establish trust and a positive relationship with LEAs. Having a law enforcement background in a ranking position often helped in this regard, as well. Being aware of obstacles presented by LEAs who are reluctant to participate in grant programs is helpful for LELs who can then develop strategies to address these challenges. The LELs tend to not take advantage of social media, which may affect their ability to recruit LEAs. Finally, the LELs saw how the COVID pandemic affected traffic enforcement policies. The findings of this report can be used to gain a greater understanding of the different aspects of LEL programs and to suggest potential ways to improve performance.

References

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. <https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/60967>

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2022, March). *Characteristics of state law enforcement liaison programs* (Traffic Tech, Technology Transfer Series. Report No. DOT HS 813 260). <https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/60968>

Appendix A: Response Tables

Topic 1: Sponsoring Organization Involvement

Table A-1. How much guidance from your sponsoring organization is helpful? (Q.1)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Some guidance	5	56%
Involved in all program activities	4	44%
Grant help	3	33%
Crash data	1	11%
Total response category count	13	-

Table A-2. How do LELs, your sponsoring agency (SA), and the SHSO communicate? (Q.2)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
In-person meetings with SHSO	9	100%
Electronic meetings with SHSO	9	100%
Informal meeting or phone/email contact with SHSO	9	100%
In-person meetings with SA	2	22%
Electronic meetings with SA	1	11%
Informal meeting or phone/email contact with SA	1	11%
Quarterly in-person meetings with SHSO	1	11%
Total response category count	31	-

Table A-3. What is the frequency of contact with your sponsoring agency (SA) and the SHSO? (Q.3)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of Responses by LEL
Daily contact (telephone or e-mail) with SHSO or SA	6	67%
Almost daily contact (telephone or email) with SHSO or SA	2	22%
Monthly teleconference, but always on call mode	1	11%
Total response category count	9	-

Table A-4. What specific guidance does your sponsoring agency provide to support your program activities? (Q.4)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Administrative support	8	89%
IT support	8	89%
Coordination with State/NHTSA	4	44%
Establish key milestones, goal, objective only	4	44%
Grant related training	3	33%
Law updates	3	33%
Enforcement training	2	22%
Performance evaluation	2	22%
Enforcement strategies	2	22%
Procedure/policy manual	2	22%
Media/outreach training	1	11%
Supervisor	1	11%
Involved with program activities	1	11%
LEL procedure handbook	1	11%
Media packets	1	11%
Total response category count	43	-

Table A-5. What specific guidance from your sponsoring organization is not helpful? (Q.5)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Not sure	6	67%
Over-management	2	22%
How to interact with LEAs	1	11%
(No) Budgetary guidance	1	11%
Policy differences - SHSO - LEAs	1	11%
All guidance is productive	1	11%
Receives little guidance	1	11%
Total response category count	13	-

Table A-6. What are the key attributes the sponsoring agency provides? (Q.6)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Providing feedback on project status	5	56%
No specifics - "All"	4	44%
Supports enforcement efforts	3	33%
Secures project resources	3	33%
Handles political obstacles	3	33%
Provides clear direction for the project	3	33%
Ensures the project is on time, on budget, and on scope	3	33%
Understands training requirements	2	22%
Accepts suggestions/recommendations	2	22%
Champions the project at the executive level	2	22%
Understands enforcement procedures	2	22%
Advances planning of activities	2	22%
Provides LEA contact information	2	22%
Provides work schedule flexibility	2	22%
Provides a lot of leeway and flexibility	1	11%
Takes ownership of program	1	11%
Allows LELs to work on their time	1	11%
Total response category count	41	-

Table A-7. Are you involved in the strategic planning of the LEL program? (Q.7)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Yes	7	78%
No	2	22%
Total response category count	9	-

