

TEA
6022
.C2
C22

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

FEB 21 1974

LIBRARY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

✓
OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL

✓
THE EVALUATION OF THE
RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE
CONSULTING FIRM

DECEMBER 1972

This project is a part of the California Traffic Safety Program and was made possible through the support of the Office of Traffic Safety, State of California, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

TEA
6022
C2C22



Supplement to Report on
OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL

Purpose of this Supplement

1. Provide background information regarding the study.
2. Outline the management structure established to provide guidance and direction to the study group.
3. Identify areas of concern to management with the product submitted by the consultant firm and explain actions taken to resolve the issues.
4. Present, in matrix format, a listing of major study recommendations, the position of appropriate State departments, and implementation status for each recommendation.

Background

On 1 Jul 69, the Department of Motor Vehicles received authorization to spend \$487,327 in Federal funds from the Office of Traffic Safety to undertake an indepth study to respond fully to Senate Resolution 160 of the 1968 Legislative Session. The two main objectives of the study were:

1. Consider the need for improvement or changes in the relationship between the agencies concerned with safety on the highways, and
2. Consider the changes needed in the traffic laws, driver licensing laws and other laws related to highway safety.

To meet the objectives, a "systems model" approach to the study was necessary. It was felt that the identification of deficiencies and coordination problems in the traffic enforcement/driver control program, could lead to significant recommendations for program improvement, e.g., organizational changes, communication mechanisms, modification of existing laws, etc. The three major components of the traffic enforcement/driver control program to be studied were: (1) traffic courts and prosecutors, (2) police traffic services, and (3) administrative regulation (Department of Motor Vehicles).

Management Structure

Since the scope of the study involved both the executive and judicial branches of State Government, as well as numerous local

governmental organizations and functions, both a Project Steering Committee and a Project Advisory Committee were established.

The Steering Committee, acting as the project policy making body, consisted of the Director of Motor Vehicles serving as Chairman, the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol (CHP), and the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Although not an official member of the Steering Committee, a representative from the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) was included and attended Steering Committee meetings.

The Advisory Committee consisted of ten individuals. Committee members included judges, prosecutors, local law enforcement personnel, court clerks, county supervisors, and citizen safety groups.

Responsibility for day-to-day management of the project was assigned to a Project Director (Chief of Research and Statistics, DMV) and Co-Director (Chief of the Division of Drivers Licenses, DMV). A project work team consisting of representatives from the Department of Motor Vehicles, California Highway Patrol and Administrative Office of the Courts was also established to work with representatives of the consulting firm.

Study Approach

In the fall of 1969, a request for proposal (RFP) was released to 16 qualified firms. Proposals of nine firms were evaluated by the Steering Committee and project staff. A contract for \$446,000 was awarded to GTE Sylvania Sociosystems Laboratory to perform the study over a 17 month period.

The study methodology consisted of several major sub-studies involving field surveys in seven counties; a series of driver record follow-up studies using central driver record data; a regression analysis of system countermeasure effectiveness and accident frequency; an experiment in driver improvement; questionnaires administered to law enforcement agencies, judges, prosecutors, juvenile traffic hearing officers, driver improvement analysts and drivers; and interviews with legislators and key administrative officials.

The results of the systems analysis performed by the contractor are reported in a three-volume set of documents titled:

1. An Optimum System for Traffic Enforcement/Driver Control, Final Report Summary of Findings and Recommendations, October 1971.
2. An Optimum System for Traffic Enforcement/Driver Control, Final Report, Volume I, October 1971.
3. An Optimum System for Traffic Enforcement/Driver Control, Final Report, Volume II (Appendices), October 1971.

Areas of Concern

Upon receipt of the final report documents, an extensive review of the findings and recommendations was carried out by the Steering Committee and the staffs of the various affected agencies. In completing this review, the agencies were confronted with several problems which greatly complicated the review process and resulted in lengthy delays in transmitting the report to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the California Legislature for review and action.

