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

Fiscal Year	2019
NHTSA Grant Application	COLORADO - Highway Safety Plan - FY 2019
State Office	Colorado Office of Transportation Safety
Application Status	Submitted

Highway Safety Plan

1 Summary information

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Highway Safety Plan Name:	COLORADO - Highway Safety Plan - FY 2019
Application Version:	4.0

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:	No
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:	Carol Gould
Submission On:	7/2/2018 7:23 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.

The Highway Safety Office (HSO), within the Office of Transportation Safety (OTS) at the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is responsible for developing and administering behavioral programs that improve the traffic safety environment in Colorado by reducing the number and severity of traffic crashes. The HSO's programs target specific high-risk driving behaviors, such as impaired driving, speeding, distracted driving and also focuses on populations at high risk for crash involvement, such as young drivers, motorcycle riders and vehicle occupants who do not use seat belts.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

In addition to the core performance measures established by NHTSA, the HSO developed three additional performance measures, specific to Colorado traffic safety challenges. These performance measures were developed utilizing in depth problem identification analyses.

To establish performance targets, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a

polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets. These models all predict significant increases in the crash numbers.

In order to address the traffic safety challenges identified, the HSO solicits applications and projects that are data driven, evidence based and employ countermeasure strategies, through a statewide Request for Proposal, in order to achieve performance targets. Extensive outreach efforts to the State and local traffic safety communities are utilized in order to target areas with persistent traffic safety issues. Applications are reviewed by panels of subject matter experts including representatives from the CDPHE, traffics stakeholders and partners and HSO staff. Applications are evaluated on their ability to impact statewide and local problem areas, as identified in the Problem Identification report, support local data, goals and proposed program activities and evaluation measures. Applications are also evaluated on their ability to impact the following core outcome measures:

C-1) Reduce the # of traffic fatalities

C-2) Reduce the # of serious injuries in traffic crashes

C-3) Reduce the # of fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

C-4) Reduce the # of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions

C-5) Reduce the # of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above

C-6) Reduce the # of speeding-related fatalities

C-7) Reduce the # of motorcyclist fatalities

C-8) Reduce the # of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities

C-9) Reduce the # of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes

C-10) Reduce the # of pedestrian fatalities

C-11) Reduce the # of bicyclist fatalities

C-12) Reduce the # of fatal crashes involving a distracted driver

C-13) Reduce the # of fatal crashes involving a driver aged 65 years and older

C-14) Reduce the # of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator testing positive for +> 5ng of Delta 9 THC

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

There are several groups and organizations that engage in various processes and programs that are designed to prevent and mitigate Colorado's highway fatalities and serious injuries. From CDOT these include the Governor's Representative for Highway Safety, the Safety and Traffic Engineering Branch, the Office of Transportation Safety, the Transportation Regional Directors, Headquarters staff, and Staff Branches. Other groups and organizations that are also involved include the Governor's office, the Colorado State Legislature, federal agencies, state agencies, political subdivisions, community groups and the private sector. Stakeholder groups include the task forces mentioned previously and members from the Strategic Highway Safety Plan's Emphasis Area teams. All of these entities are vital in the ongoing mission to reduce crashes resulting in fatalities or serious injury on Colorado roadways

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.

In 2016 and 2017 Colorado experienced increases in fatal crashes, which after adopting Moving Towards Zero Deaths in 2013, is a disconcerting statistic. Colorado has experienced recent increases in population growth and vehicle miles traveled. With the legalization of marijuana, more and more technology causing distractions, climate change, low gas prices, a thriving local economy, and increasing population density in front range counties, there are many factors which play a part in the increased fatal crashes. While none of these factors alone can explain the increase, it is assumed that these and other factors all contribute to the increases Colorado is experiencing. It is anticipated that all of these factors will continue to increase, leading to continued increases in fatalities and serious injuries. The fatalities trend in 2018 does not indicate any reductions in traffic fatalities.

CDPHE and CDOT coordinated analysis of the fatality and crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line in Excel to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial regression appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. Using this data, in conjunction with other traffic data sources including citation data, arrest data, CDPHE BAC data and judicial data, was used as the basis for setting performance targets, selecting countermeasure strategies and developing projects.

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

In order to address the traffic safety challenges identified, the HSO solicits applications and projects that are data driven, evidence based and employ countermeasure strategies, through a statewide Request for Proposal, in order to achieve performance targets. Extensive outreach efforts to the State and local traffic safety communities are utilized in order to target areas with persistent traffic safety issues. Applications are reviewed by panels of subject matter experts including representatives from the CDPHE, traffics stakeholders and partners and HSO staff. Applications are evaluated on their

ability to impact statewide and local problem areas, as identified in the Problem Identification report, support local data, goals and proposed program activities and evaluation measures. Applications are also evaluated on their ability to impact performance measures and performance targets.

Enter list of information and data sources consulted.

Fatality Data

Crash Data

Judicial Impaired Driving Data

Citation Data

Arrest Data

Annual Seat Belt Survey

CDPHE BAC Data

Previous program performance data

Population Data

VMT

Vehicle Registration Dta

Motorcycle Safety Training Data

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).

In 2015, the Stat of Colorado adopted "Moving Towards Zero Deaths" as the State's bold new safety initiative and completed the new Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). This new vision and plan guide all safety stakeholders in Colorado to reduce the incidence and severity of motor vehicle crashes and the human and economic losses that are associated with them. The SHSP set specific visionary goals for reducing our fatality and serious injury rates, as well as the total number of crashes overall as compared to previous years.

Colorado has experienced recent increases in population growth and vehicle miles traveled. With the legalization of marijuana, technology related distractions, a thriving local economy, and increasing population density in front range counties, there are many factors which play a part in increased fatal crashes. While none of these factors alone can explain the increase, it is anticipated that all of these factors will continue and lead to increases in fatalities and serious injuries. The fatalities trend continued in 2017, with a 6% increase in fatalities, from 608 in 2016 to 648 in 2017.CDPHE and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic,

and power, but the polynomial regression appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These graphs represent several potential values for future crash numbers in the state and all predict significant increases in the crash numbers.

Of the five measures, three must be identically set for NHTSA's Highway Safety Plan and FHWA's Highway Safety Improvement Plan - Number of Fatalities, Fatality Rate per 100 Million VMT, Number of Serious Injuries. This was done through collaborative statistical analysis by CDOT's HSO and Traffic and Safety Engineering Branch. The current proposed targets are as follows and will be finalized upon reporting to NHTSA in June and FHWA in August of 2018.

Colorado 2019 Safety Targets 5-year Averages 2015-2019

Fatalities - 6644

Fatality Rate - 1.21

Serious Injuries - 2909

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)	In Progress
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)	In Progress
C-14) Fatalities Involving a Driver or Motorcycle Operator Testing Positive with a Delta 9 THC level of 5ng+	In Progress
C-12) Fatalities Involving a Distracted Driver	In Progress
C-13) Drivers 65 or Older Involved in Fatal Crashes	In Progress

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 610 traffic fatalities. Colorado continued to see an increase in overall traffic related fatalities. In 2016 there were 608 traffic related fatalities, in 2017 that number increased to 648, which is a 6% increase. This was the 6th consecutive year that traffic fatalities had increased, which in part was attributable to the information outlined in the highway safety planning process, the lack of a primary seat belt law, lack of a motorcycle helmet law and changes to the distracted driving statute. However, the HSO continued to address these challenges by aggressively seeking new and innovative projects and programs, utilizing problem identification to direct enforcement efforts, engage with partners and stakeholders of unrepresented populations and high visibility enforcement in multiple traffic challenges.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 3,350. Colorado experienced a decrease in serious injury crashes from 2,938 in 2016 to 2,909 in 2017. The HSO office attributed this in part to aggressively seeking

new and innovative projects and programs, utilizing problem identification to direct enforcement efforts, engaging with partners and stakeholders of unrepresented populations and high visibility enforcement in multiple traffic challenges.

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

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 1.20. Colorado continued to see an increase in fatalities/100M VMT. In 2017 the VMT was 1.21. This was the 3rd consecutive year of increases in VMT, which in part was attributable to the information outlined in the highway safety planning process, including increases in population growth and roadway congestion. However, the HSO continued to address these challenges by aggressively seeking new and innovative projects and programs, utilizing problem identification to direct enforcement efforts, engaging with partners and stakeholders of unrepresented populations and high visibility enforcement in multiple traffic challenges.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 186. In 2016, there were 186 unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities and in 2017, there were 220 which was an increase of 29%. This was attributed in part to the lack of a primary seat belt law. However, the HSO continued to address this challenge by participating in the 2018 CIOT May Mobilization, 2 rural CIOT campaigns and supporting a primary seat belt task force that provided testimony on a failed primary seat belt law initiative.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 150. In 2016, there were 137 and in 2017, there were 142 preliminary alcohol-impaired fatalities with a driver or motorcycle operator having a BAC of .08+. The HSO attributed the decrease in alcohol-impaired traffic fatalities to aggressive high-visibility enforcement campaigns based on problem identification, high level engagement from the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, and innovative public awareness campaigns.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 211. In 2016, there were 211 and in 2017, there were 230 speed-related fatalities. The HSO attributed this increase to population growth and roadway congestion. The HSO continued to address this performance measure through targeted speed enforcement activities, including night time enforcement, and in areas identified through the problem identification process. The HSO solicited and encouraged new agencies, including urban and rural, to participate in speed enforcement initiatives.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 125. In 2016, there were 125 and in 2017, there were 103 motorcyclist fatalities. The HSO attributed this decrease to high level involvement of the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board, aggressive public awareness campaigns directed to motorcyclists and motorists, and a decrease in unhelmeted motorcycle fatalities.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 77. In 2016, there 77 and in 2017, there were 67. The HSO attributed the decrease in unhelmeted motorcycle fatalities to high level engagement of the Motorcycle Advisory Board, aggressive public awareness campaigns directed to motorcyclists and motorists and state authorized basic motorcycle training which includes training on utilizing proper motorcycle gear to include helmets.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 59. In 2016, there were 59 and in 2017, 91 drivers aged 20 or younger were involved in fatal crashes. The 91 drivers was the highest total over a 10 year

period. The HSO attributed this increase in part to an increase in roadway congestion, population growth in this specific demographic and VMT.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 77. In 2016, there were 84 and in 2017, there were 92 pedestrian fatalities. This was the highest number of pedestrian fatalities in the past 10 years. The HSO office attributed this increase in part to roadway congestion, population growth and the traffic safety culture of high risk pedestrian behavior. The HSO continued to address all aspects of the pedestrian safety challenge through targeted high visibility enforcement of drivers and pedestrians that violate traffic safety laws, robust education of all roadway users, involvement in the pedestrian safety emphasis group of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and involvement in Denver's Vision Zero Plan.

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 15. In 2016, there were 16 and in 2017, there were 16 bicyclist fatalities. The HSO office attributed in part the lack of progress in this measure to roadway congestion, population growth and the traffic safety culture of Colorado roadway users. The HSO continued to address all aspects of the bicyclist safety challenge through education of all roadway users and involvement in Denver's Vision Zero Plan.

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

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 86%. In 2016, the rate was 84% and in 2017, the rate was 83.8%. These small fluctuations in usage rates are, at least in part, due to the vagaries of vehicle occupant behaviors in a secondary law state. It should be noted that in order for secondary law states to achieve a higher seat belt usage rate requires considerable investment in media and educational efforts must be significant in order to maintain current levels and to make even small gains. The HSO continued educational, outreach and enforcement

efforts through 3 CIOT campaigns and accompanying media efforts. Until Colorado achieves primary seat belt status the investment needed to gain a higher seatbelt usage rate is not justified.

C-14) Fatalities Involving a Driver or Motorcycle Operator Testing Positive with a Delta 9 THC level of 5ng+

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was updated to 50. In 2016, there were 52 and in 2017, there were 35 fatalities involving a driver or motorcycle operator testing positive with a Delta 9 THC level of 5ng+. The HSO attributed in part this decrease to high visibility enforcement of impaired drivers, increased law enforcement training in the detection of drugged drivers, robust partnerships with cannabis industries, increased educational outreach efforts and high level involvement of the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving.

C-12) Fatalities Involving a Distracted Driver

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 67. In 2016, there were 67 and in 2017, there were 70 fatalities involving a distracted driver. The HSO attributed the lack of progress in this performance measure in part to roadway congestion, population growth, the culture of acceptability in using technological devices while driving and the changes in Colorado statute making enforcement of the law challenging. The HSO addressed these challenges through high visibility enforcement and educational efforts.

C-13) Drivers 65 or Older Involved in Fatal Crashes

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.

In 2018, the Colorado performance target for this performance measure was 92. In 2016, there were 92 and in 2017, there were 89. The HSO continued educational and outreach efforts among this driving population.

