

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

Fiscal Year	2019
NHTSA Grant Application	ARKANSAS - Highway Safety Plan - FY 2019
State Office	Arkansas Highway Safety Office
Application Status	Revision

Highway Safety Plan

1 Summary information

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Highway Safety Plan Name:	ARKANSAS - Highway Safety Plan - FY 2019
Application Version:	2.0

INCENTIVE GRANTS - The State is eligible to apply for the following grants. Check the grant(s) for which the State is applying.

S. 405(b) Occupant Protection:	Yes
S. 405(c) State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements:	Yes
S. 405(d) Impaired Driving Countermeasures:	Yes
S. 405(d) Alcohol-Ignition Interlock Law:	Yes
S. 405(d) 24-7 Sobriety Programs:	No
S. 405(e) Distracted Driving:	No
S. 405(f) Motorcyclist Safety Grants:	Yes
S. 405(g) State Graduated Driver Licensing Incentive:	No
S. 1906 Racial Profiling Data Collection:	No

STATUS INFORMATION

Submitted By:	Bridget White
Submission On:	6/28/2018 11:09 PM

Submission Deadline (EDT):	7/9/2018 11:59 PM
----------------------------	-------------------

2 Highway safety planning process

Enter description of the data sources and processes used by the State to identify its highway safety problems, describe its highway safety performance measures, establish its performance targets, and develop and select evidence-based countermeasure strategies and projects to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

The program management staff of the AHSO analyzes historical crash data for 5-10 preceding years in addition to current crash data to determine traffic fatality and injury trends and overall highway safety status. Basic crash data are obtained from the NHTSA website's FARS based data which includes annual tabulations of the statewide fatality counts for each FARS based core performance measure (e.g., total traffic fatalities; alcohol fatalities; vehicle occupant fatalities; speeding-related fatalities; fatalities from alcohol impaired driving crashes (BAC of 0.08% plus); unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities; and speeding-related fatalities. (Reference: NHTSA's Traffic Safety Information Website). Data reflecting the number of serious injuries in traffic crashes was obtained from the State crash data files, Arkansas Traffic Analysis Reporting System (TARS) which compiles data from crash reports filed by law enforcement agencies with the Arkansas State Police. Citation and conviction data was gathered from agency reports and the Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration's Driver Services. Supplemental data, such as statewide demographics, motor vehicle travel, and statewide observational safety belt use rates is also evaluated.

Data together with other pertinent information are discussed, reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated with various agencies and groups to pinpoint specific traffic safety problems. Fatal, non-fatal injury and property damage crashes on Arkansas' streets and highways are identified as primary traffic safety problems. Based on the problems identified through the above process, the AHSO recommends specific countermeasures that can be implemented to promote highway safety in an effort to reduce the incidence and severity of traffic crashes in the State.

In addition to traffic safety problems directly identifiable and measurable by crash and other traffic safety data, other problems or deficiencies are identified through programmatic reviews and assessments. For example, deficiencies in the traffic records system cannot be ascertained from analysis of crash data. Nevertheless, it is important that such problems be alleviated, as doing so can have a significant traffic safety program benefit.

Specific emphasis has been placed upon identifying baseline traffic crash statistics for the following general areas of interest:

- Overall Fatalities
- Overall Serious Injuries (Incapacitating)
- Alcohol Related Traffic Crashes
- Speeding Related Fatalities
- Occupant Restraint Use (Driver and front seat passenger)
- Number of Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities
- Motorcycle Crash Fatalities (Helmeted and Unhelmeted)
- Pedestrian Fatalities
- Bicyclist Fatalities
- Teen Fatalities

Arkansas' Performance Plan and Highway Safety Plan will focus on these identified areas. The goals are based on information derived from 5 year rolling averages, consideration of internal and external factors, guidelines from NHTSA and FHWA, meetings with collaborating agencies, input from staff at the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department and the recommendations of Arkansas Highway Safety Office staff.

Identify the participants in the processes (e.g., highway safety committees, program stakeholders, community and constituent groups).

The AHSO coordinates with the following State and local agencies to obtain data and other information.

- Criminal Justice Institute

- Arkansas Highway Police
- Arkansas Crime Laboratory
- Arkansas Department of Health
- Local Law Enforcement Agencies
- Arkansas Department of Education
- Arkansas Crime Information Center
- Arkansas Administrative Office of the Courts
- Arkansas Office of the Prosecutor Coordinator
- Arkansas Department of Transportation
- Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration's Office of Driver Services

The AHSO also collaborates with the following groups:

- Arkansas Traffic Records Coordinating Committee
- Strategic Highway Safety Steering Committee
- EMS/Emergency Medical Services for Children Advisory Committee
- Building Consensus for Safer Teen Driving Coalition
- Arkansas Alcohol and Drug Abuse Coordinating Council
- Arkansas Impaired Driving Task Force
- Arkansas Texting and Driving Coalition
- Arkansas Center for Health Improvement

Enter description and analysis of the State's overall highway safety problems as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets, selecting countermeasure strategies, and developing projects.

Analysis of Arkansas Overall Highway Safety Problems as identified through data not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data used as basis for setting performance targets, selecting countermeasure strategies, and developing projects.

FARS data for Arkansas (based on the 5 year period 2012-2016) shows the number of fatalities declined from 560 in 2012 to 545 in 2016. State data indicates this reduction continues with preliminary data showing fatalities at 492 for 2017. The fatality rate per 100 MVMT also shows a decrease from 1.67 to 1.53. Serious injuries (2's only) have also decreased from 3,226 in 2012 to 3,032 in 2016.

While these figures indicate some decreases in fatalities and injuries, an average of 525 motorists still lose their lives and another 3,256 are seriously injured each year on Arkansas's roadways each year. In 2016, there were 545 total traffic fatalities compared to 550 the previous year. Over the past five years, alcohol-related fatalities averaged 135 per year. Arkansas' alcohol-related fatalities in 2016 stood at 21% of the total fatalities. In 2016, there were 117 alcohol-related (involving a driver or motorcycle operator at .08 BAC or above) fatalities reported compared to 144 in 2012.

The AHSO also recognizes the significance and impact that motorcycle related crashes are having on the overall fatality picture in this State. Motorcycle fatalities account for approximately 15 percent of Arkansas' total traffic fatalities. In 2012 this number stood at 72 but has increased to 80 for 2016. There were 356 motorcycle involved traffic fatalities in Arkansas during the 5-year period 2012-2016. Over the past 10 years crash fatalities averaged 559 per year.

While fatality numbers were at 649 in 2007, this number has decreased to 545 in 2016 with preliminary state data showing a continued drop to 492 in 2017. Although the larger populated areas of Arkansas present the most problems involving crashes, the less populated areas exhibit a need for improving their problem locations. From 2012 thru 2016, 73 percent of fatalities occurred in rural areas of the state.

Another major area of concern continues to be the relatively low seat belt use rate in the State. In 2016, there were 393 passenger vehicle occupant fatalities. Of these fatalities, 194 or 36% were unrestrained. Arkansas' primary safety belt law took effect June 30, 2009. Immediately afterward, the use rate rose from 70.4% to 74.4%. The use rate is currently at 81% for 2017. The Arkansas Office of Driver Services reports that the number of seat belt convictions in the state has declined since 2009. During this same period, the number of seat belt citations issued also declined as shown on the chart below. Efforts continue to educate law enforcement and the judiciary of the importance of issuing seat belt citations and obtaining convictions.

Citations	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Speeding Citations	6,864	6,166	6,771	10,674	18,252
Seat Belt Citations	30,276	23,649	25,335	22,407	21,162
DUI Citations	2,084	1,942	1,246	1,072	1,065

It is obvious from the statewide problem analysis that the most effective reduction of fatalities and injuries, attributed to motor vehicle crashes, could be achieved by a significantly increased occupant protection use rate and a reduction in impaired driving, and speeding. Therefore our focus will be on creating aggressive, innovative and well publicized enforcement in conjunction with education programs and an increased focus on citations and arrests. Arkansas will also host a statewide traffic safety conference in Little Rock in September of 2019. The objective of this conference is to generate collaboration among all law enforcement and traffic safety advocates across the State.

Enter discussion of the methods for project selection (e.g., constituent outreach, public meetings, solicitation of proposals).

Methods for Project Selection (constituent outreach, public meetings, solicitation of proposals)

For Fiscal Year 2019, the projects presented in the HSP include new and continuing STEPs that target identified problem areas as well as new focus specific projects that evolve from the analysis of crash data.

The project identification/selection process begins in the preceding federal fiscal year. Problem identification is the basis for all proposed projects. This process involves collaboration and planning with select highway safety partners such as the Strategic Highway Safety Steering Committee, the Criminal Justice Institute, Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Arkansas Impaired Driving Task Force and the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee to identify emerging problems. Priority for project implementation is based on problem identification and indicators developed from crash data. Strategies and countermeasures from NHTSA's "Countermeasures that Work" along with innovative approaches developed through collaborative efforts with partner agencies are utilized to address Arkansas' problem areas .

Based on problem identification, state and local entities are targeted for implementation of new projects or for continuation of existing projects and proposals are requested. All proposed projects continuing into the next fiscal year are identified and preliminary funding estimates are developed. If new projects are recommended, requests for proposals are issued to select new sub-grantees/contractors.

Proposals submitted by State and local agencies and vendors are assigned to the appropriate program Specialists for review.

The assigned Program Specialist reviews the application against established criteria. During the preliminary review, applications are assessed to determine they are complete and appropriate and their relevancy towards meeting Highway Safety Goals. If information is missing or there are questions that need to be answered, the agency is contacted to obtain the necessary information and to provide clarification if needed.

Crash statistics are compiled for all counties in the state and rankings determined. Rankings include identified problem areas and are utilized to determine the severity of problems in the respective locations. Applications are assessed to determine the need for the type of funding requested and where they fit within the rankings.

- Highest-ranking locals are given priority.
- Lower-ranking agencies may be funded for a project because the county in which they reside ranks high or to ensure emphasis on enforcement of priority areas throughout the state.
- Some communities may be given projects to involve them as active participants in national mobilizations
- Other agencies may be given consideration when crash data indicates a problem.
- Supporting arguments and issues of concern are presented to the review team prior to individual review and scoring of applications.

Staff members review each application completely.

- Each reviewer completes a scoring sheet for the application being reviewed
- Comments may be added as needed for clarification
- Grant awards are determined based upon a compilation of points awarded, Risk Assessment levels, and other factors as appropriate.
- Final selections are made only with approval of the HSO Administrator.

Staff completes a risk assessment ranking agencies as Low, Medium or High Risk. New agencies cannot be ranked Low Risk. If the applicant is a current or prior grantee, past performance is analyzed for completeness/timeliness of reports and claims, any negative findings or unresolved problems, the level at which program objectives were met, public awareness including any earned media, and the overall success of past and/or current grant(s). Staff look at the percent of prior funds utilized, previous equipment purchases, and the size of the organization. They also consider whether the agency contact is new to the traffic safety program and may need extra guidance. Information on whether the applicant agency has had any audit findings is also assessed. Utilizing this information a determination is made as to whether the proposed project should be funded. Based on the risk assessments, different levels of monitoring may be recommended.

Grant funding is dependent on the number of proposals received, amount of funds available, and other criteria. Some proposals or portions thereof may not be funded. Based upon the reviews, scoring, and risk assessment a priority list of projects is developed. This includes projects which are determined to have the greatest effect on reducing collisions, injuries, and fatalities on the state's highways. Funding recommendations are submitted by the AHSO program management staff for approval by the AHSO Manager and the Administrator.

Enter list of information and data sources consulted.

List of Information and Data Sources Consulted for Project Selection

Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS)

Arkansas State Crash Data Base

Arkansas State Police - Statewide eCrash System (Crash Types and locations)

Arkansas State Police - Statewide eCite System (Citations)

Driver Services - Citations and Adjudication Reports

Arkansas Crime Information Center (ACIC) - AR 2018 Drug Threat Assessment

AHSO Project Results - Data from Previous year(s)

Region 7 State Partners - Input and Experience

NHTSA - "Countermeasures That Work"

Enter description of the outcomes from the coordination of the Highway Safety Plan (HSP), data collection, and information systems with the State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).

Outcomes from the coordination of the Highway Safety Plan (HSP), data collection and information systems with the State Strategic Highway Safety plan (SHSP)

Identified emphasis areas were selected and reviewed to assure that they are consistent with the guidelines and emphasis areas established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, and National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration. Using the experience and expertise of the Arkansas Highway Safety Office (AHSO) and Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) professional staff, FARS and state crash data, appropriate overall statewide performance goals and performance measures for selected emphasis areas have been established. Projections are based on 5 year rolling averages and collaboration between ARDOT and Highway Safety Office Staff. Specific goals and target dates are based on past trends and the staff's experience. Historical trends were established through the use of graph and chart information. Personnel from the Arkansas Highway Transportation Department (ARDOT), Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Arkansas Highway Safety Office (AHSO) held several meetings and conducted an in depth analysis of data for fatalities, fatality rate and serious injuries. The goals/targets outlined for these performance measures in the FY19 HSP are based on this analysis.

In accordance with 23 CFR 490.207, the national performance management measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) are shown below. The Number of Fatalities, Rate of Fatalities, and Serious Injuries Targets were coordinated between ArDOT and AHSO Each performance measure is based on a 5-year rolling average. More detailed information resulting from this planning process is included with individual program area goals.

- Number of fatalities
- Rate of fatalities
- Number of serious injuries
- Rate of serious injuries
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries

Through extensive coordination involving the Arkansas Highway Safety Office (AHSO), Arkansas Department of Transportation (ArDOT), Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) , National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), all Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and other stakeholders, a methodology to determine the targets was developed.

- The method to calculate each target is as follows.
 - Calculate the moving average for the last five years (2008-2012, 2009-2013, 2010-2014, 2011-2015, and 2012-2016). A moving average "smooths" the variation from year to year.
 - Calculate the average of these five data points.
 - For number of fatalities and rate of fatalities targets were adjusted based on National Safety Council 2016 data because the FARS 2016 ARF data is preliminary. FARS usually increases its prior year data when the current year FARS data is released.
 - For number of serious injuries, rate of serious injuries, and number of non-motorized fatalities/serious injuries, increase the targets shown below to account for internal/external factors. Although there are several anticipated factors that may

have a detrimental impact on safety performance, such as the recent state legalization of medical marijuana, possible increase in speed limit on freeways/expressways, the large increase in number of crashes captured in the database due to eCrash rollout statewide, the expected continued increase in vehicle miles traveled, the update to the definition of suspected serious injury that was implemented in 2017, this may result in an artificial increase due to how serious injuries and non-serious injuries are reported by officers, and the push by Arkansas State Police to insure that 24 out of 75 Sheriff offices that have not been reporting crashes are now doing so.

3 Performance report

Open each performance measure listed below or click Add New to create additional non-core performance measures to provide a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

Performance Measure Name	Progress
C-1) Number of traffic fatalities (FARS)	In Progress
C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	In Progress
C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	Met
C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)	In Progress
C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)	In Progress
C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)	In Progress
C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	In Progress
C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	In Progress
C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)	In Progress
C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)	In Progress
C-11) Number of bicyclists fatalities (FARS)	In Progress
B-1) Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants (survey)	Met

C-1) Number of traffic fatalities (FARS)

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

Program area level report on Arkansas' progress toward meeting the State Performance targets from previous fiscal year HSP

C-1) Traffic Fatalities

Target: **574** Current: **525**

FARS Data Year 2016

C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

C-2) Serious Injuries

Target: **3,195** Current: **3,057**

State Data FARS Data Year 2016

C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)

Progress: Met

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

Fatalities/VMT – Total

Target: **1.66** Current: **1.53**

FARS Data Year 2016

Goal Statement: Limit fatalities/VMT increase 1.54 (2011-2015) to 1.66 (2014-2018).

Using the same rationale indicated above (for total fatalities) After meeting with the ARDOT, highway police, FHWA and MPO representatives, it was decided to use the 5 year rolling average values of the most recent data available according to FARS, which is 2015 and set the 2018 target value as the average of those rolling average values. Based on the recent increases for FY 15 and 16 fatalities, lower gas prices, increased VMT, and the passage of new legislation legalizing medical marijuana, **a decision was made to set the target at 1.66 5-yr moving avg (2014-2018)** (based on 5-Year Rolling Average Values).

C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

ined passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positionsTarget: **164** Current: **192**FARS Data x Year 2016**C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)**

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.**s involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above**Target: **125** Current: **135**FARS Data x Year 2016

Although the five year average for (2012-2016) stands at 135, Alcohol Impaired fatalities actually declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 for 2016. This would indicate that current strategies have been effective in reducing this number. The AHSO will continue a campaign of high visibility STEP sustained enforcement efforts and HVE mobilization campaigns with STEP, Mini-STEP, and volunteer agencies. Section 405 d funding will also support officer training throughout the state for Drug Recognition Experts (DREs) and Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement (ARIDE). The AHSO will use printed material and public service announcements (PSAs) to increase awareness of impaired driving issues. The AHSO will incorporate the "Toward Zero Fatalities" logo into presentations, educational items, and PSAs, as appropriate, to support an education campaign and will work on educational campaigns utilizing social media. In addition efforts will continue to expand the number of DWI courts in the state.

C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

C-6) Speeding-related FatalitiesTarget: **81** Current: **83**FARS Data x Year 2016**C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)**

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.**C-7) Motorcyclist Fatalities**Target: **69** Current: **71**FARS Data x Year 2016**C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)**

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.**C-8) Unhelmeted Motorcyclist Fatalities**Target: **37** Current: **45**FARS Data x Year 2016

Motorcycle fatalities were at 23 in 1997 when the state's motorcycle helmet law was repealed. Only person(s) under the age of 21 are now required to wear protective headgear in Arkansas. In the years following the change in the law, motorcycle fatalities continue to increase. Arkansas reported 80 motorcycle related fatalities in 2015 and 2016. These account for approximately 15 percent of Arkansas' total traffic fatalities.

The Arkansas Highway Safety Office (AHSO) will continue a statewide motorcycle safety program to increase motorist's awareness, support rider education and utilize enforcement and PI&E efforts to reduce the number of motorcycle fatalities and injuries. The AHSO will purchase advertising using the "Look Twice for Motorcycles" and "Take 2 for Arkansas" campaigns to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising in a majority of counties (top 10) where there is at least one motorcycle crash causing a serious or fatal injury.

Arkansas will also utilize statewide television and radio spots to promote awareness of motorcycle safety and the dangers associated with the impaired operation of motorcycles. Efforts to deter impaired motorcyclists will be made during the National Winter DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); the National Labor Day DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); and the July 4th holiday DSOGPO campaign. The AHSO will purchase advertising to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising directed at the top five counties for impaired motorcycle crashes and fatalities.

C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

Drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashesTarget: **34** Current: **65**FARS Data Year 2016**C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)**

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

Current: 44 FARS Data Year 2016

ed at 44. The AHSO will continue educational public awareness programs along with public information and awareness efforts through programming
 courage communities to initiate additional safety measures in enforcement and infrastructure. FY19 Projects include an agreement with ArDOT for a
 es: Public service messages that target school children on bicycle and pedestrian safety Public service messages aimed at increasing awareness of
 roadways Social media to educate the public on bicycle/pedestrian laws and safety

C-11) Number of bicyclists fatalities (FARS)

Progress: In Progress

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

2018) to 5 (2015-2019).

together with their variability, render all models used in the analyses of questionable value. The AHSO will continue educational public
 ic information and awareness efforts through programming and TZD. Law Enforcement agencies will be utilized to encourage communities
 in enforcement and infrastructure.

B-1) Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants (survey)

Progress: Met

Enter a program-area-level report on the State's progress towards meeting State performance targets from the previous fiscal year's HSP.

Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants

Target: **78%** Current: **81% (2017)**

4 Performance plan

Open each performance measure listed below or click Add New to create additional non-core performance measures to provide a list of quantifiable and measurable highway safety performance targets that are data-driven, consistent with the Uniform Guidelines for Highway Safety Programs and based on highway safety problems identified by the State during the planning process.

Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target Start Year (Performance Target)	Target End Year (Performance Target)	Target Value(Performance Target)
C-1) Number of traffic fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	543.0
C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2015	2019	3,637.0
C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2015	2019	1.620
C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	212.0
C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	141.0
C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	90.0
C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	71.0
C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	40.0
C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	68.0
C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	43.0
C-11) Number of bicyclists fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2015	2019	5.0
B-1) Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants (survey)	Annual	2019	2019	81.0
Increase the number of Law Enforcement Agencies using the eCrash system from 144 to 200	Annual	2019	2019	200.0
Increase the number of courts using Contexte to 106 (33.65%) by March 31,2019	Annual	2019	2019	106.0

C-1) Number of traffic fatalities (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-1) Number of traffic fatalities (FARS)-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 543.0
Target Period: 5 Year
Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

Justification for each performance Target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection

The collaborative SHSP targets represented in this plan were mutually agreed on and set by traffic safety partners/stakeholders during the most recent revision of the State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). The performance measures, strategies, and goals were formulated after an analyses of the data. For all targets a linear trend analysis was utilized in conjunction with 5 year moving averages to nullify inconsistencies caused by fluctuations on a year-to-year basis and method show long-term trends more clearly than annual counts. Internal and external factors were also considered.

After meeting with the ARDOT, Arkansas Highway police, FHWA and MPO representatives, it was decided to use 5 yr moving average values of the most recent data available (FY16) according to FARS. Taking into account other internal and external factors including the recent state legalization of medical marijuana, possible increase in speed limit on freeways/expressways and expected continued increase in vehicle miles traveled, a choice was made to set the target as a 5 yr avg (2015-2019) at 543 (based on 5-Year moving average values)

The method to calculate the target follows.

- o Calculate the moving average for the last five years (2008-2012, 2009-2013, 2010-2014, 2011-2015, and 2012-2016).
- o Calculate the average of these five data points.
- o For number of fatalities the target was adjusted based on National Safety Council 2016 data because the FARS 2016 ARF data is preliminary. FARS usually increases its prior year data when the current year FARS data is released.

		Adjusted		Average	Adjusted
Number of Fatalities	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	by	<u>2019</u>	
Number of fatalities	555	542	+0.13%	543	

C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

--

C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)-2019

Target Metric Type: Numeric

Target Value: 3,637.0

Target Period: 5 Year

Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

After meeting with the ARDOT, Arkansas Highway Police, FHWA and MPO representatives, it was decided to use the 5 rolling average values of the most recent data available (FY 16) according to FARS, and factoring in the available state data for 2017. Internal and external factors were also considered. There are several anticipated factors that could have a detrimental impact on safety performance, such as the recent state legalization of medical marijuana, possible increase in speed limit on freeways/expressways, the large increase in the number of crashes captured in the database due to the eCrash rollout statewide, the expected continued increase in vehicle miles traveled, and the update to the definition of suspected serious injury implemented in 2017. This may result in an artificial increase due to how serious injuries and non-serious injuries are reported by officers, and the push by Arkansas State Police to insure that 24 out of 75 Sheriff's offices that have not been reporting crashes are now doing so.

After careful consideration and analysis it was agreed to set this target at 3,637 for 2015 – 2019.

	Average		Adjusted
	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2019</u>
Number of serious injuries:	3,470	3,232	3,637

C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)-2019

Target Metric Type: Percentage

Target Value: 1.620

Target Period: 5 Year

Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

Using the same rationale indicated above (for total fatalities) After meeting with the ARDOT, highway police, FHWA and MPO representatives, it was decided to use the 5 year moving average values of the most recent data available (FY16) according to FARS and set the 2019 target value of the average of those rolling average values.

- o Number of fatalities and rate of fatalities targets were adjusted based on National Safety Council 2016 data because the FARS 2016 ARF data is preliminary. FARS usually increases its prior year data when the current year FARS data is released.

Targets were increased as shown below to account for internal/external factors. There are several anticipated factors that may have a detrimental impact on safety performance, such as the recent state legalization of medical marijuana, possible increase in speed limit on freeways/expressways, the

expected continued increase in vehicle miles traveled. A decision was made to set the target at 1.62 5 year average (2015-2019)

Average	Adjusted	Adjusted
<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	by <u>2019</u>
Rate of fatalities: 1.62	1.613	+0.13%
		1.615

C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)-2019

Target Metric Type: Numeric

Target Value: 212.0

Target Period: 5 Year

Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

A target of 212 was set for the 5-year period 2014–2019 using a five year moving average and taking into account linear trends.

When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2017) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification. Although Arkansas's use rate is low, the primary seat belt law and active enforcement can be credited for increasing compliance rates since 2009. Having a primary law is identified as an effective countermeasure in NHTSA's "Countermeasures that Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices". Because data reveals that low use rates are a major contributing factor in regard to fatalities and serious injuries, Arkansas is working hard to improve this rate and will continue efforts emphasizing safety belt usage education and high visibility enforcement.

C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)-2019

Target Metric Type: Numeric

Target Value: 141.0

Target Period: 5 Year

Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

The 5 year moving average method was used in consideration of linear trends and other factors. A target of 141 was set for the 5-year average 2015–2019. We anticipate that the recent passage of a medical marijuana law and increased drug issues may contribute to higher fatalities in this area. This goal takes these issues into account as well as anticipated results from increased enforcement efforts in 2018 (Model LEL program, addition of mini-STEPs and a pilot High Five Program).

C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)-2019

Target Metric Type: Numeric

Target Value: 90.0

Target Period: 5 Year

Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

A target of 90 was set for 2015–2019 based on a 5 year moving average in consideration with linear trends and other factors. This target also took into consideration the rise in speeding fatalities for 2016 as well as the recent law increasing the interstate speed limit to 75 mph. Anticipated results of increased enforcement efforts (Model LEL program, addition of mini-STEPs, and a pilot High Five Program) were also factored into the target.

C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)-2019

Target Metric Type: Numeric

Target Value: 71.0

Target Period: 5 Year

Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

A target of 71 was set for 2015-2019 utilizing the 5 year moving average method in consideration with linear trends and other factors.

Motorcycle fatalities were at 23 in 1997 when the state's motorcycle helmet law was repealed. Only person(s) under the age of 21 are now required to wear protective headgear in Arkansas. In the years following the change in the law, motorcycle fatalities have continued to increase. Arkansas reported 80 motorcycle related fatalities for 2015 and 2016. These account for approximately 15 percent of Arkansas' total traffic fatalities.

The Arkansas Highway Safety Office (AHSO) will continue a statewide motorcycle safety program to increase motorist's awareness, support rider education and utilize enforcement and PI&E efforts to reduce the number of motorcycle fatalities and injuries. The AHSO will purchase advertising using the "Look Twice for Motorcycles" and "Take 2 for Arkansas" campaigns to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising in a majority of counties (top 10) where there is at least one motorcycle crash causing a serious or fatal injury.

Arkansas will also utilize statewide television and radio spots to promote awareness of motorcycle safety and the dangers associated with the impaired operation of motorcycles. Efforts to deter impaired motorcyclists will be made during the National Winter DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); the National Labor Day DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); and the July 4th holiday DSOGPO campaign. The AHSO will purchase advertising to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising directed at the top five counties for impaired motorcycle crashes and fatalities.

C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 40.0
Target Period: 5 Year
Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

A target of 40 was set for 2015-2019 utilizing the 5 year moving average method in consideration of linear trends and other factors.

Universal helmet laws are extremely effective but they are politically difficult to enact and retain. Motorcycle fatalities were at 23 in 1997 when the state's motorcycle helmet law was repealed. Only person(s) under the age of 21 are now required to wear protective headgear in Arkansas. In the years following the change in the law, motorcycle fatalities have continued to increase. Arkansas reported 80 motorcycle related fatalities in 2015 and 2016. These account for approximately 15 percent of Arkansas' total traffic fatalities.

The Arkansas Highway Safety Office (AHSO) will continue a statewide motorcycle safety program to increase motorist's awareness, support rider education and utilize enforcement and PI&E efforts to reduce the number of motorcycle fatalities and injuries. The AHSO will purchase advertising using the "Look Twice for Motorcycles" and "Take 2 for Arkansas" campaigns to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising in a majority of counties (top 10) where there is at least one motorcycle crash causing a serious or fatal injury.

Arkansas will also utilize statewide television and radio spots to promote awareness of motorcycle safety and the dangers associated with the impaired operation of motorcycles. Efforts to deter impaired motorcyclists will be made during the National Winter DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); the National Labor Day DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); and the July 4th holiday DSOGPO campaign. The

AHSO will purchase advertising to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising directed at the top five counties for impaired motorcycle crashes and fatalities.

C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 68.0
Target Period: 5 Year
Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

A target of **68** was set for 2015-2019 utilizing a the **5 year moving average** with consideration of linear trends and other factors.

The substantial gains demonstrated in past years were an indication of the success of past efforts in this area. Acknowledging that improvements in the current GDL law are necessary and taking into consideration the increases in fatalities (FY 2015 and FY 2016) in addition to factors such as the increase in the interstate speed limit and distracted driving occurrences, a target of **68** has been established for (2015-2019). A 5 year moving average method was used.

