



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Summary of State Activities	3
Fundable Activities	5
Alaska	6
Arizona	8
Arkansas	10
California	11
Colorado	13
Connecticut	14
Delaware	16
Florida	18
Georgia	20
Guam	22
Hawaii	23
Indiana	24
Iowa	26
Kansas	28
Kentucky	30
Louisiana	32
Maine	33
Maryland	34
Massachusetts	37
Michigan	38
Minnesota	40
Mississippi	41
Missouri	43
Montana	45
Nebraska	47
Nevada	49
New Hampshire	50
New Jersey	52
New Mexico	54
North Carolina	56
North Dakota	58
Ohio	59
Oklahoma	62
Oregon	64
Pennsylvania	65
Rhode Island	66
South Carolina	67
South Dakota	69
Tennessee.....	70
Texas	72
Vermont	73
Virginia	75
Virgin Islands	76
Washington	77
West Virginia	78
Wisconsin	80
State Contacts	82

The Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) is the states' voice on highway safety. The 501(c)(3) nonprofit association represents the highway safety programs of states and territories on the human behavioral aspects on highway safety. For more information or to order previous surveys on seatbelts, aggressive driving or underage drinking, call (202) 789-0942. The Association's activities and viewpoints are regularly updated online at: www.statehighwaysafety.org.

Introduction

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) was the most significant piece of public works legislation ever passed. In addition to restructuring federal highway, transit, and motor carrier programs, the Act reauthorized two highway safety grant programs, authorized six new incentive grant programs, and authorized two new safety-related penalty provisions. All of the grant programs and penalty provisions address driver and roadway user behavior.

The approximately \$500 million dollars a year in behavioral highway safety funding has been administered by State Highway Safety Offices -- members of the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA). TEA-21 provided every state with increased funding for programs, which in turn allowed them to increase enforcement of safety laws, embark on ambitious educational campaigns, conduct more child safety seat inspections and other safety-related activities.

The increased funding has translated into lives being saved. In 1999, 2000, 2001, and again in 2002, the nation achieved its lowest motor vehicle fatality rate on record. Particularly encouraging was that the number of children killed in auto crashes was the lowest since the government started tracking traffic deaths in the 1960's. Not coincidentally, the nation also achieved 75 percent seat belt use rate in 2001, the highest national use rate percentage recorded.

TEA-21 funding has also been extremely cost effective. In Nebraska, for example, state research has shown that for every TEA-21 dollar expended in the state, there was a public fund cost savings of \$4.66. This publication provides a mere **snapshot** of the

type of programs states have implemented to achieve such dramatic progress. If adequate funding is not provided in the reauthorization of TEA-21, which expires in September 2003, many of these innovative efforts will cease to exist.

Earlier in 2003, GHSA outlined its priorities for the reauthorization of TEA-21 in a report titled "Taking the Temperature of TEA-21: Ten Recommendations for Progress." For a copy of the report, visit www.statehighwaysafety.org or contact GHSA's Washington Headquarters Office at 202-789-0942.

Summary of State Activities

A total of 38 states and 2 territories responded to the GHSA survey on TEA-21 funded activities. States reported on TEA-21 activities and programs that **they** considered noteworthy or significant, so not every state reported on activities or programs in every category. Despite this limitation, several conclusions can be reached about what states are funding with TEA-21 funding.

Occupant Protection

Thirty-one states and two territories reported that TEA-21 grant funds had been used to support high-visibility enforcement campaigns to encourage increased safety belt use. States used 402, 405, 157 basic, and 157 innovative funds to support state and local police agencies. These agencies enforced state safety belt laws by using enforcement “waves” along with pre- and post- wave awareness activities.

Some states used funds to support overtime pay for law enforcement personnel who participated in the enforcement waves. Other states used the federal funds to support Law Enforcement Liaisons (LEL) who worked with the law enforcement agencies and encouraged their active participation in the enforcement waves.

The responding states also indicated that federal funds were used for high-visibility public information and education efforts that reinforced the safety belt message. States employed a variety of techniques for getting the message across including: public service announcements, billboards, posters, and paid radio and television announcements. A number of states targeted specific non-use populations such as pickup drivers; and at least one state used the funding to support law enforcement competitions which encouraged higher belt use.

Child Passenger Safety (CPS)

Twenty-nine states and two territories reported that TEA-21 funding had been used to improve child passenger safety. States typically used 402 funds as well as the 405 and 2003(b) funds for CPS programs.

Federal funds were used for a wide variety of purposes: to support a state CPS coordinator who worked with state agencies and private sector organizations to harmonize CPS programs and activities; to conduct child restraint clinics and safety checks, and to establish permanent fitting stations in which parents brought their restraint-equipped vehicle to be checked at an appointed time. States also utilized federal funds to train thousands of CPS technicians and instructors in the NHTSA standardized training curriculum. In addition, federal funds were used to purchase and distribute child restraints for low-income families and provide certified technicians and instructors with periodic technical updates on new developments in child restraint design and other technical issues. Finally, states used federal funds to develop awareness materials to inform parents about the most appropriate way to restrain children of different ages. States which enacted new booster seat laws or those who strengthened their current CPS laws also developed and disseminated materials to the public explaining the legislative initiatives.