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	644.0
C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2015	2019	2,909.0
C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2015	2019	1.210
C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	200.0
C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	170.0
C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	230.0
C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	125.0
C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	82.0
C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	75.0
C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	90.0
C-11) Number of bicyclists fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	2019	16.0
B-1) Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants (survey)	Annual	2019	2019	85.0
C-12) Fatalities Involving a Distracted Driver	Annual	2019	2019	70.0
C-13) Drivers 65 or Older Involved in Fatal Crashes	Annual	2019	2019	90.0

C-14) Fatalities Involving a Driver or Motorcycle Operator Testing Positive with a Delta 9 THC level of 5ng+	Annual	2019	2019	40.0
Percentage of Crash Reports Electronically Submitted to DOR	Annual	2019	2019	49.0

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: 644.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 2,909.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: Numeric

Target Value: 1.210
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 170.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 230.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 125.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?

- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 82.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 75.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth

Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 90.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State

Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: 16.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

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: Percentage
Target Value: 85.0
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.

This performance target was set given the current environment. It should be noted that in secondary law states to achieve a higher seat belt usage rate requires considerable investment in media, and educational efforts must be significant in order to maintain current levels and to make even small gains. Until Colorado achieves primary seat belt status the investment needed to gain a higher seatbelt usage rate is not justified.

C-12) Fatalities Involving a Distracted Driver

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-12) Fatalities Involving a Distracted Driver-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 70.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

C-13) Drivers 65 or Older Involved in Fatal Crashes

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-13) Drivers 65 or Older Involved in Fatal Crashes-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 90.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?

- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?
- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

C-14) Fatalities Involving a Driver or Motorcycle Operator Testing Positive with a Delta 9 THC level of 5ng+

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

No

C-14) Fatalities Involving a Driver or Motorcycle Operator Testing Positive with a Delta 9 THC level of 5ng+-2019
Target Metric Type: Numeric
Target Value: 40.0
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.

In order for the HSO to direct funds to the highest and best use, the HSO relies on the results of the annual Problem Identification report and other data sources to answer the following key questions:

- Where are the State's most urgent behavioral traffic safety problems?
- Which drivers are most likely to be involved in a crash? Are there particular segments of the population that are over-represented as drivers in crashes?

- Where should the HSO direct crash prevention funds and for what types of activities?

The Problem Identification report incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Other data sources include behavioral risk surveys (Healthy Kids Colorado, Youth Risk Behavior Survey) and the *Colorado* Health Information Dataset. The HSO also utilizes the expertise of various State mandated task forces including the Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving, State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, the Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board and the Emergency Medical Trauma Services Injury Prevention Group.

To establish the target for this performance measure, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and CDOT coordinated analysis of the crash data through various methods including Loess regression and a polynomial regression line to create best fit curves. Other models were examined including straight line, exponential, linear, logarithmic, and power, but the polynomial and loess regressions appeared to be the best fit model for the existing crash data. These analyses assisted CDOT in establishing one year performance measure targets and future targets.

Percentage of Crash Reports Electronically Submitted to DOR

Is this a traffic records system performance measure?

Yes

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

Percentage of Crash Reports Electronically Submitted to DOR-2019
Target Metric Type: Percentage
Target Value: 49.0
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.

Colorado Traffic Records System continues to make improvements and is on par with many other states across the nation, but significant problems remain. Most databases still function as islands of information with limited data sharing and integration. Data remains inconsistent from one dataset to another. The quality of some data is questionable and accessibility is limited. State agencies continue to change and build databases with limited input from other state partners. While the State Traffic Records Advisory Committee (STRAC) continues to work to solve

these issues, we are often limited by resources, involvement, support, and understanding of STRAC at the higher department levels. Today more than ever, it remains vital for stakeholders to have reliable traffic records data upon which to make decisions concerning policy formulation and allocation of resources. Continuous improvements in data collection, accessibility, and quality are required to keep pace with changing needs and technology.

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	8395
A-2) Number of impaired driving arrests made during grant-funded enforcement activities	
Fiscal year	2017
Impaired driving arrests	13499
A-3) Number of speeding citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities*	
Fiscal year	2017
Speeding citations	3340

5 Program areas

Program Area Hierarchy

1. Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
    - Training and Judicial Support
        - LE/Judical Training/Educ
            - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low
            - NHTSA 402

- Impaired Driving HVE
  - Impaired Driving HVE
    - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low

2. Speed Management
   - Sustained Enforcement
     - Sustained Speed Enforcement
       - FAST Act NHTSA 402
3. Young Drivers
   - School Programs
     - Youth Peer-to-Peer Program
       - FAST Act NHTSA 402
4. Traffic Records
   - Comprehensive TR Improvement Initiatives
     - FY19 Traffic Records Improvements
       - FAST Act 405c Data Program
5. Occupant Protection (Child Passenger Safety)
   - Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)
     - CPS Inspection Stations
       - FAST Act NHTSA 402
6. Occupant Protection (Adult)
   - Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement
     - Occupant Protection HVE
       - FAST Act 405b OP Low
       - FAST Act NHTSA 402
7. Older Drivers
   - Older Driver Education
     - Older Driver Education
       - FAST Act NHTSA 402
8. Distracted Driving
   - Distracted Driving HVE/Education
     - Distracted Driving HVE/Education
       - NHTSA 402
9. Non-motorized (Pedestrians)
   - Pedestrian Enforcement and Education
     - Enforcement and Education
       - FAST Act NHTSA 402
10. Communications (Media)
    - Communication Campaign
      - Communications and Outreach
        - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low
        - FAST Act NHTSA 402
        - FAST Act 405f Motorcycle Programs
11. Motorcycle Safety
12. Planning & Administration
    - (none)
      - Program Support
        - FAST Act NHTSA 402
        - FAST Act NHTSA 402
        - FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low

- FAST Act 405c Data Program

5.1 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)?

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 2016, there were 608 traffic fatalities in Colorado. There were 213 fatalities involving an alcohol and/or drug (5ng THC+) impaired driver. There were 161 alcohol-impaired and 52 5ng THC+ drug-impaired fatalities. 35% of all fatalities involved an impaired driver, 26% of these fatalities involved an alcohol-impaired driver and 8% involved an 5ng THC+ impaired driver. This is a 20% increase from the impaired driving fatalities in 2015.

The HSO will address impaired driving related crashes and fatalities through, high visibility enforcement, on targeted roadways identified in the 2018 Colorado Department of Transportation Problem Identification Report.

Adams County has the fifth highest population in the state of Colorado and consists of many large metro cities to include, Aurora, Westminster, Thornton, Commerce City and Brighton. In 2016 Adams County had 12 fatal crashes in which 14 individuals lost their lives. 6 or 50% of those crashes were impaired related.

The City of Aurora includes Adams and Arapahoe counties. In 2016, Adams County had 12 impaired driving related fatalities. This reflects a 32% increase over the previous 5 years. In 2016, Arapahoe County had 14 impaired driving related fatalities. This represents a 15% increase over the past 5 years. Of those 26 impaired driving fatalities in those two counties in 2016, 7 or 27% occurred in the City of Aurora.

The Colorado State Patrol enforces traffic laws of the state of Colorado on approximately 8,483 miles of state highways and more than 57,000 miles of county roads. In 2016, 317 individuals were killed in crashes

investigated by Colorado State Patrol Troopers, a 0.6% increase over the 315 fatalities in CY 2015. In 2016, CSP Troopers responded to a total of 4,103 fatal and injury crashes, 563 or 13.7% were impaired related.

The City and County of Denver, with a growing population of more than 690,000, saw a 100% increase in the number of fatalities with an impaired driver from 2015 to 2016, with 11 fatalities and 22 fatalities, respectively. With the high concentration of sporting/event centers, dance clubs, and bars in central downtown-paired with the special events and fairs that take place in Denver-make the city an environment that it is constantly at risk for having impaired drivers on the road.

The total estimated population of Jefferson County in 2016 is 571,837; and the population of unincorporated Jefferson County directly served by the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office is 200,130. In 2016, impaired driving was the largest individual contributor to crashes resulting in injuries and fatalities in Jefferson County (22.78%). Jefferson County was ranked number 2 in the State of Colorado for impaired driving caused crashes.

Checkpoint Colorado-Colorado law enforcement agencies selected through the Problem Identification Report will target areas in the state identified as having high rates of impaired driving related crashes and fatalities. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) research shows that in areas where sobriety checkpoints are routinely practiced, the number of impaired driving related crashes and fatalities are reduced. The selected law enforcement agencies will conduct a minimum of three checkpoints, with two of those checkpoints to occur during holiday weekends. This project runs from Memorial Day through Labor Day. Agency selection is based on 2016 crash and fatality data.

Of the 64 counties in the state of Colorado, 56 counties contributed to the 608 fatal crashes in 2016. 31.36% were impaired related crashes.

Used in law enforcement environments, portable breath alcohol test systems are lightweight and ideal for evidential testing applications, printing results, and in many cases mobile data collection. In 2016 the Colorado Department of Transportation distributed 103 Lifeloc and/or Intoximeters to approximately 51 law enforcement agencies. These agencies were participating in High Visibility Impaired Driving Enforcement, Law Enforcement Assistance Fund (L.E.A.F.) overtime enforcement and/or the Checkpoint Colorado campaigns.

The Colorado Task Force on Drunk and Impaired Driving (CTFDID) will continue to support the prevention, awareness, enforcement and treatment of drunk and impaired driving in Colorado through strong partnerships with public, private and non-profit organizations.

The CTFDID brings community and government organizations together, creating a forum for victims and advocates to access many subject matter experts and resources in one place. The CTFDID provides a formal mechanism to leverage resources in order to create a multi-faceted approach to solving a problem which is often minimized and understated. The CTFDID acts as a resource for the legislature, enabling it to consider more cohesive, well-thought-out proposals.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)	Annual	2019	170.0
2019	C-14) Fatalities Involving a Driver or Motorcycle Operator Testing Positive with a Delta 9 THC level of 5ng+	Annual	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	Training and Judicial Support
2019	Impaired Driving HVE

5.1.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Training and Judicial Support

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	Training and Judicial Support

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.

Training and Judicial Support are critical to Colorado's changing and complex impaired driving environment. These strategies are designed to train and support Colorado law enforcement, prosecutors, the Colorado Judicial System and specialty courts. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to reduce the prevalence of impaired driving related injuries and fatalities. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.*

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

Impaired driver fatalities represent a significant portion of Colorado's total traffic fatalities. Training and Judicial Support are vital to roadway safety by providing tools and resources to law enforcement and the judicial system to impact impaired driving in Colorado. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting these countermeasure strategies is that they are evidence-based countermeasures as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 LE and Judicial	LE/Judical Training/Educ	Training and Judicial Support

5.1.1.1 Planned Activity: LE/Judical Training/Educ

Planned activity name	LE/Judical Training/Educ
Planned activity number	FY19 LE and Judicial
Primary countermeasure strategy	Training and Judicial Support

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.

In 2019, the planned LE/Judicial Training/Education activities include;

- the Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Training/School which will continue to expand the program, enhance the current training program and increase the number of DRE's within the State.
- the DRE Tech Transfer which provides registration and travel costs to attend conferences and events related to DRE training and that will be shared with law enforcement and traffic safety partners throughout the State.
- the Law Enforcement Coordinators (LEC's) who coordinate all statewide training and local activities for law enforcement agencies. The LEC's will serve as a link to promote the HSO's programs including; Impaired Driving, Occupant Protection, Speed, Distracted Driving, Pedestrian Safety and Motorcycle Awareness.

- the LEAD Impairment Training will provide DRE/SFST practitioner and instructor training and updates to law enforcement officers in basic and advanced impaired driving programs.
- the Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) which provides training and technical assistance to prosecutors and law enforcement to increase skill and knowledge of impaired driving including SFST, DRE and courtroom testimony/prosecution.
- Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) Court Monitoring which involves implementation of a court monitoring program in the Second (Denver) and the Forth (El Paso and Teller) judicial districts focusing on Prosecutors and Judges.
- the development and implementation of DUI Courts to provide intensive treatment, monitoring and supervision of high risk impaired-driving offenders.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Colorado Department of Transportation, Office of Highway Safety

LEAD Impairment Training

Colorado Law Enforcement Traffic Safety Coordination Services, Inc.

Colorado District Attorney's Council

Mothers Against Drunk Driving

Colorado Judicial Department

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 and Judicial Support

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

	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low	405d Impaired Driving Low (FAST)	$942,500.00		
	NHTSA 402	Alcohol	$202,500.00	$1,600,000.00	$202,500.00

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.					