C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 43.0
Target Period: 5 Year
Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

ng average method in consideration of linear trends and outside factors.

ms along with public information and awareness efforts through programming and TZD. FY19 Projects include an agreement with ArDOT for a media

bicycle and pedestrian safety

; of the dangers of bicycle and pedestrian traffic on high volume roadways

in laws and safety

unities to initiate additional safety measures in enforcement and infrastructure.

C-11) Number of bicyclists fatalities (FARS)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-11) Number of bicyclists fatalities (FARS)-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 5.0
Target Period: 5 Year
Target Start Year: 2015

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

zing a 5 year moving average.

ublic awareness programs along with public information and awareness efforts through programming and TZD. FY19 Projects include an agreement using on the following education strategies:

at school children on bicycle and pedestrian safety

increasing awareness of the dangers of bicycle and pedestrian traffic on high volume roadways

c on bicycle/pedestrian laws and safety

ed to encourage communities to initiate additional safety measures in enforcement and infrastructure.

B-1) Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants (survey)

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

B-1) Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants (survey)-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 81.0
Target Period: Annual
Target Start Year: 2019

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

A target of 81% is set for 2019. Over the course of the past year the AHSO has been in the process of adjusting enforcement strategies to include more contracted agencies as opposed to volunteer agencies to work mobilizations. This change was based on guidance and input from our NHTSA Regional Office and successful programs in other states. The new enforcement strategy involves the implementation of a model LEL program, contracted mini-STEP agencies rather than volunteer agencies, and piloting a High Five Program, in conjunction with HVE, sustained enforcement and media campaigns. We will work to maintain last years significant increase in our Seat Belt use rate for FY 19.

Increase the number of Law Enforcement Agencies using the eCrash system from 144 to 200

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

Yes

Primary performance attribute:
Core traffic records data system to be impacted:

Increase the number of Law Enforcement Agencies using the eCrash system from 144 to 200-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 200.0
Target Period: Annual
Target Start Year: 2019

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

Increase the number of courts using Contexte to 106 (33.65%) by March 31,2019

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

Yes

Primary performance attribute:
Core traffic records data system to be impacted:

Increase the number of courts using Contexte to 106 (33.65%) by March 31,2019-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 106.0
Target Period: Annual
Target Start Year: 2019

Enter justification for each performance target that explains how the target is data-driven, including a discussion of the factors that influenced the performance target selection.

State HSP performance targets are identical to the State DOT targets for common performance measures (fatality, fatality rate, and serious injuries) reported in the HSIP annual report, as coordinated through the State SHSP.

Check the box if the statement is correct.

Yes

Enter grant-funded enforcement activity measure information related to seat belt citations, impaired driving arrests and speeding citations.

A-1) Number of seat belt citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities*

Fiscal year	2017
Seat belt citations	21,162

A-2) Number of impaired driving arrests made during grant-funded enforcement activities

Fiscal year	2017
Impaired driving arrests	1065

A-3) Number of speeding citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities*

Fiscal year	2017
Speeding citations	18,252

5 Program areas

Program Area Hierarchy

1. Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
 - Sustained Enforcement (OP)
 - Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low
 - Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
 - Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low
 - Rural High Five Project
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - State Observation Seat Belt Survey
 - Occupant Protection Program Management
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Int
 - Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement
 - Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)

- FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
- Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low
- Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
- Rural High Five Project
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
- School Programs
 - Teen Drive Safety Project
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
- Highway Safety Office Program Management (OP)
 - Planning and Administration
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
- Communication Campaign (OP)
 - Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
 - MAP 21 405b Occupant Protection Low Belt Use
 - MAP 21 405b Occupant Protection Low Belt Use
 - Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
- Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)
 - Statewide Child Passenger Protection Project
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low
 - FAST Act 405b OP Low

2. Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)

- SFST training for Law Enforcement Officers
- Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints
 - Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - Law Enf Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
- Laboratory Drug Testing Equipment
 - Motor Vehicle Crash Toxicology Testing
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
- Judicial Education
 - Judicial Training
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
- Highway Safety Office Program Management (Impaired Driving)
 - Alcohol and Other Drug Countermeasures Program Management
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Int
- High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
 - Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Statewide In-Car Camera and Video Storage System
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid

- DWI Courts
 - DWI Courts
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training
 - Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Court Monitoring
 - Court Monitoring Program
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)
 - Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid
3. Speed Management
- Sustained Enforcement (SP)
 - Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Int
 - Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Communication Campaign (Speed)
 - Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
4. Motorcycle Safety
- Communication Campaign (MC)
 - Motorist Awareness Campaign
 - FAST Act 405f Motorcycle Programs
 - FAST Act 405f Motorcycle Programs
5. Non-motorized (Pedestrians and Bicyclist)
- School and Community Awareness Programs
 - Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Other
 - Community Prevention Initiative
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Teen Drive Safety Project
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)
 - Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Pedestrian/Bicycle Public Awareness Campaign
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
6. Distracted Driving
- School and Community Awareness Programs
 - Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Other
 - Community Prevention Initiative
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Teen Drive Safety Project
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402

- Communication Campaign DD
 - Teen Drive Safety Project
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402

7. Traffic Records

- Improves timeliness of a core highway safety database
- Improves integration between one or more core highway safety databases
- Highway Safety Office Program Management TR

8. Roadway Safety/Traffic Engineering

- Training for Traffic Safety Advocates
 - Professional Development ARDOT
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402

9. Planning & Administration

- (none)
 - Planning and Administration
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402
 - FAST Act NHTSA 402

5.1 Program Area: Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)

Program area type Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

Yes

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

Occupant Protection: (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)

Arkansas recorded 545 fatalities in 2016. Arkansas has one of the highest unrestrained fatality rates in Region 7. Of these 545 fatalities, 194 or 36% involved unrestrained occupants representing a slight decrease from the 196 in 2015. The percentage of unrestrained fatalities as compared to total fatalities has remained at a comparatively flat trend of 35% to 36% over the last few years. When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2016) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification.

2012 - 2016 Avg. % of Total Unrestrained MV Occup Fatalities				
PULASKI	15.8	33.6	47.02%	8.54%
GARLAND	7.2	14.8	48.65%	3.76%
BENTON	4.4	14.4	30.56%	3.66%

WASHINGTON	5.4	14	38.57%	3.56%
CRAIGHEAD	4.6	12	38.33%	3.05%
HOT SPRING	4	12	33.33%	3.05%
WHITE	7.2	11.8	61.02%	3.00%
SALINE	5.6	11.4	49.12%	2.90%
FAULKNER	4.6	10.2	45.10%	2.59%
LONOKE	4.4	10	44.00%	2.54%
JEFFERSON	5.8	9.6	60.42%	2.44%
CRITTENDEN	4	9.4	42.55%	2.39%
HEMPSTEAD	3	7.6	39.47%	1.93%
MISSISSIPPI	4.8	7.6	63.16%	1.93%
UNION	3.6	7.2	50.00%	1.83%
CRAWFORD	3.8	7	54.29%	1.78%
GREENE	3.4	6.8	50.00%	1.73%
CARROLL	1.4	6.2	22.58%	1.58%
LAWRENCE	2.2	5.8	37.93%	1.47%
MILLER	2.4	5.8	41.38%	1.47%
POPE	3.2	5.8	55.17%	1.47%
YELL	4.4	5.8	75.86%	1.47%
POINSETT	2.6	5.4	48.15%	1.37%
CHICOT	3.75	5.25	71.43%	1.33%
BOONE	2.6	5.2	50.00%	1.32%
POLK	2.8	5.2	53.85%	1.32%
BAXTER	2.2	4.8	45.83%	1.22%
CONWAY	2.2	4.8	45.83%	1.22%
INDEPENDENCE	3.2	4.6	69.57%	1.17%
MONROE	2.2	4.6	47.83%	1.17%
PRAIRIE	2.25	4.5	50.00%	1.14%
ASHLEY	3.4	4.4	77.27%	1.12%
GRANT	2.6	4.4	59.09%	1.12%
JACKSON	3.4	4.4	77.27%	1.12%
CLAY	2.25	4.25	52.94%	1.08%
VAN BUREN	2.75	4.25	64.71%	1.08%
CLARK	1.8	4.2	42.86%	1.07%
CLEBURNE	3	4.2	71.43%	1.07%
SEBASTIAN	1.6	4.2	38.10%	1.07%
COLUMBIA	2.6	4	65.00%	1.02%
OUACHITA	2.2	3.8	57.89%	0.97%
RANDOLPH	2.5	3.5	71.43%	0.89%
DREW	1.6	3.4	47.06%	0.86%
FRANKLIN	3	3.4	88.24%	0.86%
SEVIER	1.4	3.4	41.18%	0.86%
ST FRANCIS	1.2	3.4	35.29%	0.86%

HOWARD	2.4	3.2	75.00%	0.81%
LITTLE RIVER	2	3.2	62.50%	0.81%
MADISON	1	3.2	31.25%	0.81%
MARION	0.6	3.2	18.75%	0.81%
PHILLIPS	1.6	3.2	50.00%	0.81%
FULTON	1.8	3	60.00%	0.76%
MONTGOMERY	1.2	3	40.00%	0.76%
NEVADA	1.6	3	53.33%	0.76%
SEARCY	1.6	3	53.33%	0.76%
SHARP	1.2	3	40.00%	0.76%
LOGAN	1.4	2.8	50.00%	0.71%
JOHNSON	1.2	2.6	46.15%	0.66%
WOODRUFF	1.2	2.6	46.15%	0.66%
CALHOUN	1.25	2.5	50.00%	0.64%
DALLAS	2	2.5	80.00%	0.64%
DESHA	1.4	2.4	58.33%	0.61%
PIKE	1.25	2.25	55.56%	0.57%
STONE	1.4	2.2	63.64%	0.56%
ARKANSAS	1	2	50.00%	0.51%
CLEVELAND	1.8	2	90.00%	0.51%
IZARD	1	2	50.00%	0.51%
SCOTT	0.5	2	25.00%	0.51%
CROSS	0.8	1.8	44.44%	0.46%
LAFAYETTE	0.75	1.75	42.86%	0.44%
LEE	1	1.75	57.14%	0.44%
BRADLEY	1	1.6	62.50%	0.41%
LINCOLN	0.8	1.6	50.00%	0.41%
PERRY	1	1.333333	75.00%	0.34%
NEWTON	1	1	100.00%	0.25%
Totals	196	393.6	49.80%	

5 Year Trend For The Top 10 Counties of 2016 - Fatalities

Arkansas Counties by 2016 Ranking		Fatalities					Percent of Total				
		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
1	Pulaski County	56	59	40	53	41	10	12	9	10	8
2	Washington County	18	16	19	22	32	3	3	4	4	6
3	Garland County	18	21	18	26	31	3	4	4	5	6
4	Benton County	22	18	13	25	29	4	4	3	5	5
5	White County	16	15	17	11	20	3	3	4	2	4
6	Craighead County	23	14	12	17	17	4	3	3	3	3
7	Faulkner County	14	14	14	14	15	3	3	3	3	3

8	Hot Spring County	14	13	17	17	15	3	3	4	3	3
9	Carroll County	8	8	4	13	14	1	2	1	2	3
10	Lonoke County	20	11	9	15	14	4	2	2	3	3
Sub Total	Top Ten Counties										
1.*		228	205	184	221	228	41	41	39	40	42
Sub Total	All Other Counties										
2.**		332	293	286	329	317	59	59	61	60	58
Total	All Counties	560	498	470	550	545	100	100	100	100	100
*This Sub Total is the Total for the Top Ten Counties											
**This Sub Total is the Total for all Counties Outside the Top Ten											

Countermeasures

- School Programs
- Short Term High Visibility SB Enforcement
- Sustained Enforcement
- Primary Law

Planned Activities

- High Visibility "Sustained Enforcement" of Primary Law-Local and Statewide
- Mini-STEPs
- High Five Pilot
- LEL Program-OP
- Child Passenger Restraint System Inspection Stations
- Child Restraint Technicians
- OP Program Management
- Statewide Communication Campaign
- Seat Belt Survey

Project Strategies

The strategies of projects to be funded in the Occupant Protection Program are:

- To achieve three vehicle stops per hour during seat belt enforcement periods.
- To conduct two waves of high visibility enforcement emphasizing occupant restraint laws.
- To work with colleges to mobilize communities in developing strategies and implementing activities to raise seat belt use rates.
- To conduct PI&E activities as a component of all enforcement projects.
- To conduct a minimum of eight child safety seat technician and instructor training courses.
- To conduct three half-day child safety seat training for law enforcement officers.
- To obtain a minimum of \$300,000 public service air time for traffic safety messages.
- To conduct a statewide public information (PI&E) and education and enforcement campaign (such as CIOT) that will emphasize occupant restraint laws.
- To provide statewide child passenger safety education to healthcare, childcare and law enforcement professionals.
- To employ a Law Enforcement Liaison to encourage enforcement of Occupant Protection laws statewide.
- To conduct a statewide survey of seat belt use and child restraint.
- To utilize information from our OP Assessment (to be conducted September 2018) to identify problem areas, improve current and implement new programming.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)	5 Year	2019	212.0
2019	C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)	5 Year	2019	68.0
2019	B-1) Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants (survey)	Annual	2019	81.0

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement
2019	School Programs
2019	Highway Safety Office Program Management (OP)
2019	Communication Campaign (OP)
2019	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

5.1.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Sustained Enforcement (OP)

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
Countermeasure strategy	Sustained Enforcement (OP)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative

countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

The Arkansas Highway Safety Office will issue sub-grants to approximately 120 different agencies and courts statewide to conduct sustained enforcement. Those agencies will include state, county and municipal law enforcement agencies in both urban and rural locations with a goal of reducing fatalities and injuries attributed to motor vehicle crashes.

It is obvious from the statewide problem analysis that a reduction in fatalities and injuries, attributed to motor vehicle crashes, could be achieved by a significantly increased occupant protection use rate. Therefore our focus will be on creating aggressive, innovative and well publicized enforcement with an increased focus on citations and arrests.

- This enforcement program will be implemented by awarding selective traffic enforcement overtime grants to law enforcement agencies across the state and in priority areas. Funding for overtime salaries and traffic related equipment will be eligible for reimbursement. Agencies will be asked to do problem identification within their city or county to determine when and where enforcement should be done for for greatest impact.
- A full-time LEL will be utilized to encourage and promote non-STEP law enforcement agencies to participate in the national safety mobilization (CIOT). In 2016, 187 agencies participated and sent in reports documenting their participation in the CIOT campaign. In 2018 the LEL duties will be expanded to include promoting non-STEP agencies to apply for a mini-STEP grant. This grant will provide funds to pay overtime enforcement to agencies during the 2-3 CIOT mobilizations.. These mobilizations will focus on enforcement of occupant protection. Equipment essential to carrying out this enforcement may be purchased if there is a justified need.

Other responsibilities of the LEL would include:

- Identify and sign up mini-STEP agencies,
- Collect agencies performance reports, provide feedback, follow up and technical assistance. Promote participation in TOPS training;
- Promote the issuance of more traffic safety citations;
- Set up summits or learning sessions with law enforcement agencies to promote traffic safety programs;
- Discuss the importance of the high-five program with all safety partners in a community.
- Assist agencies with media events related to the safety mobilizations.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Arkansas has one of the highest unrestrained fatality rates in Region 7. When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2016) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification. (See Previous section for county data)

Arkansas has the following performance targets for 2015-2019

- Increase seat belt use to 82%
- 543 Fatalities (moving average 2015-2019)
- 212 Unrestrained fatalities (moving average 2015-2019)

Activities supporting the countermeasure strategy of "Sustained Enforcement" include the following:

- Utilize 402 and 405 b funding to support overtime to approximately 50 agencies for overtime sustained enforcement efforts.
- Utilize 402 and 405 b funding to support overtime for sustained statewide enforcement efforts by the Arkansas State Police.
- Utilize 402 and 405 b funding to support a statewide Law Enforcement Liaison Project (LEL)

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Primary Enforcement of Seat Belt Laws: Sustained Enforcement by State are reported to use sustained enforcement have recorded statewide belt use well above the national belt use rates. Nichols and Ledingham (2008) conducted a review of the impact of enforcement on seat belt use over the past two decades and concluded that sustained enforcement is as effective as "blitz" enforcement. Sustained enforcement can be implemented immediately and is not usually associated with abrupt drops in belt use after program completion. Sustained enforcement is a strong component of Arkansas EB-E with the use rate currently at 81%.

Funding Allocations for planned activities:

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| • Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects | \$1,800,000 |
| • Arkansas State Police statewide Sustained Traffic Enforcement Project | \$1,500,000 |
| • Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) | \$ 422,500 |

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
OP-2019-07	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	

5.1.1.1 Planned Activity: Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)

Planned activity name	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-02
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

City and county law enforcement agencies to conduct sustained selective traffic enforcement throughout the year with primary emphasis on seat belt and child restraint violations. Child safety seat clinics/checkpoints/inspection stations may supplement enforcement efforts. The project will also participate in CIOT HVE mobilizations during the year.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (OP)

2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click **Add New** to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$1,000,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$500,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click **Add New** to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.1.2 Planned Activity: Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)

Planned activity name	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-03
Primary countermeasure strategy	Sustained Enforcement (OP)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail

required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide selective traffic enforcement throughout the year with primary emphasis on seat belt and child restraint violations. Child safety seat clinics/checkpoints/inspection stations may supplement enforcement efforts. The project will also participate in CIOT HVE mobilizations during the year.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2017	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b OP Low (FAST)	\$464,000.00	\$116,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.1.3 Planned Activity: Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)

Planned activity name	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-07
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Full-time Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) to encourage and promote non-STEP agencies to participate in CIOT mobilizations. The LEL will also identify and sign-up mini-STEP agencies, collect agency performance reports, provide technical assistance, promote participation in TOPS training, promote the issuance of seat belt citations, set up summits or learning sessions, discuss the importance of the High-Five Program, and assist agencies with media events related to CIOT mobilizations.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Criminal Justice Institute

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.2 Countermeasure Strategy: State Primary Seat Belt Use Law

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
Countermeasure strategy	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative

countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Assessment of overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded

Although Arkansas' use rate is low, the primary seat belt law and active enforcement can be credited for increasing compliance rates since 2009. Having a primary law is identified as an effective countermeasure in NHTSA's "Countermeasures that Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices". Compared with secondary laws, primary laws are associated with a higher observed seat belt use (10 to 20% higher) and higher seat belt use among front seat occupants killed in crashes (9% higher) (NHTSA, 2014b). Because data reveals that low use rates are a major contributing factor with regard to fatalities and serious injuries, Arkansas is working hard to improve this rate and will continue efforts emphasizing safety belt usage education and enforcement.

The strategies proposed for the Occupant Protection Program will impact all areas of the state. Proposed strategies are evidence-based and have been shown to be effective measures for positively impacting the issue of unrestrained driving and increasing belt use.

Statewide and Local high visibility Sustained enforcement, Short Term High Visibility Enforcement, media outreach and prevention focused projects are included as part of Arkansas' planned activities. Additional funding is included for OP Program Management, the state observational survey and an OP Assessment scheduled to be conducted this year.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Arkansas has one of the highest unrestrained fatality rates in Region 7. The percentage of unrestrained fatalities as compared to total fatalities continues at a comparatively flat trend of 35% to 36%. The percentage of unrestrained fatalities as compared to total fatalities continues at a comparatively flat trend of 35% to 36%. There were 194 fatalities involving unrestrained occupants in Arkansas in 2016, which was a slight decrease from the 196 in 2015. In 2016, 36% of these fatalities were unrestrained. When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2016) now reports usage at 81%. Compared with secondary laws, primary laws are associated with a higher observed seat belt use (10 to 20% higher) and higher seat belt use among front seat occupants killed in crashes (9% higher) (NHTSA, 2014b). With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification.

Arkansas has the following targets for FY 2019:

- **C-4 Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities**

A target of 212 was set for the 5-year period 2014–2019.

- **B-1 Observed Seat Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles, Front Seat Outboard Occupants**

A target of 82% was set for 2019.

Having a primary law is identified as a effective countermeasure (5 Stars) in NHTSA's "Countermeasures that Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices". Primary enforcement seat belt use laws permit law enforcement officers to stop and cite a violator independent of any other traffic violation. Countermeasure activities include increased enforcement efforts (Increasing number of agencies conducting HVE sustained enforcement, Expansion of LEL Program, addition of mini-STEP projects, and pilot High Five Programming) in conjunction with media campaigns and prevention focused education programs in schools and low use areas. Funding allocations also include OP Program Management, Annual Seat Belt Survey, and an OP Assessment scheduled for this year.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Having a primary law is identified as an effective countermeasure in NHTSA's "Countermeasures that Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices" receiving a 5 star rating. Compared with secondary laws, primary laws are associated with a higher observed seat belt use (10 to 20% higher) and higher seat belt use among front seat occupants killed in crashes (9% higher) (NHTSA, 2014b). Primary enforcement seat belt use laws permit law enforcement officers to stop and cite a violator independent of any other traffic violation. Because data reveals that low use rates are a major contributing factor with regard to fatalities and serious injuries, Arkansas will continue efforts to improve this rate emphasizing safety belt usage education, high visibility enforcement of the law and media outreach and education to publicize the states primary Seat Belt law.

Project

Funding Allocated

- State Observational Survey
- Occupant Protection Program Management
- HVE sustained enforcement of primary law - Local and Statewide
- Mini-STEP projects mobilizations and campaigns
- "High Five" Programs - collaborative efforts involving different disciplines
- Communication campaigns

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click **Add New** to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
OP-2019-04	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	
OP-2019-05	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (OP)
OP-2019-06	Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program	Communication Campaign (OP)
OP-2019-10	Rural High Five Project	
OP-2019-12	State Observation Seat Belt Survey	
OP-2019-13	Occupant Protection Program Management	

5.1.2.1 Planned Activity: Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)

Planned activity name	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-02
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

City and county law enforcement agencies to conduct sustained selective traffic enforcement throughout the year with primary emphasis on seat belt and child restraint violations. Child safety seat clinics/checkpoints/inspection stations may supplement enforcement efforts. The project will also participate in CIOT HVE mobilizations during the year.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$1,000,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$500,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.2.2 Planned Activity: Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)

Planned activity name	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-04
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

City and county law enforcement agencies to conduct selective traffic enforcement focusing on seat belt and child restraint violations by participating in CIOT HVE mobilizations.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b Low HVE (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$75,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.2.3 Planned Activity: Rural High Five Project

Planned activity name	Rural High Five Project
Planned activity number	OP-2019-10
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Rural High Five traffic enforcement project to include participation from up to five local law enforcement agencies with an emphasis on enforcement of occupant protection laws in low seat belt use counties. The projects will conduct HVE of seat belt laws, conduct 1-3 enforcement projects a month, conduct seat belt surveys, partner with DOT for engineering assessments, media outreach, and monthly reports.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b OP Low (FAST)	\$400,000.00	\$100,000.00	
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$300,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.2.4 Planned Activity: State Observation Seat Belt Survey

Planned activity name	State Observation Seat Belt Survey
Planned activity number	OP-2019-12
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide observational survey of seat use.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Univerity of Arkansas - Fayetteville - Civil Eng Dept

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
No records found.					

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.2.5 Planned Activity: Occupant Protection Program Management

Planned activity name	Occupant Protection Program Management
Planned activity number	OP-2019-13
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail

required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

This task will provide program management for projects within the Occupant Protection Program area. This task will provide proper administration of projects within this program area through program planning, oversight/monitoring, evaluation, coordination and staff education and development. This task will also provide program related materials that are essential for program management. Highway Safety Office OP personnel, travel, and operational costs.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2018	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Int	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$80,000.00	\$0.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.3 Countermeasure Strategy: Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
Countermeasure strategy	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

It is obvious from the statewide problem analysis that a reduction in fatalities and injuries, attributed to motor vehicle crashes, could be achieved by a significantly increased occupant protection use rate. Therefore our focus will be on creating aggressive, innovative and well publicized enforcement with an increased focus on citations and arrests. Sustained STEPs along with additional agencies will participate in Federal and statewide mobilizations, crackdowns and other special enforcement events.. For FY 19 the OP program area currently includes the following:

- State Thanksgiving Seat Belt Mobilization
- National Memorial Day Seat Belt Mobilization

The Arkansas Highway Safety Office will issue sub-grants to approximately 120 different agencies a statewide to conduct enforcement. These agencies include state, county and municipal law enforcement agencies in both urban and rural locations with a goal of reducing fatalities and injuries attributed to motor vehicle crashes. A full-time LEL will be utilized to encourage and promote non-STEP law enforcement agencies to participate in the national safety mobilization (CIOT). In 2016, 187 agencies participated and sent in reports documenting their participation in the CIOT campaign. In 2019 LEL duties will be expanded to include promoting non-STEP agencies to apply for mini-STEP grants. This grant will provide funds to pay overtime enforcement to agencies during the 2 CIOT mobilizations.. These mobilizations will focus on enforcement of occupant protection. Funding will also be used to pilot the "High Five" Project.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Arkansas has one of the highest unrestrained fatality rates in Region 7. When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey

(2016) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification. (See Previous section for county data)

Arkansas has the following performance targets for 2015-2019

- Increase seat belt use to 81%
- 543 Fatalities (moving average 2015-2019)
- 212 Unrestrained fatalities (moving average 2015-2019)

Activities supporting the countermeasure strategy of "Short-term High Visibility Enforcement" include the following:

- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support overtime to approximately 50 agencies for overtime sustained enforcement efforts.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support overtime for sustained statewide enforcement efforts by the Arkansas State Police.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support approximately 20 mini-STEP projects that will focus on statewide and national mobilizations.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support pilots of the "High Five" Project.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding for a full time LEL to encourage and promote non-STEP law enforcement agencies to participate in National safety mobilizations (CIOT)

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

The most common high visibility belt law enforcement method consists of short intense, highly publicized periods of increased belt law enforcement using checkpoints, saturation patrols or enforcement zones. Most states currently conduct short-term high visibility belt law enforcement programs in May of each year as part of national seat belt mobilizations. States also conduct seat belt mobilizations in November, NHTSA has supported these campaigns. CDC's systematic review of 15 short term high visibility enforcement programs showed increased belt use with greater gains when pre-program belt use was lower. CDC's systematic review observed that short-term high visibility enforcement campaigns increased belt use more among traditionally lower-belt use groups, including young drivers, rural drivers, males, African-Americans, and Hispanics. The following activities will be funded.

- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support overtime to approximately 50 agencies for overtime sustained enforcement efforts.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support overtime for sustained statewide enforcement efforts by the Arkansas State Police.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support approximately 20 mini-STEP projects that will focus on statewide and national mobilizations.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding to support pilots of the "High Five" Project.
- Utilize 402 OP and 405 b funding for a full time LEL to encourage and promote non-STEP law enforcement agencies to participate in National safety mobilizations (CIOT)

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click **Add New** to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)

OP-2019-04	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	
OP-2019-07	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	
OP-2019-10	Rural High Five Project	

5.1.3.1 Planned Activity: Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)

Planned activity name	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-02
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

City and county law enforcement agencies to conduct sustained selective traffic enforcement throughout the year with primary emphasis on seat belt and child restraint violations. Child safety seat clinics/checkpoints/inspection stations may supplement enforcement efforts. The project will also participate in CIOT HVE mobilizations during the year.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$1,000,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$500,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.3.2 Planned Activity: Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)

Planned activity name	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-04
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

City and county law enforcement agencies to conduct selective traffic enforcement focusing on seat belt and child restraint violations by participating in CIOT HVE mobilizations.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b Low HVE (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$75,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.3.3 Planned Activity: Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)

Planned activity name	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-07
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Full-time Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) to encourage and promote non-STEP agencies to participate in CIOT mobilizations. The LEL will also identify and sign-up mini-STEP agencies, collect agency performance reports, provide technical assistance, promote participation in TOPS training, promote the issuance of seat belt citations, set up summits or learning sessions, discuss the importance of the High-Five Program, and assist agencies with media events related to CIOT mobilizations.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Criminal Justice Institute

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.3.4 Planned Activity: Rural High Five Project

Planned activity name	Rural High Five Project
Planned activity number	OP-2019-10
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Rural High Five traffic enforcement project to include participation from up to five local law enforcement agencies with an emphasis on enforcement of occupant protection laws in low seat belt use counties. The projects will conduct HVE of seat belt laws, conduct 1-3 enforcement projects a month, conduct seat belt surveys, partner with DOT for engineering assessments, media outreach, and monthly reports.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b OP Low (FAST)	\$400,000.00	\$100,000.00	
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$300,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.4 Countermeasure Strategy: School Programs

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
Countermeasure strategy	School Programs

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative

countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Assessment of Overall projected traffic Safety Impacts of countermeasure strategy chosen and planned activities

The University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS), Arkansas Children's Hospital Injury Prevention Center has conducted a project over the last 3 years in collaboration with the Arkansas Health Department (ADH), the Allstate Foundation Teen Driving Program and the Injury Free Coalition for Kids. This year the project will focus specifically on increasing seat belt use for teens in targeted counties of the state determined to be key to increasing Arkansas's seat belt use rate.

