



A Guide for Local Impaired-Driving Task Forces

Volume I: Final Report



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

★★★★★
NHTSA
www.nhtsa.gov

This publication is distributed by the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in the interest of information exchange. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the Department of Transportation or the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The United States Government assumes no liability for its content or use thereof. If trade or manufacturers' names or products are mentioned, it is because they are considered essential to the object of the publication and should not be construed as an endorsement. The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. DOT HS 811 460A		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle A Guide for Local Impaired-Driving Task Forces, Vol. I: Final Report				5. Report Date October 2011	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) James C. Fell, Deborah A. Fisher, A. Scott McKnight				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation 11720 Beltsville Drive, Suite 900 Calverton, MD 20705-3111				10. Work Unit No. (TRAVIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-06-D-00035 Task Order 0002	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE. Washington, DC 20590				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes The Task Order Manager was Robert Hohn					
16. Abstract The purpose of this two-volume guide is to assist officials and members of the public interested in establishing an impaired-driving task force at a local or regional but not statewide level or who are exploring ways to improve their current task forces. Volume I is based on case studies of nine local task forces in Costa Mesa, California; Pikes Peak Region, Colorado; Leon County, Florida; Southeastern Louisiana; Gallatin County, Montana; Broome County, New York; Bexar County, Texas; Fairfax County, Virginia; and Kent, Washington. These task forces represent a range of histories, structures, and approaches. This guide addresses (1) how local task forces were formed, (2) the structure and operation of local task forces, (3) the types of activities the task forces perform, (4) how local task forces obtain and manage funding and other resources, (5) task force strengths and weaknesses, and (6) how to avoid pitfalls and obstacles that confront task forces. The task force contacts for this study are included in Appendix A to this volume. Complete case studies are included in Volume II.					
17. Key Words Impaired driving, task force, local, regional, membership, meetings, strategies, legislation, enforcement, sanctions, public information, recommendations				18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the public from the National Technical Information Service www.ntis.gov and www.nhtsa.gov	
19 Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21 No. of Pages 64	22. Price

Acknowledgments

To prepare this guide, a number of key State, Federal, and local officials were contacted and interviewed. We would like to thank each person who provided information and insight into the task force process. In particular, the following individuals provided detailed and extensive information for the nine case studies included in this guide:

Chris Andrieu
Southeastern Louisiana DUI Task Force
Case Management Information Systems
Division of the Louisiana Supreme Court
Louisiana

Jenna Caplette
Gallatin County DUI Task Force
Montana

Det. Cpl. Mike Davis
Bexar County DWI Task Force
Alamo Heights Police Department
Texas

James Fell
Fairfax County DWI Task Force
Virginia

Bridget Gardner
Southeastern Louisiana DUI Task Force
Medical Center of Louisiana at New
Orleans Trauma Center
Louisiana

Maile Gray
Pikes Peak Region DUI Task Force
Colorado Springs Police Department
Colorado

Christina M. Guerra
Bexar County DWI Task Force
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission
Texas

Doris Heckerman
Gallatin County DUI Task Force
Montana

Kathryn Kendrick
Alcohol Impaired-Driving Task Force of

Costa Mesa
County of Orange Health Care Agency,
Alcohol and Drug Education and
Prevention Team (ADEPT)
California

James May
Broome County Stop DWI
New York

Major Jim Russell
Leon County DUI Strike Force
Florida State University Police
Department
Florida

Craig Simpson
Pikes Peak Region DUI Task Force
Colorado Springs Police Department
Colorado

Cesi Velez
Kent Drinking Driver Task Force
Kent Police Department
Washington

J. J. Williams
Southeastern Louisiana DUI Task Force
Louisiana District Attorneys Association
Louisiana

J.J. Wolff
Pikes Peak Region DUI Task Force
Colorado State Patrol

Susan Wordal
Gallatin County DUI Task Force
Bozeman City Attorney's Office
Montana

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	
Executive Summary.....	1
Background.....	1
Methodology.....	1
Summary of Findings.....	2
Histories and Structure.....	2
Funding.....	3
Evaluations.....	3
Strengths and Barriers.....	4
Activities and Accomplishments.....	5
Recommendations and Final Thoughts.....	5
Background.....	7
About this Guide.....	7
Methodology.....	10
How This Guide Was Developed.....	10
Characteristics of Local Task Forces.....	10
Task Force Selection.....	11
Task Forces Selected for Case Studies.....	12
Case Study Reports.....	13
Findings.....	14
Task Force Histories.....	14
Task Force Objectives.....	14
Funding.....	15
Timeframes.....	16
Operational Issues.....	16
Structure.....	16
Task Force Agenda.....	17
Political Leadership and Community Support.....	17
Strengths.....	18
Barriers.....	20
Activities and Accomplishments.....	21
General.....	21
Growth.....	22
Enforcement.....	22
Obtaining Equipment.....	22

Training, Education, and Related Programs	23
Outreach to Specific Groups	23
Increasing Awareness in the General Population	23
Alternatives to Impaired Driving	24
Sharing Resources	24
Effecting Changes in Legislation and Policy	24
Task Force Membership.....	25
Relationships of Special Interest.....	27
Alcohol Industry.....	27
MADD	28
Media Involvement.....	28
Effectiveness Measures.....	29
Recommendations by Task Force Members.....	30
Summaries of Task Force Case Studies	31
References	50
Appendix: Local Task Force Contacts	51

Executive Summary

Background

Impaired-driving task forces exist to address problems caused by impaired driving primarily through enforcement and education activities. These task forces are sometimes created by State agencies and operate at the statewide level. Prior research has shown that statewide impaired-driving task forces can have a beneficial effect on the incidence/occurrence of impaired driving and impaired-driving crashes. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has published *A Guide for Statewide Impaired-Driving Task Forces* (Fell & Langston, 2009) to assist State officials and other stakeholders who are interested in establishing an Impaired-Driving Statewide Task Force or who are exploring ways to improve their current task force.

There are also many task forces that operate at the local (city or county) or regional level. These local task forces may be similar to statewide task forces in many ways, including the types of people and agencies that participate in them. They may differ in some ways, including the amount of funding and other resources they have available, the type of activities in which they participate, and how they measure the effectiveness of their efforts. The purpose of this guide is to assist State and local officials in government and law enforcement, citizen activists, and other stakeholders who are interested in establishing a task force at the local or regional level, or who are exploring ways to improve their current impaired-driving task force. The two-volume guide describes nine local impaired-driving task forces and the approaches that were taken to create them, decisions made on who to include as members, and how they address impaired driving in their communities. Task forces selected for study represent a wide range of histories, structures, and approaches to conducting task force activities. Nevertheless, there are many similarities between them.

Volume I is a guide for local impaired-driving task forces. The guide summarizes the information collected from the various task forces and includes recommendations by task force members. At the end of Volume I are summaries of the nine local task force case studies. Volume II contains the full-length case studies for each of the nine local task forces in Volume I.

Methodology

Many local driving while intoxicated (DWI) or impaired-driving task forces consist entirely of members of law enforcement agencies (LEAs); however, this project focused on task forces that include members from a variety of disciplines and which are engaged in activities in addition to law enforcement. To be considered for this study, task forces must also have been locally or regionally based (rather than statewide) and primarily dedicated to impaired-driving issues (rather than general traffic safety, substance abuse, or youth safety issues).

To prepare this guide, various key State and national organizations were contacted to identify local DWI task forces with which they were familiar. Internet and literature searches were also conducted. More than 100 local DWI task forces were identified. Task force representatives were contacted using telephone calls or e-mail. Information on certain task forces was collected to help select candidates for case studies. The list of potential case study task forces was narrowed to 23, from which further information was collected. Project staff, working with NHTSA, then selected nine task forces for in-depth case studies. Task forces were selected based upon their willingness to participate, their ability to provide geographic diversity, and the variety of disciplines of task force members.

The task forces selected for case studies were located in:

- Costa Mesa, California
- Broome County, New York
- Pikes Peak Region, Colorado
- Bexar County, Texas
- Leon County, Florida
- Fairfax County, Virginia
- Southeastern Louisiana, Louisiana
- Kent, Washington
- Gallatin County, Montana

Case study reports were created from the information collected from the task forces. The case studies have been reviewed by task force representatives to ensure their accuracy.

Summary of Findings

Histories and Structure

The local task forces studied have varied histories and structures. The majority began as law-enforcement-based groups that expanded over time to include a broader array of organizations and individuals. Some were created as multidisciplinary task forces by local governments. One task force grew out of the activities of a single activist and expanded over time. Some were formed as a result of a decision made at the State level to set up a system of task forces operating at the local level. Although all task forces studied were primarily focused on impaired driving, some began with and maintained an exclusive focus on impaired driving, while others later branched out to include other traffic safety and/or substance abuse issues such as underage drinking. Two task forces grew out of larger public health committees that created task forces to deal specifically with impaired-driving issues.

The overall objective of all task forces studied is to reduce impaired driving. The task forces approached this in several different ways. All task forces engaged in activities involving community education and awareness, and/or law enforcement activities. Other approaches include providing alternative transportation and responsible beverage service training programs. Enforcement-centered activities included high-visibility enforcement and training for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges. Educational and public

awareness activities often include media campaigns on the consequences of impaired driving, the importance of combating it, current law enforcement efforts aimed at increasing the perception of being caught if one drives while impaired, and sanctions for driving impaired.

Nearly all task forces meet at least quarterly and most meet once a month. The majority meet in the same place and on the same day (e.g., third Thursday) each month. Most have a small core of members who handle much of the work of organizing meetings and task force activities. There may be a single, officially designated coordinator or administrator. Some coordinators are paid; however, most paid positions are not full-time. Most task forces have a chair or co-chairs. These positions may be reassigned periodically.

Task force membership typically is comprised of individuals who serve as representatives of member organizations or agencies that have a stake in impaired-driving issues. Most include representatives of many or all local LEAs. Others may represent courts, alcohol beverage control agencies, local high schools and colleges, the medical community, addiction treatment providers, and drinking establishments. Some task forces also include community activists or advocates interested in the issue of impaired driving. In addition to the core group of members, some task forces have a second tier of participants, sometimes referred to as community partners, who are distinct from task force members. Community partners frequently are individuals and representatives of organizations who cannot participate fully in all aspects of the task force, but wish to contribute to the cause and support the work of the task force by hosting or sponsoring a particular program or event. Community partners often are invited to attend meetings, receive information, and address the task force, but lack some of the privileges of full membership. Some task forces make decisions by a majority of the votes; others use a consensus process for decision-making.

Some task forces form subcommittees or working groups to address particular issues. Subcommittees may exist only long enough to achieve the task for which they were created, or may be standing committees that function continuously.