5.1.2 Countermeasure Strategy: Impaired Driving HVE

Program area	Impaired Driving (Drug and Alcohol)
Countermeasure strategy	Impaired Driving HVE

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 (HVE) events are designed to deploy law enforcement resources in areas identified through problem identification as having high incidents of impaired driving. These events are designed to deter impaired driving by increasing the perceived risk of arrest on Colorado roadways. HVE events are highly publicized prior, during and after the event. Colorado's impaired driving related fatalities (alcohol and marijuana) are consistently 30% and above of the total fatality number. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to reduce the prevalence of impaired driving related injuries and fatalities. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

Impaired driver fatalities represent a significant portion of Colorado's total traffic fatalities. High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) events are vital to roadway safety by publicizing the enforcement prior, during and after the event and vigorously enforcing impaired driving laws. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 Impaired Driving HVE	Impaired Driving HVE	Impaired Driving HVE

5.1.2.1 Planned Activity: Impaired Driving HVE

Planned activity name	Impaired Driving HVE

Planned activity number	FY19 Impaired Driving HVE
Primary countermeasure strategy	Impaired Driving HVE

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.

In 2019, the Impaired Driving High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) includes the participation of multiple Colorado law enforcement agencies, both State and local, in 15 HVE campaigns that are conducted through the Highway Safety Office (HSO). The HVE campaigns are; New Years Eve, Holiday Party Enforcement, Thanksgiving Holiday Weekend, Halloween Weekend, Fall Festival Enforcement, Checkpoint Colorado, Labor Day Weekend, Sturgis Rally, July Fourth Weekend, Summer Blitz, Memorial Day Weekend, Spring Event Enforcement, St. Patrick's Day, Super Bowl Weekend and Winter Blitz. The HVE includes media campaigns prior, during and after the enforcement events to inform the public regarding the upcoming enforcement activities as well as inform them of the outcomes.

The enforcement activities are designed by the participating agencies using problem identification, approved by the HSO, and include strategies such as, saturation patrols, increased patrols, multi-jurisdictional task for activities and checkpoints.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Adams County Sheriff's Office

Aurora Police Department

Colorado State Patrol

Denver Police Department

Jefferson County Sheriff's Office

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	Impaired Driving HVE

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
	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low	405d Impaired Driving Low (FAST)	$1,120,500.00	$1,130,000.00	

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 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.

In 2016 there were 608 traffic fatalities in Colorado. There were 211 speed-related fatalities which comprised 35% of the total. This is a 3% decrease from the 217 speed-related fatalities in 2015.

The HSO will address speed-related crashes and fatalities through, high visibility enforcement, on targeted roadways identified in the 2018 Colorado Motor Vehicle Problem Identification Dashboard.

In 2016 City of Aurora had 8,328 traffic crashes involving 21,318 roadway users. Of the roadway users a total of 658 or 3 percent reported some type of injury. A review of all 2016 crashes indicated that 10% of had speed as a contributing factor and 8 percent had following too closely as a factor. Following too closely violations can be directly associated with speeding and aggressive driving behaviors.

The City of Aurora is located in Arapahoe and Adams Counties;

Adams County had 60 traffic fatalities. There were 19 speed-related fatalities which comprised 32 percent of the total.

Arapahoe County had 46 traffic fatalities. There were 19 speed-related fatalities which comprised 41 percent of the total.

In 2016 City of Colorado Springs issued 40,370 traffic citations. Forty two percent or over 17, 027 were citations for speeding. Seventy Five percent of the citations issued for speeding were for speed in excess of 10 miles over the posted limit and 14 percent were for speed in excess of 20 miles over the posted limit.

The City of Colorado Springs is located in El Paso County;

El Paso County had 48 traffic related fatalities. There were 22 speed related fatalities which comprised 45 percent of the total.

In 2016 City of Pueblo issued 5,262 traffic citations for speeding. Twenty percent of fatality crashes in in Pueblo involved excessive speed.

The City of Pueblo is located in Pueblo County. Pueblo County had 20 traffic fatalities. There were 4 speed-related fatalities which comprised 20% of the total.

In 2016 City and County of Denver ranks as one of Colorado's top 5 counties with the most fatalities from motor vehicle crashes. Speed-related fatalities remain a major traffic safety problem in Denver. There were 486 traffic crashes in Denver resulting in serious bodily injury.

Denver County had 54 traffic fatalities. There were 22 speed-related fatalities which comprised 40% of the total.

From 2015 to 2017 City of Lakewood which is located in Jefferson County had a total of over 11,000 crashes and 38 traffic fatalities analysis of these crashes by Lakewood Police indicates that excessive speed is a contributing factor in the majority of crashes.

In 2015 in Jefferson County in 2015, 6 percent of injury and fatal crashes and 5 percent of non-injury crashes involved speeding. The portion of Highway 285 in Jefferson County has consistently been third highest in

total crashes. In 2017, there were 211 total crashes on Highway 285, 219 crashes on Interstate 70 and 251 crashes on C-470. Excessive speed is overrepresented as a contributing factor in these crashes.

Jefferson County had 48 traffic fatalities. There were 20 speed-related fatalities which comprised 42% of the total.

> These six counties (Arapahoe, Adams, El Paso, Pueblo, Denver and Jefferson) counties had 134 speed related fatalities or 22% of all speed related fatalities in 2016.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-6) Number of speeding-related fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	230.0

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

5.2.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Sustained Enforcement

Program area	Speed Management
Countermeasure strategy	Sustained 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)

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.

High Visibility Speed Enforcement is designed to deploy law enforcement resources in areas identified through problem identification as having high incidents of speed related crashes and fatalities. Colorado's speed related fatalities are consistently 35% and above of the total fatality number. Speed is the most identified causal factor in all Colorado crashes. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to reduce the prevalence of speed related injuries and fatalities. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

Speed related fatalities represent a significant portion of Colorado's total traffic fatalities. Sustained speed enforcement coupled with roadway engineers setting appropriate speed limits, are integral to reducing speed related crashes and fatalities. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 Speed Enforcement	Sustained Speed Enforcement	Sustained Enforcement

5.2.1.1 Planned Activity: Sustained Speed Enforcement

Planned activity name	Sustained Speed Enforcement
Planned activity number	FY19 Speed Enforcement
Primary countermeasure strategy	Sustained Enforcement

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.

In 2019, the Speed Management Sustained Speed Enforcement activities include;

- High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) of speed-related traffic violations (Speeding, Following too Closely and Aggressive Driving) at designated times and roadways identified through problem identification as being over represented with speed-related crashes and fatalities.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Aurora Police Department

Colorado Springs Police Department

Denver Police Department

Jefferson County Sheriff's Office

Lakewood Police Department

Pueblo Police Department

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

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
	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Speed Enforcement (FAST)	$429,000.00		$429,000.00

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 Program Area: Young Drivers

Program area type	Young Drivers

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.

The number of drivers aged 15-20 years old involved in a fatal motor vehicle crash decreased by 12 percent from 2015 – 2016. However, from 2015 to 2016 the number of motor vehicle fatalities among people aged 15-20 years old, regardless of the age of driver, increased by 22 percent. Young drivers had a higher percentage of speeding, lane violations and reckless driving compared to those drivers aged 21 and older when involved in an injury or fatal crash. Other contributing factors in descending order include inexperience, distraction and impairment (drugs and/or alcohol). For drivers under 21 the highest likelihood of them being involved in a crash is their first six months of licensure.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210

2019	C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)	Annual	2019	75.0

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 Programs

5.3.1 Countermeasure Strategy: School Programs

Program area	Young Drivers
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]

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)]

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.

Youth peer-to-peer programs are designed to address the behavioral issues typically associated with novice drivers to include; alcohol, drugs, distracted driving, low seat belt use and others issues. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to reduce the prevalence of drivers aged 20 or younger involved in fatal and serious injury crashes. School based, youth peer-to-peer programs are designed to help young drivers identify behaviors that cause them the greatest risk on the road and also recognize that they have the ability and power to act upon and address them. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

Young drivers age 20 or younger are over represented in Colorado's total traffic fatalities. Youth peer-to-peer programs are vital to protecting vulnerable young drivers by providing education and awareness. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 Teen Traffic Safety	Youth Peer-to-Peer Program	School Programs

5.3.1.1 Planned Activity: Youth Peer-to-Peer Program

Planned activity name	Youth Peer-to-Peer Program
Planned activity number	FY19 Teen Traffic Safety
Primary countermeasure strategy	School 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.

High Risk Population Countermeasure Program - Young Drivers (S405b)

For 2018 the HSO will target two high-risk populations: 1) Unrestrained Drivers of Rural Roadways and 2) Young Drivers.

Fatalities involving drivers aged 20 or younger consistently range from 12%-15% of total fatalities. Although Colorado has made tremendous progress in teen motor vehicle safety, motor vehicle crashes remain one of the leading causes of death for Colorado teens. The number of drivers aged 15-20 years old involved in a fatal motor vehicle crash decreased by 12 percent from 2015 to 2016, however, from 2015 to 2016 the number of motor vehicle fatalities among people aged 15-20 years old, regardless of the age of the driver, increased by 22 percent. Young drivers had a higher percentage of speeding, lane violations, and reckless driving compared to those drivers aged 21 or older when involved in an injury or fatal crash.

In order to address these local agencies, coalitions and Schools throughout the State are being funded to support sustained multi-year programs to support occupant protection strategies to increase the overall seat belt usage rate in rural areas, reduce the number of unrestrained fatalities in rural areas and to reduce the number of overall traffic fatalities. Outreach to targeted groups including young drivers is being emphasized.

Planned program activities include information distribution at Health and Safety Fairs in schools, high school safety belt challenges, seat belt observations and awareness activities conducted by local youth groups within high schools, awareness education such as Alive at 25 and outreach to young drivers.

In 2019, Young Drivers Youth Peer-to-Peer Program activities include;

- using a peer-to-peer program led by students involved in school-based groups or clubs, such as SADD, Inc. (Students Against Destructive Decisions) or Teens in the Driver Seat (TDS), who are responsible for developing and promoting safe teen driving messages in their schools. Students are in charge of delivering the intervention(s) and participating in activities involving their peers based on identification of the problems within their specific school.
- one-time events, such as ThinkFast Interactive and University Hospital's P.A.R.T.Y. Program (Prevent Alcohol and Risk Related Trauma in Youth), which utilize additional activities for schools who have strong, on-going programs throughout the school year.
- Nine distinct young driver programs will be funded around the State that will encompass dozens of high schools and youth led groups Statewide.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Children's Hospital of Colorado

Conejos County Public Health

Denver Department of Public Health

Drive Smart Evergreen/Conifer

SADD, Inc.

Texas A&M Transportation Institute – dba Teens in the Driver's Seat

ThinkFast Interactive

University of Colorado Hospital

Weld County Public Health

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

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
	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Teen Safety Program (FAST)	$698,500.00		$698,500.00

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.					

5.4 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.

Colorado Traffic Records System continues to make improvements and is on par with many other states across the nation, but significant problems remain. Most databases still function as islands of information with limited data sharing and integration. Data remains inconsistent from one dataset to another. The quality of some data is questionable and accessibility is limited. State agencies continue to change and build databases with limited input from other state partners. While the State Traffic Records Advisory Committee (STRAC) continues to work to solve these issues, we are often limited by resources, involvement, support, and understanding of STRAC at the higher department levels. Today more than ever, it remains vital for stakeholders to have reliable traffic records data upon which to make decisions concerning policy formulation and allocation of resources. Continuous improvements in data collection, accessibility, and quality are required to keep pace with changing needs and technology.

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 End Year	Target Value(Performance

		Target)		Target)
2019	Percentage of Crash Reports Electronically Submitted to DOR	Annual	2019	49.0

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	Comprehensive TR Improvement Initiatives

5.4.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Comprehensive TR Improvement Initiatives

Program area	Traffic Records
Countermeasure strategy	Comprehensive TR Improvement Initiatives

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 following strategies were identified for Colorado's statewide traffic records system:

1. **Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management:** Provide a sustainable, ongoing, dynamic mechanism for strategic decision making for traffic records improvements, for project coordination, and for project implementation.
2. **Strategic Planning:** Develop and maintain performance measures based on recommendations from the Traffic Records Assessment.
3. **Crash Data:** Identify and implement improvements to crash records based on recommendations from the Traffic Records Assessment.
4. **Vehicle Data:** Improve integration of vehicle records into the traffic records system.
5. **Driver Data:** Improve integration of driver records into the traffic records system.
6. **Roadway Data:** Improve integration and linkage of roadway data with traffic records.
7. **Citation/Adjudication Data:** Institute electronic citation projects to facilitate the development of statewide citation data and provide linkage to traffic records.
8. **EMS/Injury Surveillance Data:** Pursue integration of EMS/Hospital files with crash and other traffic records files.
9. **Data Use and Integration:** Improve data linkage between traffic records data systems.