1. In the judgment of the Steering Committee, while most of the study tasks were completed satisfactorily, some of the tasks were not developed to the extent required in the contract work plan and a few of the more specialized technical tasks did not meet minimum performance standards. Additionally, the contractor failed to develop adequate cost/benefit data, which made it difficult and sometimes impossible to assess the feasibility of improvement recommendations.(1)
2. The three-volume set of final project reports submitted to the contractor did not provide a complete and comprehensive listing of all the recommendations in one document. The volume titled "Summary of Findings and Recommendations" was intended to provide such a comprehensive listing; however, upon detailed review of the documents, it was determined that many statements of recommendations were not brought forward from the Volume I report. Only major "systems type" recommendations appear in the summary report.
3. Several recommendations made by the contractor were multifaceted, involving action by more than one department or agency. Several other recommendations involved changes within both the executive and judicial branches of State Government. Evaluating recommendations of this nature, which is difficult even under the most favorable circumstances, was complicated by the absence of cost data and a specific implementation plan.

The above factors not only necessitated, but also prolonged the final review of the consultant's work before transmitting the reports to the Legislature. In order to crystalize specific improvement recommendations and conduct a meaningful review, it was necessary for the staff of the Department of Motor Vehicles to complete the following tasks:

(1) As a result of the noted deficiencies, on 10 Jan 72, the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles (Steering Committee Chairman) notified GTE Sylvania Incorporated that unless the study deficiencies were corrected, the final payment of \$44,600 would be considered forfeited. The State has since expended additional time and project funds to correct some of the deficiencies (see erratum to Volume II).

1. Extract and prepare from the reports a complete listing of all study recommendations. This resulted in a listing of 82 recommendations. A summary and evaluation matrix of the 82 recommendations is presented as Exhibit A.
2. Prepare an evaluation sheet (Exhibit B) for each recommendation and transmit a complete set of sheets to each of the participating agencies for completion.

The column headings of the matrix are abbreviations of the involved departments as follows:

OTS - Office of Traffic Safety
DMV - Department of Motor Vehicles
AOC - Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Council
CHP - California Highway Patrol

Within the matrix the following designations are used:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
A - Agree	C - Completed
MA- Mostly agree	P - In process
MD- Mostly disagree	S - Scheduled
D - Disagree	(-) - Undetermined
N - Neutral	
I - Insufficient data to determine position	
XX- Recommendation does not apply to this department	

Because of the compound nature of many of the recommendations and differing conventions used by each agency in formulating this response, caution must be utilized in interpreting the attached matrix and the basis of each department's position. In most cases, position was determined on the basis of what was to be accomplished by the recommendation rather than what agency should be responsible for its implementation. In the case of compound recommendations underlining has been used to indicate the part of the recommendation upon which the position was determined. The comment sheets from each agency have been saved as backup documents in the event of future inquiries and study.

The review process resulted in a breakdown of the current implementation status of the 82 recommendations as follows:

Implementation completed.....	11
Implementation in process.....	31
Implementation scheduled.....	6
Implementation undetermined...	34

In reviewing the attached recommendations, several instances can be noted in which the State unanimously disagrees (or non-concurs) with

the consultant's recommendations. In such cases, the State Project Steering Committee encourages the independent evaluation of others, most notably the Legislature, and will be happy to supply additional explanatory material to interested parties. There also are instances in which the State agencies disagree with each other on certain recommendations or in which the implementation status of acceptable recommendations is indefinite or undetermined. In these cases, further direction and impetus from the Legislature may be necessary to promote implementation of desirable changes in the traffic enforcement/driver control system. It seems particularly essential that further legislative involvement be considered in those areas involving interpretations of existing legislative intent and the questions of judicial autonomy.

Inquiries regarding the project or implementation of the study recommendations should be addressed to the Director, Department of Motor Vehicles, P. O. Box 1828, Sacramento, CA 95809.