Funding

Funding for the task forces varied substantially, ranging from no funding to a maximum of about \$460,000 per year. Some task forces started with initial funding, but have lost it over time. Some have never received funding. Task forces often receive support in the form of goods and services, in-kind donations, contributions of cash or waived fees, and volunteer labor. These may come from the community or member organizations.

Evaluations

Task forces endeavor to collect data that indicate the effectiveness of their activities, but these data can be limited. Most of the local task forces that were studied do not have the resources or expertise to conduct scientific evaluation studies. Three task forces, however, did collect sufficient data to observe changes in impaired-driving measures in their areas. The most sophisticated analysis found was that of the task force in Fairfax County, which conducted a time-series analysis of alcohol-involved crashes from 2000 to 2005. The study concluded that crashes involving drinking drivers declined significantly (by about 9% in

Fairfax County) after a sobriety checkpoint program was implemented. The resources necessary for the analyses were donated to the task force by a nonprofit research institute.

Comparing data for Broome County, NY with data for the rest of the Nation, the Broome County STOP-DWI Program, found decreases in some indicators of impaired driving. Single vehicle nighttime fatal and personal injury crashes in Broome County fell 42.1 percent from 1995 to 2007, but no such trend was observed nationally. Reductions of nearly 30 percent were observed in Broome County from 1995 to 2005 in police-reported alcohol-related crashes. There was a 50.3 percent reduction in the number of persons injured in alcohol-related crashes from 1995 to 2007, but no decline Nationwide in alcohol-related injuries.

Kent's Drinking Driver Task Force found a 45-percent reduction in the proportion of crashes involving drivers with BACs of .08 g/dL or higher between 1993 and 2005. In that time, the population in the area more than doubled while arrests for driving under the influence of alcohol (DUI) increased by only 30 percent in the face of increases in DUI enforcement. This suggests that DUI enforcement may have been working to reduce impaired driving.

Most other task forces collected data related to impaired driving, such as impaired-driving crashes, arrests, and citations. However, various barriers may prevent them from effectively using those data to evaluate their task forces. Task forces often do not have access to data for the period before the task force was established, and therefore are unable to determine how indicators of impaired driving have changed in association with task force activities. In less-populated areas, crash data can be a problematic measure of effectiveness because the number of crashes can be very low, highly variable, and susceptible to many influences other than that of the task force. Arrest and citation data can be problematic because it is difficult to determine whether changes in arrests or citations are a function of changes in enforcement or changes in impaired driving. Given this, most local task forces tend to express effectiveness in terms of a process evaluation—for example, successful completion of task force goals; increasing membership; supporting successful legislative efforts; raising awareness of impaired-driving issues; the ability of members to work more effectively due to increased communication, collaboration and access to information through the task force; or simply continuing to be active as a task force.

Strengths and Barriers

Task forces were asked to describe what they considered to be the strengths that positively influenced their effectiveness and the barriers that negatively influenced their effectiveness. Commonly mentioned strengths included a very strong interest (described as “passion,” “commitment,” “determination,” or “persistence”) in impaired-driving issues on the part of members; flexibility and the ability to adapt to changes in environments and situations; having access to the expertise of people from diverse backgrounds with ranges of knowledge and perspectives; the ability to share resources such as staff, funding, material, equipment, and facilities; the establishment of mutually beneficial relationships and improved communication between people and agencies; and the positive effects of operating locally on the ability to identify, focus upon, and solve local issues quickly and efficiently. Commonly mentioned barriers included lack of adequate resources and funding,

difficulties recruiting and retaining members, and difficulty in keeping impaired-driving issues a high priority among community and government officials. Other barriers mentioned included convincing the community to take impaired driving more seriously, impeded progress due to attempts to be inclusive and obtain consensus, overly ambitious goals set by overly enthusiastic members, and lack of access to important impaired-driving data.

Activities and Accomplishments

Some task forces considered it an accomplishment to continue to remain active for a substantial period of time (one close to 30 years). Some mentioned increases in membership and/or geographic coverage as an accomplishment. Indications that a task force was receiving support from the community, and/or that attitudes toward impaired driving were changing for the better, were also seen as accomplishments.

Many of the activities and accomplishments involved enforcement efforts. Common examples of these included facilitating checkpoints and other high-visibility efforts; purchasing equipment for LEAs; training officers in standardized field sobriety testing, drug recognition evaluations and providing effective courtroom testimony; hosting educational workshops for judges and prosecutors on current impaired-driving issues; and working with law enforcement and alcohol beverage control agencies to help identify and sanction establishments that sell alcohol to underage people or serve to obviously intoxicated patrons.

In general, task forces often consider it an accomplishment to have raised awareness of, or maintained focus upon, impaired-driving issues. More specific educational and awareness-related activities commonly mentioned by task force representatives include media awareness campaigns; presentations and awareness campaigns at high schools and colleges, local military bases and churches; responsible beverage service training; awards programs for anti DUI efforts; and submitting editorials and statistics to local news media.

Other accomplishments include drafting and promoting legislation and facilitating programs that provide alternatives to impaired driving (e.g., sober-ride programs).

To the extent that some local task forces engage in activities related to safety issues other than impaired driving (e.g., speeding, seat belt use, pedestrian safety), they also listed accomplishments related to those issues.

Recommendations and Final Thoughts

Some basic recommendations made by task force representatives include:

- Be passionate, persistent, patient, creative, and flexible. Maintain a sense of humor;
- Keep things simple. Focus on reasonable short-term goals.
- Avoid duplicating efforts. Let groups or organizations that do a task well handle that task.
- Focus on working within cooperative relationships rather than combating adversaries.
- Focus on positive messages and not scare tactics.

- Facilitate membership participation by holding meetings in the same, centrally-located place and at the same time each month, or by combining task force meetings with other events members will be attending.
- Encourage member participation by giving members a sense of ownership of task force activities and accomplishments.
- Understand the importance of media expertise and exposure. Having a voice for the task force is critical to educating leaders and the public and gaining buy-in to impaired-driving countermeasures.
- Foster working relationships with community institutions that can support task force efforts.
- Base activities on research and data that suggests they will be effective.

Background

About This Guide

The purpose of this guide is to assist State and local officials in government and law enforcement, citizen activists, and other stakeholders who are interested in establishing a task force at the local or regional level, or who are exploring ways to improve their current impaired-driving task force. This guide describes nine task forces and the approaches that were taken to create each task force, decisions made on who to include in each of the task forces, and how each task force addresses impaired driving in their areas. The task forces were selected from task forces identified during our research. Those selected for case studies represent a wide range of histories, structures, and approaches to conducting task force activities. The diversity of these task forces makes it virtually impossible to use the information collected to create a single set of rules or recommendations for starting and operating local task forces. They are all quite different. There are, however, some similarities in the experiences of the nine selected task forces—approaches that many or most found beneficial. By documenting the different approaches taken by these task forces, readers with an interest in starting a task force can find one or more in this guide with circumstances similar to their own.

Prior research has shown that statewide impaired-driving task forces can have a beneficial effect on the incidence and occurrence of impaired driving and impaired-driving crashes. For example, the New Mexico DWI Leadership Team has been a key reason why the State has made substantial progress in reducing impaired driving. Between 2003 and 2006, when most of the Nation did not experience reductions in alcohol-related fatal crashes, New Mexico saw a 15 percent decline in their alcohol-related traffic fatalities. There are many reasons for the decline, including increased enforcement, legislative changes and outstanding support for programs and resources by Governor Bill Richardson, DWI Czar Rachel O'Connor, the State's Traffic Safety Bureau, NHTSA, and the State Leadership Team.

Tough and innovative impaired-driving policy changes contributed to the reduction in alcohol-related fatalities and were the result of coordinated efforts by the DWI czar and the DWI Leadership Team. Since 2004, the New Mexico Legislature has enacted several important and innovative statutes that have contributed to the progress to date:

- Creating an alcohol ignition interlock licensing provision;
- Mandating alcohol ignition interlock devices for all DWI-convicted offenders (including all first offenders, the first such State to do so); and
- Mandating substance abuse treatment for second and subsequent DWI offenders.

At the request of the DWI czar and the Leadership Team, the legislature also provided funding for enforcing these laws including funds for the interlock compliance unit in the Motor Vehicle Division, for the Mobile Strike Unit to conduct enforcement activities and

compliance checks at bars and restaurants, for the Drunk-Busters DWI Hotline and for an early education DWI prevention curriculum in schools around the State.

Another example is from Oregon. After working on it for several years, the Oregon Governor's Advisory Committee on DUII finally succeeded in getting a traffic safety resource prosecutor (TSRP) for the State, and she serves as a liaison as a public prosecutor resource for the committee. In 2005, the committee asked for another evaluation of the dismissed suspension cases as part of the administrative process. The report identified that law enforcement officers were failing to appear at administrative license revocation hearings, but no one was informing the appropriate law enforcement agencies that officers were not appearing. When the task force discussed this issue, the Driver and Motor Vehicles Services Division (DMV) realized that they had a list of cases when this happened and could easily send that list to the law enforcement agency in question. The DMV started informing the senior administrator of police agencies when an officer did not appear at a hearing. Officers began showing up again and this problem has been reduced. The resolution of this issue required no funding and no legislation: it was resolved with improved communication.

For those interested in establishing and/or continuing *statewide* impaired-driving task forces, a guide similar to this one was published recently by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (Fell & Langston, 2009, September).

Task forces that operate at the county or city level have also been formed to focus on impaired-driving issues at the local level. It is more difficult to demonstrate the effectiveness of local impaired-driving task forces. Local task forces may not have the resources or expertise to conduct scientific studies. Most local task forces attempt to collect data on impaired-driving crashes and citations; however, they may not have access to data for the period before the task force was established, and therefore are often unable to determine how indicators of impaired driving have changed relative to task force activities. Along with issues of data access and analytic expertise, local level data on impaired driving are fraught with limitations. Crash data can be a problematic measure of local task force effectiveness because the number of crashes in a small area can be very low, highly variable, and susceptible to many influences other than that of the task force. Arrest and citation data can be problematic because it can be difficult to determine whether changes in arrests or citations are a function of changes in enforcement or changes in impaired driving. Local task forces report positive effects of their efforts. These are generally expressed in terms of successful completion of task force goals, e.g., funding training activities or equipment purchases, increasing membership, supporting successful legislative efforts, raising awareness of impaired-driving issues, or simply continuing to exist as a task force. Members of local task forces have observed the effectiveness of the task force in terms of the ability of its members to work more effectively due to increased communication, collaboration and access to information through the task force. Although these effects cannot be validated scientifically, they are, nonetheless observable, positive outcomes of the task force for the people involved.