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

Colorado Traffic Records System continues to make improvements and is on par with many other states across the nation, but significant problems remain. Most databases still function as islands of information with limited data sharing and integration. Data remains inconsistent from one dataset to another. The quality of some data is questionable and accessibility is limited. State agencies continue to change and build databases with limited input from other state partners. While the State Traffic Records Advisory Committee (STRAC) continues to work to solve these issues, we are often limited by resources, involvement, support, and understanding of STRAC at the higher department levels. Today more than ever, it remains vital for stakeholders to have reliable traffic records data upon which to make decisions concerning policy formulation and allocation of resources. Continuous improvements in data collection, accessibility, and quality are required to keep pace with our changing needs and technology.

Colorado and STRAC have engaged in strategic planning for traffic records improvements for more than a decade, and STRAC published a strategic plan in 2005, 2008, and 2012. The fourth revision to the Strategic Plan covers the four year period from 2016 through 2019. Aspects of each of these plans have been integrated into Colorado's Highway Safety

Plan and appropriate performance based objectives, action steps, and evaluation measures were integrated into Colorado's Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Additionally, in 2004, 2009, and 2015, STRAC requested that NHTSA facilitate a Traffic Records Assessment on Colorado's traffic records system. These assessments resulted in recommendations for improvement in all areas of the state's traffic records system. These recommendations form the basis of the objectives and performance measures for the revised strategic plan.

The STRAC membership believes this revised Strategic Plan will again provide the framework for improvement to the statewide traffic records system and will guide all state agencies as they plan and develop specific projects to improve our records systems and data. The plan includes clearly defined objectives and performance measures for each of the nine traffic records modules. We also believe that the partnerships and coordination provided for in this strategic plan will increase public safety and create the environment for improving the state's traffic records system. This will be accomplished by maximizing efficiencies through interagency cooperation and leveraging both existing resources and potential federal funding opportunities.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The Traffic Records program includes a number of goals, objectives and planned activities identified as areas for improvements by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). All of them serve the ultimate goal of an integrated traffic records system in Colorado that delivers timely, high quality data for appropriate traffic safety decisions at all levels.

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
FY19 Traffic Records	FY19 Traffic Records Improvements	Comprehensive TR Improvement Initiatives

5.4.1.1 Planned Activity: FY19 Traffic Records Improvements

Planned activity name	FY19 Traffic Records Improvements
Planned activity number	FY19 Traffic Records
Primary countermeasure strategy	Comprehensive TR Improvement Initiatives

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]

Yes

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]

Yes

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.

The Lakewood PD is in the process of transitioning from our current RMS (I Leads) and our current e-citation software (Report Beam) to a new RMS system (Niche) that will combine both the traffic accident reporting function and the e-citation function into one program, which will reduce the amount of time both officers and Records spend on traffic accident and citation entry

TR Coordinator to organize traffic records systems among all the agencies involved. The TRC would work closely with the STRAC, CDOT, DOR, CSP and other agencies (including Police Departments) involved with traffic records. The TRC will act as a liaison among the involved agencies, under the guidance of the Project Manager. This project will be an extension of the 2016 contract signed 1/12/16.

Fund the attendance of six core STRAC Members (to be determined based on priority) to attend the International Traffic Records Conference hosted by National Safety Council and sponsored by NHTSA, FHWA, FMCSA, and BTS (Bureau of Transportation Statistics). This task will enable the attendees to learn many aspects of TR.

Implement NICHE - Implementation of the Niche Records Management System will be accomplished in multiple phases, which will create efficiencies within the organization and improve the quality of data for CSP Law Enforcement Records.
● Phase II: Accommodate changes required for the DR3447 and the DOR interface.
● Preliminary analysis and design of the required changes will be complete by September 30, 2018 - Project start Date of March 2018 - Tentative Completion Date of Dec 2018 (partially of this budget proposal)
○ System Design, Development, Configuration and Testing Oct 2018 through Sep 2019. Note: This phase of the project is dependent on the DR3447 being finalized, approved and released.
● Phase III - Continue automation of CSP Law Enforcement Records Data for data accuracy

Support the ongoing cooperative agreement with NHTSA/NCSA for Colorado to provide an overall measure of highway safety using fatal crash data. Most of the costs are funded by FARS (NHTSA); this is just supplemental funding.

405C Traffic Records Program Management, including but not limited to: Grant and project management, Participation in STRAC events and facilitation, Operating costs & Participation in the Traffic Records Forum.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Lakewood PD
CDOT
STRAC / CDOT
CSP

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	Comprehensive TR Improvement Initiatives

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 405c Data Program	405c Data Program (FAST)	$1,055,773.00	$355,884.00	

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: Occupant Protection (Child Passenger Safety)

Program area type	Occupant Protection (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.

There were 186 unrestrained motor vehicle occupant fatalities in 2016, a 1% decrease from 2015. These 186 unrestrained fatalities represented 52% of the 352 passenger vehicle occupant fatalities. Of those 186 unrestrained fatalities, there were 5 in the 0-4 age group and 7 in the 5-8 age group.

Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death for children 4 years of age and older and the second leading cause of death for children under 4.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)	Annual	2019	200.0

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	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

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

Program area	Occupant Protection (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)]

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.

Child passenger safety (CPS) inspection stations are designed to give parents and caregivers assistance from certified technicians on the proper fit of a child passenger restraint system. Certified CPS technicians and instructors provide information to the traveling public about proper seating positions for children and air bag equipped motor vehicles, the importance of restraint use and instruction on the proper use of child restraint systems. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to improve occupant protection statewide in order to reduce the prevalence of unrestrained injuries and fatalities. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death for children 4 years of age and older and the second leading cause of death for children under 4. CPS inspection stations are vital to ensure the correct installation of child passenger seats in an effort combat misuse of child restraint devices and to reduce serious injuries and fatalities among child motor vehicle passengers. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 CPS	CPS Inspection Stations	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

5.5.1.1 Planned Activity: CPS Inspection Stations

Planned activity name	CPS Inspection Stations
Planned activity number	FY19 CPS
Primary countermeasure strategy	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

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.

In 2018, Colorado has 165 registered inspection stations throughout the state encompassing 38 counties, including stations that cover urban, rural and at risk populations. All inspections stations are staffed by national standardized child passenger safety technicians. The inspection stations are available to schedule car seat checks through regularly scheduled office hours or on an appointment basis. Hours of operation are listed by inspection station online at www.carseatscolorado.com.

The Car Seats Colorado training program has identified several counties within Colorado that have a low technician to pediatric population rate per county. In 2018, Car Seats Colorado provided technician training in those counties to increase the number of active CPS technicians in those under-served areas. In 2019, CPS technicians will continue to be active in these under-served communities across Colorado, including outreach and services to Latino, African American and Native American populations.

In 2018, CPS Team Colorado will have approximately 1266 certified child passenger safety technicians and 37 certified child passenger safety technician instructors throughout the state. The technicians and instructors increase visibility and public accessibility of available CPS programs. They also provide information to the public about proper seating positions for children in air bag equipped motor vehicles, the importance of restraint use, and instruction on the proper use of child restraint systems. In 2018, new technicians will be recruited and trained, in twelve technician training courses, through the National Standardized Child Passenger Safety Technician training curriculum. The recertification rate for Colorado CPS technicians in 2018 was 55.6% up from 54.0%, the year prior.

New Technician Trainings:

For 2018, the state will conduct national standardized technician trainings by partnering with agencies such as The Children's Hospital, Regional Emergency Trauma Advisory Councils (RETACs), Department of Health and other concerned entities. These three-day training sessions will be available statewide. It is anticipated that 150 new technicians will be trained by sub-grantees/partners. Training sessions will be held in similar locations for 2019.

Car Seats Colorado will continue to focus on assisting certified technicians with the recertification process by offering a variety of pre-approved continuing education sessions. Each session will be preauthorized by Safe Kids Worldwide with the six required continuing education units (CEU). During 2018, there will be 30 continuing education sessions and advocate trainings available to law enforcement, health care providers, and professional groups across the state. These trainings will be held Statewide, in locations similar in 2019.

Certified CPS Technician Trainings:

The following workshops are available for all certified CPS technicians:

- CEU sessions for recertification
- Inspection station administrative training workshops
- Colorado law enforcement workshops
- Hospital based CPS program sessions

The Car Seats Colorado training program has identified several counties within Colorado that have a low technician to pediatric population rate per county. In 2018, CPS Team Colorado will provide technician training courses in areas that impact those counties to increase the number of active CPS technicians in those under-served areas. Once these trainings are complete, CPS technicians will have an opportunity to be active in under-served communities across Colorado. The under-served areas were identifies by comparing population rate to technician rate by county. The counties identified for the 2018 cycle are as followed: El Paso, Mesa, Arapahoe/Douglas, Denver Metro, Alamosa/Rio Grande/Saguache, Montezuma, Grand and Pueblo.

Car Seats Colorado provides the National Standardized Child Passenger Safety Technician training to individuals to become certified CPS technicians and instructors, allowing those individuals to educate the public and assist with the proper selection, installation, and use of child safety seats. All potential CPS technicians must successfully complete the training program and meet all certification requirements outlined

in the NHTSA Standardized Child Passenger Safety Technician Policies & Procedures Manual. The information below provides an overview of trainings to date in 2018. Similar types of trainings and services will remain level for 2019.

Car Seats Colorado offered a combined total of 40 classes which included 3 renewal, 13 refresher, 17 advocate, and 7 new technician classes.

• 1423 new child passenger restraints were issued to families.

• At the end of FFY17, Colorado reached a recertification rate of 58% with the national average of 58.2% up from 56.3% last year. The program certified 112 new CPS Technicians and deployed in to the field. The technicians include nurses, caregivers, fire fighters, law enforcement officers and support staff.

• The program trained 132 CPS Technicians in CEU/ Refresher classes to complete recertification requirements.

• In 2016 Car Seats Colorado incorporated a car seat recycle program and to date over 7500 seats have been properly recycled through the program and holds 20 locations statewide.

Public education programs taught by certified CPS technicians and instructors include, but not limited to, information on the following topics:

- Parents and caregivers of newborns
- Parents and caregivers of children (birth to 16 years)
- Child care providers
- EMS and registered nurses in the hospital setting
- Law enforcement officers
- School bus drivers
- Booster seat/seat belt program (5-8 year olds)

Certified CPS technicians and instructors will provide information to the public about proper seating positions for children in airbag-equipped motor vehicles, the importance of restraint use, and instruction on the proper use of child restraint systems. The link below provides an overview of educational events and check-up events across the state in 2018: https://www.facebook.com/carseatscolorado/events?key=events.

In 2019, it is anticipated the same levels of events and trainings will be maintained.

All inspections stations are staffed by national standardized child passenger safety technicians.

In 2019, the Occupant Protection (Child Passenger Safety) Inspection Stations planned activities also include;

- ongoing nursing education to ensure that 100% of new parents discharged are receiving car seat safety education. Outreach and communication in the local community to increase the amount of infants and young children using the correct restraint for their size and age. Increase the number of people utilizing Swedish Medical Center’s car seat inspection station.
- increasing the number of certified car seat technicians, Child Passenger Safety (CPS) awareness, education and enforcement activities to all State Patrol districts statewide, and engage statewide organizations such as CO Community Health Network.
- offering educational programming to schools and daycares on the importance of using proper restraints for children in vehicles.

- targeting Denver communities and schools near the High Injury Network (HIN) with lower restraint compliance through partnership with Denver Vision Zero with messaging to support policy initiatives such as primary seat belt law.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Colorado State Patrol

Denver Department of Public Health

Summit County Public Health

Swedish Medical Center

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
	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Child Restraint (FAST)	$425,230.00		$150,230.00

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: Occupant Protection (Adult)

Program area type	Occupant Protection (Adult)

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.

The Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) Office of Transportation Safety (OTS) is the designated agency to receive highway safety funds. The Highway Safety Office (HSO), within the OTS, administers these funds with the goals of reducing traffic crashes, fatalities, and injuries in Colorado through the coordinated efforts of state and local agencies, groups, coalitions, and organizations. The HSO takes the lead on addressing occupant protection issues within Colorado and developing statewide plans to address these issues.

Lower than average seat belt use rates and high unbelted occupant fatality rates continue to be a challenge for many counties, both urban and rural, throughout Colorado. The statewide average seat belt compliance rate for 2017 was 83.8% and preliminary 2017 unrestrained passenger motor vehicle fatalities averaged 51%. The Statewide seat belt usage rate is below the national average of 90% and Colorado remains one of the few States without a primary seat belt law.

Based on the 2018 CDOT Problem Identification and the 2017 Statewide Seat Belt Use Survey, the Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) Highway Safety Office (HSO) will be focusing on establishing and enhancing Occupant Protection and Child Passenger Safety programs in several metro area locations including Denver, Arapahoe, Jefferson and El Paso counties; rural areas with high unrestrained fatalities and where seat belt usage rates are lower than the Statewide rate and numerous state-wide efforts.