Impaired Driving

Thirty states and one territory indicated that they had used TEA-21 grant funds for impaired driving programs. States typically used 402, 410, 163, and portions of penalty funds for impaired driving purposes. Nearly every one of the thirty states reported

using the TEA-21 grant funding for impaired driving enforcement. These states conducted sobriety checkpoints or saturation patrols, often in high-visibility waves accompanied by public awareness campaigns. The funds were typically used for overtime enforcement and for the public information component of the enforcement waves.

States also funded equipment purchases for law enforcement to detect impaired drivers (such as passive alcohol sensors and breath testers) or for Mobile Breath Alcohol Testing Vehicles (BATmobiles) which can be used to facilitate testing and processing of impaired driving in the field.

Traffic Records

Twenty-two states mentioned that TEA-21 grant funds have enabled them to make improvements in their traffic records system. The ideal state traffic records system is comprised of crash data linked with citation and arrest data, driver licensing data, hospital data, roadway location data, EMS data, and other safety-related databases. These data are used by states to help identify problems, set goals, select appropriate countermeasures and evaluate program performance.

Every state has a system for collecting crash data at the scene, aggregating the data at the state level, disseminating data to the various state (and frequently) local agencies, and analyzing the data for program planning purposes. Some states can also link crash data to other relevant databases, such as EMS and hospital data, which are managed by other state agencies. In most states, however, crash data collection is not fully automated and only about half the states have the capability of linking to other databases.

TEA-21 funds have enabled states to assess their traffic records systems, identify weaknesses in their system and develop strategic plans. TEA-21 grant funds have also enabled states to bring together all the state agencies with responsibility for the different components of a state traffic records system under the umbrella of a Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. Some states have used 402, 411, 157, 163, and the penalty funds to begin implementation of their traffic records strategic plans. Several states reported efforts to purchase hardware (such as mobile data terminals) and software to automate data collection, add the capability to pinpoint crash locations, add electronic collision diagramming capability and make driver licensing information available at workstations rather than through a DMV mainframe. A few states also reported using their Crash Outcome Data Evaluation system (CODES) demonstration grant funds with TEA-21 funding to enable the state to link traffic-safety related databases.

Fundable Activities

The following chart summarizes the types of programs funded under TEA-21.

Type of Program	Eligible Entities & Basis for Eligibility	Fundable Activities
Section 402 - State and Community Programs	States, Territories, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Indian Nations. Formula grant funds.	Occupant protection, impaired driving, enforcement, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and five other areas.
Section 405 - Occupant protection incentive grants	States, Territories, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico based on specific occupant protection criteria.	For occupant protection programs.
Section 2003b - Child passenger protection education grants	States, Territories, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Indian Nations. Based on specific CPS criteria.	Prevention, education and/or training programs to prevent deaths and injuries to children.
Section 157 – Safety belt incentive grants	States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico. Based on use rate criteria and annual savings in medical costs from improving use rates.	Any activity under Title 23.
Section 157 – Safety belt innovative grants	States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, based on demographic and geographic diversity, and safety belt use rates.	Innovative projects that promote increased safety belt use rates.
Section 410 - Alcohol-impaired driving funds	States, Territories, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Indian Nations that adopt specific programs, like prompt license suspension of alcohol-impaired drivers, graduated licensing systems for new drivers, etc.	Implementing and enforcing impaired driving programs.
Section 163 – Grants to prevent operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated persons	States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico for enacting and enforcing a 0.08 BAC law.	Any activity under Title 23.
Section 411 – Grants to improve and link highway safety data and databases	States, Territories, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to improve the compatibility of state and national safety data.	Activities that improve timeliness, accuracy, uniformity, and accessibility of highway safety data.
Section 154 – Open Container Laws	Penalty provision for highway safety jurisdictions that fail to enact laws prohibiting open alcoholic beverage containers in the passenger area of a motor vehicle on any public highway or right-of-way.	Portions of federal highway construction funds are transferred to the highway safety program. Funds subsequently transferred can be used for alcohol-impaired driving programs or for hazard elimination projects.
Section 164 – Repeat Offender Laws	Penalty provision for highway safety jurisdictions that fail to enact a law establishing minimum penalties for second or subsequent DWI or DUI convictions in any five-year period.	Portions of federal highway construction funds are transferred to the highway safety program. Funds transferred may only be used for alcohol-impaired driving programs, or enforcement of DWI or DUI and other related laws, or for hazard elimination projects.