UAMS will utilize conduct peer to peer education projects in the high schools of each of these counties modeled after NHTSA's evidence based "Battle of the Belt" program. The project educates both teens and parents and involves direct interaction and engagement with parents in order to change parents' behaviors and ultimately reduce teen driver crashes. A central feature of the program is a written agreement that parents and teens review and sign. The agreement limits teens' driving under various high-risk situations such as driving at night, with other teens in the car, etc. The program has the teen and parent working pairs to begin enveloping a parent teen driving agreement.

UAMS will also promote awareness in the schools of Arkansas' Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) law, enacted in 2009. The GDL law addresses teen driving issues by helping new drivers gain experience in lower-risk conditions. In other states, comprehensive GDL programs have been a proven success by reducing teen fatalities and injuries by up to 38%. Arkansas GDL emphasizes use of safety belts for all seating positions especially during learning and intermediate stages. This project will promote peer to peer influence of seat belt use and GDL principles for young drivers and passengers. The project will also educate teens and parents on the dangers of distracted driving.

Another project to raise seat belt use rates, in collaboration with the Arkansas Department of Health's (ADH) Injury Prevention and Control Branch will coordinate with state colleges to develop strategies and implement activities to raise seat belt use in low use counties. The project will place a special emphasis on working with the STEP projects in these areas to generate high visibility awareness of increased law enforcement during the STEP mobilizations.

Planned Activities:

- ADH Injury Prevention Occupant Protection Project
- UAMS Teen Project

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Description of linkage between program area problem ID, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities

Arkansas recorded 545 fatalities in 2016. Arkansas has one of the highest unrestrained fatality rates in Region 7. Of these 545 fatalities, 194 or 36% involved unrestrained occupants representing a slight decrease from the 196 in 2015. The percentage of unrestrained fatalities as compared to total fatalities has remained at a comparatively flat trend of 35% to 36% over the last few years. When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2016) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification.

In 2016 there were 71 drivers under age 21 were involved in fatal crashes in Arkansas. Motor vehicles crashes are the #1 cause of unintentional injury and death among teenagers (NHTSA). According to FARS, of the 71 drivers of passenger vehicles (motorcycles, snowmobiles, etc. excluded) aged

15-20 with known restraint usage, only 55 percent were restrained. The goal for this countermeasure is to reduce total fatalities and injuries specifically those under age 21.

The substantial gains demonstrated in past years are an indication of the success of past efforts in this area. Acknowledging that improvements in the current GDL law are necessary to continue past gains and taking into consideration the increases in fatalities (FY 2015 and FY 2016) in addition to factors such as the increase in the interstate speed limit and distracted driving occurrences, a target of 68 has been established for (2015–2019).

- **UAMS Teen Project 402 OP**

The University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS), Arkansas Children's Hospital Injury Prevention Center has conducted a project over the last 3 years in collaboration with the Arkansas Health Department (ADH), the Allstate Foundation Teen Driving Program and the Injury Free Coalition for Kids. This year the project will focus specifically on increasing seat belt use for teens in targeted counties of the state determined to be key to increasing Arkansas's seat belt use rate.

- **ADH Injury Prevention Occupant Protection Project 402 OP**

Arkansas Department of Health's (ADH) Injury Prevention and Control Branch will coordinate with state colleges to develop strategies and implement activities to raise seat belt use in low use counties. The project will place a special emphasis on working with the STEP projects in these areas to generate high visibility awareness of increased law enforcement during the STEP mobilizations.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Schools provide well-defined and somewhat controlled audiences for seat belt use programs. Education and other communications strategies can be tailored to a specific audience. School programs have been shown to increase belt use in the evaluations of school programs that have been conducted. This project is a continuing project that has demonstrated success in increasing belt use among students at the schools targeted and in the immediate surrounding areas.

The University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS), Arkansas Children's Hospital Injury Prevention Center has conducted a project over the last 3 years in collaboration with the Arkansas Health Department (ADH), the Allstate Foundation Teen Driving Program and the Injury Free Coalition for Kids. This year the project will focus specifically on increasing seat belt use for teens in targeted counties of the state determined to be key to increasing Arkansas's seat belt use rate.

Arkansas Department of Health's (ADH) Injury Prevention and Control Branch will coordinate with state colleges to develop strategies and implement activities to raise seat belt use in low use counties. The project will place a special emphasis on working with the STEP projects in these areas to generate high visibility awareness of increased law enforcement during the STEP mobilizations.

Planned Projects:

- UAMS Teen Project
- ADH Injury Prevention Occupant Protection Project

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-09	Community Prevention Initiative	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-11	Teen Drive Safety Project	

5.1.4.1 Planned Activity: Teen Drive Safety Project

Planned activity name	Teen Drive Safety Project
Planned activity number	OP-2019-11
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Implement a teen driver safety project which will employ activities in low seat belt use counties.

Enter intended subrecipients.

University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School Programs
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.5 Countermeasure Strategy: Highway Safety Office Program Management (OP)

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
Countermeasure strategy	Highway Safety Office Program Management (OP)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Provide necessary personnel and training for the administration of the Occupant Protection Program Area. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Occupant Protection Program. Funding will also provide for training to maintain an effective, efficient Occupant Protection Program that will direct and support strategies to effectively address traffic Arkansas' low seat belt use rate.

Planned Activities to be Funded:

Occupant Protection Program Management

- Provides for the administration of the Occupant Protection Program. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Occupant Protection Program.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

There were 194 fatalities involving unrestrained occupants in Arkansas in 2016, which was a slight decrease from the 196 in 2015. In 2016 36% of these fatalities where restraint use was applicable and known, were unrestrained. The percentage of unrestrained fatalities as compared to total fatalities continues at a comparatively flat trend of 35% to 36%. Arkansas has one of the highest unrestrained fatality rates in Region 7. When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2016) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification. Consider inserting table with unrestrained fatalities.

Arkansas has the following targets for FY 2019:

- **C-4 Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities**

A target of 212 was set for the 5-year period 2014–2019.

- **B-1 Observed Seat Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles, Front Seat Outboard Occupants**

A target of 81% was set for 2019.

Planned Activities to be Funded:

- Occupant Protection Program Management

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
PA-2019-01	Planning and Administration	

5.1.5.1 Planned Activity: Planning and Administration

Planned activity name	Planning and Administration
Planned activity number	PA-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for P&A salaries and benefits, travel, and operating expenses

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Highway Safety Office Program Management (OP)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Planning and Administration (FAST)	\$400,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Planning and Administration (FAST)	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.6 Countermeasure Strategy: Communication Campaign (OP)

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
Countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (OP)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Effective , high visibility communications and outreach are an essential part of successful seat belt law high visibility enforcement programs. Paid advertising can be a critical part of media strategy.

Impacts: The May 2002 Click it or Ticket campaign evaluation demonstrated the effect of different media strategies. Belt use increased by 8.6 percentage points across 10 states that used paid advertising extensively in their campaigns. Belt use increased by 2.7 percentage points across 4 states that used limited paid advertising and increased by only .5 percentage points across 4 states that used no paid advertising. Solomon et al., (2002) Milano et al (2004).

The projected impacts of this countermeasure would be an increased use rate and lower fatalities.

Planned Activities:

Statewide Public Information and Education Campaign (CJRW Advertising Firm)

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Arkansas recorded 545 fatalities in 2016. Arkansas has one of the highest unrestrained fatality rates in Region 7. Of these 545 fatalities, 194 or 36% involved unrestrained occupants representing a slight decrease from the 196 in 2015. The percentage of unrestrained fatalities as compared to total fatalities has remained at a comparatively flat trend of 35% to 36% over the last few years. When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2016) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification.

Targets:

Unrestrained Passenger Vehicle Occupant Fatalities

A target of 212 is set for the 5-year period 2015–2019 using a five year moving average and taking into account linear trends.

When Arkansas's safety belt law went into effect in July 2009, approximately 70% of drivers were recorded as wearing a safety belt. The most recent observational safety belt survey (2017) now reports usage at 81%. With a compliance rate of 81%, Arkansas has a usage rate well below the national average of 90% (2016) and is considered a "low rate" state for Section 405 b funding qualification. Although Arkansas's use rate is low, the primary seat belt law and active enforcement can be credited for increasing compliance rates since 2009. Having a primary law is identified as an effective countermeasure in NHTSA's "Countermeasures that Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices". Because data reveals that low use rates are a major contributing factor in regard to fatalities and serious injuries, Arkansas is working hard to improve this rate and will continue efforts emphasizing safety belt usage education and high visibility enforcement.

Observed Seat Belt Use for Passenger Vehicles, Front Seat Outboard Occupants

A target of 82% is set for 2019. This goal was based on anticipated results of increased enforcement efforts (Model LEL program, addition of mini-STEPs, and a pilot High Five Program) in conjunction with HVE sustained enforcement and media campaigns. A 1% improvement in the use rate is projected for FY 19.

Planned Activities:

Statewide Public Information and Education Campaign (CJRW Advertising Firm)

Countermeasure: Communication Campaign (OP)

Effective , high visibility communications and outreach are an essential part of successful seat belt law high visibility enforcement programs.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Effective , high visibility communications and outreach are an essential part of successful seat belt law high visibility enforcement programs. Paid advertising can be a critical part of media strategy.

Impacts: The May 2002 Click it or Ticket campaign evaluation demonstrated the effect of different media strategies. Belt use increased by 8.6 percentage points across 10 states that used paid advertising extensively in their campaigns. Belt use increased by 2.7 percentage points across 4 states that used limited paid advertising and increased by only .5 percentage points across 4 states that used no paid advertising. Solomon et al., (2002) Milano et al (2004)

Planned Activities:

Statewide Public Information and Education Campaign (CJRW Advertising Firm)

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-05	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (OP)
OP-2019-06	Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program	Communication Campaign (OP)

5.1.6.1 Planned Activity: Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)

Planned activity name	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
Planned activity number	OP-2019-05
Primary countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (OP)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide public information and education to promote occupant protection and particularly focus on the national CIOT enforcement mobilizations.

Enter intended subrecipients.

CJRW

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Communication Campaign (OP)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2016	MAP 21 405b Occupant Protection Low Belt Use	405b OP Low (MAP-21)	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	
2016	MAP 21 405b Occupant Protection	405b Low Public Education	\$473,000.00	\$473,000.00	

	Low Belt Use	(MAP-21)		
--	--------------	----------	--	--

Major purchases and dispositions

Click **Add New** to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.6.2 Planned Activity: Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program

Planned activity name	Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program
Planned activity number	OP-2019-06
Primary countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (OP)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Educate the public on the importance of occupant restraint usage and risks of traffic crashes by distributing non-commercial sustaining announcements (NCSAs) to radio and television stations and evaluate their use to obtain a minimum of \$300,000 in documented public service air-time for traffic safety awareness messages.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas Broadcasters Association

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
2019	Communication Campaign (OP)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$37,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.1.7 Countermeasure Strategy: Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)
Countermeasure strategy	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Increase child passenger safety resources with special focus on at-risk families by increasing the existing pool of technicians and instructors and providing inspection stations. Also provide a focus on "Tweens" to address lack of restraint use and front passenger seating among ages eight to 14. Projected impacts of these projects include increased use rates and reduced injuries and fatalities in this age group.

Activities to be funded include:

Statewide child Passenger Protection Education Project

Existing efforts for the UAMS Child Passenger Safety Education Program (CPSE) are aimed to increase child passenger safety resources around the state in order to realize an increase in child restraint use for children ages birth to fifteen.

Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program - University of Arkansas Fayetteville

One objective of this project is to increase correct use of child safety seat restraints for passengers ages 0-15 to 85% in 2020

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Unintended injury is the leading cause of death for children ages 1-15 in Arkansas and motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of unintentional injury death for ages 5-15. Arkansas child restraint use rate in 2017 was 94.1% for children birth to six and 88% for children ages six to fifteen (FY 17 Child Passenger Seat Use Survey ASP) The non-use and misuse of child passenger restraints continues to be a concern.

Specific problems to be addressed include:

- Parents and caregivers need to be educated about current child passenger restraint laws in AR
- Parents and caregivers need to be educated on proper installation of child safety seats and correct seats for children.

Activities to be funded include:

Statewide child Passenger Protection Education Project

Existing efforts for the UAMS Child Passenger Safety Education Program (CPSE) are aimed to increase child passenger safety resources around the state in order to realize an increase in child restraint use for children ages birth to fifteen.

Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program - University of Arkansas Fayetteville

One objective of this project is to increase correct use of child safety seat restraints for passengers ages 0-15 to 85% in 2020

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Unintended injury is the leading cause of death for children ages 1-15 in Arkansas and motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of unintentional injury death for ages 5-15. Arkansas child restraint use rate in 2017 was 94.1% for children birth to six and 88% for children ages six to fifteen (FY 17 Child Passenger Seat Use Survey ASP) The non-use and misuse of child passenger restraints continues to be a concern.

Specific problems that need to be addressed include:

- Parents and caregivers need to be educated about current child passenger restraint laws in AR
- Parents and caregivers need to be educated on proper installation of child safety seats and correct seats for children.

Activities to be funded include:**Statewide child Passenger Protection Education Project**

Existing efforts for the UAMS Child Passenger Safety Education Program (CPSE) are aimed to increase child passenger safety resources around the state in order to realize an increase in child restraint use for children ages birth to fifteen.

Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program - University of Arkansas Fayetteville

One objective of this project is to increase correct use of child safety seat restraints for passengers ages 0-15 to 85% in 2020

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click **Add New** to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-01	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-08	Statewide Child Passenger Protection Project	

5.1.7.1 Planned Activity: Statewide Child Passenger Protection Project

Planned activity name	Statewide Child Passenger Protection Project
Planned activity number	OP-2019-08
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide child passenger protection education. This project will provide certification training for, but not limited to, healthcare and childcare professionals to educate parents and caregivers on the proper use of child restraints. NHTSA Standardized CPS Course curriculum will be use. This project also maintains the repository for CPS inspections stations in the state.

Enter intended subrecipients.

University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b Low Community CPS Services (FAST)	\$250,000.00	\$62,500.00	
2018	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b Low CSS Purchase/Distribution (FAST)	\$25,000.00	\$6,300.00	
2019	FAST Act 405b OP Low	405b Low CSS Purchase/Distribution (FAST)	\$25,000.00	\$6,300.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click **Add New** to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2 Program Area: Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)

Program area type Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

Yes

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

Program Overview/Problem ID

For the period from 2012 through 2016 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Fatalities for 2015 were at 550 but declined to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016. The following chart shows the 30 counties with the highest alcohol related fatalities.

1	Alcohol Related Fatalities By County For 2011 - 2016						
2	County	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
3	PULASKI	18	21	14	15	17	104
4	GARLAND	5	10	9	8	8	44
5	WASHINGTON	3	3	11	5	11	43
6	BENTON	9	2	2	11	6	34
7	JEFFERSON	5	3	7	7	2	30
8	LONOKE	7	4	2	6	5	27
9	CRAIGHEAD	5	4	4	3	5	25
10	SALINE	3	6	5	5	2	25
11	WHITE	1	2	4	4	7	21
12	FAULKNER	6	3	2	3	2	19
13	CRITTENDEN	3	2	6	0	3	18
14	CLEBURNE	3	1	1	1	2	17
15	CARROLL	0	0	2	5	3	16
16	INDEPENDENCE	1	2	4	1	4	16
17	HEMPSTEAD	1	4	3	1	3	15
18	HOT SPRING	1	3	4	5	2	15
19	MISSISSIPPI	5	4	2	1	2	15
20	SEBASTIAN	2	3	3	1	6	15
21	MILLER	0	1	0	4	3	13
22	COLUMBIA	4	3	1	1	1	12
23	CRAWFORD	1	1	5	1	2	12
24	UNION	2	0	1	5	2	12
25	CONWAY	3	3	2	0	2	11
26	GREENE	3	1	2	2	1	11
27	MADISON	0	2	3	2	1	11
28	POPE	5	1	1	1	0	11
29	YELL	2	0	1	0	6	11
30	Total	98	89	101	98	108	603

In 2012, the Arkansas Crime Information Center (ACIC) reported 9,720 driving while intoxicated (DWI)/ driving under the influence (DUI) arrests. The 2015 preliminary data shows 7,108 DWI/DUI arrests. Over the past several years arrest numbers have trended downward. As previously stated, current efforts include an emphasis on increasing enforcement and arrest numbers both inside and outside of STEP.



DWI/DUI ACIC NIBRS - ASP

YEAR	ACIC NIBRS	ASP	GRAND TOTALS
2011	9902	7386	17288
2012	9720	6883	16603

2013	7941	6052	13993
2014	7034	4848	11882
2015	7108	4821	11929

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration's 2018 Drug Threat Assessment for Arkansas, the drug threat to the state of Arkansas covers the full spectrum of all types of drugs. Some of the factors that make Arkansas an attractive place to reside, including its climate, extensive Interstate Highway System and rural nature contribute to its attractiveness as a drug transit and staging region. The Arkansas Crime Lab began additional testing of fatals for substances other than alcohol in 2017.

Marijuana is the most widely abused and available drug within the state. The issues related to marijuana are exacerbated by the increase in potency seen in high grade strains of marijuana produced in states with legalized medicinal marijuana. In 2016, Arkansas voters passed a ballot measure to legalize medical marijuana. This measure will establish a system for the cultivation, acquisition and distribution of marijuana for qualifying patients through dispensaries. State and local taxes will be applied to the sales of medical marijuana and voters can ban marijuana dispensaries and cultivation in their municipalities.

Arkansas qualifies as a "medium" range" state for the FY 18 Section 405d funding application. The classification was determined based on the state's average impaired driving fatality rate using the three most recent years of data as provide through NHTSA's Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). The classification was based on 2011- 2015 FARS data.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)	5 Year	2019	141.0

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	SFST training for Law Enforcement Officers
2019	Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints
2019	Laboratory Drug Testing Equipment
2019	Judicial Education
2019	Highway Safety Office Program Management (Impaired Driving)

2019	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
2019	DWI Courts
2019	Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training
2019	Court Monitoring
2019	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

5.2.1 Countermeasure Strategy: SFST training for Law Enforcement Officers

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	SFST training for Law Enforcement Officers

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

SFST: Standardized Field Sobriety Tests, a battery of three test (one-Leg Stand, Walk and Turn, and Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus) used by law enforcement at the roadside to estimate whether a driver is at or above the illegal limit of .08 BAC. Having well trained officers that can conduct SFST is a benefit not only in recognizing impaired drivers but also in obtaining convictions. More DWI arrests and convictions result in increased public awareness of the dangers of impaired driving and a lower number of fatalities and injuries.

Provide DWI and standardized field sobriety test (SFST)/traffic occupant protection strategies (TOPS) training and education for approx. 500 law enforcement officers.

- Provide SFST refresher training to 175 law enforcement officers.
- Provide drug recognition expert (DRE) training/education to approx. 24 law enforcement officers.
- Provide instructor development training to 24 SFST/TOPS officers and 10 DRE officers.
- Fund a statewide traffic safety conference for approximately 200 law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges and other safety partners. This 2-3 day conference will focus on Impaired Driving. An awards ceremony to recognize agencies/individuals that have been instrumental in promoting traffic safety issues in Arkansas may be held in conjunction with this conference.
- Fund a training conference for Arkansas's certified Drug Recognition Experts.
- Provide Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving (ARIDE) to approximately 100 officers.

Establish a new statewide DRE database.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26%, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Total fatalities for 2015 were at 550 with a slight decline to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities have declined from 158 in

2015 to 117 in 2016. For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016.

A target of 141 was established for 2015–2019 (5-year average).

This goal takes these issues into account as well as anticipated results from increased enforcement efforts in 2019 (Model LEL program, sustained high visibility enforcement, the addition of mini-STEPs and a pilot High Five Program).

Projects funded under the "SFST Training for Law Enforcement" countermeasure include:

- Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training Criminal Justice Institute AL-1019-02-02-01 \$700,000

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

The rationale for this countermeasure strategy is to expand specialized impaired driving training for law enforcement officers to assist them in the identification and apprehension of Impaired drivers. the goal is to reduce the number of impaired drivers on the road and the associated fatalities and injuries .

TRAFFIC SAFETY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT/PROSECUTOR TRAINING

Drug Impaired Driving Laws* Education on Medication*

Project Number: AL-2018-02-02-01

Sub-recipient(s): Criminal Justice Institute

Total Project Amount: \$669,600

- Provide DWI and standardized field sobriety test (SFST)/traffic occupant protection strategies (TOPS) training and education for approx. 500 law enforcement officers.
- Provide SFST refresher training to 175 law enforcement officers.
- Provide instructor development training to 24 SFST officers .
- Fund statewide traffic safety conference for approximately 200 law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges and other safety partners focusing on Impaired Driving.
- Provide Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving (ARIDE) to approximately 100 officers.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-02	Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training	Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training

5.2.2 Countermeasure Strategy: Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
---------------------	-------------------------------------

Countermeasure strategy Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach

motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

The mobile Breath Alcohol Testing (BAT) & Sobriety Checkpoint, support and training project with the Black River Technical College, Law Enforcement Training Academy in Pocahontas, AR will be a low manpower & multi-agency sobriety checkpoint training and support. This project will also supplement the DWI/SFST/DRE program with the Criminal Justice Institute by providing a mobile platform during DRE evaluations that are part of the DRE certification process.

Officers will stop vehicles at predetermined locations across the state to check whether the driver is impaired. The purpose of checkpoints is to deter driving after drinking and reduce the number of alcohol and drug related fatalities statewide and in counties with a high number of alcohol & drug related fatalities.

Planned Activities to be funded:

Law Enforcement Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training	\$ 150,000
Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects	\$ 4,000,000
Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project	\$ 500,000

In Car Camera and Video

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Linkage between program Area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities:

In 2012, the Arkansas Crime Information Center (ACIC) reported 9,720 driving while intoxicated (DWI)/ driving under the influence (DUI) arrests. The 2015 preliminary data shows 7,108 DWI/DUI arrests. Over the past several years arrest numbers have trended downward. As previously stated, current efforts include an emphasis on increasing enforcement and arrest numbers both inside and outside of STEP.

For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Fatalities for 2015 were at 550 but declined to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016. A chart showing the number of alcohol related fatalities by county for 2015-2019 is below. Checkpoints will be conducted statewide with emphasis in areas where alcohol related fatalities are highest.

Number of fatalities involving driver or Motorcycle Operator w BAC of .08 or above

The 5 year moving average method was used in consideration of linear trends and other factors. A target of 141 was set for the 5-year average 2015–2019. We anticipate that the recent passage of a medical marijuana law and increased drug issues may contribute to higher fatalities in this area. This goal takes these issues into account as well as anticipated results from increased enforcement efforts in 2018 (Model LEL program, addition of mini-STEPs and a pilot High Five Program).

Planned Activities to be funded:

Law Enforcement Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training	\$ 150,000
Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects	\$ 4,000,000
Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project	\$ 500,000
In Car Camera and Video	

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity:

CDC's systematic review of 15 high quality studies found that checkpoints reduce alcohol-related fatal crashes by 9%. Similarly a meta-analysis found that checkpoints reduce alcohol-related crashes by 17% and all crashes by 10 to 15%. In recent years NHTSA has supported a number of efforts to reduce alcohol-impaired driving using publicized sobriety checkpoint programs. Evaluations of statewide campaigns found decreases in alcohol-related fatalities following the program as well as fewer drivers with positive BACs in roadside surveys.

Planned Activities to be funded:

Law Enforcement Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training	\$ 150,000
Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects	\$ 4,000,000
Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project	\$ 500,000
In Car Camera and Video	

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-06	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-07	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	
AL-2019-10	Law Enf Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training	
AL-2019-14	Statewide In-Car Camera and Video Storage System	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

5.2.2.1 Planned Activity: Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)

Planned activity name	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
Planned activity number	AL-2019-07
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for sustained year round DWI/DUI enforcement by Arkansas State Police.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints
2019	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving Mid (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$125,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.2.2 Planned Activity: Law Enf Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training

Planned activity name	Law Enf Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training
Planned activity number	AL-2019-10
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting,

training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Fund mobile Breath Alcohol Testing (BAT) & Sobriety Checkpoint, support and training project with the Black River Technical College, Law Enforcement Training Academy

Enter intended subrecipients.

Black River Technical College

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving High (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.3 Countermeasure Strategy: Laboratory Drug Testing Equipment

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug)
Countermeasure strategy	Laboratory Drug Testing Equipment

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

This project will provide for the testing of fatalities for substances other than alcohol, provide data for problem analysis and programming efforts to deter impaired driving. It will also provide data for prosecution.

Because of the large number of toxicological cases received, the AR State Crime Lab (ASCL) started in 2015 to perform drug testing on motor vehicle crashes (MVC) cases only if the blood alcohol results were less than .08%. The ASP – HSO notified ASCL that FARS requires drug confirmation on all MVCs. With the current infrastructure, it would be difficult for ASCL to perform and keep the back log and turn-around times down. Federal funds will provide for outsourcing toxicology testing of backlogged cases; validation of equipment; purchase of new toxicology analysis equipment; - Liquid Chromatography Mass Spectro meter (LC/MS/MS) at a cost of \$400,000, a Nitrogen/Air Generator for LC/MS/MS at a cost of \$20,000, Gas Chromatography Headspace at a cost of \$40,000, Elisa Plate Reader at a cost of \$5,000 and a Positive Pressure Manifold at a cost of \$4,500; LC/MS/MS Software Licenses at a cost of \$28,000; Drug Standards for validation of current equipment; and validation of new equipment. ASCL will provide \$158,750 in match.

ARKANSAS STATE CRIME LAB

Total Project Amount: \$635,000

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration’s 2018 Drug Threat Assessment for Arkansas, the drug threat to the state of Arkansas covers the full spectrum of all types of drugs. Some of the factors that make Arkansas an attractive place to reside, including its climate, extensive Interstate Highway System and rural nature contribute to its attractiveness as a drug transit and staging region. The Arkansas Crime Lab began additional testing of fatalities for substances other than alcohol in 2017.

Marijuana is the most widely abused and available drug within the state. The issues related to marijuana are exacerbated by the increase in potency seen in high grade strains of marijuana produced in states with legalized medicinal marijuana. In 2016, Arkansas voters passed a ballot measure to legalize medical marijuana. This measure will establish a system for the cultivation, acquisition and distribution of marijuana for qualifying patients through dispensaries. State and local taxes will be applied to the sales of medical marijuana and voters can ban marijuana dispensaries and cultivation in their municipalities.

Arkansas qualifies as a “medium” range” state for the FY 19 Section 405d funding application. The classification was determined based on the state’s average impaired driving fatality rate using the three most recent years of data as provide through NHTSA’s Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). The classification was based on 2012- 2016 FARS data.

ARKANSAS STATE CRIME LAB Total Project Amount: \$635,000

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Testing for substances other than alcohol is necessary to provide data on the extent of Arkansas’ drug problems and information to direct programming efforts to deter impaired driving. Results from this testing will also provide evidence for prosecution.

ARKANSAS STATE CRIME LAB Total Project Amount: \$635,000

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-15	Motor Vehicle Crash Toxicology Testing	

5.2.3.1 Planned Activity: Motor Vehicle Crash Toxicology Testing

Planned activity name	Motor Vehicle Crash Toxicology Testing
Planned activity number	AL-2019-15
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funds provide for outsourcing toxicology testing of backlogged cases; validation of equipment; purchase of new toxicology analysis equipment.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Crime Lab

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
-------------	------------------------------

2019	Laboratory Drug Testing Equipment
------	-----------------------------------

Funding sources

Click **Add New** to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Mid BAC Testing/Reporting (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$125,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click **Add New** to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.4 Countermeasure Strategy: Judicial Education

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	Judicial Education

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of

recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

As members of the criminal justice system, judges are impartial administrators of the law. Judges who preside over impaired driving cases need to be equipped with specific information about the challenges often faced by the judiciary as an impaired driver moves through the criminal justice system. The revolving door, as it is often called, refers to the continued exploitation of the legal system by repeat offenders. A top priority for the AHSO is to provide the information needed by judges to help close legal loopholes often exploited by attorneys representing impaired drivers, while still protecting the rights of the accused. Providing this information and education will make Arkansas' streets and highways safer by insuring that Judges have up to date information so they can implement the appropriate measures, sentences etc. to keep impaired drivers off the roads and prevent the fatalities and injuries caused due to them.

Training for Prosecutors and Law Enforcement is essential to insure that Law enforcement personnel are educated and equipped to to apprehend, arrest and take appropriate action with regard to impaired driving offenses and offenders. The AHSO contracts with the Criminal Justice Institute (CJI) to conduct training that provides updated information on laws and current legislation.

Activities to be funded:

Judicial Training Project Provide adjudication training to education to approx. 100 Arkansas district judges with emphasis on impaired driving issues. Training may include, but is not limited to, careless driving, radar, search and seizure, probable cause, pharmacology, interaction with other agencies and sentencing. Faculty will be selected from district judges, substance abuse professionals, law enforcement officers, law professors and judges from other states who teach traffic programs in their home state and at the national level.