In 2016, the State of Colorado experienced 608 motor vehicle fatalities. Of the 608, 186 or 31% of the fatalities involved an unrestrained occupant. The 186 unrestrained fatalities represent 52% of the 362 passenger vehicle occupant fatalities. Colorado is a secondary enforcement State and the Statewide Seat Belt observed usage rate hovers around 84%.

The HSO will address occupant protection related crashes and fatalities through, high visibility enforcement, on targeted roadways identified in the 2018 Colorado Department of Transportation Problem Identification

Report.

The City of Aurora is comprised of Adams and Arapahoe Counties. In 2016, Adams County had 60 fatal crashes in which there were 20 or 33% unrestrained occupants. That is double the unrestrained fatalities over the prior five years. Arapahoe County had 46 fatal crashes in which 11 had unrestrained passengers which is 24% of their fatalities. Over the past 5 years, Arapahoe County has had a 12% increase in unrestrained fatalities over the same period.

The State of Colorado has a secondary seatbelt law under which Colorado State Patrol Troopers issue citations for drivers or passengers not wearing a seatbelt. Of the 239 crash fatalities where seatbelts were available, 119 or 49.8 % of these individuals were not wearing their seatbelt at the time of their crash. This is a 9.1 % decrease in the number of unrestrained fatalities compared to CY 2015, when the Patrol investigated 131 unrestrained fatalities.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)	Annual	2019	200.0

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	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

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

Program area	Occupant Protection (Adult)
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]

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.

High visibility enforcement (HVE) events are designed to deploy law enforcement resources in areas identified through problem identification as having high incidents of fatalities and crashes of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupants. These events are designed to deter driving without the proper use of restraints by increasing the perceived risk of citation on Colorado roadways. HVE events are highly publicized prior, during and after the event.

Colorado's unrestrained fatalities are consistently 50% and above of the total passenger vehicle occupant fatality number. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to reduce the prevalence of impaired driving related injuries and fatalities. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

Unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities represent a significant portion of Colorado's total traffic fatalities. High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) events are vital to roadway safety by publicizing the enforcement prior, during and after the event and vigorously enforcing passenger restraint laws. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 OP HVE	Occupant Protection HVE	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

5.6.1.1 Planned Activity: Occupant Protection HVE

Planned activity name	Occupant Protection HVE
Planned activity number	FY19 OP HVE
Primary countermeasure strategy	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

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.

Occupant Protection Plan

The Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) Office of Transportation Safety (OTS) is the designated agency to receive highway safety funds. The Highway Safety Office (HSO), within the OTS, administers these funds with the goals of reducing traffic crashes, fatalities, and injuries in Colorado through the coordinated efforts of state and local agencies, groups, coalitions, and organizations. The HSO takes the lead on addressing occupant protection issues within Colorado and developing statewide plans to address these issues.

Lower than average seat belt use rates and high unbelted occupant fatality rates continue to be a challenge for many counties, both urban and rural, throughout Colorado. The statewide average seat belt compliance rate for 2017 was 83.8% and preliminary 2017 unrestrained passenger motor vehicle fatalities averaged 51%. The Statewide seat belt usage rate is below the national average of 90% and Colorado remains one of the few States without a primary seat belt law.

Based on the 2018 CDOT Problem Identification and the 2017 Statewide Seat Belt Use Survey, the Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) Highway Safety Office (HSO) will be focusing on establishing and enhancing Occupant Protection and Child Passenger Safety programs in several metro area locations including Denver, Arapahoe, Jefferson and El Paso counties; rural areas with high unrestrained fatalities and where seat belt usage rates are lower than the Statewide rate and numerous state-wide efforts.

Efforts and activities include:

- Providing support to law enforcement to enforce Colorado's seat belt laws during three "Click It or Ticket" high-visibility campaigns including two Rural campaigns and May Mobilization.
- Providing Occupant Protection and Child Passenger Safety, Young Driver and Older Driver education to parents, caregivers and to the general public;
- Implementing targeted and relevant seat belt campaigns and initiatives in low–belt-use and high unrestrained fatality counties
- Educating teen drivers and their parents on seat belt use and other teen driving safety issues;
- Targeting child passenger safety and booster seat usage; and
- Providing support to rural communities to address low seat belt usage rates for drivers of rural roadways

Participation in CIOT

In 2017, 220 drivers and passengers (51%), out of 408 passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, died unrestrained. Colorado's seat belt use rate also remains stalled over the past several years. In 2017, 83.8% of observed drivers and passengers were wearing seat belts, which falls below the national average of 90%

In an effort to increase seat belt use and save lives across the State the HSO will support the high-visibility 2019 *Click It or Ticke*t seat belt enforcement wave May 20 – June 2, 2019.

Funds are provided to Law Enforcement agencies to encourage all Colorado local law enforcement agencies to aggressively enforce the occupant protection laws through a combination of enforcement, education and awareness. Local law enforcement data is used to identify agencies for participation in areas that have high unrestrained fatalities and lower seat belt usage rates.

Funds support enforcement of occupant protection laws at the local level, including funds for overtime assistance and/or saturation patrols and to help support traffic safety education efforts.

The goal of the *Click It or Ticke*t May Mobilization project is to encourage all Colorado local law enforcement agencies to aggressively enforce the occupant protection laws through a combination of enforcement, education and awareness. The project supports overtime enforcement of occupant protection laws at the local level in conjunction with the national *Click It or Ticket* high visibility enforcement campaigns. This includes funds for overtime assistance and/or saturation patrols.

In addition, the Colorado State Patrol (CSP) receives HSO funding for the *Click It or Ticket* enforcement wave and provides overtime to implement and issue traffic citations for violations of occupant restraint laws during the enforcement campaigns. The CSP allocates funds to Troop Offices based on data including seat belt use, unrestrained fatality rates, and specific Troop goals.

For 2019, the plan includes soliciting and recruiting law enforcement agencies that participated in the 2018 *Click It or Ticke*t May Mobilization to again participate in the 2019 *Click It or Ticke*t May Mobilization.

Communications plays a critical role in addressing numerous traffic safety issues identified in the Problem Identification Report and the performance measures as outlined in the Colorado Integrated Safety Plan. Communications includes media relations, community relations, marketing, events, paid advertising and development of strategic partnerships that expand CDOT's goal of furthering safety education and reducing fatalities.

CDOT's Office of Communications (OC) supports the HSO, its grantees and partners with specialized assistance related to projects addressing occupant protection education and outreach. The OC conducts the high-visibility aspect of enforcement campaigns aimed at reducing fatalities, including the three "Click It or Ticket" seat belt campaigns and child passenger safety. Projects included in the Communications section of the ISP were chosen based on a problem identification process utilizing fatality and serious injury data.

Communications activities to address occupant protection include:

- Development and implementation of ongoing media and public relations campaigns for seat belt enforcement.
- Development and implementation of targeted and relevant seat belt campaigns and initiatives in low–belt-use and high unrestrained fatality counties
- Development and distribution of news releases.
- Development of relationships with statewide media to encourage news coverage of safety issues.
- Execution of newsworthy media and special events.
- Development of materials for Hispanic audience and Spanish language media.

- Execution of media events and special events which are culturally relevant for minority audiences.
- Leveraging the power of social media to increase awareness and spark conversation
- Development and production of collateral materials, including brochures, fact sheets, posters, flyers, print ads, radio spots and videos.
- Fostering of positive relationships with media, grantees and internal and external partners to expand safety education.
- Development and maintenance of campaign websites.
- Placement of paid media buys to reach campaign target audiences.
- Evaluation of campaign elements, including developing a methodology for evaluating increases in public awareness.

Sustained Seat Belt Enforcement

The Colorado State Patrol (CSP), in conjunction with Colorado law enforcement agencies, has achieved remarkable success in reducing the fatal and injury crash rates through high visibility, strict enforcement of traffic laws and maximum deployment of available resources. CSP and several metro area law enforcement agencies will continue enforcement and education strategies throughout the year while working with its partners statewide to consistently reinforce safe driving decisions when traveling within the state.

The City of Aurora, which encompasses three large metro area counties, Arapahoe, Adams and Douglas counties, receives additional HSO funding and conducts sustained year round seat belt enforcement through short-term, high-visibility belt law enforcement campaigns supplemented by individual enforcement efforts. The CSP, who primarily enforce traffic laws on interstates and state highways, has Troop Offices committed to sustained enforcement beyond working the enforcement campaigns. This includes large and small enforcement operations on specific roadways encompassing the majority of counties within Colorado. The CSP also receives additional HSO funding to conduct sustained year round seat belt enforcement.

The HSO tracks seat belt citations issued during Click It or Ticket campaigns, and outside of the campaign, through the Click It or Ticket application funding process. All agencies applying for and receiving Click It or Ticket funding are required to report campaign and non-campaign citation activity and show that seat belt enforcement efforts are sustained beyond the Click It or Ticket campaigns.

These efforts take place Statewide and involve law enforcement agencies responsible for seat belt enforcement in geographic areas in which at least 70% of the State's unrestrained serious injury crashes and fatalities occur.

High Risk Population Countermeasure Program - Drivers on Rural Roadways

For 2019 the HSO will target two high-risk populations: 1) Unrestrained Drivers of Rural Roadways and 2) Young Drivers (see Young Driver Countermeasure Strategy for detailed Information).

Drivers of rural roadways are over represented in unrestrained fatalities and have lower than average seat belt use rates. High unrestrained fatality rates continue to be a challenge for many rural counties throughout

Colorado. The statewide average seat belt compliance rate for 2017 was 83.8%, however, compliance rates in rural areas drop as low as 67% and unrestrained fatalities in rural areas are historically higher than in urban areas.

In order to address these local agencies and coalitions throughout the State are being funded to support sustained multi-year programs to support occupant protection strategies to increase the overall seat belt usage rate in rural areas, reduce the number of unrestrained fatalities in rural areas and to reduce the number of overall traffic fatalities. Outreach to drivers of rural roadways is being emphasized.

Planned program activities include information distribution at Health and Safety Fairs, seat belt observations and awareness activities conducted by local youth groups within rural high schools, awareness education such as Alive at 25 and outreach to targeted groups including drivers of rural roadways. Occupant protection messaging will be distributed to rural counties including colleges, military installations, community recreation centers and bars.

Colorado will host two Rural Click It or Ticket campaigns in March and July 2019 with officers from the Colorado State Patrol and 40+ rural law enforcement agencies participating. County-specific pocket-sized cards with a seat belt message for law enforcement to distribute at traffic stops within numerous rural counties is planned and several CSP troops and law enforcement agencies have sustained seat belt enforcement outside of planned campaigns.

CDOT's Office of Communications continues to find relevant and engaging ways to reach rural audiences through the well-established Click It or Ticket campaign. In 2019, communications and marketing in rural counties — which tend to have the lowest seat belt use rates in the state — will include a coordinated effort with community-based organizations and local media outlets to increase awareness of the importance of seat belt use. Press releases provided significant earned media coverage of the enforcement period in rural areas. Outreach to Hispanic media outlets will also reach a diverse audience for the campaign.

Enter intended subrecipients.

State and local law enforcement agencies

Community coalitions

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	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)	$675,000.00	$170,000.00	
	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	$115,000.00		$115,000.00

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: Older Drivers

Program area type	Older Drivers

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 2016, there were 608 traffic fatalities in Colorado. There were 92 fatalities involving an at fault driver that was 65 years of age or older. This is an 11% increase from the at fault driver 65 years of age or older fatalities in 2015.

The HSO will address at fault driver 65 years of age or older fatalities through education, public awareness, collaboration and partnerships with State and local agencies, law enforcement training and providing information on alternative rides to caregivers and older drivers.

The City of Aurora is in Adams and Arapahoe County. In 2016, Adams County had 12 fatalities and Arapahoe County had 7 fatalities , which involved a driver 65 or older.

The City of Denver is located in Denver County. Denver County had 6 fatalities, which involved a driver 65 or older.

El Paso County is located in the City of Colorado Springs. In El Paso County there were 11 fatalities, which involved a driver 65 or older.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-13) Drivers 65 or Older Involved in Fatal Crashes	Annual	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	Older Driver Education

5.7.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Older Driver Education

Program area	Older Drivers
Countermeasure strategy	Older Driver 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.

Older Driver Education is designed to evaluate and make adjustments as necessary for the safe operation of their motor vehicles.

Law enforcement agencies are provided training to properly identify circumstances and situations in which it is appropriate for an older driver to re-test through the Department of Revenue.