The term "local impaired-driving task force" may have different meanings to those interested in starting one. Many of the local DWI task forces identified in the research consisted entirely of members of law enforcement agencies. These generally were formed

around a perceived benefit to LEAs to demonstrate a united front against impaired driving or DWI and to work together on anti-DWI activities, such as high-visibility enforcement campaigns. Although these LEA task forces may be effective and have been studied in the past, they were not the focus of this project. For this project, the focus was on task forces that were:

- locally or regionally based (rather than statewide);
- largely or primarily dedicated to DWI issues (rather than general traffic safety, substance abuse, or youth safety issues);
- inclusive of members from a variety of disciplines (in addition to law enforcement) and engaged in countermeasure activities in addition to impaired-driving law enforcement.

Additionally, use of terminology around the issue of impaired driving varies across States and localities. Some use the term “driving under the influence” (DUI), whereas others use “driving while intoxicated” or driving while impaired” or simply “impaired driving.” These terms are used interchangeably in this document.

Methodology

How This Guide Was Developed

To prepare this guide, various key State and national organizations were contacted to identify local DWI task forces with which they were familiar. Internet and literature searches were also conducted. Well over 100 local task forces were identified. Task force representatives were contacted using telephone calls and e-mail. Information on task forces was collected to select candidates for case studies. Upon further investigation, many of the initial selections did not meet all the criteria for local task forces to be included in this study. Some of these task forces also did not respond to attempts to contact them.

Characteristics of Local Task Forces

Task forces identified fell into the following broad categories:

Local task forces under larger State programs – Some States have programs under which local DWI task forces are created, with much of the control and decision-making occurring at the local level. Some oversight, and possibly some funding, comes from the State. Task forces from Colorado, Montana, New York, and Washington fall into this category. A task force from each of these States was selected for a case study under this project.

Organizations formed by local governments – City or county governments have created DWI task forces by bringing together members of local companies and agencies to investigate DWI issues. Some of these task forces generated a set of findings and recommendations and then disbanded. Others continue to be active after fulfilling their original purposes. Many were originally intended to be active into the future. Examples from this last category are the Costa Mesa and Fairfax County case studies.

Law enforcement task forces with significant participation by non-LEA organizations – These were originally LEA task forces that evolved over time to include members from several other disciplines. Case studies of two task forces represent this category: Bexar County and Southeastern Louisiana.

Law enforcement task forces with minimal participation by non-LEA organizations – Many local task forces consist of several local LEAs focusing almost exclusively on impaired-driving enforcement efforts. These task forces may work with local prosecutors to increase the likelihood of successful convictions. They also may work with advocacy groups, such as local chapters of Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) or entities that provide citizen support for their enforcement efforts. The task force from Leon County represents this category.

Task forces with broader transportation safety interests – Some areas have local task forces that focus on a broad spectrum of transportation safety issues, such as reducing speeding,

improving bicycle and pedestrian safety, or increasing the use of seat belts and child safety seats. Impaired driving is often a concern for these organizations, but it is not considered their primary focus. Because this guide focuses on impaired driving, task forces were not considered for inclusion in this project unless they considered impaired driving to be their primary focus.

Task forces with broader alcohol and substance abuse interests—Some task forces were concerned with alcohol and drug abuse in general, and impaired driving was only a part of their focus. Task forces with a focus broader than impaired driving were not selected for inclusion in the case studies for this project.

Task forces with a focus on youth safety—Some of the groups identified in our search were concerned primarily with the safety of children and teenagers, with a focus on underage drinking and drug abuse. Anti-DWI efforts of these groups were aimed primarily at parents and teen drivers. Task forces that were only tangentially focused on impaired-driving issues also were not included in the case studies for this project.

Task Force Selection

After including them as potential task forces for the project, the list of potential case study task forces was narrowed to 23, from which further information was collected. Project staff working with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration task order manager then selected nine task forces for in-depth case studies. The rationale for selecting task forces for case studies included the following:

Geographic diversity—Attempts were made to include task forces from a number of regions across the country and not to include too many task forces from any one region. Where there were several task forces from one State (as was the case with California, Colorado, Montana, New York, Texas, and Washington), only one was chosen. Ultimately, we selected a total of nine local task forces, which represented seven NHTSA regions and nine States.

Willingness—The task force leaders had to be willing to participate in this project.

Diversity of disciplines of task force participants—Task forces with a range of disciplines represented by members were selected over task forces that had only one focus such as enforcement). Task forces that conducted more non-LEA activities were considered more appropriate for selection. Ultimately, the task forces selected varied from those with a primary (but not complete) focus on law enforcement activities to those with relatively little focus on them.

Specific focus on DUI—Task forces selected all described themselves as being interested primarily in DUI. Those ranged from focused mostly on DUI, with some interest in other transportation safety issues, to those focused entirely on DUI.

Contact information for representatives of the original 23 task forces considered is included in Appendix A. These officials expressed a willingness to participate in this study.

Task Forces Selected for Case Studies

Costa Mesa, California – A task force with a diverse group of partners conducting different types of activities. It was desirable to include a task force from California as it makes up 10 percent of the U.S. population. Another California task force was considered, but it had previously been the subject of NHTSA research and documentation, so the Costa Mesa program was preferred.

Pikes Peak Region (Colorado Springs area), Colorado – There are many DUI task forces in Colorado, and there were several on the list of 23 for consideration. Pikes Peak Region's was selected based upon the task force's activity, willingness to cooperate, and diversity.

Leon County (Tallahassee area), Florida – This task force is composed primarily of local LEAs, some of which work with a diverse group of partners as part of their anti-DWI efforts. For example, one of the contacts for this study was affiliated with a university police agency and works closely with the university and local medical community.

Southeastern Louisiana (greater New Orleans and nearby parishes), Louisiana – This task force had a large number of partners from diverse disciplines. It is an example of a task force that is not just citywide or countywide; it is regionwide.

Gallatin County (Bozeman area), Montana – Montana has a unique situation in that there is a statewide program under which local task forces have been established. The inclusion of a Montana task force was therefore desirable. Four Montana task forces were among the 23 considered for this study. Of these, the Gallatin task force was willing to participate and had a longer history and more activity than others under consideration.

Broome County (Binghamton area), New York – Every county in New York has a DUI task force in the form of its Stop-DWI program. Four task forces were regarded as good candidates. We selected Broome County because the head of this program is also the State chairman for all Stop-DWI programs and could provide insight on his own program and other New York task forces with which he is familiar.

Bexar County (San Antonio area), Texas – Of the three task forces of interest in Texas, one declined to participate and one was largely law-enforcement-oriented. The remaining task force, in Bexar County, was interested in participating and described some innovative approaches in communicating with its community.

Fairfax County (Washington, DC, suburb), Virginia – A member of the research team is both a long-time member and current chair of the Fairfax County Oversight Committee on Drinking and Driving. This provided substantial access to information on this task force. This county task force recommended and helped to implement a weekly sobriety checkpoint program in 2003 that produced measurable results (a significant 8% decrease in drinking driving crashes).

Kent (Seattle suburb), Washington – There are numerous task forces in Washington State, though they tend to be concerned with general traffic safety issues of which DUI is one. Kent's appeared to be focused sufficiently on DUI issues and expressed interest in participating.

Case Study Reports

For the nine local task force case studies, information was collected through open-ended discussions with multiple officials from each task force. Some former task force members provided historical perspectives. Additional information was collected in the form of written reports and information available on task force Web sites. Draft reports of each case study were prepared by project staff and reviewed internally. Task force representatives also reviewed draft case study reports and checked them for accuracy. See Volume II for complete case studies (Fell, Fisher, & McKnight, 2010, in press).

Findings

This section of the report summarizes the information found in the individual case studies. The structure of this section generally mirrors that of the case studies.

Task Force Histories

Although the histories of local community impaired-driving task forces were varied, there were also several commonalities. The majority of the task forces began as law-enforcement-based groups that expanded over time to include a broader array of organizations and individuals. One of the task forces examined remains a confederation of LEAs that work together to conduct enforcement operations, with individual member agencies joining with non-law-enforcement community partners to conduct related activities. Some task forces were created as multidisciplinary task forces by local governments. One task force grew out of the activities of a citizen activist, expanding over time to include various individuals, officials, and groups, and eventually worked on the adoption of legislation that provides financial support to local impaired-driving task forces throughout the State. Some of these task forces were formed as a result of a decision made at the State level to set up a system of task forces operating at the local level. For example, New York passed legislation in 1981 to establish the STOP-DWI Program. Under the legislation, any county that established a comprehensive local DWI countermeasures program to prevent impaired driving qualified for the return of all fines collected for any alcohol and other drug-related traffic and penal law offenses in that jurisdiction.

Task forces that began as law-enforcement-based collaborations often initially included local prosecutors. Citizen activist groups like MADD were often early supporters of these task forces and therefore can be considered early task force members or partners.

While all task forces studied were *primarily* focused on impaired driving, some began with and maintained an exclusive focus on impaired driving while others later branched out to include other safety and substance abuse issues such as underage drinking, occupant protection, speeding, and other drugged driving. Two task forces grew out of larger public health organizations that felt they needed to create task forces to deal specifically with impaired-driving issues.

Task Force Objectives

The overall objective of all task forces is to reduce impaired driving. They approach this in different ways. All task forces attempt to achieve their objectives through (1) educating members of the community and increasing awareness of impaired-driving issues, or (2) law enforcement activities. Most task forces use both approaches. Other approaches include providing alternatives to impaired driving (sober ride programs); working with establishments (bars, restaurants, and nightclubs) to enhance responsible beverage service

practices, such as through server training programs; and recommending laws or local ordinances.

Task forces with an enforcement focus are concerned primarily with ways in which they can mount effective and efficient enforcement activities. Some task forces have also included training activities in their efforts to increase the effectiveness of enforcement. This includes providing training or education to law enforcement officers (e.g., case law updates, standardized field sobriety testing procedures), prosecutors, and judges on technical issues surrounding the identification, successful prosecution, and adjudication of impaired drivers.

Educational and public awareness activities often take the form of media campaigns on the consequences of impaired driving, the importance of combating it, and prevention messages. Some task forces also have publicity campaigns that accompany law enforcement efforts to raise the public's perceptions of the risk of detection and punishment for driving impaired and help support general deterrence. Some task forces approach judges, legislators, and other government officials to increase their awareness of the importance of impaired-driving issues. Some task forces promote or provide responsible beverage service (RBS) training to train and educate alcohol servers to avoid service to underage drinkers and intoxicated patrons.

Funding

Annual funding for the task forces examined varied substantially, ranging from no funding to a maximum of about \$460,000 per year. Some task forces have never received institutionalized funding and others started with funding, such as a grant from the State's transportation or traffic safety agency. Over time, some task forces that began with government funding have stopped receiving it (one task force restored that funding mechanism). Others have been successful in obtaining expanded sources of funding, such as financial support from county and city governments and community coalitions. Reasons for reductions in or loss of funding include constraints on State budgets associated with the nationwide economic downturn, changes in priorities of Federal or State funders, and political issues. Several task forces listed obtaining funds for task force activities as a significant ongoing challenge.