- Three-day judicial training program for approximately 100 State traffic court judges in late September 2018 at a location TBA titled "Updated Impaired Driving Case Fundamentals" by paying for staff at the National Judicial College. The material will include an overview of sentencing practices and evidence based options for traffic offenses; circumstances providing legal basis for stops, searches, seizures arrests and admissibility of testimonial or physical evidence; describe pharmacology to effectively evaluate expert testimony; identify and utilize assessment, treatment, and counseling resources to assist with imposing appropriate sentences and identify new technology and practices used in sentencing.
- Fund seven District Court Judges and one judicial educator to attend the 2018 American Bar Association Traffic Court Seminar in the spring of 2018 (place TBD).

Funding will reimburse in-state and out-of-state travel, tuition, meals and lodging

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

In 2012, the Arkansas Crime Information Center (ACIC) reported 9,720 driving while intoxicated (DWI)/ driving under the influence (DUI) arrests. The 2015 preliminary data shows 7,108 DWI/DUI arrests. Over the past several years arrest numbers and convictions have trended downward, current efforts include an emphasis on increasing enforcement, arrest numbers and convictions. Over the past several years arrest numbers have trended downward. As previously stated, current efforts include an emphasis on increasing enforcement and arrest numbers both inside and outside of STEP.

Countermeasure: Judicial Training

Activities to be Funded and Performance Targets:

- **Judicial Training Project**
 - Provide adjudication training to education to approx. 100 Arkansas district judges with emphasis on impaired driving issues. Training may include, but is not limited to, careless driving, radar, search and seizure, probable cause, pharmacology, interaction with other agencies and sentencing. Faculty will be selected from district judges, substance abuse professionals, law enforcement officers, law professors and judges from other states who teach traffic programs in their home state and at the national level.
 - Three-day judicial training program for approximately 100 State traffic court judges in late September 2018 at a location TBA titled "Updated Impaired Driving Case Fundamentals" by paying for staff at the National Judicial College. The material will include an overview of sentencing practices and evidence based options for traffic offenses; circumstances providing legal basis for stops, searches, seizures arrests and admissibility of testimonial or physical evidence; describe pharmacology to effectively evaluate expert testimony; identify and utilize assessment, treatment, and counseling resources to assist with imposing appropriate sentences and identify new technology and practices used in sentencing.
 - Fund seven District Court Judges and one judicial educator to attend the 2018 American Bar Association Traffic Court Seminar in the spring of 2018 (place TBD).

Funding will reimburse in-state and out-of-state travel, tuition, meals and lodging

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

This Countermeasure actually incorporates two sub-countermeasures including "Education on Medication" and "Drug Impaired Driving Laws" both of which are included in NHTSA's 2017 "Countermeasures That Work". Providing updated information on laws and medications enables law

enforcement, prosecutors and Judges to do their jobs more effectively. Although there is not a lot of information on how effective this has been in raising awareness, based on the feedback received it is very much needed, utilized and appreciated. It has been very effective in contributing to the effectiveness of another countermeasure utilized by the AHSO - that of expanding the number of Arkansas' DWI Court's.

Activities to be funded:

- Judicial Training Project
- Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training:

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-01	Judicial Training	
AL-2019-02	Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training	Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training
AL-2019-16	Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor	

5.2.4.1 Planned Activity: Judicial Training

Planned activity name	Judicial Training
Planned activity number	AL-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail

required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Provide adjudication training to education to approx. 100 Arkansas district judges with emphasis on impaired driving issues.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Administrative Office of the Courts

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Judicial Education

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Alcohol (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost

No records found.

5.2.4.2 Planned Activity: Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor

Planned activity name	Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor
Planned activity number	AL-2019-16
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) Project to provide training and resources to prosecutors and law enforcement state wide to aid in the prosecution of DWI/DUI cases to help reduce impaired driving related traffic crashes, fatalities and injuries

Enter intended subrecipients.

Office of the Prosecutor Coordinator

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Judicial Education

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Alcohol (FAST)	\$150,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.5 Countermeasure Strategy: Highway Safety Office Program Management (Impaired Driving)

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug)
Countermeasure strategy	Highway Safety Office Program Management (Impaired Driving)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required

under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Provide necessary personnel and training for the administration of the Impaired Driving Program Area. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program. Funding will also provide for training to maintain an effective, efficient Impaired Driving Program that will direct and support strategies to effectively address traffic Arkansas' traffic Impaired Driving problems.

Planned Projects to be Funded:

Alcohol/Impaired Driving Program Management

Total Project Amount: \$84,700 (TR) \$100,000

Provides for the administration of the Impaired Driving Program. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Impaired Driving Program.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Problem ID: For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26%, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Total fatalities for 2015 were at 550 with a slight decline to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities have declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016. For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016.

Performance Target: Number of fatalities involving a driver or Motorcycle Operator w BAC of .08 or above

The 5 year moving average method was used in consideration of linear trends and other factors. A target of 141 was established for 2015–2019 (5-year average).

Alcohol/Impaired Driving Program Management will provide for training to maintain an effective, efficient Impaired Driving Program that will direct and support strategies to effectively address traffic Arkansas' traffic Impaired Driving problems.

Alcohol/Impaired Driving Program Management

Total Project Amount: \$100,000

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Provide necessary personnel and training for the administration of the Impaired Driving Program Area. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program. Funding will also provide for training to maintain an effective, efficient Impaired Driving Program that will direct and support strategies to effectively address traffic Arkansas' traffic Impaired Driving problems.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-17	Alcohol and Other Drug Countermeasures Program Management	

5.2.5.1 Planned Activity: Alcohol and Other Drug Countermeasures Program Management

Planned activity name	Alcohol and Other Drug Countermeasures Program Management
Planned activity number	AL-2019-17
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Provides program management for projects in the Alcohol and Other Drugs Countermeasures program area and administration for projects in this area

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Highway Safety Office Program Management (Impaired Driving)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Alcohol (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2018	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Int	Alcohol (FAST)	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.6 Countermeasure Strategy: High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required

under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

High Visibility Enforcement is a strategy within the Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol) Section. Funding will support overtime efforts throughout the state. Agencies will support STEP efforts and participate in national mobilizations. High visibility enforcement will increase the presence of law enforcement to discourage impaired driving and the projected impact is a reduction in the deaths and injuries associated with them..

The primary emphasis will be sustained year round DWI/DUI enforcement. Participating agencies will also conduct checkpoints and saturation patrols at least four nights during the National impaired driving campaign and also checkpoints/saturation patrols during state impaired driving campaigns.

A media blitz will be associated with the mobilizations and frequent PSAs will run to remind motorists of the increased potential of being stopped and ticketed/arrested. This approach is designed to condition drivers to be more attentive to their driving responsibilities while traveling. Vehicles stopped during increased enforcement campaigns will be monitored for occupant restraint and impaired driving violations.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Problem ID: For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26%, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Total fatalities for 2015 were at 550 with a slight decline to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities have declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016. For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Additional data on Arkansas Impaired Driving is included under the Impaired Driving Program Area.

Performance Target for number of fatalities involving a driver or Motorcycle Operator w BAC of .08 or above

The 5 year moving average method was used in consideration of linear trends and other factors. A target of 141 was established for 2015–2019 (5-year average). We anticipate that the recent passage of a medical marijuana law and increased drug issues may contribute to higher fatalities in this area. This goal takes these issues into account as well as anticipated results from increased enforcement efforts in 2019 (Model LEL program, sustained high visibility enforcement, and the addition of mini-STEPS).

Projects funded under the High Visibility Enforcement countermeasure will include:

- Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects
- Local Selective Traffic Enforcement
- Model LEL program
- Mini-STEPS
- In car camera and video

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Studies show that states that employ highly visible impaired driving enforcement operations and intensive publicity experienced reductions in alcohol related fatalities.

High Visibility Enforcement is a strategy within the Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol) Section. Section 402 and 405d funding will support overtime efforts though out the state. Agencies will support STEP efforts and participate in national mobilizations. High visibility enforcement will increase the presence of law enforcement to discourage impaired driving. The primary emphasis will be sustained year round DWI/DUI enforcement. Participating agencies will also conduct checkpoints and saturation patrols at least four nights during the National impaired driving campaign and also checkpoints/saturation patrols during state impaired driving campaigns.

Projects funded for this countermeasure will include:

- Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects
- Local Selective Traffic Enforcement

- Model LEL program
- Mini-STEPs
- In Car Camera and Video

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click **Add New** to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-06	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-07	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	
AL-2019-08	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-11	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-14	Statewide In-Car Camera and Video Storage System	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

5.2.6.1 Planned Activity: Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)

Planned activity name	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)
Planned activity number	AL-2019-06
Primary countermeasure strategy	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail

required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for a statewide selective traffic enforcement project. The primary emphasis will be sustained year round DWI/DUI enforcement.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints
2019	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2017	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving Mid (FAST)	\$1,000,000.00	\$700,000.00	
2018	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving Mid (FAST)	\$1,000,000.00	\$700,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.6.2 Planned Activity: Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)

Planned activity name	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
Planned activity number	AL-2019-07
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for sustained year round DWI/DUI enforcement by Arkansas State Police.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints
2019	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving Mid (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$125,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.6.3 Planned Activity: Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)

Planned activity name	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)
Planned activity number	AL-2019-08
Primary countermeasure strategy	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for overtime pay and equipment for Mini-STEP projects to conduct DWI/DUI enforcement primarily during state, regional or national campaigns.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving Mid (FAST)	\$352,000.00	\$88,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.6.4 Planned Activity: Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)

Planned activity name	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)
Planned activity number	AL-2019-11
Primary countermeasure strategy	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

LELs from Criminal Justice Institute will recruit law enforcement agencies statewide to be a mini-STEP grant agency in addition to promoting agency participation in the sustained STEP program, other responsibilities include recruiting agencies for SFST, ARIDE, and DRE training and setting up learning sessions on traffic safety issues.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Criminal Justice Institute

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Alcohol (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.6.5 Planned Activity: Statewide In-Car Camera and Video Storage System

Planned activity name	Statewide In-Car Camera and Video Storage System
Planned activity number	AL-2019-14
Primary countermeasure strategy	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

This task provides for in-car video cameras and a backend video storage system to aid in the apprehension and prosecution of DWI/DUI violators

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints
2019	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving Mid (FAST)	\$400,000.00	\$100,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.7 Countermeasure Strategy: DWI Courts

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	DWI Courts

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

DWI Courts are specialized courts dedicated to changing the behavior of DWI offenders through intensive supervision and treatment. Arkansas now has 12 courts. These courts provide a systematic and coordinated approach to prosecuting, sentencing, monitoring and treating DWI offenders, Prosecutors and judges in DWI courts specialize in DWI cases. The underlying goal is to change offenders' behavior by identifying and treating alcohol problems and holding offenders accountable for their actions thereby rehabilitating offenders, taking impaired drivers off the road, and reducing death and injuries on the streets and highways of Arkansas.

Work with court jurisdictions statewide to improve adjudication of traffic laws related to impaired driving. Activities include soliciting and generating interest statewide for the development and implementation of additional DWI Courts. Arkansas has 3 pilot DWI courts. An additional 6 courts completed training in 2011 and implemented their DWI courts in 2012. A 10th court completed training mid-2012, an 11th court in the summer of 2014 and a 12th court in December 2015. One additional court will seek initial training in 2017. This Task provides funding to maintain the operations for three pilot DWI courts and assist with training costs for new courts. AHSO will provide funding for initial and enhanced DWI Court Trainings offered through NHTSA/NDICI. Federal funds provide for salaries, fringe benefits, in and out-of state travel, meeting expenses, maintenance and operations, printing and administration. State/local funds provide additional administrative costs.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Fatalities for 2015 were at 550 but declined to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities have declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016.

In 2012, the Arkansas Crime Information Center (ACIC) reported 9,720 driving while intoxicated (DWI)/ driving under the influence (DUI) arrests. The 2015 preliminary data shows 7,108 DWI/DUI arrests. Over the past several years arrest numbers have trended downward. As previously stated, current efforts include an emphasis on increasing enforcement and arrest numbers both inside and outside of STEP.



DWI/DUI ACIC NIBRS - ASP

YEAR	ACIC NIBRS	ASP	GRAND TOTALS
2011	9902	7386	17288
2012	9720	6883	16603
2013	7941	6052	13993
2014	7034	4848	11882

2015	7108	4821	11929
------	------	------	-------

Performance Target: Reduce the number of fatalities with driver or MC rider at .08 or above

Countermeasure Strategy: DWI Courts

Planned Activities: 12 Existing DWI Courts

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

DWI Courts are listed as a 4 star countermeasure in NHTSA's 2017 Countermeasures that Work. A systematic review found that DWI courts appear to be effective in reducing recidivism. A more recent meta-analysis of 28 studies suggest DWI Courts reduce recidivism among DWI offenders by approximately 50% compared to traditional court programs. One Michigan study found that DWI court participants were 19 times less likely to be rearrested for a DWI within two years than a comparison group of offenders who were in traditional probation. Another study of three DWI Courts in Georgia found that offenders who graduated from the court program had a 9% recidivism rate within the next 4 years compared to a 24% recidivism rate for the comparison group in traditional courts. Evaluations have shown that close monitoring and individualized sanctions for DWI offenders reduce recidivism.

Activities to be Funded:

- DWI Courts (12)

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-13	DWI Courts	

5.2.7.1 Planned Activity: DWI Courts

Planned activity name	DWI Courts
Planned activity number	AL-2019-13
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funds provide for 12 DWI courts and development and implantation of additional DWI courts in jurisdictions statewide to improve adjudication of traffic laws related to impaired driving.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local District Courts

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	DWI Courts

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Mid Court Support (MAP-21)	\$500,000.00	\$250,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.8 Countermeasure Strategy: Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt

enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

To provide law enforcement with training, tools and a structured approach to assist in the prosecution and conviction of Drug Impaired Drivers and to prevent these individuals from continuing to drive while under the influence of drugs or alcohol. The projected impact is an increased number of DRE certified law enforcement officers and a reduction in the number of injuries and deaths caused by drug impaired drivers on Arkansas roads and highways.

Planned Activities:

- Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training Countermeasure and planned activities will include the following:
 - Provide a minimum of two DRE training classes for a total of approximately 24 enforcement officers.
 - Create an impaired driving blueprint for Arkansas to include a border to border mobilization.
 - Provide a statewide training for Arkansas' certified DRE's

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26%, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Total fatalities for 2015 were at 550 with a slight decline to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities have declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016. For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration's 2018 Drug Threat Assessment for Arkansas, the drug threat to the state of Arkansas covers the full spectrum of all types of drugs. Some of the factors that make Arkansas an attractive place to reside, including its climate, extensive Interstate Highway System and rural nature contribute to its attractiveness as a drug transit and staging region. The Arkansas Crime Lab began additional testing of fatalities for substances other than alcohol in 2017.

We anticipate that the recent passage of a medical marijuana law and increased drug issues may contribute to higher fatalities in this area. Marijuana is the most widely abused and available drug within the state. The issues related to marijuana are exacerbated by the increase in potency seen in high grade strains of marijuana produced in states with legalized medicinal marijuana. In 2016, Arkansas voters passed a ballot measure to legalize medical marijuana. This measure will establish a system for the cultivation, acquisition and distribution of marijuana for qualifying patients through dispensaries. We anticipate that the recent passage of the medical marijuana law and increased drug issues may contribute to higher fatalities in this area.

A target of 141 has been established for 2015–2019 (5-year average).

This goal takes the above cited issues into account as well as anticipated results from increased enforcement efforts in 2019 (Model LEL program, sustained high visibility enforcement, the addition of mini-STEPs and a pilot High Five Program).

Projects funded under the Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training countermeasure include:

- Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training Criminal Justice Institute

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

The Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) program, established with support of NHTSA in 1988 and managed by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), is a structured program of assessment of suspected impaired individuals that systematically collects and documents these and other symptoms of drug and impairment, and provides a framework for the interpretation of this evidence, indicating the class or classes of drugs most likely to be responsible. In doing so it establishes the necessary probable cause for collection of a biological sample for toxicological testing, completing the major elements needed for a robust DUID prosecution. The DRE program is the most effective tool currently available to law enforcement officers for the documentation of behavior and impairment in drug-impaired drivers. By incorporating DRE training along with other activities in the Impaired Driving Program Area Arkansas will have more trained and informed officers in the field to apprehend, identify and effectively prosecute impaired drivers. The objective being to reduce the number of deaths and injuries associated with impaired drivers.

Projects funded under the Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training countermeasure include:

- Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training Criminal Justice Institute

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

--	--	--

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-02	Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training	Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training

5.2.8.1 Planned Activity: Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training

Planned activity name	Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training
Planned activity number	AL-2019-02
Primary countermeasure strategy	Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Provide the following training for law enforcement officers: Standardized field sobriety test (SFST)/traffic occupant protection strategies (TOPS) training; SFST refresher training; Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving (ARIDE) training; Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) training & Instructor development and fund a statewide traffic safety conference and awards ceremony.

Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement/Prosecutor Training:

- Provide DWI and standardized field sobriety test (SFST)/traffic occupant protection strategies (TOPS) training and education for approx. 500 law enforcement officers.
- Provide SFST refresher training to 175 law enforcement officers.
- Provide drug recognition expert (DRE) training/education to approx. 24 law enforcement officers.
- Provide instructor development training to 24 SFST/TOPS officers and 10 DRE officers.
- Fund a statewide traffic safety conference for approximately 200 law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges and other safety partners. This 2-3 day conference will focus on Impaired Driving. An awards ceremony to recognize agencies/individuals that have been instrumental in promoting traffic safety issues in Arkansas may be held in conjunction with this conference.
- Fund a training conference for Arkansas's certified Drug Recognition Experts.
- Provide Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving (ARIDE) to approximately 100 officers.

Establish a new statewide DRE database.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Criminal Justice Institute

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	SFST training for Law Enforcement Officers
2019	Judicial Education
2019	Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Alcohol (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$0.00	\$375,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.9 Countermeasure Strategy: Court Monitoring

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	Court Monitoring

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

The projected impact of this strategy is to increase awareness in the courts and reduce the number of impaired drivers thereby reducing fatalities associated with impaired driving. Court Monitoring produces higher conviction rates and stiffer sentences than unmonitored cases and has been shown to increase DWI arrests, decrease plea agreements and increase guilty pleas.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Fatalities for 2015 were at 550 but declined to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities have declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016.

In 2012, the Arkansas Crime Information Center (ACIC) reported 9,720 driving while intoxicated (DWI)/ driving under the influence (DUI) arrests. The 2015 preliminary data shows 7,108 DWI/DUI arrests. Over the past several years arrest numbers have trended downward. As previously stated, current efforts include an emphasis on increasing enforcement and arrest numbers both inside and outside of STEP. Court Monitoring Projects will be implemented in counties with the largest number of DWI fatalities (Chart in Impaired Driving Program Area Problem ID)

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Shinar (1992) found that court-monitored cases in Maine produced higher conviction rates and stiffer sentences than unmonitored cases. Probst et al. (1987) found that judges, prosecutors, and other officials in 51 communities believed that court monitoring programs helped increase DWI arrests, decrease plea agreements, and increase guilty pleas. This strategy was chosen in order to increase awareness of the judiciary and obtain more convictions to reduce the number of impaired drivers and the fatalities and injuries associated with them.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-12	Court Monitoring Program	Court Monitoring

5.2.9.1 Planned Activity: Court Monitoring Program

Planned activity name	Court Monitoring Program
Planned activity number	AL-2019-12
Primary countermeasure strategy	Court Monitoring

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Court Monitoring program to follow DWI/DUI cases through the court process and identify gaps in prosecutorial, judicial, and law enforcement training that contribute to declining enforcement numbers and loopholes in judicial implementation of Arkansas's ignition interlock law.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Court Monitoring

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Mid Court Support (MAP-21)	\$200,000.00	\$50,000.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.10 Countermeasure Strategy: Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Projected Traffic Safety Impacts of the Communication countermeasure Strategy include:

- Increased awareness of impaired driving issues
- Reduction of unsafe driving behaviors.
- Reduction of fatalities and injuries associated with impaired driving

Planned Activities Include:

- Statewide Public Information and Education (Mass Media Campaigns) CJRW Advertising Agency
 - Create awareness among the 21 to 34 year old age group emphasizing the reduction of impaired driving crashes
 - Conduct high visibility enforcement/media campaigns emphasizing impaired driving for national mobilizations
- Traffic Safety Commercial Sustaining Announcement Evaluation Program (Mass Media Campaigns)
 - Utilize public service announcements (PSAs) to increase awareness of impaired driving issues.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Problem ID: For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26%, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016. Total fatalities for 2015 were at 550 with a slight decline to 545 in 2016. Alcohol related fatalities have declined from 158 in 2015 to 117 in 2016. For the period from 2015 through 2019 the percentage of impaired driving fatalities, as a percentage of the total were at 26 percent, dropping to 21% of total fatalities for 2016.

Performance Target: The 5 year moving average method was used in consideration of linear trends and other factors. A target of 141 was established for 2015–2019 (5-year average). We anticipate that the recent passage of a medical marijuana law and increased drug issues may contribute to higher fatalities in this area.

Countermeasure Strategy: Communication

This strategy seeks to inform the public of the dangers of driving while impaired by alcohol and to promote positive social norms of not driving while impaired.

Planned Activities Funding:

Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Evaluation Program

Statewide Public Information and Education Campaigns

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Communications and outreach strategies attempt to inform the public of the dangers of driving while impaired by Alcohol and to promote positive social norms of not driving while impaired. As with prevention and intervention, education through various communications and outreach strategies is especially important for your under 21. Education will be conducted through the media, paid advertisements and a wide variety of other communications channels such as posters, billboards, web banners and social media outlets. Communications and outreach is a critical part of deterrence and prevention.

Planned Activities Funding:

- Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Evaluation Program
- Statewide Public Information and Education Campaigns

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
AL-2019-03	Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)
AL-2019-05	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

5.2.10.1 Planned Activity: Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program

Planned activity name	Traffic Safety Non-Commercial Sustaining Announcement Eval Program
Planned activity number	AL-2019-03
Primary countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Distribute non-commercial sustaining announcements (NCSAs) to radio and television stations and evaluate their use to obtain a minimum of \$300,000 in documented public service air time for traffic safety awareness messages.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas Broadcasters Association

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Alcohol (FAST)	\$37,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.2.10.2 Planned Activity: Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)

Planned activity name	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
Planned activity number	AL-2019-05
Primary countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide public information and education to promote awareness of the impacts of impaired driving and support national mobilizations such as "Drive Sober or Get pulled Over" (DSGPO) targeting messages to young persons age 18 to 34 and motorcycle operators. Media placements may include television, radio, internet and print.

Enter intended subrecipients.

CJRW Advertising Agency

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2017	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Mid Paid/Earned Media (FAST)	\$800,000.00	\$800,000.00	
2017	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Mid	405d Impaired Driving Mid (FAST)	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.3 Program Area: Speed Management

Program area type Speed Management

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

No

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

According to FARS data, over the last five years (2012 – 2016) there have been 414 fatalities recorded as speed-related, this accounts for 15.7% of the total number of traffic-related fatalities (2,623) during the same time period. Between 2011 and 2014 Arkansas saw a decline in the number of speed-related fatalities (86 to 56) but in 2015 fatalities rose to 92 and again in 2016 to 117 bringing them to 21.4% of total fatalities. The state recognizes the importance of remaining vigilant in addressing and enforcing speed. The 2017 Public Awareness/Attitude Survey included questions about speed. 54% of individuals surveyed indicated they said they recalled reading seeing or hearing about speed enforcement efforts by police last year.

A target of 90 was set for 2015–2019 based on a 5 year moving average in consideration of linear trends and other factors. This target also took into consideration the rise in speeding fatalities for 2016 as well as the recent law increasing the interstate speed limit to 75 mph. Anticipated results of increased enforcement efforts (Model LEL program, addition of mini-STEPs) were also factored into the target.

In FY 2019, the AHSO will contract with law enforcement agencies throughout the state to conduct high visibility enforcement of speed. These Agencies will conduct speed enforcement independently and in conjunction with other violations such as occupant protection and impairment.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	90.0

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (SP)
2019	Communication Campaign (Speed)

5.3.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Sustained Enforcement (SP)

Program area	Speed Management
--------------	------------------

Countermeasure strategy Sustained Enforcement (SP)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach

motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Sustained high visibility enforcement campaigns will be used to deter speeding through both specific and general deterrence. Law enforcement agencies will target selected high-crash or high violation geographical areas using designated patrols. This is the same approach as high visibility seat belt and alcohol-impaired driving enforcement: The purpose is to convince the public that speeding is likely to be detected and offenders will be punished. The 2017 AHSO Public Awareness/Attitude Survey included questions about speed. 54% of individuals surveyed indicated they said they recalled reading seeing or hearing about speed enforcement efforts by police last year and 41% felt they would likely get a ticket if speeding. The projected impact of this countermeasure is public awareness of this problem, a decrease in drivers that are speeding and injuries and fatalities associated with speeding.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

According to FARS data, over the last five years (2012 – 2016) 414 fatalities were speed-related, this accounts for approximately 17% of the total number of traffic-related fatalities (2,623) for the same time period. Between 2012 and 2016 Arkansas saw an increase in the number of speed-related fatalities (76 to 117). In 2016 fatalities are up considerably (at 117) as compared to 2015 (92).

A target of 90 was set for 2015–2019 based on a 5 year moving average in consideration with linear trends and other factors. This target also took into consideration the rise in speeding fatalities for 2016 as well as the recent law increasing the interstate speed limit to 75 mph. Anticipated results of increased enforcement efforts (Model LEL program, addition of mini-STEPS) were also factored into this target.

Sustained enforcement will be used to deter speeding through both specific and general deterrence. Law enforcement agencies will target high-crash or high violation geographical areas using designated patrols. This is the same approach as high visibility seat belt and alcohol-impaired driving enforcement: The purpose is to convince the public that speeding is likely to be detected and offenders will be punished. The projected impact is a decrease in drivers that are speeding and the injuries and fatalities associated with it. The 2017 Public Awareness/Attitude Survey included questions about speed. 54% of individuals surveyed indicated they said they recalled reading seeing or hearing about speed enforcement efforts by police last year.

The state recognizes the importance in remaining vigilant in addressing and enforcing speed. In FY 2019, the AHSO will contract with law enforcement agencies throughout the state to conduct high visibility enforcement of speed. Although efforts may also emphasize other core measures such as occupant protection and impairment, agencies will enforce speed violations as well.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Over the last five years (2012 – 2016) there have been 414 fatalities recorded as speed-related, this accounts for approximately 17% of the total number of traffic-related fatalities (2,623) for the same time period. Between 2012 and 2016 Arkansas saw an increase in the number of speed-related fatalities (76 to 117). In 2016 fatalities are up considerably (at 117) as compared to 2015 (92). The state recognizes the importance

of addressing and enforcing speed laws. Speed citations issued by law enforcement continue to increase every year and the 2017 Public Awareness/Attitude Survey, which included questions about speed, showed that 54% of individuals surveyed indicated they said they recalled reading seeing or hearing about increased speed enforcement by police last year and 41% felt it was likely they would receive a ticket if speeding. In FY 2019, the AHSO will contract with law enforcement agencies throughout the state to conduct high visibility enforcement of speed. These Agencies will conduct speed enforcement independently and in conjunction with other violations such as occupant protection and impairment. This is the same approach as high visibility seat belt and alcohol-impaired driving enforcement: The purpose is to convince the public that speeding is likely to be detected and offenders will be punished.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
SC-2019-01	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)	Sustained Enforcement (SP)
SC-2019-02	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	
SC-2019-03	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)	

5.3.1.1 Planned Activity: Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)

Planned activity name	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)
Planned activity number	SC-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	Sustained Enforcement (SP)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for selected cities and counties to conduct sustained selective traffic enforcement projects. Speed enforcement will be a vital component of these enforcement efforts

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (SP)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Speed Control (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$300,000.00	\$500,000.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Speed Control (FAST)	\$500,000.00	\$300,000.00	\$500,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost

No records found.

5.3.1.2 Planned Activity: Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)

Planned activity name	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)
Planned activity number	SC-2019-02
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for a statewide selective traffic enforcement project through the Arkansas State Police. The primary emphasis will be speed enforcement throughout the year.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (SP)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Speed Control (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$0.00
2019	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Int	Police Traffic Services (FAST)	\$225,000.00	\$56,300.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.3.1.3 Planned Activity: Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)

Planned activity name	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)
Planned activity number	SC-2019-03
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for overtime pay and equipment for Mini-STEP projects to conduct speed enforcement primarily during state, regional or national speed campaigns.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Sustained Enforcement (SP)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Speed Control (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$300,000.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Speed Control (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$300,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.3.2 Countermeasure Strategy: Communication Campaign (Speed)

Program area	Speed Management
Countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (Speed)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt

enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Effective high visibility communications and outreach are an essential part of successful speed enforcement programs. High visibility enforcement in conjunction with extensive communications campaigns to support the enforcement has been proven effective. The success of paid advertising in seat belt use campaigns suggests that it is worth considering in speed campaigns. The objective is to provide information about the program, including the expected safety benefits and persuade motorists that detection and punishment for violations is likely. The impact of this communication program is to reduce the number of drivers who speed and the fatalities and injuries associated with this behavior.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

According to FARS data, over the last five years (2012 – 2016) there have been 414 fatalities recorded as speed-related, this accounts for 15.7% of the total number of traffic-related fatalities (2,623) during the same time period. Between 2011 and 2014 Arkansas saw a decline in the number of speed-related fatalities (86 to 56) but in 2015 fatalities rose to 92 and again in 2016 to 117 bringing them to 21.4% of total fatalities. The 2017 Public

Awareness/Attitude Survey included questions about speed. 54% of individuals surveyed indicated they said they recalled reading seeing or hearing about speed enforcement efforts by police last year.