Table A-8. What specific planning activities are your responsibilities? (Q.8)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Enforcement activities	7	78%
Coordination with State/NHTSA	6	67%
Enforcement strategies	5	56%
Enforcement campaigns	5	56%
Establish key milestones, goal, objective	4	44%
LEA conferences and meeting	4	44%
Enforcement training	3	33%
Selecting LEA	3	33%
LEA performance evaluation	3	33%
LEA funding	3	33%
Coordinating LEL goals	3	33%
Media/Community outreach	2	22%
Helping coordinate mobilizations	2	22%
Total response category count	43	-

Table A-9. What specific planning activities do you believe are essential for the LEL program to control? (Q.9)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
LEA outreach	5	56%
LEA training	4	44%
LEA performance evaluation	4	44%
Advisory position	4	44%
Enforcement strategies	3	33%
Establish key milestones, goal, objective	3	33%
LEA amount funding	2	22%
Review all federal funded grants	2	22%
Enforcement efforts	2	22%
Enforcement campaign timeline	1	11%
Coordination with State/NHTSA	1	11%
Data analysis	1	11%
Grant application notices	1	11%
Multi-agency enforcement campaigns	1	11%
More communications with LELs and SHSO	1	11%
Operation oversight	1	11%
LEA outreach	1	11%
Educational efforts	1	11%
Total response category count	38	-

Topic 2: Staff and Resource Allocation

Table A-10. Who is responsible in determining the number of LELs in your State? (Q.1)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
SHSO	9	100%
LEL coordinator and SHSO	1	11%
Total response category count	10	-

Table A-11. How was the number of LELs in your State determined? (Q.2)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Unknown	3	33%
By number of LEAs	3	33%
Geography	3	33%
County/region	3	33%
Program area	1	11%
SHSO	1	11%
State police troops divisions	1	11%
Transportation districts	1	11%
Total response category count	16	-

Table A-12. Would you increase, decrease, or keep the same number of LELs in your State? (Q.3)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Same	4	44%
Increase	3	33%
Decrease	1	11%
Not sure	1	11%
Total response category count	9	

Table A-13. What determined your part-time or full-time LEL status? (Q.4)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Decided by SHSO	7	78%
LEL decision	2	22%
Workload	2	22%
Do not know	1	11%
Decided by sponsoring agency	1	11%
Available funding	1	11%
Number of program responsibilities	1	11%
Full-time officer duties with their LEA	1	11%
Crash data (for Topic)	1	11%
Occupant protection assessment recommendation	1	11%
Total response category count	18	-

Table A-14. Who is responsible to administrate LEL time and resources? (Q.5)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
SHSO	5	56%
LEL coordinator	5	56%
Sponsoring agency	1	11%
LEL	1	11%
SHSO - Grant officer manager	1	11%
Highway safety plan	1	11%
Total response category count	14	-

Table A-15. How are LEL responsibilities divided? Identify percentages by activity? (Q.6)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
LEA outreach	5	56%
Equipment management*	3	33%
LEA grant activities	3	33%
Tech assistance and monitoring	3	33%
High-visibility enforcement	2	22%
Administrative	2	22%
Communication	1	11%
Monthly newsletter	1	11%
LEA evaluation and assessment	1	11%
Strategies with SHSO	1	11%
Partner planning	1	11%
Total response category count	23	-

(*) Collecting equipment, inspecting equipment, inspecting sites, and preparing monthly newsletter

Table A-16. If you are an officer with a LEA, how do you manage your LEL responsibilities? (Q.7)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Full-time law enforcement officer (LEO), but I perform LEL responsibilities when they are assigned	2	22%
Monthly meeting responsibilities as LEOs in each of 16 regions	1	11%
Total response category count	3	-

Topic 3: Roles and Responsibilities

Table A-17. How are crash data used to establish LEL priorities? (Q.1)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
How much time and resources in each program area	8	89%
To recruit LEAs	7	78%
Separated into program areas	6	67%
Type of enforcement strategies	6	67%
Enforcement locations	5	56%
Time and resources dedicated to each grantee	4	44%
Number of LEAs	3	33%
Helps dedicate LEL time	2	22%
Retraining of LEAs	1	11%
Data distributed to 16 regional coordinators	1	11%
Total response category count	43	-