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
1. The California Traffic Safety Program should be expanded to meet the broad objective (as stated in Section 2900 C.V.C.) of reducing death and injury due to traffic accidents. This will involve going far beyond insuring compliance with federal standards to the development of a coordinated approach to traffic safety problems by all agencies of government. (Vol. I, Page III-2.)	A	A	A	A	P	-	-	-
2. The Office of Traffic Safety should broaden its role and be charged with coordinating the development and implementation of the California Traffic Safety Program and with evaluating its effectiveness. The line agencies which would implement the Program should also be involved with its development. (Vol. I, Page III-2 and 14.)	A	A	XX	I	P	-	-	-
3. The Traffic Court Coordinator in the Administrative Office of the Courts should work closely with the Office of Traffic Safety to aid in the development, implementation and evaluation of the California Traffic Safety Program. This relationship should be formalized. (Vol. I, Page III-2 and 14.)	A	A	MA	A	-	-	C	-
4. <u>The Legislature should amend the Vehicle Code to require a more comprehensive California Traffic Safety Plan</u> dealing with all aspects of traffic safety to be developed and to be updated on a yearly basis. The Plan should include the traffic safety problems facing California, the approaches to be taken to alleviate problems, the roles and responsibilities of agencies with regard to each program, experimental and research program to be carried out, and the legislation and funding needed to accomplish the programs. (Vol I, Page III-3.)	D	MD	XX	MD	-	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree	N - Neutral
MA - Mostly Agree	I - Insufficient data
MD - Mostly Disagree	XX - Does not apply to this department.
D - Disagree	

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
 P - In Process
 S - Scheduled
 - - Undetermined

APPENDIX A

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
5. The Office of Traffic Safety should develop formalized procedures for coordinating the courts, the Department of Motor Vehicles and the California Highway Patrol to achieve a unified comprehensive approach to traffic safety. (Vol. 1, Page III-5.)	A	A	MD	A	P	-	-	-
6. The Office of Traffic Safety, with the help of the Traffic Court Coordinator and the Departments of Education and Health, should be charged with developing a unified approach to the drinking driver and coordinating the implementation of the plan. (Vol. I, Page III-6.)	A	A	A	A	P	-	-	-
7. The Office of Traffic Safety should take the lead in further developing and coordinating the use of sequential penalties and treatments and, through the Traffic Court Coordinator, actively encourage judges and traffic referees to use them. (Vol. I, Page III-7.)	A	A	I	MA	S	-	-	-
8. The Office of Traffic Safety should take the initiative to bring the problem on the use and enforcement of license controls up for consideration and help reach policy agreement among all agencies concerned. It should then encourage actions consistent with policy and help establish necessary information exchange. (Vol. I, Page III-8.)	A	A	MA	A	S	-	-	-
9. The Office of Traffic Safety should serve as initiator and as the focus to establish a study to determine if a more complex and expensive communication system should be designed and implemented between the Department of Motor Vehicles and the courts. (Vol. I, Page III-8, X-2, 6.)	MA	MA	MA	MA	P	P	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
10. The Office of Traffic Safety should impartially review traffic safety budgets with the objective of insuring that funds are spent where they will do the most good in terms of overall traffic safety. To accomplish this, the Office of Traffic Safety will need data developed within operating agencies and may also require additional studies to be performed. (Vol. I, Page III-9 and 14.)	D	MA	XX	N	-	-	-	-
11. The Office of Traffic Safety should propose, develop or coordinate development and implementation of traffic safety experimental and research studies. The studies would be performed by research staff of the appropriate agency and the Office of Traffic Safety could provide assistance in designing, monitoring and disseminating information regarding the study. (Vol. I, Page III-11, 14 & 15.)	A	A	N	MA	P	-	-	-
12. The Office of Traffic Safety should develop a Traffic Safety Program legislative package, press for its passage and act as spokesman for all agencies concerned with traffic safety. (Vol. I, Page III-11 and 16.)	D	MD	N	N	-	-	-	-