When funding is available for task force operations, there is sometimes a paid task force coordinator. This position may be part time. Most task force members are volunteers; others are paid by the agencies or organizations they represent.

Instead of or in addition to institutionalized funding, task forces often receive support in the form of goods and services, in-kind donations, contributions of cash or waived fees, and volunteer labor. These may come from the community or member organizations. Examples include refreshments for officers at checkpoint operations, space for meetings, earned media coverage, and administrative support from government agencies. One task force organized law enforcement training classes and had some funds left over from registration fees that they used for other task force activities.

Timeframes

In terms of longevity, task forces tended to fall into one of two groups. Several task forces were formed in the 1980s and have been operating for 20 to 25 years. Several others have been in existence for just 5 years or less. In addition, one task force evolved from an organization that started in the late 1970s, and two formed in the late 1990s. No task forces reported that there had been any end date in mind when the task force was formed, and all are expected to continue into the future.

Most task forces meet about once a month. The majority meet in the same place and on the same day (e.g., third Thursday) each month. Some reported not scheduling task force meetings in December due to the holidays. A task force representative expressed the opinion that a meeting held at a predictable time and location helped keep attendance high by reducing potential confusion. Holding a meeting in a central location in the community also helped in this regard.

Operational Issues

Structure

In general, most of the local task forces examined have a small core of people who handle much of the work of organizing meetings and task force activities. There may be a single officially designated coordinator or administrator. Some of these people are paid; however, the funds usually do *not* support full-time positions. Volunteer (unpaid) coordinators often are not able to dedicate enough time for the task force to be as effective as paid coordinators. When there is a paid, dedicated task force coordinator, that person usually is not employed by a member agency. One advantage of having an independent paid coordinator is that the coordinator can remain free of the influence of any particular agency's agenda or perspective.

Most task forces have a chair or co-chairs. These positions may be reassigned periodically. Chairs may be representatives of member organizations. When the task force focuses more on enforcement issues or has evolved from an enforcement-oriented group, chairs are more likely to be representatives of local LEAs.

Task force membership typically is comprised of people who represent member organizations. Most task forces have local LEAs as members. Often, the individual representatives from an agency or organization will change over time due to changes in personnel, availability, or interest in the task force. Some task forces also include community residents who are very interested in the issue of impaired driving but not affiliated with member organizations (e.g., the family member of an impaired-driving crash victim). In addition to the core group, some task forces have a second tier of participants, sometimes referred to as community partners, who are distinct from task force members. Community partners frequently are individuals and representatives of organizations who cannot participate fully in all aspects of the task force but wish to contribute to the cause and support the work of the task force by hosting or sponsoring a particular program or event. For example, in Costa Mesa, in addition to the core group there are individuals and

organizations such as the California Alcohol Beverage Control Agency, the group Recording Artists, Actors and Athletes Against Drunk Driving, and a local insurance company among others that are interested in keeping abreast of the task force activities and, when possible, participating in specific events. In Bexar County, the task force is supported by community partners such as the restaurant association and the Anheuser-Busch local distributor, which assist with activities such as trainings and alternative transportation programs, and EMS and fire departments, which participate in special programs such as the Shattered Dream program. Community partners often are invited to attend meetings, receive information, and address the task force but lack some of the privileges of full membership such as voting rights and the ability to shape the task force agenda. Some task forces make decisions by voting; others use a consensus process for decision-making.

Some task forces form subcommittees or working groups to address particular issues. These groups' members usually have a special interest or ability in the relevant topic. Examples include subcommittees dedicated to Web site development, data analysis, media relations, or preparation for upcoming events. These subcommittees may exist only long enough to achieve the task for which they were created; other working committees may be standing committees that function continuously.

Task Force Agenda

Task force coordinators, chairs, and co-chairs generally handle the administrative task of establishing agendas for meetings. However, most task forces stressed that members are often solicited in advance to provide input for the agenda or are encouraged to bring up issues for discussion during the meeting. Giving all members the opportunity to contribute takes advantage of the diversity of the group, promotes a sense of ownership, and encourages continued participation.

The task force agenda tends to be "fluid"; that is, although the core focus of the task force may remain stable over time, individual activities and approaches may change. This happens because of the changing environment (e.g., changing statistics, laws, or attitudes), current affairs (e.g., high-visibility impaired-driving crashes), changing interests of members, and past successes. An example of the latter is a case where a task force worked to raise funding to provide LEAs with the necessary equipment. The agencies subsequently decided the equipment was so useful they obtained the funding themselves, which allowed the task force to focus resources elsewhere.

Political Leadership and Community Support

The extent to which task forces seek, receive, and rely on support from political leaders and the community varies across task forces. Task forces that develop from grassroots efforts tend to be independent of political leaders. They may seek support from political leaders but do not depend upon it. Lack of involvement by task force representatives with political leaders also may be a function of laws that prevent government and other employees from lobbying.

Support from political leaders may be more passive than active. That is, political leaders may help to establish a task force and agree to provide periodic assistance but are not members and generally do not participate in task force activities. Sometimes, task forces have found leaders to be reluctant to support strong anti-DWI efforts because community support is not always strong. Community support for anti-DWI efforts can rise and fall in response to current events (e.g., high-profile impaired-driving crashes). Political leaders also are under pressure to address many issues that compete with task forces for attention and funding. Some elected officials may work against the task force's goals, perhaps in response to pressure from constituents; however, reports of this were rare.

Task force representatives point out that an advantage of working at the local level is that they can work independently of State government and political leaders and are relatively free of political concerns and bureaucracy (although they may be dealing with local government agencies and officials). This can help them make decisions and take actions more quickly. Task forces that generally do not involve State or local officials in their activities expressed the belief that they had access to government officials if they needed it. In States that have a statewide impaired-driving task force, it is possible to use the State task force to access government officials. Local task forces also may have relationships with officials at other State agencies (e.g., departments of transportation or health) who can provide indirect access to elected officials at the State level.

Task forces that were formed by local government or operate out of government agencies usually have more interaction with local elected officials. A common benefit of this relationship is that elected officials are in a position to publicly recognize and express support for the task force and its activities. This, in turn, raises the profile of the task force and helps to communicate its message to the public. Task forces that work closely with local governments may more easily persuade the government to adopt policy recommendations. These task forces may have county or city councils that must approve task force membership. One task force found that this slowed the process of adding new members and obtained approval to accept automatically the representatives of approved agencies or companies as members.

An important indication of community support is the extent to which members of the public are joining task forces or participating as community partners in task force activities. Support from the community also may appear in the form of contributions of goods and services to the task force. Task forces also gauge community support by reactions to task force activities. For example, participation in sobriety checkpoint operations gives the public an opportunity to meet with local law enforcement. Some task force representatives consider the number of people stopped at checkpoints who complain about them and the number of people who praise the operation as measures of the community's support for the task force and its goals.

Strengths

Most task forces evolve due to strong interest in impaired-driving issues on the part of a few people. Members who subsequently join the task force also tend to have this strong interest sometimes described as "passion," "commitment," or "determination". The strong

interest of task force members in addressing the impaired-driving problem is considered by most task forces as one of their greatest strengths. Often task force members become less active over time, or active representatives of member agencies are replaced with less active members. By remaining open to new members with a high level of interest, the task force can maintain the overall high level of interest in task force issues.

Nearly all task forces used the term “flexibility” in describing their principal strengths. The ability to adapt to changes was seen as critical to addressing changing environments and situations. Over time, important resources that had been available to task forces may become unavailable. Task forces must continually seek and be open to new opportunities for resources or actively search for them while avoiding wasted effort trying to use methods that are no longer productive. In one task force, flexibility derived from an operating structure in which member LEAs participate as an informal confederation with no charter or bylaws and no source of funding. As such, the task force is unencumbered by requirements that may be set forth in outdated bylaws or attached to funding sources.

Another commonly mentioned strength is having access to the expertise of a group of people from diverse backgrounds. Having members with a range of knowledge and perspectives increases the task force’s ability to assess problems and find solutions. Exposure to other members’ knowledge and perspectives is a valuable educational experience. Allowing members from various parts of the community to participate in the task force gives participants a sense of ownership of and participation in the process of solving the problem.

The ability to share resources in the form of staff, funding, material, equipment, and facilities was mentioned as a strength by numerous task forces. This was especially true for LEAs. In some task forces, smaller agencies could not engage in task force activities such as checkpoint operations without additional staff and equipment from larger LEAs and other task force members.

Multiple task force representatives mentioned the value of operating at the local level, whether funding comes from the State or not. Operating locally allows a task force to identify, focus upon, and solve local issues. This helps garner community support, which further helps the task force to grow and be effective. Another benefit of local control is the speed of implementation that comes from not needing approval or participation of larger bureaucracies.

Another strength of local task forces is that members can establish mutually beneficial relationships and improved communication. This benefits members and furthers task force goals even when communications occur outside of regular task force meetings. Meeting people from other parts of the community with expertise in various subjects makes it easier for task force members to contact each other to obtain useful information quickly. By knowing what others in the community are doing, task force members are less likely to waste time engaging in redundant activities. Increased communication between neighboring LEAs leads to increased cooperation.

To the extent that agencies and organizations assign high-ranking officials -- police chiefs, tavern owners, agency directors -- to participate in the task force, the ability of these

representatives to commit their organizations' resources to task force activities is seen as a strength.

Barriers

The most frequently mentioned barrier to success for local DWI task forces is the lack of adequate resources and funding. Task force members may not have as much time as they need to accomplish the goals the task force has established. Although there may be many task force members contributing ideas for task force activities, the actual work of implementing these ideas often falls to a few members who have limited time available. Significant time is also needed to seek funding and to market the task force to legislators and other government officials who may need to remain convinced that the task force is valuable to the community. One task force mentioned that there are more requests from the community for support, programs, and presentations offered by the task force than it can address. Task forces have always struggled to identify sources of funding. Under current economic conditions obtaining funding has become more difficult. Sometimes funding comes from agencies with specific goals. Addressing the goals of funding agencies can leave little or no time or resources for addressing other issues of interest to some task force members.

Some task forces mentioned having difficulties recruiting and retaining members. One task force mentioned that identifying and recruiting representatives of agencies, especially smaller agencies, was particularly difficult. Other task forces have seen their membership grow substantially because of joining forces with other organizations, such as community coalitions or expansion from a citywide to a countywide task force.

Task forces may have difficulty keeping impaired-driving issues a high priority among community and government officials. Consequently, proposed anti-DWI laws may be compromised in the process of being adopted.