Table A-18. What is the most important LEL responsibility? (Q.2)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Establish and maintain open communication with LEAs	6	67%
General assistance to LEAs	4	44%
Outreach with partners	2	22%
Outreach to LEAs	2	22%
Building relationships	2	22%
Technical assistance/support	1	11%
Enforcement coordination	1	11%
Monitoring budgets and activities	1	11%
Keeping LEAs focused on traffic safety	1	11%
Networking	1	11%
Being the single point of contact with LEAs	1	11%
Total response category count	22	-

Table A-19. What role does an LEL have in selecting LEAs? (Q.3)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
LEL input with SHSO	7	78%
Interviews LEAs	6	67%
LEA performance evaluations	5	56%
Data analysis	3	33%
LEA resource assessment	3	33%
Joint meeting with LELs to decide grant allocations	3	33%
No role	2	22%
Recruiting LEAs	2	22%
Multi-LEA enforcement campaigns	2	22%
LEL Regional Coordinators decide grantees	1	11%
SHSO tier system based on data	1	11%
Total response category count	35	-

Table A-20. What role does the LEL have in establishing budgets for LEAs? (Q.4)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
No role in budgets	5	56%
Assesses LEA resources to utilize funding	4	44%
Assists SHSO with budgets	3	33%
Reviews performance and compliance to adjust or eliminate budgets	3	33%
Makes recommendations to create budgets	3	33%
Reviews and adjusts budgets based on LEA recommendations	2	22%
LEAs get no funding for enforcement or equipment	1	11%
Total response category count	21	-

Table A-21. What is the level of assistance you give LEAs in supporting their grant program or applications for grants? (Q.5)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Provide technical assistance with application when requested	7	78%
Support LEAs throughout entire grant project	6	67%
Meet with LEAs on a regular timetable	4	44%
Work with LEAs when requested	3	33%
Essential part of LEL grant program	3	33%
Help each LEA with every application	3	33%
SHSOs determine LEA budgets	2	22%
Grant application not online - Assistance needed	2	22%
Technical assistance	2	22%
Work with multiple LEAs involved in special task force campaigns	1	11%
16 regional coordinators are in control of LEA budgets	1	11%
Total response category count	34	-

Table A-22. What are the most important activities that increase LEA grant applications or participation? (Q.6)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Provide technical assistance/training	8	89%
Interact with LEA chief/admin./political entity	7	78%
In-person agency contact	6	67%
Review grant application	3	33%
Increase funding	2	22%
Other indirect LEA contacts	2	22%
Assist LEA with other activities	2	22%
Equipment	2	22%
Crash data information	2	22%
Interact with patrol officers	1	11%
Problem ID with agency	1	11%
Create task forces	1	11%
Complete the grant application	1	11%
Team events - LEA conferences	1	11%
Seeing results	1	11%
Total response category count	40	-

Table A-23. What are the key strategies LELs use to convince the “hard-to-reach” LEAs to participate in grant programs? (Q.7)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Personal visits	7	78%
Demonstrate value of crash data analysis	6	67%
Invite LEAs to trainings	4	44%
Provide equipment	4	33%
Provide funding	2	22%
Attend LEA association meetings and conferences	2	22%
Peer pressure	1	11%
N/A - All LEAs are onboard	1	11%
Use of mini grants	1	11%
2- to 4-year sheriff terms helped	1	11%
Assist LEAs in creating seat belt policy	1	11%
LEA overtime policy	1	11%
Equipment as incentives	1	11%
Streamline application process	1	11%
Total response category count	32	-

Table A-24. What resources and data improve the LEL’s ability to keep existing grantees and recruit new grantees? (Q.8)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Current and accurate data	6	67%
Technical assistance	5	56%
Equipment	3	33%
Feedback/assessment	3	33%
Resources (e.g., handouts, brochures)	3	33%
Increase funding	2	22%
Constant face-to-face interaction	2	22%
Coordination of enforcement	1	11%
Assistance to reduce LEA admin. time	1	11%
Conferences, meetings, awards	1	11%
Mini grants	1	11%
Data relating to the LEA improvements	1	11%
Total response category count	29	-