13. The Secretary of the Business and Transportation Agency should continue to administer the California Traffic Safety Program. The Office of Traffic Safety should carry out the day-to-day functions associated with developing the program and administering its implementation and should advise the Secretary on all matters pertaining to traffic safety. (Vol. I, Page III-12.)	A	MA	XX	MA	P	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree	N - Neutral
MA - Mostly Agree	I - Insufficient Data
MD - Mostly Disagree	XX - Does not apply to
D - Disagree	this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
14. The staff of the Office of Traffic Safety should be expanded sufficiently so that it can perform the additional functions of coordinating development, implementation and evaluation of the California Traffic Safety Program, and advising the Secretary on all matters pertaining to traffic safety. (Vol. I, Page III-12.)	A	MA	XX	I	P	-	-	-
15. The Traffic Safety Coordinator should meet on a regular basis with a committee composed of the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol, the Chief of the Division of Highways and the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts to establish policy and to resolve major problems that will arise. From time to time, representatives from other agencies, e.g., Education, Public Health, should attend the meetings. (Vol. I, Page III-14.)	A	A	A	A	P	P	-	-
16. The Department of Motor Vehicles, California Highway Patrol, Division of Highways and Administrative Office of the Courts should each appoint a representative to work closely with the Office of Traffic Safety and to serve as liaison between it. (Vol. I, Page III-14.)	A	A	A	A	P	C	-	C
17. The Legislature should provide, when necessary, the enabling legislation so that experimental studies may legally be performed. (Vol. I, Page III-16.)	A	A	A	A	P	C	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
18. The licensing examination for new drivers should be more comprehensive in scope, more thorough and the threshold for passing should be raised. Changes should include developing sets of written questions dealing with safe driving practices and driver attitudes, developing a more comprehensive driving skill test and raising the level of skill that must be demonstrated by a new driver. This recommendation should be subject to an experimental program to gather actual data on the improvement new drivers will show before it is instituted throughout the State. (Vol. I, Page IV-1, 2, 6-10.)	N	MA	XX	N	-	P	-	-
19. The Department of Motor Vehicles should conduct a small study to determine if applicants for a California driver's license who possess a valid license from another state should be required to take the same comprehensive test as new drivers or whether they can be given a simpler, more economical test, such as is given for license renewals. (Vol. I, Page IV-1.)	A	A	XX	XX	-	C	-	-
20. The Departments of Motor Vehicles and Education, in coordination with the Office of Traffic Safety, should develop jointly a requirement and more suitable high school course for education and training for the potential driver, with particular emphasis on instilling in him a better attitude toward driving. The current study of high school courses and commercial driving schools should produce much more definitive recommendations. (Vol. I, Page IV-2 and 4.)	A	A	XX	XX	P	C	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
21. The driver education study being conducted by the Department of Motor Vehicles should take into consideration attitudinal education as well as attempt to evaluate the curriculum with regard to the number of hours spent in the classroom and its ratio to the number of hours on the road in actual driving. (Vol. I, Page IV-4.)	N	ND	XX	XX	-	-	-	-
22. The Driver Handbook should include material that provides information on safe driving practices and some discussion of driver attitude. (Vol. I, Page IV-6 and 8.)	A	A	XX	XX	-	S	-	-
23. Data necessary to perform a cost-effectiveness analysis of traffic patrol should be obtained as soon as possible and the results of the analysis should be considered by all law enforcement agencies and budgeting authorities. The findings of the Operation 101 and 500 studies should be made available as soon as possible and if they are not conclusive a new study should be undertaken. (Vol. I, Page V-2 and 7.)	N	N	XX	A	-	-	-	P
24. The California Highway Patrol should eliminate uniform officers from passenger vehicle inspection and use trained mechanics instead. (Vol. I, Page V-2.)	A	XX	XX	A	-	-	-	C
25. Traffic officers should not be required to appear at every contested case involving an arrest they made, but only in major violation cases. The San Francisco Municipal Court program should be evaluated and, if successful, adopted by other jurisdictions throughout the State. (Vol. I, Page V-2, 10 & 11.)	A	I	I	A	P	-	-	P