A target of 90 was set for 2015–2019 based on a 5 year moving average in consideration with linear trends and other factors. This target also took into consideration the rise in speeding fatalities for 2016 as well as the recent law increasing the interstate speed limit to 75 mph. Anticipated results of increased enforcement efforts (Model LEL program, addition of mini-STEPs, and a pilot High Five Program) were also factored into the target.

The state recognizes the importance of remaining vigilant in addressing and enforcing speed. In FY 2019, the AHSO will contract with law enforcement agencies throughout the state to conduct high visibility enforcement of speed. These Agencies will conduct speed enforcement independently and in conjunction with other violations such as occupant protection and impairment. These efforts will be supplemented by a statewide communication campaign.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

In FY 2019, the AHSO will contract with law enforcement agencies throughout the state to conduct high visibility enforcement of speed. These Agencies will conduct speed enforcement independently and in conjunction with other violations such as occupant protection and impairment. Effective high visibility communications and outreach are an essential part of successful enforcement efforts. High visibility enforcement in conjunction with extensive communications campaigns to support the enforcement has been proven effective. The proven success of paid advertising in seat belt use campaigns warrants its inclusion as a countermeasure in the speed program area..

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
SC-2019-04	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (Speed)

5.3.2.1 Planned Activity: Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)

Planned activity name	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
Planned activity number	SC-2019-04
Primary countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (Speed)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide public information and education to promote adherence to speed limits with particular focus on the national "Obey the Sign or Pay the Fine" enforcement mobilization surrounding the Independence Day holiday.

Enter intended subrecipients.

CJRW Advertising Firm

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign (Speed)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

--	--	--	--	--	--

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Paid Advertising (FAST)	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$75,000.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Speed Control (FAST)	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.4 Program Area: Motorcycle Safety

Program area type Motorcycle Safety

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

No

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

Arkansas reported 64 motorcycle related fatalities in 2011. Fatalities are at 80 for 2016 and account for approximately 15 percent of Arkansas' total traffic fatalities. Arkansas repealed the helmet law in 1999, and now only requires helmets for motorcyclists age 21 or younger. In the years following the change in the law motorcycle fatalities tripled. Motorcycle fatalities were at 23 in 1997 when the state's motorcycle helmet law was repealed. In 2016, 71 percent of all motorcyclist fatalities were not helmeted.

The Arkansas Highway Safety Office (AHSO) will conduct statewide motorcycle safety program to increase motorist's awareness, support rider education and utilize enforcement and PI&E efforts to reduce the number of motorcycle fatalities and injuries. The AHSO will purchase advertising for the "Look Twice for Motorcycles" and "Take 2 for Arkansas" campaigns to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising in a majority of counties where there is at least one motorcycle crash causing a serious or fatal injury. Motorcycle data was submitted via the GMSS Motorcycle Grant Data Import Template. This information is provided in the 405 application.

Arkansas will also utilize statewide television and radio spots to promote awareness of motorcycle safety and the dangers associated with the impaired operation of motorcycles. Efforts to deter impaired motorcyclists will be made during the National Winter DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); the National Labor Day DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); and the July 4th holiday DSOGPO campaign. The AHSO will purchase advertising to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising directed at the top five counties for impaired motorcycle crashes and fatalities.

Planned Activities

MOTORIST AWARENESS CAMPAIGN

Sub-recipient(s): CJRW

Provides funding to purchase items promoting motorcycle safety activities. Items that will be produced and purchased are educational pamphlets, posters, radio and television ads and other items as appropriate to advance the program.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	71.0
2019	C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	40.0

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign (MC)

5.4.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Communication Campaign (MC)

Program area	Motorcycle Safety
Countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (MC)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Arkansas will utilize statewide television and radio spots to promote an awareness of motorcycle safety and the dangers associated with the impaired operation of motorcycles. Efforts to deter impaired motorcyclists will be made during the National Winter DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); the National Labor Day DWI Mobilization (DSOGPO); and the July 4th holiday DSOGPO campaign in. The AHSO will purchase advertising to include broadcast, cable, radio and online advertising directed at the top five counties for impaired motorcycle crashes and fatalities.

Effective, high visibility communications and outreach are important in changing attitudes and behavior of both riders and drivers. The objective of Arkansas' Communication Campaign for Motorcycle awareness is to provide information concerning the safe operation of motorcycles and persuade riders and drivers of the benefits associated with drivers and motorcycle operators taking the time to be more aware of their surroundings, be safe and courteous and not drink while operating or riding a vehicle or motorcycle. The projected impact would be increased awareness and safer behaviors on the part of drivers and motorcycle operators resulting in fewer fatalities and injuries.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Motorcycle fatalities were at 23 in 1997 when the state's motorcycle helmet law was repealed. Arkansas' law requires only person(s) under the age of 21 to wear protective headgear which contributes significantly to this problem. In the years following the change in the law motorcycle fatalities tripled. Arkansas reported 64 motorcycle related fatalities in 2011. This number has fluctuated up and down but has remained consistently high. Fatalities for 2016 are up at 80. They account for approximately 15 percent of Arkansas' total traffic fatalities.

C-7 Number of Motorcyclist Fatalities

A target of 71 was set for 2015-2019 utilizing the 5 year moving average method in consideration with linear trends and other factors.

C-8 Number of Unhelmeted Motorcyclist Fatalities

A target of 40 was set for 2015-2019 utilizing the 5 year moving average method in consideration of linear trends and other factors.

Planned Activities

MOTORIST AWARENESS CAMPAIGN

Sub-recipient(s): CJRW Advertising Agency

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Effective, high visibility communications and outreach are important in changing attitudes and behavior of both riders and drivers. The objective of Arkansas' Communication Campaign for Motorcycle awareness is to provide information concerning the safe operation of motorcycles and persuade riders and drivers of the benefits associated with drivers and motorcycle operators taking the time to be more aware of their surroundings, be safe and courteous and not drink while operating or riding a vehicle or motorcycle.

Planned Activity

MOTORIST AWARENESS CAMPAIGN

Sub-recipient(s): CJRW

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
MC-2019-01	Motorist Awareness Campaign	Communication Campaign (MC)

5.4.1.1 Planned Activity: Motorist Awareness Campaign

Planned activity name	Motorist Awareness Campaign
Planned activity number	MC-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (MC)

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Provides funding to purchase educational pamphlets, posters, radio and television ads as appropriate to provide information and create awareness of motorcycle safety and dangers of impaired riding.

Enter intended subrecipients.

CJRW Advertising Agency

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign (MC)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act 405f Motorcycle Programs	405f Motorcyclist Awareness (FAST)	\$58,000.00	\$14,500.00	
2019	FAST Act 405f Motorcycle Programs	405f Motorcyclist Awareness (FAST)	\$58,000.00	\$14,500.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.5 Program Area: Non-motorized (Pedestrians and Bicyclist)

Program area type Non-motorized (Pedestrians and Bicyclist)

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

No

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

Over the last five years pedestrian fatalities have averaged around 44 with a low of 37 in 2014. Bicycle fatalities have averaged around 5 with lows of 3 in 2015 and 2016.

During 2016 there were 44 pedestrian fatalities. These fatalities represented 8 percent of all motor vehicle fatalities for this period. Information on pedestrian and bicycle safety will be a part of the "Toward Zero Deaths" (TZD) Campaign Project which was developed in collaboration with AHSO, ArDOT, and ADH and other injury prevention projects (See Occupant Protection /Injury Prevention Program and PI&E projects). Countermeasures conducted in Arkansas will include both enforcement and education efforts. Pedestrians need to understand that even though they are walking or running they still have a responsibility to obey the same traffic laws that motorists are subject to. However, under Arkansas law, motorists are to yield to pedestrians at all times.

Between 2011-2015 a total of 26 persons lost their lives in bicycle crashes. In addition to press-related activities, enforcement and educational efforts are planned for 2019 to bring awareness to pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The AHSO will continue to work with the ARDOT to provide informational posters/brochures in public areas around the city as part of the TZD initiative. In FY 2019, law enforcement agencies within communities with pedestrian and bicyclist related fatalities and serious injuries will be encouraged to be proactive in pedestrian and bicyclist enforcement and overall safety issues.

Planned Projects:

- AHSO Statewide Media Campaign
- ArDOT media campaign focusing on the following education strategies:
 - Public service messages that target school children on bicycle and pedestrian safety
 - Public service messages aimed at increasing awareness of the dangers of bicycle and pedestrian traffic on high volume roadways
 - Social media to educate the public on bicycle/pedestrian laws and safety
 - ArDOT initiated a pedestrian safety program in Eldorado, Arkansas in 2014. Assessments for additional projects are ongoing.
- Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Program (U of A Fayetteville)
 - The Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project at the U of A will provide information as part of their program to address safety issues in that area.

The AHSO will continue educational public awareness programs along with public information and awareness efforts through the media, programming and TZD. Law Enforcement agencies will be utilized to encourage communities to initiate additional safety measures in enforcement and infrastructure.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	43.0
2019	C-11) Number of bicyclists fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	5.0

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)

5.5.1 Countermeasure Strategy: School and Community Awareness Programs

Program area	Distracted Driving
Countermeasure strategy	School and Community Awareness Programs

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail

required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Impacts of these Activities are projected to increase the awareness of the dangers of distracted driving and deter the use of cell phones and the practice of texting to reduce deaths and injuries associated with this problem. Activities will also include information on pedestrian and bicycle safety to increase awareness and reduce deaths and injuries in this area.

- Teen Driver Safety (UAMS)
- Community Prevention Initiative (ADH)
- Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project (U of A Fayetteville)

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Every year in the U.S., almost a half million people are injured or killed in traffic accidents attributed to the combination of texting and driving. The statistics are shocking, especially in view of the fact that this danger could be completely avoided. With the latest statistics available as of 2018, in 2015, according to statistics compiled by the Department of Transportation, 3,477 people died and another 391,000 were injured in motor vehicle crashes caused by drivers who were distracted because they were texting or using cell phones. Anything that takes your attention away from driving can be a distraction. Sending a text message, talking on a cell phone, using a navigation system, and eating while driving are a few examples of distracted driving. Any of these distractions can endanger the driver and others. More and more fatalities in Arkansas are being attributed to the emerging issue of distracted driving. Although information on this issue is limited at the present, Arkansas has implemented processes and procedures to capture data related to distracted driving and provide a clearer picture of the problem that exists in the state.

Over the last five years pedestrian fatalities have averaged around 44 with a low of 37 in 2014. Pedestrians need to understand that even though they are walking or running they still have a responsibility to obey the same traffic laws that motorists are subject to. However, under Arkansas law, motorists are to yield to pedestrians at all times.

Bicycle fatalities have averaged around 5 with lows of 3 in 2015 and 2016. Between 2011-2015 a total of 26 persons lost their lives in bicycle crashes. The Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project at the U of A will provide information as part of their program to address safety issues in that area. In FY 2019, law enforcement agencies within communities with pedestrian and bicyclist related fatalities and serious injuries will be encouraged to be proactive in pedestrian and bicyclist enforcement and overall safety issues.

The performance targets for the planned activities are to increase the awareness of the dangers of distracted driving, deter the use of cell phones and texting while driving, and promote pedestrian and bike safety to reduce the deaths and injuries associated with these problems.

- Teen Driver Safety (UAMS)
- Community Prevention Initiative (ADH)
- Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project (U of A Fayetteville)

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

School and community projects will include information on distracted driving. Impacts of these Activities are projected to increase the awareness of the dangers of distracted driving, deter the use of cell phones and the practice of texting in an attempt to reduce deaths and injuries associated with this problem.

Communications and outreach strategies will inform the public of the dangers of driving while distracted and pedestrian and bicycle safety. As with prevention and intervention, education through various communications and outreach strategies is especially important. Education will be conducted through these projects in communities, schools and colleges. A variety of mediums will be utilized such as posters, billboards, web banners and social media outlets. Communications and outreach is a critical part of deterrence and prevention.

Planned Activities Funding:

- Teen Driver Safety (UAMS)
- Community Prevention Initiative (ADH)
- Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project (U of A Fayetteville)

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure

OP-2019-01	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-09	Community Prevention Initiative	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-11	Teen Drive Safety Project	

5.5.1.1 Planned Activity: Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program

Planned activity name	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program
Planned activity number	OP-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	School and Community Awareness Programs

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Provides Increased awareness and usage of occupant protection systems, materials and technical assistance to businesses and civic groups, community service organizations, media, health professionals, law enforcement agencies and the general public to address several areas including distracted driving and pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Enter intended subrecipients.

University of Arkansas Fayetteville

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD
2019	Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)
2019	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Safe Communities (FAST)	\$20,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$20,000.00
2019	Other	Child Restraint	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.5.1.2 Planned Activity: Community Prevention Initiative

Planned activity name	Community Prevention Initiative
Planned activity number	OP-2019-09
Primary countermeasure strategy	School and Community Awareness Programs

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide motor vehicle crash prevention information including collaboration on community level activities, strategies and interventions to affect measurable individuals and community-level change in several problematic areas including distracted driving to reduce injuries and deaths. The project will mobilize communities to conduct evidence-based strategies in high risk counties with low seat belt use.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas Department of Health (ADH)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School Programs
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$150,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.5.1.3 Planned Activity: Teen Drive Safety Project

Planned activity name	Teen Drive Safety Project
Planned activity number	OP-2019-11
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under

§ 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State’s most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Implement a teen driver safety project which will employ activities in low seat belt use counties.

Enter intended subrecipients.

University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School Programs
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit

2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00
------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

Major purchases and dispositions

Click **Add New** to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.5.2 Countermeasure Strategy: Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)

Program area	Non-motorized (Pedestrians and Bicyclist)
Countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Countermeasures conducted in Arkansas will include both enforcement and education efforts. Pedestrians need to understand that even though they are walking or running they still have a responsibility to obey the same traffic laws that motorists are subject to, and that under Arkansas law, motorists are to yield to pedestrians at all times. The objective will be to provide information and education through careful framing, highlighting expected safety benefits. The success of paid advertising in seat belt campaigns suggests that communications and outreach programs urging the public to be aware and implement safety precautions to avoid injuries and death are worth considering for pedestrian and bicyclist issues. Increased awareness and utilization of these safety precautions should result in fewer traffic crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists and hopefully translate into fewer deaths and injuries.

Planned Activities:

- Safely Share the Road -Pedestrian/Bicyclist Public Awareness Campaign (ArDOT)
- Statewide Public Information and Education (CJRW)

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

C-10 Number of Pedestrian Fatalities

A target of 43 was set for 2015-2019 utilizing the 5 year moving average method

Over the last five years pedestrian fatalities have averaged around 44 with a low of 37 in 2014. Bicycle fatalities have averaged around 5 with lows of 3 in 2015 and 2016. During 2016 there were 44 pedestrian fatalities. These fatalities represented 8 percent of all motor vehicle fatalities for this period. Information on pedestrian and bicycle safety will be a part of the “Toward Zero Deaths” Campaign and other injury prevention projects (See Occupant Protection /Injury Prevention Program (Safe Communities) and PI&E projects). Countermeasures conducted in Arkansas will include both enforcement and education efforts. Pedestrians need to understand that even though they are walking or running they still have a responsibility to obey the same traffic laws that motorists are subject to. However, under Arkansas law, motorists are to yield to pedestrians at all times.

C-11 Number of Bicyclist Fatalities

A target of 5 was set for 2015-2019 utilizing a 5 year moving average.

Between 2012 - 2016 a total of 23 persons lost their lives in bicycle crashes. In addition to press-related activities, enforcement and educational efforts are planned for 2019 to bring awareness to pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The AHSO will continue to work with the ARDOT to provide informational posters/brochures in public areas around the city as part of the TZD initiative. In FY 2019, law enforcement agencies within communities with pedestrian and bicyclist related fatalities and serious injuries will be encouraged to be proactive in pedestrian and bicyclist enforcement and overall safety issues.

Countermeasures conducted in Arkansas will include both enforcement and education efforts. Pedestrians need to understand that even though they are walking or running they still have a responsibility to obey the same traffic laws that motorists are subject to, and that under Arkansas law, motorists are to yield to pedestrians at all times. The objective will be to provide information and education through careful framing, highlighting expected safety benefits. The success of paid advertising in seat belt campaigns suggests that communications and outreach programs urging the public to be aware and implement safety precautions to avoid injuries and death are worth considering for pedestrian and bicyclist issues. Increased awareness and utilization of these safety precautions should result in fewer traffic crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists and hopefully translate into fewer deaths and injuries.

FY19 Projects targeting Pedestrian and Bicyclists will include the following:

- Safely Share the Road -Pedestrian/Bicyclist Public Awareness Campaign (ArDOT)
- Statewide Public Information and Education (CJRW)

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Communications and outreach strategies inform the public of the dangers for pedestrians and bicyclists. As with prevention and intervention, education through various communications and outreach strategies is especially important. Education will be conducted through news media, paid advertisements and a wide variety of other communications channels such as posters, billboards, web banners and social media outlets. Communication and outreach is a critical part of safety and prevention.

Planned Activities Funding:

- Safely Share the Road -Pedestrian/Bicyclist Public Awareness Campaign (ArDOT)
- Statewide Public Information and Education (CJRW)

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-01	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program	School and Community Awareness Programs
PS-2019-01	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	
PS-2019-02	Pedestrian/Bicycle Public Awareness Campaign	

5.5.2.1 Planned Activity: Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)

Planned activity name	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
Planned activity number	PS-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Provide funding to develop public information and educational materials promoting pedestrian and bicycle safety

Enter intended subrecipients.

CJRW

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety (FAST)	\$150,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.5.2.2 Planned Activity: Pedestrian/Bicycle Public Awareness Campaign

Planned activity name	Pedestrian/Bicycle Public Awareness Campaign
Planned activity number	PS-2019-02
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

ArDOT Public Service announcement campaign to increase awareness of laws regulating bicycle and pedestrian traffic

Enter intended subrecipients.

AR Department of Transportation (ArDOT)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.6 Program Area: Distracted Driving

Program area type Distracted Driving

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

Yes

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

Drivers in their 20s make up 27 percent of the distracted drivers in fatal crashes. At any given daylight moment across America, approximately 660,000 drivers are using cell phones or manipulating electronic devices while driving, a number that has held steady since 2010.

The number of people killed in distraction-affected crashes decreased slightly from 3,360 in 2011 to 3,328 in 2012. An estimated 421,000 people were injured in motor vehicle crashes involving a distracted driver, this was a nine percent increase from the estimated 387,000 people injured in 2011.

More and more fatalities in Arkansas are being attributed to the emerging issue of distracted driving. Although information on this issue is limited at the present, Arkansas has implemented processes and procedures to capture data related to distracted driving on citations and crash reports to get a clearer picture of the problem that exists in the state.

Information on Distracted Driving will be included as part of other injury prevention projects and law enforcement agencies in the state will be encouraged to engage in enforcement of Arkansas' "No Texting" law and to participate in the National Distracted Driving Mobilization. In Arkansas the fine for using a wireless device to transmit text based communications was recently increased. Fines are currently \$250 for the first offense with subsequent violations subject to a fine of not more than \$500.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-1) Number of traffic fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	543.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	3,637.0

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD

5.6.1 Countermeasure Strategy: School and Community Awareness Programs

Program area	Distracted Driving
Countermeasure strategy	School and Community Awareness Programs

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Impacts of these Activities are projected to increase the awareness of the dangers of distracted driving and deter the use of cell phones and the practice of texting to reduce deaths and injuries associated with this problem. Activities will also include information on pedestrian and bicycle safety to increase awareness and reduce deaths and injuries in this area.

- Teen Driver Safety (UAMS)
- Community Prevention Initiative (ADH)
- Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project (U of A Fayetteville)

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Every year in the U.S., almost a half million people are injured or killed in traffic accidents attributed to the combination of texting and driving. The statistics are shocking, especially in view of the fact that this danger could be completely avoided. With the latest statistics available as of 2018, in 2015, according to statistics compiled by the Department of Transportation, 3,477 people died and another 391,000 were injured in motor vehicle crashes caused by drivers who were distracted because they were texting or using cell phones. Anything that takes your attention away from driving can be a distraction. Sending a text message, talking on a cell phone, using a navigation system, and eating while driving are a few examples of distracted driving. Any of these distractions can endanger the driver and others. More and more fatalities in Arkansas are being attributed to the emerging issue of distracted driving. Although information on this issue is limited at the present, Arkansas has implemented processes and procedures to capture data related to distracted driving and provide a clearer picture of the problem that exists in the state.

Over the last five years pedestrian fatalities have averaged around 44 with a low of 37 in 2014. Pedestrians need to understand that even though they are walking or running they still have a responsibility to obey the same traffic laws that motorists are subject to. However, under Arkansas law, motorists are to yield to pedestrians at all times.

Bicycle fatalities have averaged around 5 with lows of 3 in 2015 and 2016. Between 2011-2015 a total of 26 persons lost their lives in bicycle crashes. The Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project at the U of A will provide information as part of their program to address safety issues in that area. In FY 2019, law enforcement agencies within communities with pedestrian and bicyclist related fatalities and serious injuries will be encouraged to be proactive in pedestrian and bicyclist enforcement and overall safety issues.

The performance targets for the planned activities are to increase the awareness of the dangers of distracted driving, deter the use of cell phones and texting while driving, and promote pedestrian and bike safety to reduce the deaths and injuries associated with these problems.

- Teen Driver Safety (UAMS)
- Community Prevention Initiative (ADH)
- Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project (U of A Fayetteville)

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

School and community projects will include information on distracted driving. Impacts of these Activities are projected to increase the awareness of the dangers of distracted driving, deter the use of cell phones and the practice of texting in an attempt to reduce deaths and injuries associated with this problem.

Communications and outreach strategies will inform the public of the dangers of driving while distracted and pedestrian and bicycle safety. As with prevention and intervention, education through various communications and outreach strategies is especially important. Education will be conducted through these projects in communities, schools and colleges. A variety of mediums will be utilized such as posters, billboards, web banners and social media outlets. Communications and outreach is a critical part of deterrence and prevention.

Planned Activities Funding:

- Teen Driver Safety (UAMS)
- Community Prevention Initiative (ADH)
- Occupant Protection and Injury Prevention Project (U of A Fayetteville)

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-01	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-09	Community Prevention Initiative	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-11	Teen Drive Safety Project	

5.6.1.1 Planned Activity: Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program

Planned activity name	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program
Planned activity number	OP-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	School and Community Awareness Programs

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under

§ 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Provides Increased awareness and usage of occupant protection systems, materials and technical assistance to businesses and civic groups, community service organizations, media, health professionals, law enforcement agencies and the general public to address several areas including distracted driving and pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Enter intended subrecipients.

University of Arkansas Fayetteville

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD
2019	Communication Campaign (Ped/Bike)
2019	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Safe Communities (FAST)	\$20,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$20,000.00
2019	Other	Child Restraint	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.6.1.2 Planned Activity: Community Prevention Initiative

Planned activity name	Community Prevention Initiative
Planned activity number	OP-2019-09
Primary countermeasure strategy	School and Community Awareness Programs

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide motor vehicle crash prevention information including collaboration on community level activities, strategies and interventions to affect measurable individuals and community-level change in several problematic areas including distracted driving to reduce injuries and deaths. The project will mobilize communities to conduct evidence-based strategies in high risk counties with low seat belt use.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas Department of Health (ADH)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School Programs
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$150,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.6.1.3 Planned Activity: Teen Drive Safety Project

Planned activity name	Teen Drive Safety Project
Planned activity number	OP-2019-11
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Implement a teen driver safety project which will employ activities in low seat belt use counties.

Enter intended subrecipients.

University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School Programs
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.6.2 Countermeasure Strategy: Communication Campaign DD

Program area	Distracted Driving
Countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign DD

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

Yes

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required

under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

A Statewide distracted driving public awareness campaign will be conducted as part of the National Distracted Driving Mobilization efforts. Impacts of these Activities are projected to be an increased awareness of the dangers of distracted driving to deter the use of cell phones and the practice of texting and to reduce deaths and injuries associated with this problem.

Planned Activities Funding:

- Statewide Communication Campaign

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Every year in the U.S., almost a half million people are injured or killed in traffic accidents attributed to the combination of texting and driving. The statistics are shocking, especially in view of the fact that this danger could be completely avoided. With the latest statistics available as of 2018, in 2015, according to statistics compiled by the Department of Transportation, 3,477 people died and another 391,000 were injured in motor vehicle crashes caused by drivers who were distracted because they were texting or using cell phones. Anything that takes your attention away from driving can be a distraction. Sending a text message, talking on a cell phone, using a navigation system, and eating while driving are a few examples of distracted driving. Any of these distractions can endanger the driver and others.

More and more fatalities in Arkansas are being attributed to the emerging issue of distracted driving. Although information on this issue is limited at the present, Arkansas has implemented processes and procedures to capture data related to distracted driving and provide a clearer picture of the problem that exists in the state.

A Statewide distracted driving public awareness campaign will be conducted as part of the National Distracted Driving Mobilization efforts. Impacts of these Activities are projected to increase the awareness of the dangers of distracted driving, deter the use of cell phones and the practice of texting in an attempt to reduce the deaths and injuries associated with this problem. In Arkansas the fine for using a wireless device to transmit text based communications was recently increased. Fines are currently \$250 for the first offense with subsequent violations subject to a fine of not more than \$500

Planned Activities Funding:

- Statewide Communication Campaign

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

More and more fatalities in Arkansas are being attributed to the emerging issue of distracted driving. Communications and outreach are a critical part of deterrence and prevention. Communications and outreach strategies inform the public of the dangers of driving while distracted.

Education will be conducted through news media, paid advertisements and a variety of other communications channels such as community prevention projects at schools and colleges, posters, billboards, web banners and social media outlets.

Planned Activities Funding:

- Statewide Communication Campaign

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
------------------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

OP-2019-01	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-09	Community Prevention Initiative	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-11	Teen Drive Safety Project	
DD-2019-01	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	

5.6.2.1 Planned Activity: Teen Drive Safety Project

Planned activity name	Teen Drive Safety Project
Planned activity number	OP-2019-11
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Implement a teen driver safety project which will employ activities in low seat belt use counties.

Enter intended subrecipients.

University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS)

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	School Programs
2019	School and Community Awareness Programs
2019	Communication Campaign DD

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	\$200,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.6.2.2 Planned Activity: Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)

Planned activity name	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)
Planned activity number	DD-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

Yes

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Statewide public information and education to promote adherence to texting and cell phone laws. The components of this task may include, but are not limited to, educational materials such as brochures, posters, public service announcements (PSAs) to enhance other traffic safety projects.

Enter intended subrecipients.

CJRW Advertising Agency

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Communication Campaign DD

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Distracted Driving (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$150,000.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Distracted Driving (FAST)	\$300,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$150,000.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.7 Program Area: Traffic Records

Program area type	Traffic Records
-------------------	-----------------

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

No

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

In conjunction with the strategic plan, the goals of the Traffic Records Program are to maintain the reduction of the backlog of crash report data to be entered into the Traffic Analysis Reporting System (TARS) and improve the accuracy of data. The State Traffic Records Strategic Plan, Assessment and 405 C IPR (including the list of the TRCC members, description of quantifiable and measurable improvements, recommendations from the most recent assessment, recommendations to be addressed with projects and performance measures, and descriptions of the performance measures and supporting data to show quantitative improvement in the preceding 12 months) are provided with the 405 Traffic Records application.

The Program will continue efforts to maintain the reduction of the backlog and improve the accuracy of crash data. This will be accomplished through two projects. One will continue the paperless system by using a computer image of the crash report for review and data entry into the eCrash system. Another project will continue capturing the data that is uploaded by the troopers and other law enforcement officers through the eCrash system. The transition from to the eCrash system has further streamlined the entry of Crashes by ASP with 153 local agencies using eCrash with an additional 31 agencies having been trained as of May 11, 2018.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	Increase the number of Law Enforcement Agencies using the eCrash system from 144 to 200	Annual	2019	200.0
2019	Increase the number of courts using Contexte to 106 (33.65%) by March 31,2019	Annual	2019	106.0

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Improves timeliness of a core highway safety database
2019	Improves integration between one or more core highway safety databases
2019	Highway Safety Office Program Management TR

5.7.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Improves timeliness of a core highway safety database

Program area	Traffic Records
Countermeasure strategy	Improves timeliness of a core highway safety database

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

The Program will continue efforts to maintain the reduction of the backlog and improve the accuracy of data. This will be accomplished through two projects. One will continue the paperless system by using a computer image of the crash report for review and data entry into the eCrash system. Another project will continue capturing the data that is uploaded by the troopers and other law enforcement officers through the eCrash system. The transition from the TraCS system to the eCrash system has further streamlined the entry of Crashes by ASP with 105 local agencies using eCrash with an additional 35 agencies having been trained as of June 1, 2017. This has increased the amount of data captured and rendered unnecessary the merging of data into the database further decreasing the backlog of reports.