Table A-25. What are your most significant challenges with getting non-participating LEAs to apply for grants? (Q.9)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Convincing LEAs importance of traffic enforcement	6	67%
Lack of staffing for extra enforcement	5	56%
Lack of funding	1	11%
Difficulty reaching chief or decision maker	1	11%
Officers not willing to work overtime	1	11%
LEA liability concerns working out of jurisdiction	1	11%
LEAs not getting reimbursed	1	11%
LEO program coordinator (Not dedicated to effort)	1	11%
No overtime policy	1	11%
No challenges with non-participating agencies	1	11%
Total response category count	19	-

Table A-26. Do LELs complete financial audits on funded LEAs? (Q.10)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Yes	5	56%
No	4	44%
SHSOs with LEL assistance	4	44%
SHSO grant analysts	1	11%
Monitor staff and equipment use on grants	1	11%
Total response category count	15	-

Table A-27. What role does the LEL have in the financial audits of LEA grantees? (Q.11)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Assists SHSO	7	78%
Reviews LEA performance	5	56%
Reviews officer time	4	44%
Reviews rate and payments	3	33%
Reviews enforcement documents only	2	22%
Reviews compliance and reporting	2	22%
LEL is solely responsible for all aspects of program audits	1	11%
Reviews officer performance	1	11%
Other	1	11%
No role in audits	1	11%
Total response category count	27	-

Topic 4: Performance Measures

Table A-28. How much responsibility do LELs have in LEA grantees reaching their goals? (Q.1)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Must work with every LEA to reach goals	5	56%
Some responsibility	4	44%
No responsibility	3	33%
Coaching on regular basis	3	33%
Monitors effort without feedback	2	22%
Full responsibility	1	11%
Only works with LEA when requested	1	11%
Only if requested by SHSO	1	11%
Recommendations to LEA grantees	1	11%
Total response category count	21	-

Table A-29. How important are traffic safety outcome measures to the LELs? (Q.2)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Very important	7	78%
Not important	2	22%
Total response category count	9	-

Table A-30. How important are traffic safety outcome measures to the SHSOs? (Q.3)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Very important	8	89%
Somewhat important	1	11%
Not important	0	0%
Total response category count	9	-

Table A-31. Who establishes the traffic safety outcome measures? (Q.4)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
SHSO	8	89%
LELs	2	22%
Combination of LEA and others	2	22%
Other	1	11%
NHTSA	1	11%
Total response category count	14	-

Table A-32. Who reviews and assesses outcome measures? (Q.5)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
SHSO	9	100%
SHSO grant specialists	2	22%
LELs	1	11%
Assessment team	1	11%
Total response category count	13	-

Table A-33. How do you review and assess LEA performance and activities? (Q.6)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Regular review and assessments are completed	5	56%
LEA must report after a specific time period	5	56%
A standard review and assessment document is used	5	56%
Review and assessment after each campaign	4	44%
Informal review and assessment are completed	3	33%
Routine monitoring of activities	2	22%
No review or assessment	1	11%
Reviews and assesses LEA activities upon request by grant manager	1	11%
Total response category count	26	-

Table A-34. What is the procedure if a LEA does not reach performance measurements? (Q.7)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Informal contact (phone or email)	8	89%
Personal meeting	6	67%
Re-assess data and goals	4	44%
Budget reduction	2	22%
Monitor	2	22%
Written notice	1	11%
Remove grant	1	11%
Pause grant and re-train	1	11%
Unknown at this time	1	11%
Grant application re-training	1	11%
Coaching	1	11%
Do not invite to participate next fiscal year	1	11%
Inform SHSO of deficiencies	1	11%
Total response category count	30	-