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
26. Uniform enforcement guidelines should be developed and adopted by all enforcement agencies. The guidelines should stress those moving violations that produce a high accident risk under the particular circumstances existing at the time of the violation. The California Highway Patrol should disseminate this information as well as propose uniform enforcement standards to local agencies. Local agencies should make a greater effort to apply this information to their own particular traffic enforcement needs. (Vol. I, Page V-2 and 8.)	A	MA	XX	A	-	-	-	C
27. At every contact made with drivers, the validity of his driver's license should be verified by the traffic officer and in every instance where a driver does not have his license in his possession, he should be cited. (Vol. I, Page V-2.)	D	A	XX	MA	-	-	-	-
28. The Office of Traffic Safety should promote the exchange of information between law enforcement agencies regarding the effectiveness of traffic enforcement techniques and should provide research and experimental studies to obtain data needed to determine program effectiveness. (Vol. I, Page V-3 and 7.)	A	A	XX	A	P	-	-	-
29. Local law enforcement agencies should review their programs and give consideration to selective enforcement techniques that have proven successful, e.g., the Paul Dixon Method of Selective Enforcement. (Vol. I, Page V-8.)	A	MA	XX	A	P	-	-	P

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
30. Local enforcement agencies should provide all their traffic officers with some training in traffic enforcement. (Vol. I, Page V-9.)	A	A	XX	A	P	-	-	-
31. The effectiveness of the current Passenger Vehicle Inspection Program should be determined to see if it is cost-effective and to compare its effectiveness to a periodic inspection program where the inspection is performed in a fully equipped inspection station. (Vol. I, Page V-10.)	A	MA	XX	A	-	-	-	-
32. The California Highway Patrol should make use of radar as an enforcement aid. (Vol. I, Page V-12.)	N	A	XX	A	-	-	-	P
33. The uniform accident investigation and reporting procedures proposed as part of the Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System should be adopted by all enforcement agencies in the State. (Vol. I, Page V-13.)	A	A	XX	A	P	-	-	P
34. Tow truck operators should be required to notify the police of an accident if the police are not already at the scene of the accident. (Vol. I, Page V-13.)	N	N	XX	N	-	-	-	-
35. Ordinary rules-of-the-road violations (Division 11 C.V.C. except for most of Chapter 12) should be reclassified as infractions so that simplified procedures can be used to adjudicate these violations. More serious traffic violations should remain misdemeanors and felonies. (Vol. I, Page VI-1, 2 & 8-10.)	A	MA	A	N	C	-	P	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
 MA - Mostly Agree
 MD - Mostly Disagree
 D - Disagree
 N - Neutral
 I - Insufficient Data
 XX - Does not apply to this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
 P - In Process
 S - Scheduled
 - - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
36. A defendant should not have to appear more than once to contest a citation. This can be accomplished by scheduling both the arraignment and trial to occur at the same time. A second appearance would be necessary only if the defendant wants a jury trial or the officer to be present. (Vol. I, Page VI-2, 11-13.)	A	MA	MA	A	P	-	P	-
37. Infractions (Reference Recommendation #35) should be adjudicated by a lesser legal officer than a judge in Municipal Courts. (Vol. I, Page VI-2, VII-1, 3, 4.)	A	A	I	N	P	-	P	-
38. <u>The Judicial Council and/or the Legislature should review and better define the procedures under which prior convictions, particularly those for drunk driving, may be dismissed.</u> The Department of Motor Vehicles should tabulate, by court, the number of prior drunk driving convictions each court has dismissed and should forward this information to the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Office of Traffic Safety to determine reasons for the dismissals and discussion of problems with judges. (Vol. I, Page VI-2, X-4.)	N	A	I	MA	-	-	-	-
39. Courts should consider allowing a driver to make his intentions as to whether he will plead guilty with explanation or not guilty known to the court clerk by mail. (Vol. I, Page VI-13.)	N	I	I	XX	-	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
40. The Grunsky bill, SB 1312, should be passed by the Legislature so as to stop the abuses of the Mitchell vs. Orr decision. (Vol. I, Page VI-16.)	A	MA	A	XX	-	-	C	-
41. The Judicial Council should impress on all judges the meaning of the Mitchell vs. Orr decision and not abuse it. (Vol. I, Page VI-16.)	A	A	MA	XX	-	-	P	-
42. The prosecutor should check the license status with DMV of every driver who did not have a license in his possession when he was stopped and should file an amended complaint of driving with a suspended license if that was the case. (Vol. I, Page VI-17.)	A	A	XX	A	C	-	-	-
43. Judges should allow charges in complaints amended to include driving with a suspended license (refer to Recommendation #42) to be prosecuted to the full extent of the law when the driver is also charged with another traffic violation. (Vol. I, Page VI-17.)	A	A	I	A	C	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
44. <u>Courts should make every effort to obtain and forward to the Department of Motor Vehicles the license of drivers convicted of a violation that requires a mandatory suspension or revocation. An informational program to make courts aware of the requirement would be helpful.</u> AMIS should check to see if courts have picked up the license of the driver in cases where a mandatory suspension or revocation is required. Failures to do so should be tabulated by court and forwarded to the Administrative Office of the Courts for action. (Vol. I, Page VI-17, VIII-3, 17 & 25, X-4.)	A	A	MA	XX	-	P	-	-
45. The Office of Traffic Safety, in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Department of Motor Vehicles, should undertake a study to determine the feasibility of removing the adjudication of ordinary rules-of-the-road violations and other traffic infractions from the courts and establishing an administrative adjudication system similar to the one recently established in New York City. (Vol. I, Page VII-2, 4-6.)	A	A	MA	MD	-	-	P	-
46. The powers of traffic referees should be expanded to include the hearing of contested infraction cases, including the rendering of decisions concerning guilt and the imposition of penalties in such cases. (Vol. I, Page VII-3.)	A	MA	I	N	P	-	P	-