Data Collection and Information Systems –

eCrash – eCrash is a data collection and reporting tool to streamline and automate the capture and transmission of critical traffic safety related data. The eCrash program is an initiative by the Arkansas State Police (ASP) in collaboration with University of Alabama to collect data from law enforcement at the scene of a motor vehicle crash and send that data electronically to the ASP who serves as the repository for crash data. eCrash is partially funded through Section 405c. Features of eCrash includes electronic forms, data validation, case management, document workflow, data transmission, peripheral compatibility, and eCrash Web. The transition from to the eCrash system has further streamlined the entry of Crashes by ASP with 153 local agencies using eCrash with an additional 31 agencies having been trained as of May 11, 2018. Data Collection and Analysis is also Primary Emphasis Area in the SHSP and includes strategies regarding eCrash as well as other data collection methods and tools.

Crash Report Form –On July 15, 2015, the ASP released a revised crash form electronically to the ASP troopers and have been continuously providing it to local law enforcement agencies throughout the state since that date. Additional fields were added to the form, thus allowing for additional data to be collected throughout the state which can then be analyzed to support traffic safety improvements. Those agencies scheduled for eCrash but not yet on-board and smaller law enforcement agencies provide paper submittals.

Crash Data – The ASP will continue to work with law enforcement partners on the importance of crash data with a goal to lower the number of crash reports containing “unknown” for various data elements.

Reports by ASP – The ASP Highway Patrol uses data to implement enforcement, write reports and proposals, design presentations, or increase traffic safety awareness. Traffic safety stakeholders are encouraged to utilize the services provided by ASP. For law enforcement, reports specific to their jurisdiction can help identify evidence-based problem areas in which to focus overtime efforts.

Funding is allocated for the following planned activities.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORTING SYSTEM (TARS) PROGRAM OPERATION

Project Number: TR-2018-04-01-01, M3DA-2018-03-01-01

Sub-recipient(s): ASP, SourceCorp

Total Project Amount: \$ 423,800 (\$141,800 ASP) (\$282,000 SourceCorp)

Project Description: Provides for retaining the services of a qualified firm to input crash data in a timely manner. It also provides for the operation of the TARS by the ASP including data entry staff time, hardware and software maintenance and data processing charges needed to carry out the daily work.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORTING SYSTEM (TARS) IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Project Number: TR-2018-04-02-01, M3DA-2018-03-02-02

Sub-recipient(s): ASP

Total Project Amount: \$100,000

Provides for the acquisition of computer hardware, software, and peripherals needed for TARS improvements including continuation of paperless processing of crash reports through TARS and the purchasing of equipment less than \$5,000 each) to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of TARS.

ELECTRONIC CITATION SYSTEM

Project Number (s): K4TR-2018-12-05-01, M3DA -2018-03-05-01, M3DA-2018-03-05-02

Sub-recipient(s): Arkansas State Police, Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Total Project Amount: \$850,000

Provides for a vendor to continue development and implementation of a system which electronically captures and submits traffic citations by state and local law enforcement. This system will facilitate faster, more accurate and more efficient issuance of a citation to the violator and will capture citation data for timely reporting to various entities. The system is currently allowing submission of citations directly to the Administrative Office of the Courts for their dissemination to various courts and to the Office of Driver Services. Funding will provide for vendor/contract services; equipment with an acquisition cost of less than \$5,000 each, including laptops, handheld 2D barcode scanners and printers In addition, provide for two part time individuals to help support the eCite application on a 7 day 24 hour basis. Funding will also provide for sub-grants to local departments to purchase computer hardware to utilize the eCite software

ELECTRONIC TRAFFIC CRASH RECORD ENTRY SYSTEM PROJECT

Project Number: K4TR-2018-12-03-01, M3DA-2018-03-03-02, M3DA-2018-03-03-04

Sub-recipient(s): ASP, Local Law Enforcement Agencies TBD

Total Project Amount: \$800,000 (\$50,000 ASP (K4TR) ; \$500,000 ASP (M3DA); \$250,000 Locals (M3DA)

Continue modification of computer software applications for the ASP and other agencies to enter crash data within a few hours of the crash using eCrash and allow the AHSO to integrate the data directly into its database without reentering the data. In-car computer systems with necessary operating software will be purchased at approximately \$4,000 each. The in-car computer systems are used at the crash scene to capture data and enable multimedia, magnetic strip and bar code data capture and transfers along with GPS receivers to accurately locate the crash via longitude and latitude readings. Provide for a technician/liaison position to expand e-Crash to local agencies. Travel, training and materials will also be associated with this effort. Federal funds will also provide for travel/training, additional software, supplies, user fees, vendor/contractor services and equipment. Funding will also provide for sub-grants to local departments to purchase computer hardware and peripherals to utilize eCrash software.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Increase the number of Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA's) using the eCrash system to report crashes rather than submitting paper reports that must be manually entered by data entry personnel into the eCrash database thereby alleviating and eventually removing the backlog of reports to be entered.

There are a total of 441 LEA's in Arkansas. Counting agencies (Arkansas State Police in it's entirety is one (1) agency) live in eCrash.

Time Frame Ending; # LEA's Live in eCrash

03/31/2017 98 (22.22%)

03/31/2018

144 (32.62%)

Goal:

Increase the number of agencies using eCrash to 200 (45.35%) by 03/31/2019.

Funding for Planned Activities is included in previous section "Assessment of Traffic Safety Impacts and Countermeasure chosen" under "Planned Activities to be funded"

Evidence of effectiveness**Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.**

The findings and recommendations of the Traffic Records Assessment team, together with input from the TRCC and recommendations by the NHTSA GO Team are the basis for Arkansas' 2018 – 2022 Traffic Records Strategic Plan. In conjunction with the strategic plan, the goals of the Traffic Records Program are to maintain and reduce the backlog of crash report data to be entered into the Traffic Analysis Reporting System (TARS) and improve the accuracy of data.

The Program will continue efforts to maintain the reduction of the backlog and improve the accuracy of crash data. This will be accomplished through two projects. One will continue the paperless system by using a computer image of the crash report for review and data entry into the eCrash system. Another project will continue capturing the data that is uploaded by the troopers and other law enforcement officers through the eCrash system. The transition from to the eCrash system has further streamlined the entry of Crashes by ASP with 153 local agencies using eCrash with an additional 31 agencies having been trained as of May 11, 2018. Funding has been allocated to the following planned activities.

ELECTRONIC CITATION SYSTEM \$800,000

ELECTRONIC CRASH SYSTEM \$800,000

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORTING SYSTEM (TARS) PROGRAM OPERATION \$423,000

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORTING SYSTEM (TARS) IMPROVEMENT PROJECT \$100,000

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
No records found.		

5.7.2 Countermeasure Strategy: Improves integration between one or more core highway safety databases

Program area	Traffic Records
Countermeasure strategy	Improves integration between one or more core highway safety databases

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
No records found.		

5.7.3 Countermeasure Strategy: Highway Safety Office Program Management TR

Program area	Traffic Records
Countermeasure strategy	Highway Safety Office Program Management TR

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

Provide necessary personnel and training for the administration of the Traffic Records Program and support for other program areas. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program. Funding will also provide for continued training in the administration of computer systems software and eGrants operations to maintain an effective, efficient Traffic Records Program that will provide timely, accurate information and data to direct and support strategies to effectively address traffic Arkansas' traffic safety problems.

Planned Projects to be Funded:

TRAFFIC RECORDS PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Project Number (s): 2018-04-07-01 thru 03

Sub-recipient(s): Arkansas State Police

Total Project Amount: \$84,700 (TR) \$22,100 (M7*TR)

Provides for the administration of the Traffic Records Program and provides support for other program areas. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time (see page 90 for positions funded under TR), travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program. Funding will also provide for continued training in the administration of computer systems software and eGrants operations.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Project Number (s): TR- 2018-04-06-01, TR- 2018-04-06-02, K4TR-2018-12-06-38

Sub-recipient(s): Arkansas State Police, AR Dept. of Transportation

Total Project Amount: \$34,000

Provides for specified training to law enforcement and other highway safety professionals. In matters related to traffic records. May involve continued crash investigation and reconstruction training courses.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

The Traffic Records Assessment was conducted for the State of Arkansas July – October 2015 by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's assessment team. In conjunction with the strategic plan, the goals of the Traffic Records Program are to maintain the reduction of the backlog of crash report data to be entered into the Traffic Analysis Reporting System (TARS)

and improve the accuracy of data.

Goals:

Increase the number of agencies using eCrash to 200 (45.35%) by 03/31/2019.

The Program will continue efforts to reduce the backlog and improve the accuracy of data. This will be accomplished through two projects. One will continue the paperless system by using a computer image of the crash report for review and data entry. Another project will continue capturing a portion of the data that is uploaded by the troopers and other law enforcement officers through the TraCS system.

This countermeasure will provide funding for the necessary personnel and training for the administration of the Traffic Records Program and support for other program areas. Funding will also provide for the necessary staff time travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program and for continued training in the administration of computer systems software and eGrants operations to maintain an effective, efficient Traffic Records Program.

Planned Projects to be Funded:

TRAFFIC RECORDS PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Project Number (s): 2018-04-07-01 thru 03

Sub-recipient(s): Arkansas State Police

Total Project Amount: \$84,700 (TR) \$22,100 (M7*TR)

Provides for the administration of the Traffic Records Program and provides support for other program areas. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time (see page 90 for positions funded under TR), travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program. Funding will also provide for continued training in the administration of computer systems software and eGrants operations.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Project Number (s): TR- 2018-04-06-01, TR- 2018-04-06-02, K4TR-2018-12-06-38

Sub-recipient(s): Arkansas State Police, AR Dept. of Transportation

Total Project Amount: \$34,000

Provides for specified training to law enforcement and other highway safety professionals. In matters related to traffic records. May involve continued crash investigation and reconstruction training courses.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

This countermeasure is necessary. to maintain an effective, efficient Traffic Records Program that will provide timely, accurate information and data to direct and support strategies to effectively address traffic Arkansas' traffic safety problems. **\$100,000 funding** will provide staff and training for the administration of the Program as well as support for relevant program areas. Funds will also provide for travel and training expenses and programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program.

Planned Projects to be Funded:

TRAFFIC RECORDS PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Project Number (s): 2018-04-07-01 thru 03

Sub-recipient(s): Arkansas State Police

Total Project Amount: \$84,700 (TR) \$22,100 (M7*TR)

Provides for the administration of the Traffic Records Program and provides support for other program areas. Funding will provide for the necessary staff time (see page 90 for positions funded under TR), travel and training expenses directly related to the planning, programming, monitoring, evaluation and coordination of the Traffic Records Program. Funding will also provide for continued training in the administration of computer systems software and eGrants operations.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Project Number (s): TR- 2018-04-06-01, TR- 2018-04-06-02, K4TR-2018-12-06-38

Sub-recipient(s): Arkansas State Police, AR Dept. of Transportation

Total Project Amount: \$34,000

Provides for specified training to law enforcement and other highway safety professionals. In matters related to traffic records. May involve continued crash investigation and reconstruction training courses.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click Add New to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its

performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
No records found.		

5.8 Program Area: Roadway Safety/Traffic Engineering

.....
Program area type Roadway Safety/Traffic Engineering

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

Yes

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

No

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

The AHSO works in partnership with the ArDOT to identify and implement innovative infrastructure improvements and hazard elimination strategies to aid in the reduction of motor vehicle fatalities and serious injuries on Arkansas Roadways. This countermeasure assists in this area by assuring that ArDOT personnel are properly trained and have access to current information and innovations. The following Goals were established by ArDOT in the SHSP which will impact the AHSO performance targets for reduction of total fatalities and injuries.

Workzones

Although less than one percent of roadway fatalities in Arkansas occurred in construction work zones in 2014, the number is expected to increase due to additional highway construction activity as a result of the Connecting Arkansas Program. **ArDot Goal:** No more than 11 work zone fatalities and 12 serious injuries in Arkansas by 2022.

Railways

Although railroad crossing fatalities represented less than two percent of all roadway fatalities in Arkansas in 2014, railroad crossing crashes tend to be more severe. There are almost five thousand public and private railroad grade crossings in Arkansas. **ArDot Goal:** No more than five railroad crossing fatalities and 19 serious injuries in Arkansas by 2022.

Intersections

Approximately 17 percent of all roadway fatalities in Arkansas occurred at intersections in 2014, down from 20 percent in 2010. Approximately half of all intersection fatalities occur in urban areas, compared to 20 percent of all roadway fatalities that occur in urban areas. Approximately 90 percent of all intersection fatalities occur at un-signalized intersections. Almost half of all intersection fatalities are the result of angle collisions, virtually all of which involved a vehicle turning left or continuing through the intersection. The second most predominant type of intersection fatal crashes is single vehicle collisions, mainly as a result of the driver failing to stop at a T-intersection or attempting a turning maneuver. **ArDOT Goal:** No more than 82 intersection fatalities and 654 serious injuries in Arkansas by 2022.

There is a need to identify strategies to facilitate collaboration and coordination between the Arkansas Department of Transportation, Arkansas Highway Safety Office and stakeholders to accomplish the following:

- Reduce the number of fatal and serious injury crashes in Arkansas
- Keep traffic safety advocates abreast of ongoing changes
- Provide for educational opportunities offered at traffic safety conferences, workshops and forums to include training on crash data, railroad crossing safety, and current traffic safety programs.

The ArDOT promotes educational opportunities by sending personnel to conferences. Due to limited funds and travel restrictions, adequate funds are not always available to send personnel to some conferences. The use of 402 funds will provide funding for travel and valuable training to ArDOT personnel.

Performance measures

Select at least one performance measure that is data-driven, that enables the State to track progress toward meeting the quantifiable annual target. For program areas where performance measures have not been jointly developed (e.g., distracted driving, drug-impaired driving) for which States are using HSP funds, the State shall develop its own performance measures and performance targets that are data-driven.

Performance Measures in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-1) Number of traffic fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	543.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	3,637.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.620

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies to submit for program area.

Countermeasure Strategies in Program Area

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Training for Traffic Safety Advocates

5.8.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Training for Traffic Safety Advocates

Program area	Roadway Safety/Traffic Engineering
Countermeasure strategy	Training for Traffic Safety Advocates

Innovative countermeasure strategies are countermeasure strategies which have not yet been proven effective in the highway safety arena but show potential based on limited practical application. Justification of innovative countermeasure strategies can be based on past successes when applied to other behavioral safety problems.

Is this countermeasure strategy innovative?

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the planned high visibility enforcement strategies that support national mobilizations? § 1300.11(d)(6)

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the seat belt enforcement criterion? § 1300.21(e)(3) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the high risk population countermeasure programs criterion? § 1300.21(e)(4) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan required under § 1300.21(d)(1)]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) under the comprehensive occupant protection program criterion? § 1300.21(e)(5)(ii)(B) [Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach), at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this countermeasure strategy part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d),

supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Countermeasure strategy description

To describe the program area countermeasure strategy that will help the State complete its program and achieve specific performance targets, complete the following:

Enter assessment of the overall projected traffic safety impacts of the countermeasure strategy chosen and of the planned activities to be funded.

The AHSO works in partnership with the ArDOT to identify and implement innovative infrastructure improvements and hazard elimination strategies to aid in the reduction of motor vehicle fatalities and serious injuries on Arkansas Roadways. This countermeasure assists in this area by assuring that ArDOT personnel are properly trained and have access to current information and innovations. The impact of training for highway safety professionals on railway and highway hazard elimination strategies will be to enable them to develop and implement projects that will reduce the severity of traffic crashes on sections of Arkansas highways with high crash rates and the number of fatalities and injuries associated with them.

Enter description of the linkage between program area problem identification data, performance targets, identified countermeasure strategy and allocation of funds to planned activities.

The AHSO works in partnership with the ArDOT to identify and implement innovative infrastructure improvements and hazard elimination strategies to aid in the reduction of motor vehicle fatalities and serious injuries on Arkansas Roadways. This countermeasure assists in this area by assuring that ArDOT personnel are properly trained and have access to current information and innovations. The following Goals were established by ArDOT in the SHSP which will impact the AHSO performance targets for reduction of total fatalities and injuries.

Workzones

Although less than one percent of roadway fatalities in Arkansas occurred in construction work zones in 2014, the number is expected to increase due to additional highway construction activity as a result of the Connecting Arkansas Program. **ArDot Goal:** No more than 11 work zone fatalities and 12 serious injuries in Arkansas by 2022.

Railways

Although railroad crossing fatalities represented less than two percent of all roadway fatalities in Arkansas in 2014, railroad crossing crashes tend to be more severe. There are almost five thousand public and private railroad grade crossings in Arkansas. **ArDot Goal:** No more than five railroad crossing fatalities and 19 serious injuries in Arkansas by 2022.

Intersections

Approximately 17 percent of all roadway fatalities in Arkansas occurred at intersections in 2014, down from 20 percent in 2010. Approximately half of all intersection fatalities occur in urban areas, compared to 20 percent of all roadway fatalities that occur in urban areas. Approximately 90 percent of all intersection fatalities occur at un-signalized intersections. Almost half of all intersection fatalities are the result of angle collisions, virtually all of which involved a vehicle turning left or continuing through the intersection. The second most predominant type of intersection fatal crashes is single vehicle collisions, mainly as a result of the driver failing to stop at a T-intersection or attempting a turning maneuver. **ArDOT Goal:** No more than 82 intersection fatalities and 654 serious injuries in Arkansas by 2022.

Evidence of effectiveness

Enter a rationale for selecting the countermeasure strategy and funding allocation for each planned activity.

The AHSO works in partnership with the ArDOT to identify and implement innovative infrastructure improvements and hazard elimination strategies to aid in the reduction of motor vehicle fatalities and serious injuries on Arkansas Roadways. This countermeasure and planned activity assists in this area by assuring that ArDOT personnel are properly trained and have access to current information and innovations.

Planned Activity:

- Professional Development: Sub-recipient: Arkansas Department of Transportation (AR DOT)

Provides funds for specified training to highway safety professionals in matters of roadway and rail-highway safety. Professional development funds will provide for in-state and out-of-state travel, meals, lodging, and registration fees to conferences, workshops and other training opportunities promoting traffic safety.

Planned activities

Select existing planned activities below and/or click **Add New** to enter and select planned activities that the State will conduct to support the countermeasure strategies within each program area to address its problems and achieve its performance targets.

Planned activities in countermeasure strategy

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
RS-2019-01	Professional Development ARDOT	Training for Traffic Safety Advocates

5.8.1.1 Planned Activity: Professional Development ARDOT

Planned activity name	Professional Development ARDOT
Planned activity number	RS-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	Training for Traffic Safety Advocates

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Training for Traffic Safety Advocates

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Roadway Safety (FAST)	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

5.9 Program Area: Planning & Administration

Program area type Planning & Administration

Will countermeasure strategies and planned activities be described in this plan to address the program area?

No

Is this program area part of the State occupant protection program area plan for a 405(b) application that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c) and (d)?

No

Problem identification

Enter description and analysis of the State's highway safety problems (for this program area) as identified through an analysis of data, including but not limited to fatality, injury, enforcement, and judicial data, to be used as a basis for setting performance targets and developing countermeasure strategies.

The overall program management of the Highway Safety Program is the responsibility of the Highway Safety Office (AHSO) of the Arkansas State Police (ASP).

The management and fiscal staff will build on and maintain their expertise in all aspects of the program by attending available training sessions. The staff will attend meetings and other sessions in the performance of their normally assigned functions. The percentage of funding distribution for positions by program area is provided . The costs associated with the overall management and operation of the Highway Safety Program under Planning and Administration are itemized as follows:

Salaries and Benefits

The entire salaries and benefits for 4 full-time position fulfilling management, fiscal, and clerical support functions are paid from federal funds.

Travel and Subsistence

This component provides for travel and subsistence costs for management and fiscal support personnel.

Operating Expenses

This component provides for operating expenses directly related to the overall operation of the Highway Safety Program including the expenses for development and implementation of a state grants management system (GMS). The GMS may be developed, operated, and maintained through a contractor to be determined.

Planned Activities in the Planning & Administration

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
PA-2019-01	Planning and Administration	

5.9.1 Planned Activity: Planning and Administration

Planned activity name	Planning and Administration
Planned activity number	PA-2019-01
Primary countermeasure strategy	

Is this planned activity part of the evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP)? § 1300.11(d)(5)

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child restraint inspection stations? § 1300.21(d)(3) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State occupant protection grant application (§ 405(b)) for child passenger safety technicians? § 1300.21(d)(4) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State traffic safety information system improvements grant application (§ 405(c)) for the State traffic records strategic plan? § 1300.22(b)(2)(iii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement a recommendation(s) from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment]

No

Is this planned activity part of the impaired driving countermeasure grant application (§ 405(d)) for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities as a high-range State? § 1300.23(f)(1)(ii) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for spending grant funds on impaired driving activities listed in § 1300.23(j)(4) that must include high-visibility enforcement efforts]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the motorcyclist awareness program criterion? § 1300.25(f) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State motorcyclist safety grant application (§ 405(f)) under the impaired driving program criterion? § 1300.25(h)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest]

No

Is this planned activity part of the State racial profiling data collection grant application (§ 1906)? § 1300.28(b)(2) [Planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), supporting the assurances that the State will undertake activities during the fiscal year of the grant to comply with the requirements of § 1300.28(b)(1)]

No

Enter description of the planned activity.

Funding for P&A salaries and benefits, travel, and operating expenses

Enter intended subrecipients.

Arkansas State Police

Countermeasure strategies

Select existing countermeasure strategies below and/or click Add New to enter and select countermeasure strategies that the planned activity will support.

Countermeasure strategies in planned activities

Fiscal Year	Countermeasure Strategy Name
2019	Highway Safety Office Program Management (OP)

Funding sources

Click Add New to enter federal funding source, eligible use of funds, and estimates of funding amounts, amount for match and local benefit.

Source Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Eligible Use of Funds	Estimated Funding Amount	Match Amount	Local Benefit
2018	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Planning and Administration (FAST)	\$400,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Planning and Administration (FAST)	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Major purchases and dispositions

Click Add New to enter equipment with a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more.

Item	Quantity	Price Per Unit	Total Cost	NHTSA Share per unit	NHTSA Share Total Cost
No records found.					

6 Evidence-based Traffic Safety Enforcement Program (TSEP)

Evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP) information

Identify the planned activities that collectively constitute an evidence-based traffic safety enforcement program (TSEP).

Planned activities in the TSEP:

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
OP-2019-04	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	
OP-2019-05	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (OP)
OP-2019-07	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	
OP-2019-10	Rural High Five Project	
AL-2019-05	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)
AL-2019-06	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-07	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	

AL-2019-08	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-10	Law Enf Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training	
AL-2019-11	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-14	Statewide In-Car Camera and Video Storage System	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
SC-2019-01	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	Sustained Enforcement (SP)
SC-2019-02	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	
SC-2019-03	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	
SC-2019-04	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (Speed)
DD-2019-01	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	
DD-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
DD-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	

Analysis

Enter analysis of crashes, crash fatalities, and injuries in areas of highest risk.

COUNTY	(K) Fatal Injury	COUNTY	(A) Suspected Serious Injury
Pulaski	170	Pulaski	974
Washington	78	Benton	408
Benton	71	Washington	325
Garland	62	Garland	314
Craighead	54	Craighead	231
Faulkner	48	Faulkner	231
Saline	39	Sebastian	218
Hot Spring	36	Crawford	211
White	36	Saline	200
Carroll	34	White	188

Of the top ten counties with the most fatalities, there are STEP's in eight of the counties. In regard to the top ten counties with the most serious injuries, there are STEP's in all of the counties.

Crash Summary by County

Jurisdiction	2012			2013			2014			2015			2016			2012 - 2016			2016 - Crash Data		
	# Fat	Spd	Alc	# Fat	Spd	Alc	# Fat	Spd	Alc	# Fat	Spd	Alc	# Fat	Spd	Alc	# Fat	Spd	Alc	#Crashes	Speed	Alcohol
Arkansas - Statewide	560	76	190	499	33	121	470	26	109	478	69	133	537	100	122	2,544	304	675	77,038	4,622	2,393
Arkadelphia	3	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	240	9	2
Batesville	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	5	1	1	462	10	4
Bella Vista	2	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	10	1	3	381	50	22
Benton	2	1	0	9	0	1	4	0	0	5	1	1	2	0	0	22	2	2	679	41	12
Bentonville	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	5	0	1	14	0	4	1899	35	26

Blytheville	2	0	0	4	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	0	1	337	7	5
Bryant	2	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	9	1	0	905	41	26
Cabot PD	3	0	1	8	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	3	810	17	16
Camden	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	11	1	1	147	5	12
Centerton	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	176	14	8
Clarksville	3	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	335	5	10
Conway	1	0	1	9	1	1	3	0	0	3	0	2	3	0	0	19	1	4	2,392	64	51
Dardanelle	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	141	6	3
De Queen	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	137	4	3
El Dorado	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	675	11	10
Fayetteville	5	0	1	7	0	1	3	0	0	6	0	1	6	0	2	27	0	5	3,053	70	118
Ft. Smith	3	1	2	7	0	1	3	0	1	5	0	1	7	1	0	25	2	5	3,054	30	80
Harrison	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	2	318	11	6
Hope	2	2	0	4	0	1	6	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	16	4	3	326	4	8
Hot Springs	7	1	4	17	2	8	4	0	1	10	0	4	9	1	1	47	4	18	1,757	70	47
Jacksonville	2	0	1	4	1	1	3	0	2	3	1	0	1	1	0	13	3	4	503	24	15
Jonesboro	11	0	4	9	1	4	6	0	0	8	0	2	12	0	0	46	1	10	3,163	133	49
Little Rock	33	7	16	33	2	12	20	0	8	20	5	7	20	3	2	126	17	45	9,627	167	157
Lonoke	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0
Magnolia	2	0	1	4	0	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	8	1	5	236	7	4
Malvern	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	157	2	2
Marion	2	0	0	6	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	5	253	4	3
Marked Tree	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Maumelle	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mayflower	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	3	63	4	0
Mena	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	113	3	1
Monticello	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6	1	0	117	4	5
Mountain Home	1	0	0	4	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	10	1	1	378	10	5
N. Little Rock	8	0	2	16	0	5	6	0	1	5	1	1	3	0	0	38	1	9	2,543	82	33
Osceola	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	140	7	3
Paragould	4	0	0	5	0	1	12	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	1	1,259	39	25
Prairie Grove	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	5	0	2	101	7	7
Rogers	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	2	13	0	4	1,294	18	30
Russellville	3	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	0	2	1	0	14	1	1	1,011	11	32
Searcy	3	0	0	6	0	1	2	0	0	4	1	1	1	0	0	16	1	2	854	7	3
Sherwood	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	2	3	0	1	11	4	4	606	33	22
Siloam Springs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	425	10	7
Springdale	7	0	3	4	0	0	3	0	1	9	0	2	16	5	6	39	5	12	2,290	70	82
Texarkana	3	0	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	1	0	18	1	2	911	69	29
Tontitown	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	3	121	11	6
Trumann	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	123	5	7
Van Buren	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	486	6	13
West Memphis	5	1	1	4	0	2	5	0	3	4	0	2	1	0	0	19	1	8	697	0	22
White Hall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	2	1
Baxter	5	1	2	4	1	1	6	0	1	8	1	1	0	0	0	23	3	5	101	7	6
Benton	23	1	9	19	3	1	13	2	2	21	2	5	1	0	0	77	8	17	92	14	3
Boone	5	0	1	6	0	2	3	0	0	8	1	1	0	0	0	22	1	4	0	0	0

Carroll	8	0	0	8	1	0	4	0	0	14	3	4	1	0	0	35	4	4	89	11	5
Cleburne	9	0	4	5	0	1	6	0	1	5	3	1	0	0	0	25	3	7	57	6	3
Conway	11	1	3	7	0	2	6	0	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	30	1	6	106	11	6
Crittenden	16	0	3	15	0	9	12	1	5	10	1	3	1	1	0	54	3	20	127	9	5
Drew	3	0	0	4	1	0	3	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	15	2	1	41	6	1
Faulkner	15	3	5	14	1	1	14	0	2	14	2	7	2	0	1	59	6	16	268	32	12
Garland	18	0	4	21	2	9	18	0	5	22	4	8	0	0	0	79	6	26	297	34	19
Hempstead	5	0	1	6	0	2	9	1	3	10	2	3	0	0	0	30	3	9	50	11	0
Independence	5	0	1	4	0	2	8	0	4	7	1	4	1	0	1	25	1	12	153	20	6
Izard	3	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	2	0	0	0
Jackson	8	0	2	4	0	1	4	0	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	20	1	5	100	12	10
Logan	5	0	1	4	0	3	2	0	1	10	3	3	0	0	0	21	3	8	23	3	0
Lonoke	20	0	1	11	3	4	9	1	1	12	0	3	2	0	0	54	4	9	167	14	6
Madison	3	0	0	4	0	2	5	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	18	1	5	0	0	0
Miller	7	0	2	9	0	1	6	0	0	9	1	3	0	0	0	31	1	6	60	11	4
Nevada	7	0	5	2	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	6	0	0	0
Newton	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Poinsett	4	0	2	4	0	1	7	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	23	0	6	43	8	1
Pulaski	54	3	17	60	4	20	40	1	12	44	12	14	4	2	2	202	22	65	494	119	32
Saline	13	1	2	20	4	5	14	1	2	15	4	1	5	1	1	67	11	11	400	67	13
St. Francis	1	1	0	5	0	1	5	0	1	8	2	3	1	0	0	20	3	5	32	6	1
Sebastian	4	1	3	10	0	1	5	0	2	7	1	1	1	1	0	27	3	7	89	9	2
Washington	17	0	4	15	0	3	19	1	7	19	0	4	2	0	0	72	1	18	286	55	26

Enter explanation of the deployment of resources based on the analysis performed.