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

Drivers 65 years and older represent a significant portion of Colorado's total traffic fatalities. Older driver education is vital to providing information on safe driving practices, identify and making proper adjustments for the operator, transportation alternatives and provides the information to older drivers, caregivers, family members and law enforcement. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*. Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 OD Ed	Older Driver Education	Older Driver Education

5.7.1.1 Planned Activity: Older Driver Education

Planned activity name	Older Driver Education
Planned activity number	FY19 OD Ed
Primary countermeasure strategy	Older Driver Education

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.

In 2019, the Older Driver Education planned activities include;

- Cordy & Company and Drive Smart Colorado continuing to conduct CarFit events.
- training CarFit technicians, to increase the capacity of trained volunteers to assist with the CarFit events. The newly trained CarFit technicians will participate at churches and senior events.
- older driver transportation information being distributed, via public service announcements to care givers and family members in several western Colorado counties.
- collaboration with the Department of Revenue and State and local law enforcement to revise the Medically At-Risk form.
- creating a video for law enforcement agencies statewide to encourage officer use of the Medically At-Risk form as well as citation issuance.
- creating study groups for Occupational Therapist Practitioners (OT), to discuss and determine the roles and responsibilities of occupational therapy in driving wellness.
- increasing the capacity of providers and the level of services offered regarding driving, wellness, and risk identification and community mobility opportunities.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Cordy and CO

Drive Smart Colorado

Health Promotions Partner, LLC

Red Hawk

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	Older Driver 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
	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Driver Education (FAST)	$175,068.00		$175,068.00

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.					

5.8 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)?

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 2016, there were 608 traffic fatalities in Colorado. Of the 608 traffic fatalities 98 were distracted driving related which comprised 16% of the total.

In 2016, Adams County had 60 traffic fatalities. There were 9 distracted driving related fatalities which comprised 15% of the total.

In 2016, Arapahoe County had 46 traffic fatalities. There were 7 distracted driving related fatalities which comprised 17% of the total.

The City of Aurora is in Adams County and Arapahoe County. In 2016, Adams County recorded that 24 % of the 12,304 crashes in Adams County had distracted driving as a contributing factor.

Arapahoe County had 24% of the 14,444 crashes that occurred in the county. The 3,466 or 24% of the crashes were distracted driving related. A review of all 7,635 crashes that occurred in the City of Aurora during 2017, 1,353 or 18% showed that distracted driving was a contributing factor in the causation.

In 2017, there was a total of 27 fatal crashes in the City of Aurora. Of those 27 crashes, 5 or 19 % the driver was recorded as being distracted by the investigating officer.

In 2017, Aurora Police Department (APD) officers wrote 11,517 summonses. Aurora PD issued 3,455 distracted driving summonses which was 30% of the total.

In 2016, the City and County of Denver had 19,360 crashes. Fifty-four crashes were fatalities and 6 of the traffic fatalities were distracted driving related.

The City of Greeley is the largest jurisdiction in Weld County.

Within the last four years, the City of Greeley, had 783 crashes within 13 major intersections. One hundred and thirty nine of those crashes were distracted driving related. The majority of the drivers were preoccupied at 123 or 89%, the 15 or 11% were distracted by their passengers. Greeley has a significant number of young drivers, with seven high schools and the University of Northern Colorado.

The Data-Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS), has been used by Greeley Police Department (GPD) for three years. There has been a 1% decrease in the rate of motor vehicle fatalities since DDACTs was introduced in 2014.

In 2016, Weld County had 55 traffic fatalities, 11 of those crashes were distracted driving related.

El Paso County had 48 traffic fatalities, 11 or 23% of those fatalities were attributed distracted driving related. Five percent of the fatal crashes involved a driver 20 years or younger.

The City of Colorado Springs is located in El Paso County.

In the City of Pueblo, there were 20 traffic fatalities in 2016, 2 or 14% of the crashes involved distracted driving. Two percent of those fatalities involved a driver 20 years or younger.

Pueblo is a county in Southeast Colorado.

Eagle County had 1,241 crashes, 5 or 14% were traffic fatalities were distracted driving related.

The Eagle River Valley portion of Eagle County is a major thoroughfare through the state with I-70 running 60 miles through the heart of the valley.

According to the 2018 Colorado Motor Vehicle Problem Identification Dashboard (2018 Problem ID), the Central Regional Emergency Trauma Advisor Council (CMRETAC) had 28 fatalities in 2016. Four of those fatalities involved a driver 20 years or younger. The CMRETAC serves the following regions: Chaffee, Eagle, Lake, Park, Pitkin and Summit counties.

The Eagle River Youth Coalition, (EYRC) conducted a parent survey, 497 parents completed the survey. There were 422 or 85% of the parents responded that they had used their phones while driving.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-12) Fatalities Involving a Distracted Driver	Annual	2019	70.0

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	Distracted Driving HVE/Education

5.8.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Distracted Driving HVE/Education

Program area	Distracted Driving
Countermeasure strategy	Distracted Driving HVE/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.

Distracted driving targeted enforcement and education directed to distracted drivers are designed to deploy law enforcement and other educational resources in areas identified through problem identification as having high incidents of fatalities and serious injuries involving distracted driving. These education and enforcement events are designed to deter behavioral traffic violations committed by distracted drivers. Colorado's fatalities involving a distracted driver are 11% of the total fatality number. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to reduce the prevalence of fatalities and injury crashes involving a distracted driver. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

Fatalities involving a distracted driver represent a significant portion of Colorado's total traffic fatalities. Targeted enforcement and education is vital to mitigating instances of distracter driver related serious injury and fatal crashes. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 Public Relations	Communications and Outreach	Communication Campaign
FY19 Distracted Driving	Distracted Driving HVE/Education	Distracted Driving HVE/Education

5.8.1.1 Planned Activity: Distracted Driving HVE/Education

Planned activity name	Distracted Driving HVE/Education
Planned activity number	FY19 Distracted Driving
Primary countermeasure strategy	Distracted Driving HVE/Education

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.

In 2019, the Distracted Driving HVE/Education planned activities include;

- the Aurora Police Department (APD) focusing on the motoring public that commutes daily through the City of Aurora. Traffic officers assigned to the Traffic Section of APD will conduct high visibility cell phone/text messaging enforcement, enforce the model traffic code violations where distraction is a causation and educate the motoring public.
- the Colorado State Patrol (CSP) continuing to provide education and training to the motoring public by conducting High Visibility Enforcement (HVE).
- The CSP continuing to utilize the driving simulators in community and school presentations with an additional focus on classroom based presentations. CSP will focus on Distracted Driving Education and High Visibility Enforcement.
- Denver Police Department (DPD) utilizing targeted enforcement for both hot spot enforcements by individual officers and the spotter method. The spotter method enables DPD to document more specifically when

drivers are committing traffic violations as a result of cellphone use and to keep and analyze this data for further evaluation and operations.

- Greeley Police Department (GPD) utilizing Data Drive Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS) to deploy officers to specific zones, known for increased motor vehicle crashes and fatalities. Officers will be primarily focused on school zones to enforce Graduated Driving Licenses (GDL) requirements and cell phone laws with young drivers. During summer hours, efforts will vary on events and activities in the City of Greeley.
- Drive Smart Colorado (DSC) developing and launching a culturally relevant distracted driving outreach campaign targeting active duty personnel and their spouses at four military installations in El Paso County and the students at Pikes Peak Community College (PPCC), University of Colorado-Colorado Springs (UCCS), Colorado College (CC), United States Airforce Academy, Colorado State University-Pueblo (CSU-Pueblo), and Pueblo Community College (PCC).
- Eagle River Youth Coalition (ERYC) providing training and education in distracted driving awareness and GDL requirements to students and parents in Eagle River Valley area.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Aurora Police Department

Colorado State Patrol

Denver Police Department

Greeley Police Department

Drive Smart Colorado

Eagle River Youth Coalition

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	Distracted Driving HVE/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	Funding	Eligible Use of	Estimated Funding	Match	Local

Year	Source	Funds	Amount	Amount	Benefit
	NHTSA 402	Distracted Driving	$417,500.00		$262,500.00

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.					

5.9 Program Area: Non-motorized (Pedestrians)

Program area type	Non-motorized (Pedestrians)

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 2016, there were 608 traffic fatalities in the State of Colorado, of which 79 or 13% were pedestrians, and 16 or 3% were bicyclists. The pedestrian total fatalities is up from 33% in 2015.

The Mile High Regional Emergency Medical and Trauma Advisory Council (MHRETAC) reports that there were 190 traffic fatalities in the six county Mile High region, which serves: Adams, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Denver, Douglas and Elbert Counties.

The City of Aurora had 8,328 traffic crashes, which involved 21,318 roadway users.

The City of Aurora is in Adams County and Arapahoe County. A total of 21 pedestrian fatalities occurred in those two counties (13 in Adams and 8 in Arapahoe). Of those 21 pedestrian fatalities, 12 or 57% occurred

in the City of Aurora. Pedestrian fatalities in the City of Aurora account for 37% of all fatal crashes. That is up from 2015's 12%.

Aurora Police Department (APD) reported 7,635 crashes that occurred in the City of Aurora in 2017, 194 or 3% involved a pedestrian.

In 2017, there were 27 traffic fatalities in the City of Aurora. Of those 27 or 7% involved pedestrians.

In 2016, the City of Denver had 19,360 crashes and 54 traffic fatalities and 19 of the traffic fatalities involved pedestrians.

The City and County of Denver, launched the Denver Vision Zero initiative, which is the coordination of multiple city agencies to collaborate on best practices for reducing fatal crashes in Denver to zero by 2030.

In Colorado Springs, the second largest city in Colorado and the largest population center in El Paso County, pedestrian deaths accounted for six of the 34 motor vehicle fatalities in 2016.

There were 10 pedestrian fatalities and 3 bicycle fatalities out of a record of 39 traffic fatalities.

Major road arterials run directly through, or immediately next to the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs (UCCS) and Colorado College (CC) campuses in Colorado Springs. Austin Bluffs Parkway runs immediately to the south of the UCCS campus, with large youth residential area.

El Paso County has 32,501 college and university students. The UCCS has more than 12,400 undergraduate students on campus. CC has 2,101 students and Colorado State University (CSU-Pueblo) has 4,500 students. Drive Smart Colorado (DSC) will focus on these institutions, because many students walk to and from the campuses.

From 2016-17, Colorado Springs PD data indicates that 75 crashes occurred on Austin Bluffs Parkway. There are three pedestrian crosswalks on Austin Bluffs parkway, which connect to campuses.

Colorado College reported that 50 crashes on or near campus, 10 involved students pedestrian and or bicycle crashes with vehicles.

Among the 18-24 age group, 17% of pedestrian fatalities occurred in El Paso County.

The City of Pueblo is located in Pueblo County. Pueblo had 20 traffic and 2 Pedestrian fatalities in 2016.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)	Annual	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	Pedestrian Enforcement and Education

5.9.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Pedestrian Enforcement and Education

Program area	Non-motorized (Pedestrians)
Countermeasure strategy	Pedestrian Enforcement and 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.

Targeted enforcement and education directed to drivers and pedestrians who are high risk for violations of pedestrian laws are designed to deploy law enforcement and other educational resources in areas identified through problem identification as having high incidents of fatalities and serious injuries involving pedestrians. These education and enforcement events are designed to deter behavioral traffic violations committed by drivers or pedestrians. Colorado's fatalities involving pedestrians are 14% of the total fatality number. This strategy is part of a comprehensive, evidence-based effort to reduce the prevalence of fatalities and injury crashes involving pedestrians. It is an evidence-based activity countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

Fatalities involving a pedestrian represent a significant portion of Colorado's total traffic fatalities. Targeted enforcement and education is vital to protecting Colorado's most vulnerable roadway user. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 Ped HVE/Education	Enforcement and Education	Pedestrian Enforcement and Education

5.9.1.1 Planned Activity: Enforcement and Education

Planned activity name	Enforcement and Education
Planned activity number	FY19 Ped HVE/Education
Primary countermeasure strategy	Pedestrian Enforcement and Education

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.

In 2019, the Non-motorized (Pedestrians) Enforcement and Education activities include;

- the Aurora Police Department (APD) traffic officers conducting High Visibility Targeted Enforcement, coupled with education focused on pedestrian safety. APD traffic officers will be the primary officers working this project and they will conduct directed operations, issue citations, warnings, contact pedestrians, motorist and bicyclist to educate these individuals about violations.
- the Denver Police Department (DPD) employing a targeted enforcement campaign focused on pedestrian safety. DPD officers will issue warnings to drivers and pedestrians and citations for dangerous violations committed by both pedestrians and motorists. Some of the dangerous violations include: turning on the red when prohibited, not using a crosswalk when one is available and crossing at an intersection against the signal when traffic is present.
- DPD officers receiving training in the Denver Pedestrian Safety curriculum. This curriculum was created using the principles and techniques presented in the NHTSA Pedestrian Safety Program Management course.
- Drive Smart Colorado (DSC) developing and launching a culturally relevant pedestrian education and outreach campaign targeting 18-24-year-old students at, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs (UCCS), Colorado College (CC), Colorado State University in El Paso and Pueblo counties.
    - DSC has selected several student groups (government, campus health, wellness groups, etc.) to develop culturally relevant pedestrian safety, education and outreach campaigns.
    - Students will conduct surveys on campus, to focus on pedestrian safety issues.
    - DSC will participate in new student orientations at each school.
    - DSC will focus on Pedestrian Safety Zones and Impaired Pedestrians.
    - UCCS will gather feedback on a regular basis from the student groups to gauge their impressions of the campaign effectiveness.