Other barriers mentioned by task force representatives include the following:

- Convincing the community to take impaired driving seriously.
- Impeding the rate of progress on activities and initiatives by trying to be inclusive and obtaining consensus. Many task forces strive to include all interested parties and ensure that all voices at the table are heard. These principles help encourage active participation, grassroots support, and a sense of community ownership. However, a balance must be struck between consensus decision-making and keeping the process moving to ensure that goals are accomplished. Otherwise, if projects do not proceed with timeliness from planning to implementation, members may become frustrated and disinterested in the task force.
- Setting of overly ambitious goals by overly enthusiastic members. As with many community-based initiatives, local task forces often rely on the participation of people and organizations deeply dedicated to the issue. Often, task force members are volunteers or employees of organizations working in the public health and safety field. Thus, personal interest and commitment are high and translate into setting ambitious

goals for the task force that may be difficult to attain. Sometimes goals may be unattainable because participants lack a complete understanding of an issue, what can be done, or what other important players are willing or able to do. Sometimes, a goal may be overly ambitious because of the level of work required to put the plan into action and the relatively short period set aside to accomplish the goal. Among task forces with paid coordinators or chairs, this may be less of a problem as paid staff may be able to do much of the groundwork (i.e., administrative and detail-oriented work) necessary to move activities from the planning to implementation phase.

- Obtaining impaired-driving data from sources. Several task forces reported engaging in data-driven decision-making processes, whereby epidemiological data was used to identify problems and plan task force priorities and programs. Some data was available from member agencies (e.g., departments of health, State traffic safety agencies, community organizations). For some task forces, however, obtaining the necessary data was problematic. To the extent that data is not readily available, planning processes could be stalled.

Activities and Accomplishments

The task forces described an array of activities as successes. There were some problems or barriers that the task forces overcame. Many of these were programs that they implemented successfully. The following is a description of the types of successful programs and barriers overcome considered by the task forces as measures of success.

General

- Ongoing operation of the task force
- Continued public awareness of the problem
- Sustained member focus and commitment to the goals
- Increased cooperation and communication among task force members and agencies
- Increase in drug recognition experts (DREs)
- Non-DWI programs implemented (anti-racing, car/booster seat distribution, poster contest, occupant protection)
- Reductions in impaired-driving crashes and arrests.

For example, after Fairfax County initiated a weekly sobriety checkpoint program, drinking-driver crashes decreased significantly by 9 percent. Additionally, the study estimated that over the 2½-year period when the checkpoint program was in force, **213 impaired-driving crashes were prevented**, saving the county at least \$1 million (conservatively assuming that 80% of the 213 crashes prevented were property damage only and 20% were minor injuries).

Another example is from Broome County. Since the Broome County STOP-DWI Program was initiated 28 years ago, the county has made substantial progress reducing alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes (ARMVCs) and alcohol-related fatalities and injuries. From 1979 and 1981 through 2005, ARMVCs dropped from 286 per year on average to 85 per year. The number of ARMVCs in 2005 was 70 percent lower than the yearly average prior to the STOP-DWI Program (1979-1981) and 35 percent lower than the annual average for the 1990s. Along with reductions in impaired-driving crashes, alcohol-related fatalities have decreased dramatically.

During the 1980s on average 13 people were killed in drunk driving crashes in Broome County; in the 1990s, the annual average declined to 5 fatalities per year, and for the period from 2000-2008, the average fell to 3 fatalities per year. Substantial reductions are similarly found among the county's injury cases due to impaired driving. The average annual number of people seriously injured in ARMVCs from 2000-2007 represents a 69 percent reduction from annual averages prior to the STOP-DWI program (1979-1981) and a 31 percent reduction from the annual average for the 1990s. Data on nighttime personal injury and fatal crashes and weekend nighttime personal injury and fatal crashes also suggest reductions in the range of 30 percent to 40 percent from the annual average of the 1990s to 2006.

Arrests for DWI have ranged from about 600 per year in 1978 to a high of about 1,100 in 1984, with data from 24 of 31 years falling in the range of 600 to 850 DWI arrests per year. For the 5 most recent years for which data are available (from 2004 to 2008), DWI arrests have ranged from 730 to 762. Data on recidivism are harder to come by and assess, but rates are thought to be essentially stable at between 25 to 30 percent of offenders.

Growth

- Expansion of citywide to countywide task force
- Creation of statewide system of local task forces
- Addition of new members
- Longer meetings to accommodate input from larger membership

Enforcement

- Sustained enforcement
- Sobriety checkpoint operations (including on college campuses)

Obtaining Equipment

- Obtaining equipment or grant funding for the purchase of equipment for impaired-driving traffic enforcement (e.g., in-vehicle video recorders for police cars, breath-testing equipment, mobile blood, breath, and DRE testing facility)

Training, Education, and Related Programs

- Training law enforcement officers and others on horizontal gaze nystagmus and pharmaceutical diversion
- Training law enforcement officers on providing courtroom testimony
- Training district attorneys on DWI enforcement and legal issues
- Providing RBS programs for alcohol outlets
- Hosting a community forum to discuss innovative strategies for reducing impaired driving

Outreach to Specific Groups

- Making presentations on drugs, alcohol, and traffic safety to schools and military groups
- Holding press conferences to announce a new or upcoming activity
- Conducting demonstrations involving mock crashes
- Working with area university students to raise awareness of DWI
- Working with tavern owners on programs to reduce underage drinking, open container violations, and DWI violations
- Working with local clergy to discuss impaired-driving issues at church services

Increasing Awareness in the General Population

- Increased or continuing media coverage
- Maintaining task force Web site
- Creating awards program to raise awareness of people who are contributing to reducing impaired driving
- Submitting guest op-ed pieces to newspapers
- Disseminating DWI statistics to interested parties
- Creating innovative methods for disseminating anti-DWI messages (e.g., through flyers in pizza boxes during Super Bowl weekend, in water bills, on free key chains at departments of motor vehicles, “disguised” as ads in classified section of local newspaper [e.g., “For sale – Your vehicle if you are convicted of DWI”])
- Using other methods for disseminating anti-DWI messages (e.g., advertising on movie screens before features, advertising on buses)

Alternatives to Impaired Driving

- Working with sober-ride providers
- Establishing and funding a free-ride service for impaired drivers

Sharing Resources

- Interagency cooperation to provide staffing for checkpoint operations

Effecting Changes in Legislation and Policy

- Establishing a statewide system of local task forces funded by the State and reestablishing funding after it lapsed
- Effecting a change in the city blood draw policy that facilitates extrapolation of BAC at time of driving
- Instituting other procedural changes to facilitate DWI enforcement (e.g., accessing warrants; reducing the time and paperwork required of law enforcement officers to process an impaired driver)
- Working with alcohol beverage control agency to develop a process that denies liquor licenses to establishments with frequent calls for service
- Working with community to establish a system to encourage or mandate RBS training for all applicable employees
- Coordinating the collection of place-of-last-drink data until the activity was taken over by State departments of health and human services
- Working toward modifications to laws concerning chemical test refusal and license suspension for DWI. For example, in New York, the County STOP-DWI programs are represented at the State and national levels through membership in the New York State STOP-DWI Association. The New York State STOP-DWI Association is at the forefront of public policy and legislative debate and often joins with the district attorney's, probation, police chiefs and sheriff's associations to lobby for legislation (e.g., aggravated DWI legislation, enhanced sanctions for high BACs and others) that have been passed in New York State. In Texas, where the Bexar County DWI Task Force operates, new legal provisions were signed into law (SB328, "Relating to operating a motor vehicle or a watercraft while intoxicated or under the influence of alcohol") and became effective September 1, 2009. The most significant change to the new law is that it allows officers to obtain blood evidence without a warrant from impaired drivers who are under arrest for: (1) a repeat offense of DWI that is classified as a felony, (2) DWI and have a minor child in their vehicle, or (3) causing an accident and bodily injury to another person. This law change also addressed prior legal constraints such as limitations in some jurisdictions allowing only certain types of judges to review and sign the warrants. The update to the law under SB328 has expanded the types of judges who will be allowed to review and sign the warrants. This change should serve to

increase the number of blood warrant initiatives across the State and will give some jurisdictions the ability to obtain warrants without the need to have an officer travel a long distance to locate a judge.

Task Force Membership

Some task forces reported that they try to be as open as possible to new members. Task force Web sites and other material may include invitations to join. Advantages to being inclusive are that (1) more members mean more people to share the work, (2) more members likely lead to increased diversity, and (3) new members often bring a high level of enthusiasm to the task force. Some task forces reported that it was sometimes a challenge to keep existing members engaged and keep meeting attendance high. One task force representative suggested that this is a good reason to be inclusive in accepting new members (i.e., new members are needed to replace those who drop out over time).

Membership in some task forces has been relatively stable since they began. These task forces tend to have a strong enforcement component and, therefore, have largely LEAs as members. Even so, participation by some agencies can decrease at times. Representatives may not attend meetings, or higher-level officials may send lower-level staff to meetings rather than attend themselves.

Some task forces have grown substantially over time, often by affiliating with a second large group or broadening their focus to include other safety issues.

For some task forces, membership is controlled by a local government agency. This can slow the process of adding new members.

Local task forces typically include members or community partners from the following fields:

- Law enforcement, including representatives of local State police barracks, city and county police, military police, Sheriff's offices, college campus police, traffic law enforcement, crime labs, toxicology departments, and ABC officials;
- Prosecution, including special DWI prosecutors;
- Courts, including active or recently retired judges or representatives of traffic courts or DWI courts;
- Probation departments;
- Local governments, including mayors, city councils, county commissioners, health departments, and safety councils;
- Local transportation safety-oriented organizations;
- Local drug and alcohol abuse-oriented agencies;
- Local child and youth safety-oriented organizations (e.g., Safe Kids);
- The medical community, including local hospitals, emergency medical services, trauma centers, and fire and rescue services ;

- Treatment and rehabilitation providers;
- Colleges, universities, and public schools, including administrators, teachers, school health offices, student groups (e.g., Students Against Destructive Decisions ;)
- The insurance industry;
- Public health agencies, including the Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse;
- The alcohol industry, including brewers, distillers, distributors, restaurants, bars, and tavern owners, and associations;
- Providers of alternative transportation, including taxi companies and transit providers;
- Citizen activists, including MADD, Recording Artists Against Drunk Driving, and Remove Intoxicated Drivers;
- Drivers' associations (e.g., American Automobile Association);
- Members of the general public with an interest in impaired-driving issues; and
- Others (as deemed appropriate by task force leaders).