The Arkansas Highway Safety Office considers safety issues by focusing on behavioral aspects at the driver level. The goal of this fatality reduction focus is to reduce highway fatalities by better identifying driver behaviors that cause fatal crashes and targeting problem areas where fatal crashes occur. An evidence based Traffic Safety Enforcement Plan (E-BE) has been developed to reduce injuries and fatalities in the State.

Particular attention is being focused on continued participation in impaired driving, occupant protection and speed issues through Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS). This program will sponsor active participation by approximately 55 Arkansas law enforcement agencies in the state. The following chart show the citations issued by STEP agencies from 2012 through 2017.

Citations	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Speeding Citations	6,864	6,166	6,771	10,674	18,252
Seat Belt Citations	30,276	23,649	25,335	22,407	21,162
DUI Citations	2,084	1,942	1,246	1,072	1,065

The Arkansas Office of Driver Services reports that the number of seat belt convictions in the state has steadily declined since 2009. During this same period, the number of seat belt citations issued also declined as shown on the previous chart. Efforts continue to educate law enforcement and the judiciary of the importance of issuing seat belt citations and obtaining convictions.

STEP projects will include high visibility and sustained enforcement of impaired driving, occupant protection and speed limit laws to over 40 law enforcement agencies in the state. A new initiative will focus on approximately 20 smaller law enforcement agencies to participate in mini-STEP grants. These grants would fund overtime enforcement or equipment to agencies that participate in the national safety campaigns. Targeted media, including paid television, radio, billboards and internet will support these campaigns, which include CIOT and DSOGPO.

FARS data for Arkansas (based on the 5 year period 2012-2016) shows the number of fatalities declined from 560 in 2012 to 545 in 2016. The fatality rate per 100 MVMT also shows a decrease from 1.67 to 1.53. However, serious injuries (2's only) increased from 3,226 in 2012 to 3,032 in 2016.

While these figures indicate some decreases in fatalities and injuries, an average of 525 motorists lose their lives and another 3,256 are seriously injured each year on Arkansas's roadways. In 2016, there were 545 total traffic fatalities compared to 550 the previous year. Over the past five years, alcohol-related fatalities averaged 135 per year. Arkansas' alcohol-related fatalities in 2016 stood at 21% of the total fatalities. In 2016, there were 117 alcohol-related (involving a driver or motorcycle operator at .08 BAC or above) fatalities reported compared to 144 in 2012.

A major area of concern continues to be the relatively low seat belt use rate in the State. In 2016, there were 393 passenger vehicle occupant fatalities. Of these fatalities, 194 or 36% were unrestrained. Arkansas' primary safety belt law took effect June 30, 2009. Immediately afterward, the use rate rose from 70.4% to 74.4%, while the National use rate stood at 83%. In 2015 the use rate stood at 77.7% and is currently at 81% for 2017. In FY13 the Legislature passed an amendment to allow the addition of court costs to the seat belt citation increasing the cost of a ticket for not wearing a seat belt to approximately \$90.

If the State is to increase seat belt use, all law enforcement agencies must make seat belt enforcement a priority. In cooperation with other safety partners, there was an increase in law enforcement participation in the national safety mobilizations in 2016. During 2017, 136 non-STEP agencies participated in the CIOT campaign and 116 non-STEP agencies participated in the DSOGPO campaign.

The AHSO also recognizes the significance and impact that motorcycle related crashes are having on the overall fatality picture in this State. Motorcycle fatalities account for approximately 15 percent of Arkansas' total traffic fatalities. In 2012 this number stood at 72 but has increased to 80 for 2016. There were 356 motorcycle involved traffic fatalities in Arkansas during the 5-year period 2012-2016.

Targeted and identified projects are best undertaken on a statewide approach. This is the direction taken for selective traffic enforcement programs and training, occupant protection strategies, public information and education. The long-term goal is to develop a comprehensive traffic safety program in each geographical area. Initiating a project in selective traffic enforcement has the potential to build local commitment to improving the traffic safety problems. Towards this end, the AHSO is collaborating with the Arkansas Department of Health to build a network of local coalitions to encourage seat belt use. These coalitions will target local businesses and employers, develop relevant information materials and implement evidence based prevention activities in targeted counties.

Although the larger populated areas of Arkansas present the most problems involving crashes, the less populated areas exhibit a need for improving their problem locations. From 2012 thru 2016, 75 percent of fatalities occurred in rural areas of the state. Over the past 10 years crash fatalities averaged 559 per year. While fatality numbers were at 649 in 2007, this number has decreased to 545 in 2016. The AHSO will continue to implement statewide projects as cited above and utilize their resources to combat this problem.

In FY19 Arkansas Highway Safety Office will issue sub-grants to approximately 120 different agencies and courts statewide to target Highway Safety issues. Those agencies will include state, county and municipal law enforcement agencies in both urban and rural locations. Other sub-grantees include, but are not limited to, Arkansas Highway & Transportation Department, Arkansas Administrative Office of the Courts, University of Arkansas System, Arkansas Department of Health, and Black River Technical College Law Enforcement Training Academy.

It is obvious from the statewide problem analysis that the most effective reduction of fatalities and injuries, attributed to motor vehicle crashes, could be achieved by a significantly increased occupant protection use rate and a reduction of impaired driving. Therefore our focus will be on creating aggressive, innovative and well publicized enforcement in conjunction with education programs and an increased focus on citations and arrests.

Arkansas will host a statewide traffic safety conference in Little Rock in 2019. The objective of this conference is to generate collaboration among all law enforcement and traffic safety advocates across the State. The Conference will incorporate discussions on innovations around the country that could increase the effectiveness of Arkansas's impaired driving program efforts. We expect this to be a catalyst for a strong movement in implementing new and more effective programming across the State.

The evidence-based (E-BE) traffic safety enforcement program is focused on preventing traffic crashes, crash-related fatalities and injuries. Analysis of Arkansas' crashes, crash fatalities and serious injuries are extracted from the "Arkansas State Traffic Records Data and FARS". The chart below provides data on the number of crashes, fatalities and injuries by county. Information on unrestrained fatalities is provided in the Occupant Protection Problem ID Section. Utilizing this data, priority areas are identified to implement proven enforcement activities.

Arkansas's E-BE is implemented through deployment of our resources in these areas throughout the year with the exception of mobilizing the entire state during the "Click It or Ticket" (CIOT) mobilizations and the "Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over" (DSOGPO) crackdowns. Each enforcement effort is analyzed at its conclusion and adjustments are made to the E-BE. Arkansas's comprehensive enforcement program is developed and implemented as follows:

- The approach utilized by the AHSO is through projects developed for selective overtime enforcement efforts in the areas of alcohol, speed, distracted driving and occupant protection. Funding assistance is awarded to law enforcement agencies in priority areas. Additional projects also target these priority areas with public information and education for the specific dates and times of the enforcement efforts. Additional agencies are recruited to participate in Federal and statewide mobilizations and crackdowns. For FY 19 these will include the following:

- State Thanksgiving Seat Belt Mobilization
- National Winter DWI Mobilization
- National Memorial Day Seat Belt Mobilization
- State July 4th Holiday DWI Mobilization
- National Labor Day DWI Mobilization
- Regional Speed Mobilization

- Who, what, when, where and why are used to determine where to direct our resources for the greatest impact. Data is broken down by type of crash, i.e. speed, alcohol, restraint usage, impaired driving etc. Arkansas's fatal, and serious injury crash data is utilized to determine priority areas and provide direction on how to make the greatest impact.

- The enforcement program is implemented by awarding selective traffic enforcement overtime grants to law enforcement agencies in these priority areas. Funding for overtime salaries and traffic related equipment is eligible for reimbursement. Agencies applying for funding assistance for selective overtime enforcement are encouraged to do problem identification within their city or county to determine when and where to conduct enforcement for the greatest impact. The components of the awards include PI&E and required activity reporting. The enforcement program includes statewide enforcement efforts for the mobilizations and crackdowns which involve extensive national and state media campaigns.

- All law enforcement working alcohol and seat belt selective overtime must provide proof of their successful completion of the Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST) training and Traffic Occupant and Protection Strategies (TOPS) training.

- The AHSO monitors and assesses each of the awarded selective traffic enforcement overtime grants upon receipt of the activity report and reimbursement request and adjustments are made as needed. Seat Belt survey results along with performance standards results (officer violator contacts/stops and arrests per hour) are evaluated to adjust enforcement strategies and determine future awards. Adjustments to enforcement plans continue throughout the year. The AHSO staff reviews the results of each activity/mobilization. Likewise, state, local and county law enforcement agencies are encouraged to review their activity and jurisdictional crash data on a regular basis. Based upon these reviews, continuous follow-up and timely adjustments are made to enforcement plans to improve sustained and High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) effectiveness.

Enter description of how the State plans to monitor the effectiveness of enforcement activities, make ongoing adjustments as warranted by data, and update the countermeasure strategies and projects in the Highway Safety Plan (HSP).

The AHSO monitors and assesses each of the awarded selective traffic enforcement overtime grants upon receipt of the activity report and reimbursement request and adjustments are made as needed. Seat Belt survey results along with performance standards results (officer violator contacts/stops and arrests per hour) are evaluated to adjust enforcement strategies and determine future awards. Adjustments to enforcement plans continue throughout the year. The AHSO staff reviews the results of each activity/mobilization. Likewise, state, local and county law enforcement agencies are encouraged to review their activity and jurisdictional crash data on a regular basis. Based upon these reviews, continuous follow-up and timely adjustments are made to enforcement plans to improve sustained and High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) effectiveness.

7 High Visibility Enforcement

High-visibility enforcement (HVE) strategies

Planned HVE strategies to support national mobilizations:

***Reminder: When associating a countermeasure strategy to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Countermeasure Strategy Name
Sustained Enforcement (SP)
Sustained Enforcement (OP)
State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement
SFST training for Law Enforcement Officers
Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints
High Visibility Saturation Patrols
High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
High Visibility Enforcement (Speeding)
Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training
Communication Campaign DD
Communication Campaign (OP)
Communication Campaign (Impaired Driving)

HVE activities

Select specific HVE planned activities that demonstrate the State's support and participation in the National high-visibility law enforcement mobilizations to reduce alcohol-impaired or drug impaired operation of motor vehicles and increase use of seat belts by occupants of motor vehicles.

HVE Campaigns Selected

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
OP-2019-04	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	
OP-2019-10	Rural High Five Project	
AL-2019-06	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-08	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
AL-2019-10	Law Enf Training Academy BAT & Sobriety Checkpoint Mobile Training	

AL-2019-14	Statewide In-Car Camera and Video Storage System	High Visibility Enforcement (Impaired)
SC-2019-01	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)	Sustained Enforcement (SP)
SC-2019-03	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPS)	

8 405(b) Occupant Protection Grant

Occupant protection information

405(b) qualification status:	Lower seat belt use rate State
------------------------------	--------------------------------

Occupant protection plan

Submit State occupant protection program area plan that identifies the safety problems to be addressed, performance measures and targets, and the countermeasure strategies and planned activities the State will implement to address those problems.

Program Area
Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Distracted Driving
Occupant Protection (Adult and Child Passenger Safety)

Participation in Click-it-or-Ticket (CIOT) national mobilization

Select or click Add New to submit the planned participating agencies during the fiscal year of the grant, as required under § 1300.11(d)(6).

Agencies planning to participate in CIOT

Agency
Alexander Police Department
Altus Police Department
Amity Police Department
Arkansas Tech University
Ashdown Police Department
Atkins Police Department
Augusta Police Department
Austin Police Department
Barling Police Department
Bauxite Police Department
Bay Police Department
Bearden Police Department

Bella Vista Police Department
Bradford Police Department
Bradley Police Department
Bradley Co. Sheriff's Office
Brinkley Police Department
Buffalo National Park Service
Bull Shoals Police Department
Cabot Police Department
Caddo Valley Police Department
Calhoun Co. Sheriff's Office
Caraway Police Department
Cave City Police Department
Chicot Co. Sheriff's Office
Cherry Valley Police Department
Chidester Police Department
Clarendon Police Department
Clarksville Police Department
Clay Co. Sheriff's Office
Clinton Police Department
Coal Hill Police Department
Cotter Police Department
Conway Co. Sheriff's Office
Columbia Co. Sheriff's Office
Crawford Co. Sheriff's Office
Craighead Co. Sheriff's Office
Crosset Police Department
Cross Co. Sheriff's Office
Dallas Co. Sheriff's Office
Danville Police Department
Decatur Police Department
Dermott Police Department
Desarc Police Department
Dequeen Police Department
Dewitt Police Department
Dierks Police Department
Drew Co. Sheriff's Office

Dumas Police Department
Dyer Police Department
Earle Police Department
East Camden Police Department
Elaine Police Department
Elm Springs Police Department
England Police Department
Eudora Police Department
Eureka Springs Police Department
Fordyce Police Department
Forrest City Police Department
Farmington Police Department
Franklin Co. Sheriff's Office
Fulton Co. Sheriff's Office
Gassville Police Department
Glenwood Police Department
Goshen Police Department
Grady Police Department
Grannis Police Department
Grant Co. Sheriff's Office
Gravette Police Department
Greenbrier Police Department
Green Forest Police Department
Greenland Police Department
Gurdon Police Department
Guy Police Department
Hamburg Police Department
Hardy Police Department
Harrisburg Police Department
Hartford Police Department
Haskell Police Department
Heritage Police Department
Highfill Police Department
Holley Grove Police Department
Hot Springs Village Police Department
Howard Co. Sheriff's Office

Hughes Police Department
Humphrey Police Department
Huntsville Police Department
Huttig Police Department
Izard Co. Sheriff's Office
Jasper Police Department
JefferSheriff's Officen Co. Sheriff's Office
Jericho Police Department
JohnSheriff's Officen Police Department
JohnSheriff's Officen Co. Sheriff's Office
Junction City Police Department
Kensett Police Department
Lafayette Co. Sheriff's Office
Lakeview Police Department
Lake City Police Department
Lake Village Police Department
Lake View Police Department
Lamar Police Department
Lavaca Police Department
Lee Co. Sheriff's Office
Lepanto Police Department
Lincoln Co. Sheriff's Office
Little Flock Police Department
Little River Co. Sheriff's Office
Lonoke Co. Sheriff's Office
MadiSheriff's Officen Police Department
Magazine Police Department
Malvern Police Department
Mansfield Police Department
Marianna Police Department
Marion Co. Sheriff's Office
Marvell Police Department
McCroy Police Department
McGehee Police Department
Mena Police Department
Menifee Police Department

Monette Police Department
Monroe Co. Sheriff's Office
Montgomery Co. Sheriff's Office
Monticell Police Department
Mountainburg Police Department
Mountain View Police Department
Murfreesboro Police Department
Nashville Police Department
Newport Police Department
Newton Police Department
Norfolk Police Department
Ola Police Department
Opello Police Department
Ouachita Co. Sheriff's Office
Ozark Police Department
Palestine Police Department
Paris Police Department
Pea Ridge Police Department
Perry Co. Sheriff's Office
Pike Co. Sheriff's Office
Plainview Police Department
Pine Bluff Police Department
Pocahontas Police Department
Poinsett Co. Sheriff's Office
Polk Co. Sheriff's Office
Pope Co. Sheriff's Office
Portland Police Department
Pottsville Police Department
Prairie Co. Sheriff's Office
Prairie Grove Police Department
Prescott Police Department
Quitman Police Department
Ravenden Police Department
rector Police Department
RiSheriff's Officen Police Department
Rockport Police Department

Russellville Police Department
salem Police Department
Sevier Co. Sheriff's Office
Sheridan Police Department
Shannon Hills Police Department
Sparkman Police Department
Stamps Police Department
Star City Police Department
Univ. Arkansas- Morrilton Campus
Univ. Arkansas- Little Rock Campus
St. Charles Police Department
Stephens Police Department
Stuttart Police Department
Sulphur Springs Police Department
Tontitown Police Department
Union Co. Sheriff's Office
Vilonia Police Department
Waldo Police Department
Waldron Police Department
Ward Police Department
Warren Police Department
West Fork Police Department
West Memphis Police Department
Wheatley Police Department
White Co. Sheriff's Office
White Hall Police Department
Woodruff Co. Sheriff's Office
Wynne Police Department
Yell Co. Sheriff's Office

Enter description of the State's planned participation in the Click-it-or-Ticket national mobilization.

Law enforcement partners play an important role in the area of occupant protection. High visibility Enforcement efforts such as national mobilizations and Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP) in addition to education and public awareness are utilized to change unsafe driving behaviors. One of the objectives of the current LEL contract with the Criminal Justice Institute is for the Law Enforcement Liaison's (LELS) to solicit law enforcement agencies to participate in the CIOT mobilization. In 2017 301 agencies were solicited for participation resulting in participation by 170 agencies. Law enforcement agencies are encouraged to involve and inform the media during special enforcement events. The national tagline of "Click It or Ticket" will be used in efforts to promote occupant protection. To promote the use of safety belts and support NHTSA's "Click It or Ticket" national mobilization and the state's two-week STEP effort, CJRW, Arkansas's advertising agency of record will secure paid media per NHTSA's pre-determined media timeline for the campaign.

The Click It or Ticket (CIOT) Campaign has been instrumental in raising the adult seat belt use rate and will continue to play an important part in Arkansas' efforts to increase the state's usage rate. The projects mentioned above, along with the CIOT program, are an integral part of the FY 19 Highway Safety Plan. Efforts in FY19 will include emphasis on increasing total enforcement efforts and the number of agencies participating and encouraging agencies outside of STEP to address seat belt enforcement at a much higher level.

Child restraint inspection stations

Submit countermeasure strategies, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification.

***Reminder: When associating a countermeasure strategy to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Countermeasure Strategy Name
Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Submit planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating an active network of child passenger safety inspection stations and/or inspection events based on the State's problem identification.

***Reminder: When associating a planned activity to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-01	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
OP-2019-08	Statewide Child Passenger Protection Project	

Enter the total number of planned inspection stations and/or events in the State.

Planned inspection stations and/or events: 12

Enter the number of planned inspection stations and/or inspection events serving each of the following population categories: urban, rural, and at-risk.

Populations served - urban	22
Populations served - rural	21
Populations served - at risk	43

CERTIFICATION: The inspection stations/events are staffed with at least one current nationally Certified Child Passenger Safety Technician.

Child passenger safety technicians

Submit countermeasure strategies, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification.

***Reminder:** When associating a countermeasure strategy to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.

Countermeasure Strategy Name
Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Submit planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), for recruiting, training and maintaining a sufficient number of child passenger safety technicians based on the State's problem identification.

***Reminder:** When associating a planned activity to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-01	Occupant Protection/Injury Prevention Program	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPS)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
OP-2019-08	Statewide Child Passenger Protection Project	

Enter an estimate of the total number of classes and the estimated total number of technicians to be trained in the upcoming fiscal year to ensure coverage of child passenger safety inspection stations and inspection events by nationally Certified Child Passenger Safety Technicians.

Estimated total number of classes	8
Estimated total number of technicians	529

Maintenance of effort

ASSURANCE: The lead State agency responsible for occupant protection programs shall maintain its aggregate expenditures for occupant protection programs at or above the level of such expenditures in fiscal year 2014 and 2015.

Qualification criteria for a lower seat belt use rate State

To qualify for an Occupant Protection Grant in a fiscal year, a lower seat belt use rate State (as determined by NHTSA) must submit, as part of its HSP, documentation demonstrating that it meets at least three of the following additional criteria. Select application criteria from the list below to display the associated requirements.

Primary enforcement seat belt use statute	Yes
---	-----

Occupant protection statute	No
Seat belt enforcement	Yes
High risk population countermeasure program	Yes
Comprehensive occupant protection program	No
Occupant protection program assessment	No

Primary enforcement seat belt use statute

Open each requirement below to provide legal citations to demonstrate that the State statute meets the requirement.

- The State's statute(s) demonstrates that the State has enacted and is enforcing occupant protection statutes that make a violation of the requirement to be secured in a seat belt or child restraint a primary offense.
 - A.C.A. 27-37-701

Seat belt enforcement

Submit countermeasure strategies, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred.

***Reminder: When associating a countermeasure strategy to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Countermeasure Strategy Name
Sustained Enforcement (OP)
State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
School Programs
Communication Campaign (OP)
Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Submit planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5), demonstrating that the State conducts sustained enforcement (i.e., a program of recurring efforts throughout the fiscal year of the grant to promote seat belt and child restraint enforcement), and that based on the State's problem identification, involves law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70 percent of either the State's unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities occurred or combined fatalities and serious injuries occurred.

***Reminder: When associating a planned activity to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)

OP-2019-04	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	
OP-2019-05	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (OP)
OP-2019-07	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	
OP-2019-10	Rural High Five Project	

High risk population countermeasure programs

Submit countermeasure strategies, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan.

***Reminder: When associating a countermeasure strategy to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Countermeasure Strategy Name
Sustained Enforcement (OP)
State Primary Seat Belt Use Law
School Programs
Communication Campaign (OP)
Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Submit planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs to improve seat belt and child restraint use for at least two of the following at-risk populations: (i) Drivers on rural roadways; (ii) Unrestrained nighttime drivers; (iii) Teenage drivers; (iv) Other high-risk populations identified in the occupant protection program area plan.

***Reminder: When associating a planned activity to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
OP-2019-02	Local Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (STEPs)	
OP-2019-03	Statewide Selective Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP)	Sustained Enforcement (OP)
OP-2019-04	Mini Selective Traffic Enforcement Projects (M-STEPs)	
OP-2019-05	Statewide Public Information and Education (PI&E)	Communication Campaign (OP)
OP-2019-07	Statewide Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL)	
OP-2019-09	Community Prevention Initiative	School and Community Awareness Programs
OP-2019-10	Rural High Five Project	
OP-2019-11	Teen Drive Safety Project	
AL-2019-09	BAC Intoximeter and Blood Testing Training Project	

9 405(c) - State Traffic Safety Information System Improvement Grant

Traffic records coordinating committee (TRCC)

Submit at least three meeting dates of the TRCC during the 12 months immediately preceding the application due date.

Meeting Date
2/14/2018
4/24/2018
5/15/2018

Enter the name and title of the State's Traffic Records Coordinator

Name of State's Traffic Records Coordinator:	Karen Bonds
Title of State's Traffic Records Coordinator:	Traffic Records Program Manager

Enter a list of TRCC members by name, title, home organization and the core safety database represented, provided that at a minimum, at least one member represents each of the following core safety databases: (A) Crash; (B) Citation or adjudication; (C) Driver; (D) Emergency medical services or injury surveillance system; (E) Roadway; and (F) Vehicle.

<u>LIST OF TRCC MEMBERS</u>				
NAME	Function	AGENCY	TITLE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Karen Bonds	Crash	ASP/HSO	TR Program Manager	karen.bonds@asp.arkansas.gov
Eddie Brawley	Crash	City of West Memphis	MPO Study Dir.	bce@sbcglobal.net
Ronnie Burks	Crash	ArDOT/AHP	Chief	ron.burks@ArDOT.ar.gov
Tim Carter	Crash	ASP/HwyPatrol	Sergeant	tim.carter@asp.arkansas.gov
Greg Dycus	Crash	ASP/HwyPatrol	Corporal	greg.dycus@asp.arkansas.gov
Allen Fitzgerald	Crash	ASP/IT	Chief Information Officer	allen.fitzgerald@asp.arkansas.gov
Mike Foster	Crash	ASP/HwyPatrol	Major	mike.foster@asp.arkansas.gov
Shawn Garner	Crash	ASP/DO	Lt. Colonel	shawn.garner@asp.arkansas.gov
Lester (JR) Hankins	Crash	ASP/Records	Program Mgr.	lester.hankins@asp.arkansas.gov
Hans Haustein	Crash	MetroPlan	MPO Study Director	hhaustein@metroplan.org

Renee Hill	Crash	ArDOT/AHP	Motor Carrier Sfty Spec	renee.hill@ArDOT.ar.gov
Debra Hollis	Crash	ASP/HSO	Hwy. Safety Mgr.	debra.hollis@asp.arkansas.gov
Chuck Lewis	Crash	ASP/DO	Corporal	chuck.lewis@asp.arkansas.gov
Rodney Lewis	Crash	LRPD	Sergeant	rlewis@littlerock.gov
Forrest Marks	Crash	ASP/HwyPatrol	Major	forrest.marks@asp.arkansas.gov
Teris McClay	Crash	LRPD	Patrolman	tmcclay@littlerock.org
Lonnie Miles	Crash	LRPD	Lieutenant	lmiles@littlerock.org
Jay Thompson	Crash	ArDOT/AHP	Major	jay.thompson@ArDOT.ar.gov
Bill Van Newkirk	Crash	ASP/IT	Sr. Project Manager	bill.vannewkirk@asp.arkanss.gov
Bridget White	Crash	ASP/HSO	Hwy. Safety Administrator	bridget.white@asp.arkansas.gov
Adnan Qazi	Crash/Roadway	ArDOT/TSS	Section Head	adnan.qazi@ArDOT.ar.gov
Cody Burk	Citation/Adjudication	PCSO	Lieutenant	cburk@pcso.org
Stacey Cardin	Citation/Adjudication	AOC	Applications Mgr.	stacey.cardin@arkansas.gov
Keith Caviness	Citation/Adjudication	AOC	Staff Atty.	keith.caviness@arkansas.gov
Tim Holthoff	Citation/Adjudication	AOC	CIS Division Director	tim.holthoff@arkansas.gov
James Kingsbury	Citation/Adjudication	ASP/IT	Project Lead	james.kingsbury@asp.arkansas.gov
Tim K'Nuckles	Citation/Adjudication	ASP/Dir Off	Lt. Colonel	tim.knuckles@asp.arkansas.gov
Alex Rogers	Citation/Adjudication	AOC	Program Manager	alex.rogers@arkansas.gov
Tonie Shields	Driver	DFA/DrSvcs	Administrator	tonie_shields@dfa.arkansas.gov
	EMS/Injury Surveillance	ADH/EMS	Administrator	Greg.Brown@arkansas.gov
Stephen Lein	EMS/Injury Surveillance	ADH/PHP	Injury Epidemiologist	stephen.lein@arkansas.gov
Austin Porter	EMS/Injury Surveillance	ADH/PHP	Injury Epidemiologist	austin.porter@arkansas.gov

Ted English	Roadway	ArDOT/TSS	Administrative Officer	ted.english@ArDOT.ar.gov
Sharon Hawkins	Roadway	ArDOT/P&R	Section Head/GIS & Mapping	sharon.hawkins@ArDOT.ar.gov
Jessie Jones	Roadway	ArDOT/Trans. Planning & Policy	Division Head	jessie.jones@ArDOT.ar.gov
John Mathis	Roadway	ArDOT/Maint	Safety Pgm. Mgr.	john.mathis@ArDOT.ar.gov
Greg Nation	Roadway	ArDOT/PTP	Public Transportaion Administrator	greg.nation@ArDOT.ar.gov
Johnna Thomas	Roadway	ArDOT/Syst. Info.	Research Analyst	johnna.thomas@ArDOT.ar.gov
Christy Earnhart	Vehicle	DFA/VehReg	Assistant Administrator	christy.earnhart@dfa.arkanss.gov
Wayne Hamric	Vehicle	DFA/VehReg	Administrator	wayne.hamric@dfa.arkansas.gov

FEDERAL PARTNERS

NAME	Function	AGENCY	TITLE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Kevin Breedlove		FMCSA	Division Administrator	kevin.breedlove@dot.gov
Joe Heflin		FHWA	Safety Pgm. Mgr.	joseph.heflin@dot.gov
Dean Scott		NHTSA	Regional Pgm. Mgr.	dean.scott@dot.gov
Mark Westmoreland		FMCSA	State Pgm. Spec.	mark.westmoreland@dot.gov
		ADH = Arkansas Department of Health		
		AHP = Arkansas Highway Police		
		Arkansas Department of ArDOT = Transportation		
		AOC = Administrative Office of the Courts		
		ASP = Arkansas State Police		
		DFA = Department of Finance & Administration (Dept. of Revenue)		

DO = Director's Office		
EMS = Emergency Medical Services		
HSO = Highway Safety Office		
IT = Information Technology		
LRPD = Little Rock Police Department		
PCSO = Pulaski County Sheriff's Office		
PHP = Public Health Practice		
P&R = Planning & Research		
PTP = Public Transportation Programs Section		
TSS = Traffic Safety Section		

State traffic records strategic plan

Upload a Strategic Plan, approved by the TRCC, that— (i) Describes specific, quantifiable and measurable improvements, as described in paragraph (b)(3) of this section, that are anticipated in the State's core safety databases, including crash, citation or adjudication, driver, emergency medical services or injury surveillance system, roadway, and vehicle databases; (ii) Includes a list of all recommendations from its most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment; (iii) Identifies which recommendations identified under paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section the State intends to address in the fiscal year, the countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement each recommendation, and the performance measures to be used to demonstrate quantifiable and measurable progress; and (iv) Identifies which recommendations identified under paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section the State does not intend to address in the fiscal year and explains the reason for not implementing the recommendations.