Table A-35. How are the results of the traffic safety performance measures (TSPMs) used to improve the effectiveness of grantee activities? (Q.8)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Improve enforcement strategies and details	5	56%
Better evaluate enforcement details	4	44%
Adjust budgets	3	33%
Defund	3	33%
Provide additional training, education, equipment	2	22%
Target enforcement	2	22%
Better use manpower or resources	2	22%
Unsure	2	22%
Participation is our main goal	2	22%
Provide additional "coaching"	1	11%
Total response category count	26	-

Table A-36. Is your LEL program required to complete performance assessment for your sponsoring agency or SHSO? (Q.9)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Yes	6	67%
No	3	33%
Standard assessment form	2	22%
Quarterly performance report	1	11%
Use LEL reporting form	1	11%
Based on contract deliverables	1	11%
Total response category count	14	-

Topic 5: Outreach

Table A-37. Who are your prime contacts when visiting LEAs? (Q.1)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Chief/sheriff	8	89%
Project coordinator	6	67%
Officer in charge	3	33%
Patrol supervisor	1	11%
Mayor	1	11%
Task force coordinator	1	11%
Total response category count	20	-

Table A-38. How often do you visit LEAs per year? (Q.2)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
1 time	1	11%
2 times	3	33%
3 to 5 times	3	33%
More than 5 times	2	22%
Total response category count	9	-

Table A-39. Describe the methods you use to contact and interact with your LEAs. (Q.3)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Personal contacts	9	100%
Phone	8	89%
Internet	8	89%
Lunch meeting	3	33%
Social media	2	22%
Group meetings	2	22%
Interact at trainings	2	22%
Conferences	2	22%
Writing articles for LEA journals and magazines	1	11%
Total response category count	37	-

Table A-40. What are your key training activities to encourage LEA participation in grant programs? (Q.4)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
SFST	9	100%
DRE	7	78%
Checkpoint training	6	67%
Below 100	5	56%
DDACTS	3	33%
TOPS	2	22%
Other/criminal justice system	2	22%
Child passenger certification	2	22%
Traffic stop training	2	22%
Grant writing	1	11%
Grant management training	1	11%
Executive and leadership training	1	11%
Crash reporting	1	11%
Instruction for intoxilizer instruments	1	11%
Older driver	1	11%
Graduated driver licensing	1	11%
Radar	1	11%
Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE)	1	11%
OP training	1	11%
Total response category count	48	-

Table A-41. What methods do not work to attract new grantees or mobilize LEAs? (Q.5)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Strong-arming	2	22%
Informing them of their problems	2	22%
Reaching out to political agents	1	11%
Cold calling	1	11%
Circumventing the chain of command	1	11%
Imposing restrictions to the grant activity	1	11%
Expecting LEAs to search for grant opportunities on State DOT bulletins	1	11%
Tries by calling a few times then moves on	1	11%
Federal govt wants you to participate	1	11%
Not having incentives	1	11%
Total response category count	12	-

Table A-42. Other than working with LEAs describe your other important outreach activities (Q.6)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Working with highway safety partners	6	67%
Working with social groups	3	33%
Working with media	3	33%
MADD	3	33%
Working with schools/colleges	2	22%
Health care	2	22%
Other State agencies	2	22%
Do not use outreach activities	1	11%
Working with other governmental agencies	1	11%
Roadside testing vehicle	1	11%
LEL program focuses on enforcement only	1	11%
Operation lifesaver	1	11%
Other government agencies	1	11%
Social media	1	11%
Coalitions	1	11%
Total response category count	29	-

Table A-43. What are the most important outreach methods LELs use to get community involvement in supporting traffic safety activities? (Q.7)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Do not document or measure outreach	3	33%
Joining groups/organizations/committees	2	22%
Social media	2	22%
Personal visits	1	11%
Media exposure	1	11%
Interaction with schools	1	11%
LEA chief association	1	11%
SHSO media specialist handles	1	11%
Child passenger safety (CPS) check-up event	1	11%
Coordinate through task forces	1	11%
Coalitions	1	11%
Total response category count	15	-