Some local task forces find it useful to have members in the following fields of expertise:

- Communications and marketing (to provide advice on how best to publicize certain issues and events);
- Public relations (to provide expertise on how to manage relations between the task force and the public);
- Research (to provide the task force with the latest findings on the effectiveness of certain strategies and to provide an understanding of methods for determining the effectiveness of task force activities);
- Data and records (to ensure that appropriate data are collected, processed, analyzed, and available);
- Federal Government, including representatives from NHTSA and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), acting either as private citizens who are members of task forces, or as government employees, working with task forces in an advisory capacity; and
- State governments, including legislators, governor's highway safety office, State departments of transportation, State departments of health, DMVs, departments of public safety, State DWI task forces, and insurance commissions.

Relationships of Special Interest

There were three types of task force members that were of particular interest for this report:

- *Alcohol industry representatives* – The alcohol industry has the potential to devote more resources to anti-drinking and driving efforts than many other companies or agencies. On the other hand the industry could be considered to have a vested interest in avoiding or preventing efforts that could result in reducing the consumption of alcohol. It was considered important to understand the experiences of local task forces in relation to the alcohol industry.
- *MADD* – MADD has a presence in most parts of the country and has a major part of anti-drinking driving efforts for a relatively long time. Therefore it is important to understand the nature of relationships between local DUI task forces and local MADD chapters.
- *Media representatives* – For most local task forces, their activities require some amount of communicating to the community. This often involves local media outlets. Whether or not media representatives are considered members of the task forces, it is important to understand the relationship between task forces and the media.

Alcohol Industry

Task force representatives were asked specifically to discuss the task forces' relationships with representatives of the alcohol industry. The alcohol industry could be brewers, distillers, local distributors, or establishments in the community (bars, nightclubs, and restaurants that serve alcohol). Some task forces reported having alcohol industry representatives as task force members or community partners. Large companies in the industry, such as brewers and distributors, have enough funds to make significant contributions to task forces, including hosting and providing material for meetings, trainings, and other activities. In some task forces, the alcohol and hospitality industries are involved in programs that fund cab rides, promote the use of designated drivers, and provide responsible beverage service (RBS) training. Smaller establishments that represent the alcohol industry, such as owners and managers of individual bars and restaurants, sometimes contribute items, such as materials for activities, space for meetings, and refreshments for checkpoint operations.

Some task forces reported having little or no interaction with the alcohol industry. One task force representative expressed the belief that MADD has policies that limit the extent to which they can work with the alcohol industry; therefore, the task force's relationship with MADD has limited *its* interaction with the industry. However, other task forces that include MADD reported no restrictions preventing them from working with members of the alcohol industry.

Overall, task forces generally reported positive contributions from industry representatives or little or no interaction with them. Only one task force reported a case in which a recent local controversy concerning the legality of compliance checks *may* have begun with complaints from entities in the alcohol industry.

MADD

All task forces have some type of relationship with local chapters of MADD, although the nature of that relationship varies. Mostly, MADD is considered a member or partner of the task force, but one task force considered MADD as independent. This task force still interacts with MADD and works with MADD on certain activities. It reported a benefit of independence from MADD is that the task force can generally be more responsive to the local community rather than being constrained by the national priorities set by MADD.

Task force representatives mentioned that a function of MADD is to work towards anti-impaired-driving legislation, and task forces that include MADD may rely on MADD to work on legislative efforts. The task force that reported working independently from MADD leaves legislative issues for MADD to concentrate upon, but supports them in whatever way they can. Task forces that include or are run by government employees must be careful not to break laws that prevent those employees from engaging in lobbying. Having MADD involved in the task force makes it possible for MADD to take on the lobbying efforts on behalf of the task force, when others cannot.

Media Involvement

Generally, media representatives do not serve as members or community partners of task forces. Task force representatives believe that it is important to maintain good relations with the media, cultivate relationships with representatives of the media where possible, and remain accessible. Some task forces have designated public information officers to work with the media. Task forces often generate their own press releases and other material for the public. Some task forces include member agencies that are well equipped to handle media-related activities for the task force.

Task forces generally were successful in obtaining media coverage for task force activities, though this varied somewhat from one task force to another. Some task forces pay for media coverage but more often rely upon earned media coverage. One task force reported engaging in creative “guerilla” marketing that included taking advantage of free classified ads to place anti-impaired-driving ads in the form of for-sale ads. Most task forces were not able or did not attempt to measure publicity efforts (e.g., audience reached, number of times a public service announcement (PSA) was broadcast; gross rating points [GRPs]).

One task force representative cautioned that not all task force business is appropriate for coverage by media. Task force discussions involving law enforcement officers and agencies sometimes can include sensitive issues that should not be shared with the media.

Effectiveness Measures

Most task forces attempt to collect data to gauge their effectiveness and facilitate future planning and program development. The data collected normally include the number of crashes (fatal or otherwise), the proportion of crashes (fatal or otherwise), or both, that involve alcohol, and the number of impaired-driving arrests. A few task forces also reported collecting compliance check¹ data.

The relatively few crashes that occur in a local community and the high degree of variation from year to year can make it difficult to understand the effect that the task force might be having on crash rates. Several of the task forces are relatively new, which also makes it difficult to find effects of task force activities from the crash data. The use of arrest data is problematic, as it can be difficult to determine whether reductions in arrests are evidence of a decrease in impaired driving or a decrease in enforcement activity.

Task force effectiveness studies that use a control group, a time-series analysis, or both would be best for measuring the effects of task force activities; however, this type of analysis would likely require more in the way of resources and data than most task forces have available. Only one task force in our case studies used this research approach: Fairfax County, Virginia. In order to determine if the implementation of the checkpoint program (July 2003) actually caused a reduction in the rate of drinking drivers involved in crashes in Fairfax County, the Oversight Committee on Drinking and Driving, conducted a “time series” analysis of Fairfax County Police crash files covering the period from 2000 through mid-December of 2005. Over this period, there were a total of 113,618 crashes recorded, of which 5,848 (6.3%) were alcohol-related. The annual alcohol crash percentage rates were as follows:

2000: 5.8%	2003: 6.6%
2001: 6.8%	2004: 5.6%
2002: 6.9%	2005: 6.1%

¹ Compliance checks, or “stings,” involve law enforcement sending an obviously underage person into an alcohol outlet in an attempt to purchase alcohol. The underage decoys do not use false identification. If asked for identification, they either say that they do not have any ID with them or they show their real identification. If the decoy is then able to purchase alcohol the person who sold the alcohol as well as the licensed establishment may be cited for selling alcohol to minors. One task force reported collecting place-of-last-drink data to understand how its activities affect service to intoxicated patrons.

Of these crashes, for which the driver drinking status was known (76%), 4991 (3.5%) were recorded as “had been drinking.” The percent of all drivers involved in crashes who were drinking was 3.6 percent before the checkpoint program and 3.3 percent after the checkpoint program. The time series analysis used for this study is an accepted method for research conducted for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The results indicated:

- a significant 8.5 percent ($p=0.02$) reduction in alcohol-related crashes after checkpoints were introduced,
- a significant 8.5 percent ($p=0.03$) reduction in the percentage of drinking drivers who were involved in crashes in Fairfax County, and
- a significant 8.8 percent ($p=0.03$) reduction of the ratio of drinking to non-drinking drivers during the post period.

The study concluded that crashes involving drinking drivers declined significantly (about 9%) after the Fairfax County Sobriety Checkpoint Program was instituted in July 2003.

Recommendations by Task Force Members

Some basic recommendations made by task force representatives include:

- Be passionate, persistent, patient, creative and flexible. Maintain a sense of humor;
- Keep things simple. Focus on reasonable short-term goals.
- Avoid duplicating efforts. Let groups or organizations that do a task well handle that task.
- Focus on working within cooperative relationships rather than combating adversaries.
- Focus on positive messages and not scare tactics.
- Facilitate membership participation by holding meetings in the same, centrally-located place and at the same time each month, or by combining task force meetings with other events members will be attending.
- Encourage member participation by giving members a sense of ownership of task force activities and accomplishments.
- Understand the importance of media expertise and exposure. Having a voice for the task force is critical to educating leaders and the public and gaining buy-in to impaired-driving countermeasures.
- Foster working relationships with community institutions that can support task force efforts.
- Base activities on research and data that suggests they will be effective.

Summaries of Task Force Case Studies

THE ALCOHOL IMPAIRED DRIVING TASK FORCE OF COSTA MESA

The Alcohol Impaired Driving Task Force of Costa Mesa was established in November of 2005 in response to data collection and analyses undertaken three years earlier to investigate DUI incidents in Orange County, California, and inform the development of community-based DUI prevention interventions. The Orange County Health Care Agency's Alcohol and Drug Education and Prevention Team (ADEPT) took the lead in organizing the task force, whose goal was to reduce alcohol impaired driving in Costa Mesa among 21- to 34-year-olds. The task force seeks to achieve this goal using a three-pronged approach to DUI: (1) responsible beverage service trainings to Costa Mesa alcohol servers and staff; (2) communitywide media campaigns to increase awareness of the social, legal, or financial consequences of DUI; and (3) education of local officials on criteria and options for integrating RBS trainings as a requirement for new conditional use permits (CUPs). Orange County is launching a new countywide task force using the Costa Mesa task force as a blueprint. The task force in Costa Mesa will be incorporated into this new countywide effort.

The current task force in Costa Mesa is comprised of 18 active members representing 11 separate agencies. These agencies represent law enforcement (Costa Mesa Police Department), education (University of California, Irvine, and Orange County Department of Education), research (UCI Center for Trauma and Injury Prevention Research), public health (Orange County Health Care Agency and ADEPT), the hospitality industry (a night club), other businesses and business organizations (Orange County Marketplace, Costa Mesa Chamber of Commerce, Automobile Club of Southern California), citizen activists (MADD) and other community organizations (Community Service Program – Project PATH). The active members are those who attend the task force meetings, make the decisions that guide the task force, and are actively engaged in task force activities (distributing media campaign material, RBS training, conducting surveys, etc.). In addition to the core group of active members, there are 13 other individuals and organizations interested in keeping abreast of the task force activities and participating in events. They are referred to as community partners and are on the elist for distribution of meeting minutes.

There are three working committees that correspond to the three activities on which the task force focuses: (1) RBS training, (2) coalition infrastructure (includes education and media campaigns), and (3) RBS training requirements. When the task force started, there were no committees as the group was small enough that everyone could participate in each strategy. Over time, it became apparent that people were interested in focusing on one issue. Thus, the task force moved to a working committee structure to accommodate differences in interest and expertise.

Operating funds for the task force come from the sponsoring agency in the form of Tobacco Settlement Funds and Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block

Grant funds from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; The Automobile Club of Southern California (a member of the task force) provides additional core funding. Members and other community partners provide in-kind and financial resources to support programs and events (e.g., police provide space for meetings, AAA provides food for events).