POSITION:

A - Agree	N - Neutral
MA - Mostly Agree	I - Insufficient Data
MD - Mostly Disagree	XX - Does not apply to this department.
D - Disagree	

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
47. Judges should continue to handle adjudication of misdemeanor violations of the Vehicle Code; Justice Court judges should continue to hear both infractions and misdemeanors. (Vol. I, Page VII-4.)	N	I	I	N	-	-	P	-
48. The courts should report to the Department of Motor Vehicles all convictions in which the driver was sentenced to traffic school and the Department of Motor Vehicles should count all these convictions. (Vol. I, Page VIII-1 & 12.)	A	MA	N	A	-	-	-	-
49. <u>Drivers, instead of being sent to traffic school, should be sent to the more cost-effective group education meeting (GEM) run by the Department of Motor Vehicles.</u> Consideration should be given to changing driving schools to more closely meet GEM standards or phasing out the schools. (Vol. I, Page VIII-1 & 13.)	N	MA	I	N	-	-	-	-
50. The Administrative Office of the Courts should undertake an informational program to make judges more aware of which sentences are effective in dealing with various types of drivers. (Vol. I, Page VIII-1.)	A	A	A	A	-	-	C	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
51. <u>The Department of Motor Vehicles should notify the court of the discrepancy every time they receive an abstract showing that a mandatory jail sentence was not imposed in cases requiring it or when a sentence does not comply with the Vehicle Code.</u> AMIS should also be programmed to see that penalties imposed meet the requirements of the Vehicle Code. Conflicts should be reported to the Administrative Office of the Courts. Frequent conflicts with regard to a particular violation or court should be resolved by the Department of Motor Vehicles, Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Office of Traffic Safety. (Vol. I, Page VIII-1, 2, 9, X-4.)	D	MA	MA	XX	-	-	-	-
52. The Department of Motor Vehicles should develop and determine the effectiveness experimentally of tailored treatments for negligent operators who are accident prone and those who are violation prone. (Vol. I, Page VIII-2, 18-22.)	MA	A	XX	XX	-	S	-	-
53. A regression model to identify drivers for treatment should be used rather than the current system of negligent operator points. (Vol. I, Page VIII-2 & 15.)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
54. The causes of long delays should be identified and eliminated between: a) the time the Department of Motor Vehicles is notified of a conviction and the time it holds a Neg-Or hearing or takes a mandatory action, b) accident involvement and a reexamination, and c) a physical and mental incident and a DMV action. (Vol. I, Page VIII-2, 15-18.)	A	A	XX	A	-	P	-	-

*Subsequent to completion of final report by the contractor, the Department of Motor Vehicles investigated the validity of the data in the regression model and found that the data was incorrect. See addendum to Volume II.

POSITION:

A - Agree
 MA - Mostly Agree
 MD - Mostly Disagree
 D - Disagree
 N - Neutral
 I - Insufficient Data
 XX - Does not apply to this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
 P - In Process
 S - Scheduled
 - - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
55. Criteria for suspension or restriction of a license and the procedures used to monitor probation should be reviewed for possible improvements. (Vol. I, Page VIII-2, 21.)	A	A	XX	A	-	-	-	-
56. The status of every driver should be checked by AMIS every time a conviction abstract or accident report is entered into his record and if it is determined the driver was driving while suspended, the DMV should provide this information to the District Attorney's office so that a complaint may be filed. (Vol. I, Page VIII-3, 25, 28; X-1, 3.)	A	MA	XX	A	-	-	-	-
57. A more consistent approach toward the driver to achieve greatest improvement in his future driving performance should be developed and implemented by the DMV and the courts. This approach should include a progression of penalties and treatments which depend upon the driver's prior record as well as the violation and should have as its measure of effectiveness, the degree to which it improves the driver's future performance. (Vol. I, Page VIII-3, 11, 21.)	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-
58. <u>The Office of Traffic Safety should initiate a test project to evaluate the use and effectiveness of a sequential set of penalties and treatments and implement those proven effective.</u> Funds should be set aside by appropriate agencies for innovative research to develop new and better treatment. (Vol. I, Page VIII-11, 29, 33.)	A	A	A	XX	P	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
59. The Office of Traffic Safety should initiate and coordinate the development of a policy for penalizing and treating the drunk driver which can be adopted by all concerned agencies and implemented uniformly. (Vol. I, Page VIII-4.)	A	A	A	A	-	-	-	-
60. <u>Courts should make an effort to forward all abstracts to the Department of Motor Vehicles within the 10 days required by the Vehicle Code.</u> The DMV should tabulate the promptness of each court and should take action to make those courts that are consistently late comply with the Vehicle Code. (Vol. I, Page VIII-15; X-4.)	MA	MA	MA	XX	-	-	-	-
61. Local police should be required to file accident reports with the California Highway Patrol on a weekly basis rather than monthly. (Vol. I, Page VIII-17 & 18.)	N	MA	XX	MA	-	-	-	P
62. The Office of Traffic Safety should work with the Departments of Motor Vehicles and Public Health to speed up the reporting process for physical and mental incidents. (Vol. I, Page VIII-18.)	A	MA	XX	XX	-	P	-	-
63. The Department of Motor Vehicles should conduct an experiment to determine the effectiveness of placing negligent operators on probation. (Vol. I, Page VIII-2, 21.)	A	MA	XX	XX	-	C	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
64. The Department of Motor Vehicles should use individual hearings to identify other problems a driver may have that are contributing to his poor driving record. A complete list of agencies should be available to each Driver Improvement Analyst for referral purposes. (Vol. I, Page VIII-4 & 33.)	N	MD	XX	XX	-	-	-	-
65. Severe penalties should be imposed on the drinking driver to discourage such dangerous driving behavior in the future. The first conviction should include a heavy fine, perhaps imprisonment, and a license restriction should be imposed. A second conviction within a few years should include a heavier fine, a jail sentence and a license suspension. A third conviction should require a mandatory 14-day observation in a mental hospital as well as license suspension or revocation. (Vol. I, Page VIII-36.)	D	MD	I	N	-	-	-	-
66. In addition to checking his prior driver record, a check should be made with the Bureau of Criminal Statistics to determine whether a drinking driver has a prior record of common drunk charges and/or if there is evidence of homicidal or suicidal tendencies. If so, immediate referral to an alcoholic treatment center should be made. (Vol. I, Page VIII-36.)	MA	MA	I	XX	-	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree	N - Neutral
MA - Mostly Agree	I - Insufficient Data
MD - Mostly Disagree	XX - Does not apply to
D - Disagree	this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
67. The DMV should make use of license restrictions instead of license suspensions in certain cases where suspension appears too severe and probation not severe enough. Violation of a restriction must be considered as serious an offense as driving with a suspended license. The DMV, in conjunction with the Office of Traffic Safety, should mount an information program to make traffic officers, prosecutors, and judges aware of the use of restrictions and that its violation should be dealt with in the same manner as suspensions. <u>The effectiveness of restrictions should be evaluated and, if demonstrated successful, use of restrictions could be expanded.</u> (Vol. I, Page VIII-37 & 38.)	A	MA	MA	A	-	-	-	-
68. The Department of Motor Vehicles should better allocate its use of tests to test more thoroughly drivers deemed to be high risks and reward good drivers by waiving all tests. Experimentation is necessary to determine the best policy. (Vol. I, Page IX-1, 2, 3.)	N	A	XX	MD	-	S	-	-
69. The Office of Traffic Safety, with the help of the Department of Public Health, should make doctors aware of the need to report physical and mental conditions promptly to the DMV. (Vol. I, Page IX-1, 5.)	A	MD	XX	XX	S	-	-	-
70. Driver Improvement Analysts should receive additional training in psychology, counseling and traffic safety. (Vol. I, Page IX-2, 5, 6.)	A	MA	XX	XX	-	P	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
71. The Department of Motor Vehicles should recruit Driver Improvement Analysts with backgrounds in sociology or psychology without the need for them to first be Drivers License Examiners. (Vol. I, Page IX-2, 5, 6.)	A	MA	XX	XX	-	-	-	-
72. The prohibition against testing a driver solely because of his age should be removed and drivers over 70 should not be allowed to renew their license automatically, even if they are among the group of good drivers. (Vol. I, Page IX-3.)	A	MA	XX	XX	-	-	-	-
73. Each Driver Improvement Analyst should work in a caseload so that each individual case can be followed and guided into a state of reduced social stress. (Vol. I, Page IX-6.)	D	MD	XX	XX	-	-	-	-
74. Driver Improvement Analysts should determine which of their programs are of little value and DMV should investigate the effectiveness of those programs. (Vol. I, Page IX-6.)	MD	MD	XX	XX	-	-	-	-
75. The courts should be required to report to the DMV all probations, suspensions, etc., that they impose on drivers so that accurate license status checks can be performed. (Vol. I, Page X-1.)	A	A	I	XX	-	-	-	-
76. The DMV should make use of the information contained in the AMIS System that indicates how well the traffic enforcement/driver control system is performing and then provide information regarding particular problems to each component of the system for action. (Vol. I, Page X-1, 2, 3, 4.)	A	MA	XX	A	-	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
77. <u>The courts should be required to obtain priors for those cases in which conviction could lead to mandatory suspension.</u> The DMV could make use of requests for priors to provide courts with additional information, e.g., license status, unserved notices and a reminder to pick up the driver's license if convicted of a violation that requires mandatory suspension or revocation. (Vol. I, Page X-2 & 5.)	MA	A	MA	MA	-	-	-	-
78. The DMV should provide current license status information to those counties which have their own local computerized driver record system. (Vol. I, Page X-2 & 6.)	D	MA	XX	XX	-	P	-	-
79. Section 13209 of the Vehicle Code should be amended to require priors to be obtained before sentencing a driver in any case where mandatory suspension or revocation is required rather than just for drunk driving. (Vol. I, Page X-4.)	A	A	MA	XX	-	-	-	-
80. The DMV should receive an accident report from both the California Highway Patrol and the driver for all accidents in which an injury or fatality occurred. <u>When a report is received from one source but not the other, the DMV should notify the deficient party accordingly.</u> When there is a long time lag between the date of the accident and receipt of the report from the CHP, the DMV should tabulate this deficiency and forward the information to the CHP for action. (Vol. I, Page X-5.)	D	I	XX	MD	-	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