Documents Uploaded
FY 2019 AR - 405c IPR Form - Contexte System.docx
TR Strategic Plan 2017.docx

Enter a direct copy of the section of the State traffic records strategic plan that lists all recommendations from the State's most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment.

Traffic Records Assessment Recommendations

The State is required to address the recommendations from the most recent Traffic Records Assessment within the TRSP. The following table is split into two columns. The left column contains the recommendations from the 2015 Traffic Records

Assessment. The right column details the State's actions to address the recommendation. Topics are presented in the same order as in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory (DOT HS 811 644).

Strategic Planning:

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State
Strengthen the TRCC's abilities for strategic planning to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.	The State TRCC requested technical assistance using the NHTSA GO Team process in March 2016. This GO Team is assisting the State in creating a comprehensive Traffic Records Strategic Plan (TRSP).

Crash System

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State
Improve the procedures/process flows for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.	The State has documented the system data flow processes for crash data. State agencies have begun creating both internal and external data exchanges.
Improve the interfaces with the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.	There are new projects identified in the 2017 TRSP that address crash data interfaces. The SAFETYNET exchange is listed as a high priority project within the plan. This project will be ramping up for testing in Q3 of 2017. The State is also submitting data to FARS through NHTSA's electronic data transfer program.

Improve the data quality control program for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory	The TRCC has created a project within the 2017 TRSP to establish a data quality performance measure subcommittee.
--	---

Vehicle System

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State
<p>Improve the procedures/process flows for the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The State will begin offering Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) verification through the eCrash software. It will be tested with the Arkansas State Police prior to full statewide implementation.</p>
<p>Improve the data quality control program for the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The implementation of the Arkansas Integrated Revenue System – Driver Services and Motor Vehicles (AIRS-DSMV) module has mitigated the errors in vehicle coding. New vehicle entries are standardized by drop down lists. The State also included a project to address the codes that are not uniform with the current system.</p> <p>The TRCC has created a project within the 2017 TRSP to establish a data quality performance measure subcommittee.</p>

Driver

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State
<p>Improve the description and contents of the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The State has the data dictionary for the Driver system. This was confirmed during the AR strategic planning session. However, this information is proprietary to the AIRS software. The State is unable to include it within a formal data inventory.</p>
<p>Improve the interfaces with the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The CONTEXTE deployment will benefit the driver system through the update of driver records when a citation is adjudicated.</p> <p>AR is also a pilot State for Driver's License photo exchange between States.</p>

<p>Improve the data quality control program for the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The Driver services staff are currently evaluating ways to improve data quality.</p> <p>The TRCC has created a project within the 2017 TRSP to establish a data quality performance measure subcommittee.</p>
---	--

Roadway

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State
<p>Improve the data dictionary for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The ARDOT is addressing the data quality issues for collecting the MIRE FDE. The State has initiated collecting data for all public roads while leveraging the 911 centerline file.</p>
<p>Improve the procedures/process flows for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The State is currently adding new data elements to the Roadway system. Process flow documents are available to show the information.</p> <p>ARDOT is updating the mapping application used for the eCrash application for improved location data.</p>
<p>Improve the data quality control program for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The roadway system will work with the TRCC Performance Measure subcommittee to measure data quality for the roadway system.</p>

Citation/Adjudication

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State

<p>Improve the applicable guidelines for the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The Court system (CONTEXTE) does not use NIEM as its primary framework. However, the system can make data exchanges and/or data sets that are compliant to NIEM 3.2.</p> <p>This currently addresses approximately 80% of the functional requirements for Traffic Court Case Management Systems.</p>
<p>Improve the interfaces with the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>ASP is adding VIN Verification to the State Police deployment of the eCitation.</p> <p>The citation interface to the driver record is complete.</p>
<p>Improve the data quality control program for the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The State is looking at the potential use of transaction logs in the citation to driver interface as a measure of timeliness. One hurdle is creating a statewide citation repository. The State will use the TRCC Performance Measures Subcommittee to help with developing this performance measure.</p>

EMS / Injury Surveillance

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State
<p>Improve the interfaces with the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>EMS receives hospital data currently as a data exchange.</p>
<p>Improve the data quality control program for the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</p>	<p>The State added a new project in the 2017 TRSP that will provide feedback to law enforcement agencies on injury data collection. The ISS will work with the TRCC Performance Measure subcommittee to measure data quality for this system.</p>

Data Use and Integration

Recommendations from 2015 Assessment	Actions taken by the State
Improve the traffic records systems capacity to integrate data to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.	The applicable data integration efforts have been referenced in the previous system sections.

Enter a direct copy of the section of the State traffic records strategic plan that identifies which recommendations the State intends to address in the fiscal year, the countermeasure strategies and planned activities, at the level of detail required under 23 C.F.R. 1300.11(d), that implement each recommendation, and the performance measures to be used to demonstrate quantifiable and measurable progress.

FY2018 - 2019 Projects				
Project #	Project Name	Countermeasure Strategy	Planned Activities	Performance Measures
AR-TR-0007	Trauma Band and Crash Integration	Link data using trauma band number; look at other possible linkages	look at other possible linkages by June 1, 2018	July 1, 2018 - first testing of linkages; September 1, 2018 - possible final linkage; November 1, 2018 - 'Go-Live'
AR-TR-0008	Traffic Records Data Clearinghouse	Driver Records & AOC linked data in 2010; EMS & eCrash Data to be linked by 09/01/2018; Training Issues to be discussed with training officers; Follow-up Meeting with Sub-Committee 05/31/2018	Discuss Countermeasure progress with Sub-Committee 05/31/2018	TBD
AR-TR-0016	Traffic Records Inventory	Karen Bonds will meet with James Kingsbury to discuss all aspects	TBD	TBD
AR-TR-0017	Analytic Tool and Assistance for Stakeholders	Karen Bonds will meet with James Kingsbury to discuss all aspects; If necessary, this will be placed on TRCC meeting agenda	TBD	TBD

Submit the planned activities, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d), that implement recommendations.

***Reminder:** When associating a planned activity to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure Strategy
TR-2019-03	Electronic Traffic Crash Record Entry System Project (eCrash)	
TR-2019-04	EMS Data Injury Surveillance Continuation Project	
TR-2019-05	Electronic Citation System (eCite)	

Enter a direct copy of the section of the State traffic records strategic plan that identifies which recommendations the State does not intend to address in the fiscal year and explains the reason for not implementing the recommendations.

All recommendations are being addressed.

Quantitative improvement

Enter a direct copy of the section of the State traffic records strategic plan that describes specific, quantifiable and measurable improvements, as described in 23 C.F.R. 1300.22(b)(3), that are anticipated in the State's core safety databases, including crash, citation or adjudication, driver, emergency medical services or injury surveillance system, roadway, and vehicle databases. Specifically, the State must demonstrate quantitative improvement in the data attribute of accuracy, completeness, timeliness, uniformity, accessibility or integration of a core database by providing a written description of the performance measures that clearly identifies which performance attribute for which core database the State is relying on to demonstrate progress using the methodology set forth in the "Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems" (DOT HS 811 441), as updated.

<i>Documentation of Progress</i>			
State: <u>AR</u> Report Date: <u>05/27/2018</u> Submitted by: <u>K. Bonds</u>			
System to be Impacted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CRASH <input type="checkbox"/> DRIVER <input type="checkbox"/> VEHICLE <input type="checkbox"/> ROADWAY <input type="checkbox"/> CITATION/ADJUDICATION <input type="checkbox"/> EMS/INJURY		
Performance Area(s) to be Impacted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ACCURACY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TIMELINESS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COMPLETENESS <input type="checkbox"/> ACCESSIBILITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNIFORMITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INTEGRATION		
Performance Measure used to track Improvement(s)	Narrative Description of the Measure Increase the number of agencies utilizing eCrash for reporting crashes to the Arkansas State Police.		
Is project included in the Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	Yes If the project is not currently included in the State Strategic Plan, the plan will need to be modified prior the State's FY19 application.		
Is this a new project? Or was it the same measure used to show progress previously?	New Measure - Yes Same Measure as FY18 - No If yes, is the State using the same data set, with the same time period to demonstrate progress? Choose an item.		
Improvement(s) Achieved or Anticipated	Narrative of the Improvement(s) Increase the number of agencies utilizing eCrash to 50% by FY2020.		
Specification of how the Measure is calculated / estimated	Narrative Description of Calculation / Estimation Method Divide the number of agencies utilizing eCrash by the total number of law enforcement agencies in the State (442).		
Date and Baseline Value for the Measure <small>(A contiguous, 12 month performance period starting no earlier than April 1, 2016, e.g., April 1, 2016 – March 31, 2017)</small>	Is supporting documentation attached? No		
	Time Frame	Agencies Utilizing eCrash	% of Total Agencies
	04/01/2015-03/31/2016	44	9.95
	04/01/2016-03/31/2017	97	21.95
	04/01/2017-03/31/2018	138	31.22

State: AR Report Date: 05/30/2018 Submitted by: K. Bonds

System to be Impacted	<u>CRASH</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>DRIVER</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>VEHICLE</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>ROADWAY</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>CITATION/ADJUDICATION</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>EMS/INJURY</u>																
Performance Area(s) to be Impacted	<u>ACCURACY</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>TIMELINESS</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>COMPLETENESS</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>ACCESSIBILITY</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>UNIFORMITY</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>INTEGRATION</u>																
Performance Measure used to track Improvement(s)	Narrative Description of the Measure Increase the number of courts providing conviction data on-line into the driver license database.																
Is project included in the Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	Yes If the project is not currently included in the State Strategic Plan, the plan will need to be modified prior the State's FY19 application.																
Is this a new project? Or was it the same measure used to show progress previously?	New Measure - No Same Measure as FY18 - No If yes, is the State using the same data set, with the same time period to demonstrate progress? Yes																
Improvement(s) Achieved or Anticipated	Narrative of the Improvement(s) Increase the number of courts using Contexte to provide conviction data on-line into the driver's license data base. This is a system that allows two-way communication between Courts and the DMV, allowing for real-time updates. The Courts have access to the driver's license data as well as the capability to enter convictions into the driver's license system. This is a phase in project that began with District Courts, then AR Supreme Court/Appellate and Circuit Courts. Arkansas continues to increase the number of Courts providing and gaining data in the on-line driver's license data base. In Arkansas there are a total of 315 Courts. Total number of Courts: Appellate - 2 District - 238 Circuit - 75																
Specification of how the Measure is calculated / estimated	Narrative Description of Calculation / Estimation Method Comparing the number of courts submitting on-line data in each year.																
Date and Baseline Value for the Measure (A contiguous, 12 month performance period starting no earlier than April 1, 2016) e.g., April 1, 2016 - March 31, 2017)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Is supporting documentation attached? Yes</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Time Frame</th> <th colspan="2"># Courts on Context</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">April 1, 2015 - March 31, 2016</td> <td>Appellate</td> <td>2</td> <td>100.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District</td> <td>16</td> <td>6.72%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Circuit</td> <td>64</td> <td>85.33%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Is supporting documentation attached? Yes			Time Frame	# Courts on Context		April 1, 2015 - March 31, 2016	Appellate	2	100.00%	District	16	6.72%	Circuit	64	85.33%
	Is supporting documentation attached? Yes																
Time Frame	# Courts on Context																
April 1, 2015 - March 31, 2016	Appellate	2	100.00%														
	District	16	6.72%														
	Circuit	64	85.33%														
Date and Current Value for the Measure (An identical contiguous, 12 month baseline period starting no earlier than April 1, 2017, e.g., April 1, 2017 - March 31, 2018)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Is supporting documentation attached? Yes</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Time Frame</th> <th colspan="2"># Courts on Context</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">April 1, 2017 - March 31, 2018</td> <td>Appellate</td> <td>2</td> <td>100.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District</td> <td>25</td> <td>10.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Circuit</td> <td>67</td> <td>89.33%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Is supporting documentation attached? Yes			Time Frame	# Courts on Context		April 1, 2017 - March 31, 2018	Appellate	2	100.00%	District	25	10.50%	Circuit	67	89.33%
	Is supporting documentation attached? Yes																
Time Frame	# Courts on Context																
April 1, 2017 - March 31, 2018	Appellate	2	100.00%														
	District	25	10.50%														
	Circuit	67	89.33%														

Upload supporting documentation covering a contiguous 12-month performance period starting no earlier than April 1 of the calendar year prior to the application due date, that demonstrates quantitative improvement when compared to the comparable 12-month baseline period.

Documents Uploaded
FY 2019 AR - 405c IPR Form - Contexte System.docx
TR Strategic Plan 2017.docx

State highway safety data and traffic records system assessment

Enter the date of the assessment of the State's highway safety data and traffic records system that was conducted or updated within the five years prior to the application due date and that complies with the procedures and methodologies outlined in NHTSA's "Traffic Records Highway Safety Program Advisory" (DOT HS 811 644), as updated.

Date of Assessment: 10/20/2015

Requirement for maintenance of effort

ASSURANCE: The lead State agency responsible for State traffic safety information system improvements programs shall maintain its aggregate expenditures for State traffic safety information system improvements programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

10 405(d) Impaired Driving Countermeasure Grant

Impaired driving assurances

Impaired driving qualification - Mid-Range State

ASSURANCE: The State shall use the funds awarded under 23 U.S.C. 405(d)(1) only for the implementation and enforcement of programs authorized in 23 C.F.R. 1300.23(j).

ASSURANCE: The lead State agency responsible for impaired driving programs shall maintain its aggregate expenditures for impaired driving programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

Authority to operate

Enter a direct copy of the section of the statewide impaired driving plan that describes the authority and basis for the operation of the Statewide impaired driving task force, including the process used to develop and approve the plan and date of approval.

The Task Force was established under proper authority of the State of Arkansas. The process was initiated by the Governor's Highway Safety Representative. The purpose and operation of the Task Force is described in the Arkansas Impaired Driving Prevention Plan (AIDPP).

The purpose of the task force is to foster leadership, commitment, and coordination among stakeholders interested in impaired driving issues, including both traditional and non-traditional parties, and to develop and implement an impaired driving prevention plan.

The purpose of the plan is to identify short- and long-term impaired driving activities to be developed, implemented and evaluated based on available data, careful problem identification, and evidence-based prevention interventions or strategies to achieve progress towards the mission and overall goal.

In July of 2013, the Arkansas Highway Safety Office (HSO) convened a meeting for the purpose of recruiting leadership for a statewide impaired driving prevention task force whose purpose would be to foster planning, commitment, and coordination among stakeholders interested in impaired driving issues, including both traditional and non-traditional parties and to develop and implement an overall plan for short- and long-term impaired driving prevention activities based on careful and data-driven problem identification. From a review of statewide data, problem analysis, and research, the task force concluded that the most effective reduction of fatalities and injuries, attributed to motor vehicle crashes, could be achieved by the reduction of impaired driving, and a significantly increased occupant protection use rate in the state.

The leadership of the Task Force is the Arkansas HSO, Law Enforcement, Criminal Justice System Representatives (Prosecution, Adjudication, and Probation), and Public Health. These serve as the task force leadership to ensure that the program is managed effectively and that program activities are implemented.

Key stakeholders will be recruited to ensure a comprehensive membership roster of parties interested in impaired driving issues, including both traditional and nontraditional parties, such as highway safety enforcement, criminal justice, driver licensing, treatment, liquor law enforcement, business, medical, health care, public health, advocacy and multicultural groups, the media, institutions of higher education, and the military.

After agreeing to organize and adopt the charter, a review of data and discussion of findings by the task force members dictated that committing the time, energy, and resources to draft, review, refine, and produce a statewide plan in very short-order was the primary objective. Furthermore, the charter members have a scheduled timeline to ensure that short- and long-term objectives are being met, that the strategies are evaluated, data is reviewed and the plan is relevant.

The task force will meet on the second Tuesday of each odd month.

Committees.

At the direction of the whole, the Chair will appoint committees. Committees will exist for a stated purpose and time period. Each committee will have a Chairperson to ensure that the committee convenes in order to serve its stated purpose and that committee recommendations are presented to the full task force in a timely manner. Generally, these committees will establish procedures to ensure that program activities are implemented as intended. 7

Meeting Schedule.

The task force will meet on the second Tuesday of each odd month.

Acceptable Meetings.

It is acceptable to conduct interim meetings at the call of the Chair, via email, or telephone as necessity dictates.

Quorum.

A quorum for voting is fifty percent (50%) of the number of NHTSA mandated members. In the event of a tie, the Chair will determine outcome.

Proxy.

A mandated member agency representative may designate a proxy to attend a meeting.

Rules of Order.

Decisions will be made by consensus. At the vote of the whole, Robert’s Rules of Order may be invoked for the purpose of formal, binding business decisions.

Amendments.

The Charter may be amended with 30 days written (via electronic or posted correspondence) notice to members and a seventy-five percent (75%) of the number of NHTSA mandated members vote to amend

Acceptable Meetings.

It is acceptable to conduct interim meetings at the call of the Chair, via email, or telephone as necessity dictates.

Quorum.

A quorum for voting is fifty percent (50%) of the number of NHTSA mandated members. In the event of a tie, the Chair will determine outcome.

Proxy.

A mandated member agency representative may designate a proxy to attend a meeting.

Rules of Order.

Decisions will be made by consensus. At the vote of the whole, Robert’s Rules of Order may be invoked for the purpose of formal, binding business decisions.

Amendments.

The Charter may be amended with 30 days written (via electronic or posted correspondence) notice to members and a seventy-five percent (75%) of the number of NHTSA mandated members vote to amend.

Input the date that the Statewide impaired driving plan was approved by the State's task force.

Date impaired driving plan approved by task force: 8/1/2016

Task force member information

Enter a direct copy of the list in the statewide impaired driving plan that contains names, titles and organizations of all task force members, provided that the task force includes key stakeholders from the State highway safety agency, law enforcement and the criminal justice system (e.g., prosecution, adjudication, probation) and, as determined appropriate by the State, representatives from areas such as 24–7 sobriety programs, driver licensing, treatment and rehabilitation, ignition interlock programs, data and traffic records, public health and communication.

Member Representatives

Arkansas Highway Safety Office.

Arkansas State Police – Highway Safety Office

One State Police Plaza Drive

Little Rock, AR 72209

Chip Payne, Impaired Driving Program Specialist

Law Enforcement.

Pulaski County Sheriff's Department

2900 S. Woodrow

Little Rock, AR 72204

Lt. Cody Burk

University of Arkansas Criminal Justice Institute

26 Corporate Hill Drive

Little Rock, AR 72205

Tara Amuimuia , Law Enforcement Liaison

Criminal Justice System (Prosecution, Adjudication and Probation).

Arkansas Office of the Prosecutor Coordinator

Tower Building, Suite 750

323 Center Street

Little Rock, AR 72201

Mark Carpenter , Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor

Arkansas Administrative Office of the Courts

Justice Building

625 Marshall Street

Little Rock, AR 72201

Kari Powers, State Drug/DWI Court Coordinator

Arkansas Department of Community Correction, Parole and Probation

Two Union National Plaza

105 W. Capitol Avenue

Little Rock, AR 72201

Dana Otto, Assistant Area Manager for Parole/Probation, Area 6 Conway

Public Health.

Arkansas Department of Health

Injury Prevention and Control Branch

4815 West Markham, Slot 4

Little Rock, AR 72205

Teresa Belew, Section Chief, Injury and Violence Prevention

Ex Officio Members – Arkansas Highway Safety Office and NHTSA.

Bridget White, Administrator, Highway Safety Office

Debra Hollis, Manager, Highway Safety Office

Ann Whitehead, Public Information/Education Program Specialist, Highway Safety Office Sherri Cannon, Regional Program Manager, NHTSA

NOTE: Key stakeholders will be recruited to ensure a comprehensive membership roster of parties interested in impaired driving issues, including both traditional and non-traditional parties, such as highway safety enforcement, criminal justice, driver licensing, treatment, liquor law enforcement, business, medical, health

care, public health, advocacy and multicultural groups, the media, institutions of higher education, and the military.

Strategic plan details

Select whether the State will use a previously submitted Statewide impaired driving plan that was developed and approved within three years prior to the application due date.

Click link to view Highway Safety Guidelines No. 8

<http://icsw.nhtsa.gov/nhtsa/whatsup/tea21/tea21programs/pages/ImpairedDriving.htm>

Continue to use previously submitted plan

No

List the page number(s) from your impaired driving strategic plan that is based on the most recent version of Highway Safety Program Guideline No. 8 - Impaired Driving, which at a minimum covers the following:

Prevention:	9-10
Criminal justice system:	23-26
Communication program:	16-17
Alcohol and other drug misuse, including screening, treatment, assessment and rehabilitation:	27-28
Program evaluation and data:	28

Upload a copy of the Statewide impaired driving plan. The strategic plan must contain the following information, in accordance with part 3 of appendix B: (i) Section that describes the authority and basis for the operation of the Statewide impaired driving task force, including the process used to develop and approve the plan and date of approval; (ii) List that contains names, titles and organizations of all task force members, provided that the task force includes key stakeholders from the State highway safety agency, law enforcement and the criminal justice system (e.g., prosecution, adjudication, probation) and, as determined appropriate by the State, representatives from areas such as 24-7 sobriety programs, driver licensing, treatment and rehabilitation, ignition interlock programs, data and traffic records, public health and communication; (iii) Strategic plan based on the most recent version of Highway Safety Program Guideline No. 8—Impaired Driving, which, at a minimum, covers the following— (A) Prevention; (B) Criminal justice system; (C) Communication programs; (D) Alcohol and other drug misuse, including screening, treatment, assessment and rehabilitation; and (E) Program evaluation and data.

Statewide impaired driving plan type:

Revised

Documents Uploaded
No documents uploaded to GMSS

11 405(d) Alcohol-Ignition Interlock Law

Alcohol-ignition interlock laws

Open each requirement below to provide legal citations to demonstrate that the State statute meets the requirement.

- The State has enacted and is enforcing a law that requires all individuals convicted of driving under the influence or of driving while intoxicated to drive only motor vehicles with alcohol-ignition interlocks for an authorized period of not less than 6 months.
 - ACA 5-65-118 <http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/assembly/2017/2017R/Acts/Act1094.pdf>

12 405(f) Motorcyclist Safety Grant

Motorcycle safety information

To qualify for a Motorcyclist Safety Grant in a fiscal year, a State shall submit as part of its HSP documentation demonstrating compliance with at least two of the following criteria. Select application criteria from the list below to display the associated requirements.

Motorcycle rider training course	No
Motorcyclist awareness program	Yes
Reduction of fatalities and crashes	No
Impaired driving program	Yes
Reduction of impaired fatalities and accidents	No
Use of fees collected from motorcyclists	No

Motorcyclist awareness program

Enter the name and organization of the head of the designated State authority over motorcyclist safety issues.

State authority agency:	Arkansas State Police Highway Safety Office
State authority name/title:	Colonel William Bryant

CERTIFICATION: The State's motorcyclist awareness program was developed by or in coordination with the designated State authority having jurisdiction over motorcyclist safety issues.

Select one or more performance measures and corresponding performance targets developed for motorcycle awareness that identifies, using State crash data, the counties or political subdivisions within the State with the highest number of motorcycle crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle.

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	71.0
2019	C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	5 Year	2019	40.0

Enter the counties or political subdivisions within the State with the highest number of motorcycle crashes (MCC) involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle. Such data shall be from the most recent calendar year for which final State crash data are available, but data no older than three calendar years prior to the application due date.

County or Political Subdivision	# of MCC involving another motor vehicle

Arkansas	1
Ashley	2
Baxter	14
Benton	67
Boone	14
Bradley	3
Carroll	10
Chicot	1
Clark	1
Clay	2
Cleburne	2
Conway	6
Craighead	26
Crawford	20
Crittenden	7
Cross	2
Drew	2
Faulkner	29
Franklin	6
Fulton	3
Garland	42
Grant	2
Greene	9
Hempstead	3
Hot Spring	2
Independence	6
Izard	3
Jackson	1
Jefferson	11
Johnson	2
Lawrence	2
Little River	1
Logan	6
Lonoke	11
Madison	8
Marion	2

Miller	5
Mississippi	2
Montgomery	1
Newton	3
Ouachita	5
Perry	1
Phillips	3
Pike	1
Poinsett	4
Polk	2
Pope	9
Pulaski	106
Randolph	1
St. Francis	3
Saline	26
Scott	1
Searcy	1
Sebastian	50
Sevier	1
Sharp	1
Stone	2
Union	4
Van Buren	1
Washington	83
White	10

Enter total number of motorcycle crashes (MCC) involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle.

Total # of MCC crashes involving another motor vehicle: 655

Submit countermeasure strategies that demonstrate that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest. The State shall select countermeasure strategies to address the State's motorcycle safety problem areas in order to meet the performance targets identified above.

***Reminder: When associating a countermeasure strategy to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.**

Countermeasure Strategy Name
Communication Campaign (MC)

Submit planned activities that demonstrate that the State will implement data-driven programs in a majority of counties or political subdivisions where the incidence of crashes involving a motorcycle and another motor vehicle is highest. The State shall select planned activities to address the State's motorcycle safety problem areas in order to meet the performance targets identified above.

***Reminder:** When associating a planned activity to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
MC-2019-01	Motorist Awareness Campaign	Communication Campaign (MC)

Impaired driving program

Select one or more performance measures and corresponding performance targets developed to reduce impaired motorcycle operation. Each performance measure and performance target shall identify the impaired motorcycle operation problem area to be addressed. Problem identification must include an analysis of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator by county or political subdivision.

Fiscal Year	Performance Measure Name	Target Period(Performance Target)	Target End Year	Target Value(Performance Target)
2019	C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)	5 Year	2019	141.0

Submit the countermeasure strategies demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest (i.e., the majority of counties or political subdivisions in the State with the highest numbers of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator) based upon State data.

***Reminder:** When associating a countermeasure strategy to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.

Countermeasure Strategy Name
Communication Campaign (MC)

Submit the planned activities demonstrating that the State will implement data-driven programs designed to reach motorcyclists in those jurisdictions where the incidence of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator is highest (i.e., the majority of counties or political subdivisions in the State with the highest numbers of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator) based upon State data.

***Reminder:** When associating a planned activity to an incentive grant, you must ensure sufficient detail is provided to satisfy the additional incentive grant criteria, where applicable.

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
MC-2019-01	Motorist Awareness Campaign	Communication Campaign (MC)

Enter counties or political subdivisions with motorcycle crashes (MCC) involving an impaired operator. Such data shall be from the most recent calendar year for which final State crash data are available, but data no older than three calendar years prior to the application due date.

County or Political Subdivision	# of MCC involving an impaired operator
Baxter	2
Benton	5
Boone	1
Carroll	3
Chicot	1
Cleburne	2
Conway	2
Craighead	2
Crawford	1
Crittenden	1
Dallas	1
Faulkner	5
Garland	1
Greene	1
Hempstead	2
Independence	1
Izard	2
Jackson	1
Lonoke	2
Madison	2
Mississippi	1
Ouachita	1
Phillips	1
Poinsett	1
Polk	3
Pope	1
Pulaski	4
Saline	4
Sebastian	4
Sevier	1
Union	1
Van Buren	1
Washington	8
White	1

Enter total number of motorcycle crashes involving an impaired operator.

Total # of MCC involving an impaired operator 70

13 Certifications, Assurances, and Highway Safety Plan PDFs

Documents Uploaded
AR 2019 Certifications and Assurances.pdf