Table A-44. How does your program document and measure the performance and success of outreach activities? (Q.8)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Do not document or measure outreach	5	56%
Quarterly reports and annual reports	5	56%
Have a standardized collection form	1	11%
Informal collection of activities	1	11%
Media specialist handles it	1	11%
Total response category count	13	-

Topic 6: Communication

Table A-45. What is the LEL's role in interacting with the communities' non-LEA partners and stakeholders? (Q.1)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Does not interact with partners or stakeholders	4	44%
Does not engage with media - SHSO does	2	22%
LEA invite only	2	22%
Very little interaction with partners or stakeholders	2	22%
Referral	1	11%
CPS-related events	1	11%
Meetings – GDL-related	1	11%
Fraternities and sororities	1	11%
Community meetings	1	11%
Supports LEA coordinator's activities	1	11%
Total response category count	16	-

Table A-46. Describe the information communication technology your LEL program uses to communicate with partners and stakeholders. And what is the percentage of use? (Q.2)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Email	7	78%
Phone	6	67%
Facebook	3	33%
Zoom	2	22%
Twitter	1	11%
Does not interact with partners or stakeholders	1	11%
Total response category count	20	-

Table A-47. What is the LEL's role in (when) interacting with the media? (Q.3)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Does not work with media	8	89%
Works with SHSO media specialists	4	44%
16 LEL Regional coordinators handle public outreach	1	11%
Print media	1	11%
Events	1	11%
Social media	1	11%
Total response category count	16	-

Table A-48. How do you interact with the media? (Q.4)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
SHSO handles messaging	5	56%
Do not interact with the media	4	44%
Press events	3	33%
Attending events	3	33%
Interviews	2	22%
Social media	1	11%
SHSO media specialist	1	11%
Behind scene	1	11%
Total response category count	20	-

Table A-49. What type of messaging and information do you put on social media? (Q.5)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Do not post on social media	5	56%
Share messaging or post	4	44%
Campaign material	4	44%
SHSO handles messaging	3	33%
Enforcement campaigns	2	22%
We push out SHSO material	2	22%
Crash statistics	1	11%
Highway safety messages	1	11%
Crash stats	1	11%
Focus areas	1	11%
Total response category count	24	-

Table A-50. Who do you target with your social media messaging? (Q.6)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Do not use social media	4	44%
General public	3	33%
Social media followers of the SHSOs	3	33%
All LEAs	2	22%
General broadcast	2	22%
Funded LEAs	1	11%
Social media - target groups	1	11%
Impaired-driving partners	1	11%
Traffic safety research partners	1	11%
Targets different age groups	1	11%
Total response category count	19	-

Table A-51. What social media sites do you use and follow?
(Response category for this table is “Yes” or “No” if they follow LEA social media.) (Q.7)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Yes	7	78%
No	2	22%
Total response category count	9	-

Topic 7: COVID Pandemic

Table A-52. Have you noticed a difference in performance measures this year following the start of the COVID pandemic (c. March 2020)? (Q.1)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Decrease in number of enforcement contacts	9	100%
Decrease in hours of enforcement	9	100%
Decrease in number of arrests	8	89%
Dropped out or paused grant	1	11%
Decrease in participation in trainings	1	11%
Decrease in training attendance	1	11%
Unwilling to sponsor checkpoints	1	11%
Total response category count	30	-

Table A-53. Has there been a difference in willingness by law enforcement agencies in wanting to participate in highway safety grants since the beginning of the COVID pandemic?(Q.2)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Yes	7	78%
No	2	22%
Total response category count	9	-

Table A-54. Have you come up with any strategies to gain back grantees who have dropped out of highway safety programs this year? (Q.3)

Response Options	Count of responses	Percentage of responses by LEL
Yes	7	78%
No	2	22%
Increase phone, email, video contacts	2	22%
Allow to carryover funding	2	22%
Needed to use up funding grants so it picked up end of year	2	22%
Crash data	2	22%
More flexible with enforcement timelines	1	11%
Education on importance of traffic enforcement	1	11%
Monitoring the LEAs coming back online	1	11%
Different enforcement strategies (e.g., saturation patrols instead of checkpoints)	1	11%
Moving locations of training/meeting to increase attendance	1	11%
Not sure	0	0%
Total response category count	22	-