Over the four years since its inception, the task force in Costa Mesa has had numerous accomplishments associated with specific programs and activities that fall under its RBS training and media campaign components. The task force has successfully trained more than 150 Costa Mesa alcohol servers, expanded the RBS training curriculum to include a 30-day follow-up component, and co-researched existing RBS training requirements in California. It developed a multipronged media campaign that has earned statewide coverage. It has made inroads with the police department to incorporate RBS training in CUPs for new establishments and eventually requiring RBS training activities for existing establishments.

In a broader sense, accomplishments include new collaborations with alcohol establishments and renewed and strengthened cooperative relationships with the police department. Perhaps one of the most exciting developments derived from the success of the citywide task force's efforts are the plans to expand into a countywide task force. The countywide task force will broaden its DUI prevention efforts to all of Orange County and will incorporate components not currently covered by the Costa Mesa task force, including an enforcement component and a legislative/policy component that will track events in Sacramento.

Although considerable progress has occurred in each area of focus, there have also been some limitations. In most cases, however, the task force has been able to make adjustments to programmatic efforts relatively quickly to overcome the challenges faced.

Costa Mesa is starting to examine its data on alcohol-impaired fatalities, injuries and crashes, and DUI recidivism rates. Although outcome data on impaired driving are still being analyzed, the positive results of the task force have been used to leverage additional resources. The move to a countywide task force is seen as evidence of the successes of the Costa Mesa task force. The strong member participation, community partnerships, and financial and in-kind contributions also demonstrate the effectiveness of the task force.

THE PIKES PEAK REGION DUI TASK FORCE

The Pikes Peak Region DUI (PPRDUI) Task Force was formed in September 2005 in response to an unusually high proportion of fatal crashes involving alcohol or drugs. In that year, 73 percent of fatal crashes in Colorado Springs involved alcohol or drugs, which was well above the national average. In response, the PPRDUI was started as a joint venture between a detective with the Colorado Springs Police Department, a trooper with the Colorado State Patrol, and DRIVE SMART Colorado, a 501(c) 3 nonprofit organization formed in 1989 by the Colorado Springs City Council to address issues related to driving safety in the area. The purpose of the PPRDUI task force is to pool the resources of area law enforcement agencies in an effort to reduce the number of DUI drivers, crashes, and fatalities in the area by identifying impaired drivers and removing them from the roads of Colorado. An important goal of the PPRDUI is the education and increased awareness of the community regarding the negative consequences of driving while impaired.

When the task force was initially created it was comprised entirely of representatives from local law enforcement agencies, DRIVE SMART, and the local district attorney's office. Soon after its inception, other law enforcement agencies in the Pikes Peak region, which is comprised of El Paso and Teller counties, were invited to participate in the task force. More recently, Pueblo (although not officially considered part of the Pikes Peak Region) has also been invited to be a part of the task force, because it has a large impaired-driving problem and could benefit from access to a blood alcohol testing mobile (the BATmobile) unit that is available to task force members. Believing that enforcement alone is not likely to reduce impaired-driving fatalities, the task force decided it needed to include members from local community and business organizations, such as Drive Smart Colorado and the Memorial Health System. There are approximately 20 member agencies currently participating in the task force.

The task force recently has established positions of chairperson, co-chairperson, and secretary to provide structure as the task force expands. There are also subcommittees to work in specific areas including the statistics subcommittee (works to compile and analyze statistics related to impaired driving), the media subcommittee (involved primarily with the news media, press releases, and public information officer duties), the awards subcommittee (tasks include preparation of the "Above and Beyond the Call of Duty" letters of commendation for officers and deputy district attorneys who put extra work into efforts to combat impaired driving), and the Web site subcommittee (worked to create a standalone Web site for the task force, separate from the Drive Smart site, of which it has historically been a part).

The task force has no institutionalized funding. It has received some funding in the past in the form of small donations for its programs. The task force has also organized several law enforcement training seminars, one of which was able to

generate more funds than it cost, so that funds were left over to use for task force activities. The task force is investigating the possibility of doing this again. It is looking for more sources of grant funding, and considering working with businesses that might sponsor it or some of its activities. MADD has been a useful source of information on possible funding sources.

In the few years since its formation, the PPRDUI task force has had numerous accomplishments. The task force was able to obtain a Colorado DOT grant for \$280,000 for the purchase of a mobile blood, breath and DRE testing facility that will be available to all task force agencies as needed. The task force has sponsored and organized law enforcement training sessions. Efforts of the task force have increased staffing for several programs, with greater interagency cooperation contributing manpower for sobriety checkpoint operations and an increase in the number of drug recognition experts in the area. Finally, since the task force was formed it has been able to change the blood draw policy in Colorado Springs to allow for more accurate extrapolation to blood alcohol at the time of driving and better testimony in court.

The task force has faced some typical challenges. These include time constraints in completing projects; obtaining funding and establishing a budget; accessing data from participating agencies; and recruiting and retaining members from certain agencies, especially smaller agencies or agencies with high rates of turnover.

The task force has been examining data on fatal crashes and proportions of these with drug or alcohol involvement. It has also been tracking DUI arrest data. The numbers suggest a sharp decline in impaired driving in the first year after the formation of the task force, followed by a return to pre-task force numbers. However, given the short time the task force has been in operation and the large variability in the numbers of crashes, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the task force in affecting the problem of impaired driving based on available data.

THE LEON COUNTY MULTI-AGENCY DUI STRIKE FORCE

The Leon County Multi-Agency DUI Strike Force was started in October 2003 by Maj. Mark Trammell of the Florida Highway Patrol (FHP). Data from Florida's Department of Transportation indicated that a subset of 20 counties in the State contributed to 78 percent of the DUI crashes and fatalities. Because Leon County was one of the counties contributing disproportionately to DUI incidents, it was designated a sustained enforcement county, which required it to make enforcement an ongoing or sustained activity rather than a periodic one, and to report regularly on these enforcement efforts. As FHP did not have the manpower to conduct the necessary sustained enforcement, contacts were made with other enforcement agencies and plans were made to work together to maintain sustained enforcement in Leon County. The goal of the strike force has consistently been to form a confederation of law enforcement agencies to work collaboratively to create omnipresence for law enforcement in Leon County. Ultimately, it is hoped that this effort will lead to a reduction in DUI crashes and fatalities and the removal of Leon County from the sustained enforcement list.

The core members of the strike force are the five founding law enforcement agencies – FHP, the Leon County Sheriff's Department, Tallahassee Police Department, Florida A & M University Police Department, and Florida State University Police Department. Participation is open to any enforcement agency that wants to be part of the strike force and can commit to two enforcement operations per month (one saturation patrol and one checkpoint, or two checkpoints). Other enforcement agencies that do not have the resources to commit to sustained enforcement but help out as they can are affiliated with the strike force. The strike force also has community partners that attend meetings and help support enforcement efforts. They include Florida's DOT, State prosecutors, educational institutions, student groups, a local alcohol distributor, several community and citizens' activist groups, and a consortium of restaurants, bars, and others in the hospitality industry that are interested in prevention.

As a loose confederation with no central fiscal agent, the strike force has no operating budget. Each agency has its own budget for dedicating personnel, and all expenses for enforcement operations such as overtime are paid by individual agencies. Community members and coalitions such as MADD and the hospitality industry group provide monetary or in-kind donations (food, bottled water, etc.) for refreshments for officers conducting checkpoints.

The strike force has successfully created and maintained sustained enforcement, the purpose for which it was founded. The collaboration has not only improved the efficiency of enforcement efforts (the "force multiplier" effect), but has helped foster better communication among law enforcement agencies as a result of their participation in the strike force. Another accomplishment has been the ability to keep members focused and committed. Time and effort has been invested to make

direct personal contacts to ensure that command staff, who can commit resources and make decisions, stay more actively involved in planning efforts and meetings. This ability to keep decision makers at the table has contributed to the strike force's sustained enforcement efforts. In addition to its core mission of sustained enforcement, the strike force supports programs and activities hosted or sponsored by its members, including education and outreach targeting college students and a community coalition focused on delivering alcohol and DUI awareness/education activities to high school students.

Since the strike force's inception in 2003, Leon County has not experienced a substantial decline in its alcohol-related fatality rate. Arrest rates for DUI did increase initially after the strike force was instituted. More recently, there has been a slight decrease in DUI arrests as officers whose primary duty was DUI enforcement have switched assignments and new officers taking on this responsibility are still learning and gaining expertise. Data on recidivism rates are not available. Because Leon County is home to FSU, like many college or university towns, it has a transient population, making it difficult to ascertain reoffending rates. Although impaired driving statistics have not shown significant change, the development of the strike force has led to more efficient enforcement operations, improved communication among agencies, and increased collaboration between law enforcement and others in the community interested in prevention of impaired driving.

THE SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA DWI TASK FORCE

The Safe Communities Coalition (SCC), an initiative of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, was formed in 1997 to identify major causes of unintentional injury and death in the greater New Orleans area. Within a year after its formation, SCC established a subcommittee, the Southeast Louisiana DWI Task Force, called SELA. SELA was established in response to a high incidence of alcohol-related crashes and fatalities in metropolitan New Orleans, coupled with a perceived lack of emphasis on DWI enforcement and prosecutions by State agencies and the recognition that the DWI/DUI issue was a specialized problem requiring expertise not found in SCC. The overall goal of SELA was to change the permissive culture surrounding impaired driving. The specific goal was to change the thinking of criminal justice participants to aggressively arrest, prosecute, and sentence drunk drivers. According to its mission statement, SELA's mission is to "form a partnership between law enforcement, judiciary, communities, businesses, leaders, civic organizations, and individuals in an effort to reduce the incidence of DWI/DUI through awareness, education, and legislative change."

Participation in the task force is relatively open. All law enforcement, prosecutor, judicial, community awareness, and other groups interested in DWI issues from parishes around the metropolitan New Orleans area are invited and encouraged to participate in the task force. Other member organizations include AAA, the Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse for Greater New Orleans, Dependable Source Corp of MS, the Louisiana Property and Casualty Commission, the Federal Highway Administration, Hartman Engineering, Louisiana Highway Safety Commission, Jefferson Parish Safe and Drug Free, Metropolitan Safety Council, Medical Center of Louisiana in New Orleans, the Charity Hospital Trauma Program, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Progressive Insurance Company, Remove Intoxicated Drivers, State Farm Insurance, Touro Rehabilitation Center, and area schools. Law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and Louisiana Highway Safety Commission employees have tended to be the dominant members of the task force, in terms of both numbers and assertiveness. Currently this is beginning to change as non-law-enforcement participants are becoming numerous and more assertive.

The structure of the task force is described as relatively informal. There is a chairperson and an informal executive committee comprised of former chairpersons and some of the more active members in the task force. Tasks or activities undertaken by the task force are assigned by the executive committee to individual task force members. There is also a committee system in place that allows for both working and ad hoc committees. Committees include a legislative committee that translates suggestions for legislation and writes them in a format the legislature is familiar with, and a membership committee that contacts agencies to encourage representatives to come to meetings.