Enter intended subrecipients.

Aurora Police Department

Denver Police Department

Drive Smart Colorado

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	Pedestrian Enforcement and 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
	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Pedestrian Safety (FAST)	$201,500.00		$201,500.00

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.					

5.10 Program Area: Communications (Media)

Program area type	Communications (Media)

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.

Motor vehicle crashes are among the leading causes of death across the nation and in Colorado. Motor vehicle fatalities were on the decline and reached a low of 447 deaths in 2011. Since 2011 Colorado's fatalities from motor vehicle crashes have continually increased, reaching 608 fatalities reported in 2016.

In 2016 there were:

- 128,009 motor vehicle crashes, a four percent increase from 2015.
- 558 fatal crashes; a 10 percent increase from 2015.
- 608 people were fatally injured; an 11 percent increase from 2015.
- 211 speeding-related fatalities; comprising 35 percent of all fatalities.
- 9,936 motor vehicle injury crashes, a three percent decrease from 2015.
- 11,786 persons were injured by those 9,936 motor vehicle injury crashes, an 8 percent decrease from 2015.
- 2,956 had injuries that were classified as serious (incapacitating), an 8 percent decrease from 2015.

In 2016 there were:

- 186 Unrestrained fatalities (51 percent of all passenger vehicle occupant fatalities)
- 161 Alcohol-impaired driver fatalities (26 percent of all fatalities)
- 52 5ng THC+ impaired driver fatalities (9 percent of all fatalities)
- 211 Speed related fatalities (35 percent of all fatalities)
- 125 motorcyclist fatalities (20 percent of all fatalities), and 82 unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities
- 59 drivers under the age of 21 involved in a fatal motor vehicle crash
- 79 pedestrian fatalities (13 percent of all fatalities)
- 77 distracted drivers involved in a fatal crash
- 131 drivers aged 65 years or older involved in a fatal crash

The HSO incorporates data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), annual observed seat belt use survey results, the Department of Revenue's Crash Record file and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), in order to fund public relations campaigns that address the most serious behavioral traffic safety challenges.

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	644.0
2019	C-2) Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes (State crash data files)	5 Year	2019	2,909.0
2019	C-3) Fatalities/VMT (FARS, FHWA)	5 Year	2019	1.210
2019	C-4) Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions (FARS)	Annual	2019	200.0
2019	C-5) Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of .08 and above (FARS)	Annual	2019	170.0
2019	C-7) Number of motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	125.0
2019	C-8) Number of unhelmeted motorcyclist fatalities (FARS)	Annual	2019	82.0
2019	C-9) Number of drivers age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes (FARS)	Annual	2019	75.0
2019	C-10) Number of pedestrian fatalities (FARS)	Annual	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	Communication Campaign

5.10.1 Countermeasure Strategy: Communication Campaign

Program area	Communications (Media)
Countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign

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]

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]

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]

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.

Communications and outreach campaigns for the general pubic are designed to educate, inform and provide resources to the public regarding the behavioral traffic safety challenges on Colorado's roadways and efforts to address them. These campaigns also provide information regarding numerous high visibility enforcement campaigns. These strategies are part of a comprehensive, overall traffic safety program and are designed to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on Colorado roadways. Communication and outreach campaigns are evidence-based activity countermeasures as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work*.

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

As Colorado fatalities continue to rise, a robust communication strategy is critical to create greater awareness among the traveling public. Communications campaigns are developed based on problem identification to address specific behavioral traffic safety challenges. Funding for this and all other strategies are distributed based on problem I.D.

Evidence of effectiveness

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

The rationale for selecting this countermeasure strategy is that it is an evidence-based countermeasure as identified in NHTSA's *Countermeasures That Work.* Funding allocations for each planned activity are based on a robust problem identification couple with agency capacity.

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
FY19 Public Relations	Communications and Outreach	Communication Campaign

5.10.1.1 Planned Activity: Communications and Outreach

Planned activity name	Communications and Outreach
Planned activity number	FY19 Public Relations
Primary countermeasure strategy	Communication Campaign

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.

CDOT's Office of Communications (OC) supports the Office of Transportation Safety (OTS), its grantees and partners with specialized assistance related to projects addressing occupant protection and impaired driving education and outreach. The OC conducts the high-visibility aspect of enforcement campaigns aimed at reducing fatalities, including the *Click It or Ticket* seat belt campaign and *The Heat Is On* impaired driving campaign. Other major communications initiatives are teen driving, child passenger safety,

motorcycle safety, distracted driving, and pedestrian safety. The projects included in the Communications section of the ISP were chosen based on problem identification and requests from the Office of Transportation Safety.

Activities by the OC to address occupant protection, impaired driving and other traffic safety issues include:

- Development and implementation of ongoing media and public relations campaigns for high-visibility enforcement, including DUI/drugged driving and seat belt enforcement.
- Development and implementation of safety education campaigns for motorcycle safety, teen driving, child passenger safety, pedestrian safety, and distracted driving.
- Development and distribution of news releases.
- Development of relationships with statewide media to encourage coverage of safety issues.
- Development and implementation of a comprehensive social media strategy through Facebook, Snapchat, Twitter and YouTube.
- Execution of newsworthy special events and press conferences.
- Development of materials for Hispanic audience and Spanish language media.
- Execution mass media messages and campaigns which are culturally relevant for minority audiences.
- Development and production of collateral materials, including brochures, fact sheets, posters, flyers, print ads, radio spots and videos.
- Fostering of positive relationships with media, grantees, task forces, coalitions and internal and external partners to expand safety education.
- Development and maintenance of campaign websites.
- Placement of paid media buys to reach campaign target audiences.
- Evaluation of campaign elements, including developing a methodology for evaluating increases in public awareness.

External Statewide Traffic Safety Stakeholders and Media Outlets

Enter intended subrecipients.

Office of Communications Media Vendors

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	Distracted Driving HVE/Education
2019	Communication Campaign

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
	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low	405d Low Other Based on Problem ID (FAST)	$750,000.00		
	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Paid Advertising (FAST)	$1,335,000.00		$0.00
	FAST Act 405f Motorcycle Programs	405f Paid Advertising (FAST)	$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.					

5.11 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?

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.

In 2016, there were 608 traffic fatalities. There were 125 motorcyclist fatalities and of those fatalities 77 were unhelmeted. Motorcyclist fatalities represented 20.6% of Colorado's total traffic fatalities (125 of 608). Motorcyclist fatalities increased from 106 in 2015 to 125 in 2016, a 17.9% increase. The 17.9% increase in motorcyclist fatalities is a greater change than observed for overall traffic fatalities, which increased by 11.2% (547 to 608) in 2016. Additionally, 89 (78%) motorcycle operators involved in fatal crashes were determined to be "at fault" and 50 (42%) fatal crashes involved only the motorcycle and no other vehicle.

In 2016, the Counties representing the highest annul motorcyclist fatalities included; Adams (13), Arapahoe (11), Denver (14), Douglas (10), El Paso (10), Jefferson (15) and Larimer (11). These Counties represent 67% of all Colorado motorcyclist fatalities.

Statewide in 2016, there were 118,780 total recorded vehicle crashes and 2,273 (1.9%) of those crashes involved motorcycles. Though motorcyclists were involved in 2% of all crashes, when they did crash, 62.5% of the time (1,420/2,273) the motorcyclist was at fault.

In 2016, among all motorcycle operators involved in a crash, 48% (1,124/2,356) were properly wearing helmets.

Colorado has a legislative mandated Motorcycle Operator Safety Advisory Board (MOSAB) which includes a Highway Safety Office (HSO) member. The member holds an executive leadership position and through this involvement provides input and direction on motorcycle safety training, awareness, media and funding. A member from the HSO management team represents Colorado motorcycle safety interests on the State Motorcycle Safety Administrators organization. The HSO utilizes funding to support media campaigns designed to increase motorists awareness of motorcycles on Colorado roadways. The campaigns are developed through problem identification and disseminated to the public during peak motorcycle riding activity.

5.12 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.

In 2016 and 2017 Colorado experienced increases in fatal crashes, which after adopting Moving Towards Zero Deaths in 2013, is a disconcerting statistic. Colorado has experienced recent increases in population growth and vehicle miles traveled. With the legalization of marijuana, more and more technology causing distractions, climate change, low gas prices, a thriving local economy, and increasing population density in front range counties, there are many factors which play a part in the increased fatal crashes. While none of these factors alone can explain the increase, it is assumed that these and other factors all contribute to the increases Colorado is experiencing. It is anticipated that all of these factors will continue to increase, leading to continued increases in fatalities and serious injuries. The fatalities trend in 2018 does not indicate any reductions in traffic fatalities.

In 2016 there were 608 traffic related fatalities, in 2017 that number increased to 648, which is a 6% increase. This was the 6th consecutive year that traffic fatalities had increased, which in part was attributable to the information outlined in the highway safety planning process, the lack of a primary seat belt law, lack of a motorcycle helmet law and changes to the distracted driving statute. However, the HSO continued to address these challenges by aggressively seeking new and innovative projects and programs, utilizing problem identification to direct enforcement efforts, engage with partners and stakeholders of unrepresented populations and high visibility enforcement in multiple traffic challenges.

Planned Activities in the Planning & Administration

Planned activity unique identifier	Planned Activity Name	Primary Countermeasure
FY19 Program Support	Program Support	

5.12.1 Planned Activity: Program Support

Planned activity name	Program Support
Planned activity number	FY19 Program Support
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.

The Office of Transportation Safety, as the designated state highway safety agency (Section 24-42-101, CRS) is responsible for the planning, coordinating and administering of the State's highway safety program authorized by the Federal Highway Safety Act 23 USC 402. Planning and Administration (P&A) costs are those expenses that are related to the overall management of the State's highway safety programs. Costs include salaries and related personnel costs for the Governors' Representatives for Highway Safety and for other technical, administrative, and clerical staff, for the State's Highway Safety Offices. P&A costs also include other office costs, such as travel, equipment, supplies, rent and utility expenses. P&A costs also include other office costs, such as travel, equipment, supplies, rent and utility expenses. Program support tasks include establishing resource requirements, departmental roles and responsibilities, assignment of tasks and schedules, and program management of the FY 19 grants. Costs include external project project audit costs, program-specific staff training and necessary operating expenses. other support functions include the bi-annual HSO Summit and any program assessment costs.

The HSO supports traffic safety education efforts and enforcement campaigns by providing coalitions and other traffic safety stakeholders with support, resources, training and materials. This enables agencies ot better execute and support statewide OP, CPS, motorcycle safety and impaired driving prevention programs.

The purpose of tech transfer funds is to provide training, community outreach and coalition building for traffic safety educational programs. The funds are also used to send HSO partners and stakeholders to State and National conferences.

Enter intended subrecipients.

HSO Staff

HSO Traffic Safety Partners and Stakeholders

Local Law Enforcement

Colorado State Patrol

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
No records found.	

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	Planning and Administration (FAST)	$165,000.00	$0.00	$0.00
2019	FAST Act NHTSA 402	Occupant Protection (FAST)	$265,000.00		$0.00
2019	FAST Act 405d Impaired Driving Low	405d Impaired Driving Low (FAST)	$285,000.00		
2019	FAST Act 405c Data Program	405c Data Program (FAST)	$120,000.00		

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.					

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
FY19 Impaired Driving HVE	Impaired Driving HVE	Impaired Driving HVE
FY19 Speed Enforcement	Sustained Speed Enforcement	Sustained Enforcement
FY19 Public Relations	Communications and Outreach	Communication Campaign
FY19 OP HVE	Occupant Protection HVE	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Analysis

Enter analysis of crashes, crash fatalities, and injuries in areas of highest risk.

In 2016 there were:

- 128,009 motor vehicle crashes, a four percent increase from 2015.
- 558 fatal crashes; a 10 percent increase from 2015.
- 608 fatalities; an 11 percent increase from 2015.
- 211 speeding-related fatalities; comprising 35 percent of all fatalities.
- 9,936 motor vehicle injury crashes, a three percent decrease from 2015.
- 11,786 persons were injured by those 9,936 motor vehicle injury crashes, an 8 percent decrease from 2015.
- 2,956 had injuries that were classified as serious (incapacitating), an 8 percent decrease from 2015.