Appendix B: LEL Interview Guide

Topic 1: Sponsoring Organization Involvement

1. How much guidance from your sponsoring organization is helpful?
2. How do LELs, your sponsoring agency, and the SHSO communicate?
3. What is the frequency of contact with your sponsoring agency and the SHSO?
4. What specific guidance does your sponsoring agency provide to support your program activities?
5. What specific guidance from your sponsoring organization is not helpful?
6. What are the key attributes the sponsoring agency provides?
7. Are you involved in the strategic planning of the LEL program?
8. What specific planning activities are your responsibility?
9. What specific planning activities do you believe are essential for the LEL program to control?

Topic 2: Staff and Resource Allocation

1. Who is responsible in determining the number of LELs in your State?
2. How was the number of LELs in your State determined? (i.e., size of State, number of LEAs, program areas)
3. Would you increase, decrease, or keep the same number of LELs in your State? And why?
4. What determined your part-time or full-time LEL status?
5. Who is responsible to administrate LEL time and resources?
6. How are LEL responsibilities divided? Identify percentages by activity.
7. If you are an officer with a LEA, how do you manage your LEL responsibilities?

Topic 3: Roles and Responsibilities

1. How are crash data used to establish LEL priorities?
2. What is the most important LEL responsibility?
3. What role does an LEL have in selecting LEAs?
4. What role does the LEL have in establishing budgets for the LEAs?
5. What is the level of assistance you give LEAs in supporting their grant program or applications for grants?
6. What are the most important activities that increase LEA grant applications or participation?
7. What are the key strategies LELs use to convince the “hard-to-reach” LEAs to participate in grant programs?

8. What resources and data improve the LEL's ability to keep existing grantees and recruit new grantees?
9. What are your most significant challenges with getting non-participating LEAs to apply for grants?
10. Do LELs complete financial audits on funded LEAs?
11. What role does the LEL have in the financial audits of LEA grantees?

Topic 4: Performance Measures

1. How much responsibility do LELs have in LEA grantees reaching their goals?
2. How important are traffic safety outcome measures to the LELs?
3. How important are traffic safety outcome measures to the SHSOs?
4. Who establishes the outcome measures?
5. Who reviews and assesses outcome measures?
6. How do you review and assess LEA performance and activities?
7. What is the procedure if a LEA does not reach performance measurements?
8. How are the results of the traffic safety performance measures used to improve the effectiveness of grantee activities?
9. Is your LEL program required to complete performance assessment for your sponsoring agency or SHSO?

Topic 5: Outreach

1. Who are your prime contacts when visiting LEAs?
2. How often do you visit LEAs per year?
3. Describe the methods you use to contact and interact with your LEAs.
4. What are your key training activities to encourage LEA participation in grant programs?
5. What methods do not work to attract new grantees or mobilize LEAs?
6. Other than working with LEAs describe your other important outreach activities.
7. What are the most important outreach methods LELs use to get community involvement in supporting traffic safety activities?
8. How does your program document and measure the performance and success of outreach activities?

Topic 6: Communication

1. What is the LEL's role in interacting with the communities' non-LEA partners and stakeholders?
2. Describe the information communication technology your LEL program uses to communicate with partners and stakeholders.
3. What is the LEL's role in interacting with the media?

4. How do you interact with the media?
5. What type of messaging and information do you put on social media?
6. Who do you target with these messaging and information? (LEAs, partners, media, etc.)
7. What social media sites do you use and follow? (e.g., LEAs)

Topic 7: COVID Pandemic

1. Have you noticed a difference in performance measures this year following the start of the COVID pandemic (c. March 2020)?
2. Has there been a difference in willingness by law enforcement agencies in wanting to participate in highway safety grants since the beginning of the COVID pandemic?
3. Have you come up with any strategies to gain back grantees who have dropped out of highway safety programs this year?

DOT HS 813 392
March 2023



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