OPTIMUM SYSTEM FOR TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT/DRIVER CONTROL
EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Position				Implementation			
	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP	OTS	DMV	AOC	CHP
81. If the Los Angeles County prior system is successful, a similar program should be reinstituted in San Diego County or any other county that will have a computerized local driver records system. (Vol. I, Page X-6.)	D	MA	MA	XX	-	-	-	-
82. When a record checking capability exists at its field offices, the DMV should establish procedures to check a driver's record before a temporary or interim driver's license is issued. (Vol. I, Page X-9.)	MD	A	XX	XX	-	-	-	-

POSITION:

A - Agree
MA - Mostly Agree
MD - Mostly Disagree
D - Disagree

N - Neutral
I - Insufficient Data
XX - Does not apply to
this department.

IMPLEMENTATION:

C - Completed
P - In Process
S - Scheduled
- - Undetermined

APPENDIX B

SYLVANIA (SR-160) RECOMMENDATION
EVALUATION SHEET

A. Recommendation No.: _____

B. Location in SR-160 Report: Vol. _____. Page _____

C. Summary of Recommendation:

D. Evaluation Submitted by:

☐ DMV ☐ CHP ☐ AOC ☐ OTS
☐ Other (Identify): _____

E. Position:

☐ Agree ☐ Mostly agree ☐ Mostly disagree
☐ Disagree ☐ Neutral
☐ Insufficient data to determine position ☐ Does not apply to this department

F. Implementation Considerations:

☐ Already implemented ☐ Being implemented
☐ Implementation scheduled ☐ Should not be implemented
☐ Other (Explain)

G. Comments:

☐ Attached ☐ Unnecessary

H. Direct Inquiries Regarding Evaluation to:

Name: _____ Location: _____

Phone: _____

I. Date Submitted: _____