The counties with the highest number of traffic fatalities in 2016 were: Adams (60), Weld (55), Denver, (54), El Paso (48), Jefferson (48).

The counties with the highest number of serious injuries in 2016 were: Denver (486), Arapahoe (388), Adams (339), Jefferson (203) and Boulder (202).

The Colorado Department of Transportation, Office of Transportation Safety, Highway Safety Office (HSO) Traffic Safety Enforcement Plan for Occupant Protection, Impaired Driving and Speed is based on problem identification that identifies areas of the State that are over represented in crashes and fatalities involving impaired driving, unrestrained occupants and excessive speed. The Colorado Department of Transportation sets targets in their Highway Safety Plan (HSP) every year to reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries from motor vehicle crashes for the state of Colorado. Based on the crashes that took place on Colorado public roadways during 2016, the following factors comprised the majority of fatalities:

- 211 Speeding fatalities (35 percent of all fatalities)
- 186 Unrestrained fatalities (51 percent of all passenger vehicle occupant fatalities)
- 213 fatalities involving an alcohol and/or drug (5ng THC+) impaired driver. 35% of all fatalities involved an impaired driver, 26% of these fatalities involved an alcohol-impaired driver and 8% involved an 5ng THC+ impaired driver. This is a 20% increase from the impaired driving fatalities in 2015.

OCCUPANT PROTECTION

Unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities decreased by only two fatalities from 2015 to 2016 from 188 to 186 and still exceeded the 2016 State goal of 176 unrestrained fatalities. 186 of the 362 (51 percent) motor vehicle occupants who died in a fatal crash in 2016 were not using seat belts or other restraints. 511 of the 1,956 (26 percent) motor vehicle occupants who were seriously injured in a crash in 2016 were not using seat belts or other restraints.

- The estimate of overall statewide seat belt usage for all vehicle types in 2016 was 84.0 percent, a 1.4 percent decrease from 85.2 percent in 2015.

- In 2016, the counties with the highest number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities were: Adams (20), Weld (20), El Paso (16), Jefferson (12), Larimer (12).

- Of the 29 counties in the 2016 Statewide Seat Belt Survey, observed seat belt use was below the 2016 state goal of 84.0 percent for the following twelve counties: Adams (83.1%), Baca (63.9%), Delta (77.8%), Denver (78.3%), Eagle (82.9%), El Paso (83.0%), Fremont (83.2%), Huerfano (80.1%), La Plata (81.5%), Lincoln (81.3%), Montezuma (81.6%), Montrose (83.8%), Morgan (76.8%), Pueblo (70.8%) and Weld (82.2%).

Colorado's Highway Safety Office supports the Click It or Ticket May Mobilization and Child Passenger Safety Week national mobilizations.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

- In 2016, there were 161 fatalities where a driver had a blood alcohol content (BAC) ≥ 0.08; corresponding to a six percent increase from 2015, and 52 fatalities involving an impaired driver with 5ng THC+.

- In 2016, the counties with the highest number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC ≥ 0.08 were: Denver (22), El Paso (20), Arapahoe (14), Larimer (14) and Weld (13).

SPEED ENFORCEMENT

- In 2016, there were 211 speeding related fatalities, corresponding to a 2 percent decrease from 2015.

- Law enforcement officers indicated that speeding was the driver action, or specific law violation, leading to a crash in 33 percent of all motor vehicle fatalities and 9 percent of all serious injuries in 2016.

- In 2016, the counties with the highest number of speeding related fatalities were: Denver (22), El Paso (22), Jefferson (20), Adams (19) and Arapahoe (19).

Enter explanation of the deployment of resources based on the analysis performed.

When locations are identified that are over represented in these areas, the HSO High Visibility Enforcement Coordinator, through the Law Enforcement Coordinator and the Local Law Enforcement Liaisons, contact law enforcement in the identified areas to form enforcement partnerships.

The Colorado State Patrol (CSP) provides statewide enforcement year round, in addition to the two weeks of enforcement during May. In addition to the CSP, local law enforcement agencies are recruited and provided with overtime funding for May Mobilization. While all local law enforcement agencies are encouraged to apply for overtime enforcement funding, allocations are made through problem identification with consideration to the number of unrestrained fatalities, serious injuries and the seat belt compliance rate of an area, along with the past performance of the agency during the campaign.

In addition to May Mobilization, Colorado supports two weeks of occupant protection enforcement in the rural areas of the state during March and April. Compliance rates are also generally lower than the state rate in these rural and frontier areas but historically, after an enforcement event, these areas show a significant increase in seat belt usage rates.

Colorado law enforcement agencies participate in all seven national high visibility enforcement (HVE) campaigns as well as five other Statewide HVE campaigns during the year. The State specific HVE campaigns that the Highway Safety Office promotes include Spring Events (six weeks), Memorial Day Weekend (four days), Checkpoint Colorado (16 weeks), Fall Festivals (six weeks), and New Year's Eve (four to six days). These five HVE enforcement campaigns were created to address events in the State that have an impact on impaired driving related motor vehicle crashes and fatalities.Law enforcement agencies apply for HVE funding and are selected using FARS and other data sources to identify the areas with a high number of impaired driving related crashes and fatalities. Agencies deploy their resources at their discretion during the enforcement periods, using local data to determine enforcement strategies as to location, day of week, time of day, etc. Law enforcement agencies report their activity through narrative reports and also report arrest and citation data on the readily available CDOT "Heat Is On!" website.Law enforcement agencies participating in Colorado's HSO Speed Enforcement Programs are identified through a problem identification analysis. Law enforcement agencies in the Speed Enforcement Program work closely with the HSO Law Enforcement Coordinator (LEC) to create enforcement plans that include officer performance standards, project baselines and goals, an evaluation plan and a night-time speed enforcement element.

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 LEC and LEL monitor performance on all HVE grants including data entry that includes number of citations/arrests. Regular monitoring of all HVE activities, including cost per ticket, overtime activity, etc.is completed by the LEC and LEL and recommendations for continued funding are based on these factors. Adjustments to funding are made after examination of each HVE event to ensure funds are utilized in a cost efficient manner. If agencies are not meeting specified expected performance targets the LEC and LELs work with the local agencies to make adjustment to, and provide suggestions on how to improve performance. Working with the enforcement partners the HSO's Public Relations Office (PRO) develops outreach and awareness programs to make the public aware of the enforcement and to track effectiveness of the outreach (media impressions, surveys, etc).

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
Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement
Impaired Driving HVE
Communication Campaign

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
FY19 Impaired Driving HVE	Impaired Driving HVE	Impaired Driving HVE
FY19 Speed Enforcement	Sustained Speed Enforcement	Sustained Enforcement
FY19 OP HVE	Occupant Protection HVE	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

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
Young Drivers
Occupant Protection (Child Passenger Safety)
Occupant Protection (Adult)

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
ADAMS COUNTY SO
ALAMOSA PD
ARAPAHOE COUNTY SO
ARVADA PD
AULT PD
AURARIA CAMPUS PD
AVON PD
BAYFIELD PD
BLANCA PD
BLUE RIVER MARSHAL PD
BRECKENRIDGE PD
BRIGHTON PD
BRUSH PD
CASTLE ROCK PD
CENTER PD
CHEYENNE PD
COLORADO SPRINGS PD
COMMERCE CITY PD
CORTEZ PD
COSTILLA PD
CSU PD
DACONO PD
DENVER PD
DILLON PD
EAGLE PD
EAGLE COUNTY SO
EATON PD
EDGEWATER PD

EL PASO COUNTY SO
EMPIRE PD
ENGLEWOOD PD
FORT COLLINS PD
FREDERICK PD
FRISCO PD
FORT LUPTON PD
GILPIN COUNTY PD
GLENWOOD SPRINGS PD
GOLDEN PD
GRAND COUNTY SO
GREELEY PD
HOLYOKE PD
JEFFERSON COUNTY SO
LA PLATA COUNTY SO
LAFAYETTE PD
LAKESIDE PD
LAKEWOOD PD
LAS ANIMAS PD
LONE TREE PD
LONGMONT PD
LOVELAND PD
MONTE VISTA PD
MONTROSE PD
MONTROSE COUNTY SO
NORTHGLENN PD
PARACHUTE PD
PARKER PD
PUEBLOPD
PUEBLO COUNTY SO
RIDGEWAY MARSHAL

RIFLE PD
SAGUACHE COUNTY SO
SILT PD
SILVERTHORNE PD
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS PD
STERLING PD
THORNTON PD
TRINIDAD PD
VAIL PD
WASHINGTON COUNTY SO
WHEAT RIDGE PD
YUMA PD

Enter description of the State's planned participation in the Click-it-or-Ticket national mobilization.

In 2017, 220 drivers and passengers (51%), out of 408 passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, died unrestrained. Colorado's seat belt use rate also remains stalled over the past several years. In 2017, 83.8% of observed drivers and passengers were wearing seat belts, which falls below the national average of 90%

In an effort to increase seat belt use and save lives across the State the HSO will support the high-visibility 2019 *Click It or Ticke*t seat belt enforcement wave May 20 – June 2, 2019.

Funds are provided to Law Enforcement agencies to encourage all Colorado local law enforcement agencies to aggressively enforce the occupant protection laws through a combination of enforcement, education and awareness. Local law enforcement data is used to identify agencies for participation in areas that have high unrestrained fatalities and lower seat belt usage rates.

Funds support enforcement of occupant protection laws at the local level, including funds for overtime assistance and/or saturation patrols and to help support traffic safety education efforts.

The goal of the *Click It or Ticke*t May Mobilization project is to encourage all Colorado local law enforcement agencies to aggressively enforce the occupant protection laws through a combination of enforcement, education and awareness. The project supports overtime enforcement of occupant protection laws at the local level in conjunction with the national *Click It or Ticket* high visibility enforcement campaigns. This includes funds for overtime assistance and/or saturation patrols.

In addition, the Colorado State Patrol (CSP) receives HSO funding for the *Click It or Ticket* enforcement wave and provides overtime to implement and issue traffic citations for violations of occupant restraint laws during the enforcement campaigns. The CSP allocates funds to Troop Offices based on data including seat belt use, unrestrained fatality rates, and specific Troop goals.

For 2019, the plan includes soliciting and recruiting law enforcement agencies that participated in the 2018 *Click It or Ticke*t May Mobilization to again participate in the 2019 *Click It or Ticke*t May Mobilization. This includes Statewide HVE through the CSP with all CSP Troops participating in the May Mobilization, 71 local agencies which encompass 56 local Police Departments and 15 Sheriff's Offices.

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
FY19 CPS	CPS Inspection Stations	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

Enter the total number of planned inspection stations and/or events in the State.

Planned inspection stations and/or events:	161

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	138
Populations served - rural	23
Populations served - at risk	33

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
FY19 CPS	CPS Inspection Stations	Child Restraint System Inspection Station(s)

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	40
Estimated total number of technicians	150

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	No
Occupant protection statute	No
Seat belt enforcement	Yes
High risk population countermeasure program	Yes
Comprehensive occupant protection program	Yes
Occupant protection program assessment	No

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
Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement
Communication Campaign
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
FY19 Public Relations	Communications and Outreach	Communication Campaign
FY19 OP HVE	Occupant Protection HVE	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

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
Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement
School Programs
Communication Campaign

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

FY19 Teen Traffic Safety	Youth Peer-to-Peer Program	School Programs
FY19 Public Relations	Communications and Outreach	Communication Campaign
FY19 OP HVE	Occupant Protection HVE	Short-term, High Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Comprehensive occupant protection program

Enter the date of NHTSA-facilitated program assessment that was conducted within five years prior to the application due date that evaluates the occupant protection program for elements designed to increase seat belt use in the State.

Date of NHTSA-facilitated program assessment	3/31/2014

Upload the multi-year strategic plan based on input from Statewide stakeholders (task force) under which the State developed – (A) Data-driven performance targets to improve occupant protection in the State, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(c); (B) Countermeasure strategies (such as enforcement, education, communication, policies/legislation, partnerships/outreach) designed to achieve the performance targets of the strategic plan, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d); (C) A program management strategy that provides leadership and identifies the State official responsible for implementing various aspects of the multi-year strategic plan; and (D) An enforcement strategy that includes activities such as encouraging seat belt use policies for law enforcement agencies, vigorous enforcement of seat belt and child safety seat statutes, and accurate reporting of occupant protection system information on police accident report forms, at the level of detail required under § 1300.11(d)(5).

Documents Uploaded
Colorado 405(b) 2019 OPTF Section.docx

List the page number(s) from your occupant protection multi-year strategic plan that addresses:

Data-driven performance targets	1
Countermeasure strategies	2
Program management strategy	2
Enforcement strategy	2