The task force is unfunded. Some member agencies make in-kind contributions. A traffic safety resource prosecutor grant from NHTSA to the Louisiana District Attorneys Association is used to underwrite annual training conducted by SELA. The Louisiana State Police provide a meeting space. The Louisiana Highway Safety Commission provides a paid staff member to contribute administrative support.

The Southeastern Louisiana DWI Task Force has had numerous accomplishments since being established. The past 3 years have witnessed considerable success in legislative changes, with Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Tammany parishes having adopted aggressive DWI enforcement policies. Additionally, in the past 5 years SELA was part of the impetus for modifications to the DWI refusal for chemical testing and DWI suspension laws. In addition to legislative changes, the task force has enhanced law enforcement and adjudication efforts by hosting conferences for law enforcement, helping to establish the first DWI court in Louisiana, providing trainings for Drug Recognition Experts, and sponsoring other trainings.

The task force has faced some challenges in its work. Legislation that the task force has supported through member agencies and the State DWI task force is often watered down through the legislative process. Also, many at SELA would like any impairment, whatever the cause (e.g., drugs other than alcohol), to be the standard for a violation; however, there is no discussion of this in the legislature. Finally, there has been some difficulty in persuading agencies in Orleans Parish (New Orleans) to participate in the task force and work toward DWI reduction. This may be due to the fact that the economy of New Orleans is largely based on entertainment, and it is therefore not perceived to be in the best economic interest of New Orleans to discourage drinking.

Because the task force keeps a low profile and tends to work through its member agencies (e.g., furnishing additional information, having agencies compare activities to one another), it is difficult to assess the success of the task force. The task force does examine impaired-driving crash and arrest data to understand the possible effects of its activities. For the past 10 years the numbers of impaired-driving crashes in the State have remained relatively stable. The number of impaired-driving crashes and DWI arrests in the State were lower this past year, which may be a function of the economy and gasoline prices causing people to limit driving. It is difficult to interpret statistics for Southeast Louisiana because populations remain low since Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. This has also affected DWI arrests, as there are fewer people, fewer officers, and enforcement efforts have been refocused.

THE GALLATIN COUNTY DUI TASK FORCE

The impetus for the Gallatin County DUI Task Force was a 1978 drunk-driving fatality in Gallatin County in which a young woman was struck and killed by an intoxicated driver while walking in her driveway. Believing that DUI was not being treated as an important issue in her area and drunk drivers were not being held properly accountable, the victim's mother assembled a group called Montanans Against Drunk Driving. This group raised awareness of the DUI issue and worked with a local State legislator to encourage Montana to pass anti-DUI legislation. In March 1983, Montana passed a law that authorized county governments to create local DUI task forces funded by license reinstatement fees. A year later, the Gallatin County DUI Task Force was created and Montanans Against Drunk Driving disbanded, with most of its members joining the county task force.

The general purpose of the task force is to develop or fund public education and enforcement projects to reduce the number of alcohol-related crashes and deaths in Gallatin County. More specifically, the goals of the task force are to: support increased, focused, and effective DUI enforcement; provide a collaborative environment where solutions to DUI can be addressed; improve communication and collaboration of professionals in the field with residents; promote citizen education and awareness on the issue of DUI; provide the tools and motivation to combat DUI on a personal and family level; educate local politicians, decision makers, and the community about DUI; and support, inform, and energize everyone involved in the fields of DUI prevention, intervention, and enforcement.

The task force is made up of residents and representatives from several agencies, led by a paid coordinator. A recent list indicated 18 task force members including 4 private citizens, 9 law enforcement representatives, 2 members of city or county attorney's office, 1 representative of the county health department, a representative of the Associated Students of Montana State University, and a representative of Alcohol & Drug Services of Gallatin County. There are no standing subcommittees. Subcommittees are sometimes created to address specific needs, often because groups of members want to work on specific activities. Once the activity is completed, the subcommittee is disbanded.

The task force has been funded by the State using funds from DUI license reinstatement fees. Although the funding is specifically set aside by the State for the task force, the county government maintains fiscal oversight for the program because money goes through the county government. A fee is paid to the county for administering and overseeing the funds. A perceived benefit of this system is that the State provides funding while leaving decisions on how to run the task force to those at the local level.

Over the years, the task force has had numerous accomplishments. A primary accomplishment of the task force has been its ability to keep the issue of DUI in front of the public. This has required keeping the message out there, which has in turn

required creating new ways to do so including educational/awareness and media advocacy efforts. Additionally, the task force has been instrumental in providing funds for enforcement operations and the purchase of equipment to aid police in enforcing DUI laws. The task force has also developed innovative programs and activities such as its “Swimming Upstream Awards” program to honor community members who work to change how the county perceives the negative consequences of alcohol misuse. The task force established and provides funding for a free ride service for impaired drivers and worked with tavern owners in downtown Bozeman to reduce underage drinking, open container, and DUI violations. At the State level, the Gallatin County Task Force worked with a State legislator and a coordinator of another DUI task force to reinstate funding after it had been stopped for two years. The re-funding affected DUI task forces across the State. This is especially important as Montana has many local DUI task forces.

The task force has faced several challenges over time. Perhaps the most enduring challenge has been the fluctuations in the amount and nature of support for the task force, with Montana having a culture that places great importance on personal freedom. Despite progress over the years, the task force continues to struggle against older, entrenched attitudes that tend to protect the drinking driver or to consider a DUI crash to be a regrettable outcome from a mistake in judgment rather than a crime. Consistent with the high value placed on personal freedom, some legislative initiatives supported by the task force (e.g., upgrading to a primary seat belt law and efforts to change the laws regarding refusal to submit a breath test) have met with resistance from law makers.

The task force tries to track statistics such as DUI arrests, conviction rates, and proportion of crashes involving alcohol in the county. Because DUI arrests, crashes, and fatalities do not tell the whole story other factors are viewed as being indicative of success. One issue identified is that attitudes in the larger community appear to be shifting more toward viewing DUI as being socially unacceptable and the issue as being important. People are more willing to publicly stand with the task force on the issue. The fact that media outlets have volunteered marketing resources is seen as a sign of change in attitude.

BROOME COUNTY STOP-DWI PROGRAM

In November 1981, after examining the research literature on prevention of impaired driving, the New York State Legislature concluded that it needed to enhance its general deterrence approach by focusing on higher levels of enforcement and prosecution coupled with workable penalties and a public awareness and education campaign. Thus, it passed legislation creating the Special Traffic Options Program for Driving While Intoxicated (STOP-DWI), which permits each of the State's 62 counties to establish a county STOP-DWI program. Shortly after the STOP-DWI legislation was passed, New York's 62 counties began setting up their local programs. In early 1982, Broome County established its local STOP-DWI program.

As specified in the enabling legislation, the mission of the STOP-DWI program is "to develop and coordinate a comprehensive DWI counter-measure program to deter the incidence of drunk driving and the occurrence of alcohol-related traffic injuries and fatalities." To accomplish its mission, the STOP-DWI Program in Broome County has developed and implemented a comprehensive DWI prevention approach that places a high priority on enhancing general deterrence, i.e., increasing the certainty of detection, arrest, and sanctioning for impaired driving. Key programs include maintaining a highly visible law enforcement campaign, supporting prosecution efforts, lobbying for tougher laws to deal with DWI offenders, and developing an education and public awareness campaign to keep the issue of impaired driving out in front of the public.

A STOP-DWI coordinator is appointed to oversee each county's program, with specific duties to develop the program, coordinate efforts by agencies involved in alcohol and highway safety, and submit fiscal and program data to the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles. In Broome County, the coordinator is appointed by the County Executive. In addition to a coordinator, a board is charged with assisting the coordinator in developing a comprehensive DWI prevention plan; in Broome County, the STOP-DWI Advisory Board is also appointed by the county executive. The current advisory board has 11 people from a cross-section of professions and activist groups that deal with the DWI problem. They include: prosecution (the district attorney), law enforcement (chief of police, captain of State Police), school administration (2 high school principals), probation (probation director), media (general sales manager at a local radio station), alcohol and treatment professional (director of addictions and outpatient services at a local hospital), university official (alcohol and other drugs coordinator from a local university), hospitality/beverage industry (president of a distributorship), and marketing and advertising (vice president/owner of an advertising agency).

The legislation that established the STOP-DWI program provided an institutionalized funding mechanism that makes each county's program financially self-sufficient. By setting up a county STOP-DWI program, each county qualifies for the return of all fines collected for any alcohol and other drug-related traffic and

penal law offenses in that jurisdiction. Pursuant to State legislation passed in the 1990s, counties were also authorized to charge monthly supervision fees to those serving sentences of probation for DWI. Broome County STOP-DWI uses the supervision fees to support its DWI probation programming. Thus, by using DWI fines and probation supervision fees, the program operates at no cost to taxpayers. In addition to the fines fees, Broome County's STOP-DWI program is also supported by private and corporate sponsorship, State and Federal grants, in-kind donations, and event entry fees for its special events that provide more than \$600,000.

Over the past 28 years, the Broome County STOP-DWI accomplishments include development and implementation of a comprehensive, research-based DWI countermeasures program that strengthened high-visibility enforcement. The program has also expanded and enhanced prosecutions and probations. It conducts extensive public awareness campaigns that include sizable print and electronic media components in addition to several nationally recognized and widely attended special events.

Challenges include developing a comprehensive case tracking system that solves problems in matching records across police, prosecution, courts, and other agencies; keeping the impaired-driving issue in the spotlight and a high priority within the community; and taking anti-impaired-driving efforts to the next level.

Consistent with its emphasis on general deterrence, the Broome County STOP-DWI Program points to decreases over several decades in the annual incidence of numerous DWI indicators as evidence of the program's success. For example, single-vehicle nighttime fatal and personal injury crashes (often used as a surrogate for alcohol-related crashes) fell from 292 in 1995 to 169 in 2007, which represents a 42.1-percent reduction. During this same period, no such downward trend in single-vehicle nighttime crashes was observed nationally. Similarly, reductions of nearly 30 percent were observed in Broome County from 1995 to 2005 in police-reported, alcohol-related crashes. Indicators of program effectiveness are also found in the number of people injured in alcohol-related crashes, which steadily declined from 161 in 1995 to 80 in 2007 (50.3% reduction) at a time when nationwide alcohol-related injuries did not decline.

BEXAR COUNTY DWI TASK FORCE

The Bexar County DWI Task Force was created in 1985 using a “seed” grant from the Texas Department of Transportation. At the time, Bexar County was consistently ranked among the top counties in Texas for alcohol-related crashes. Following research by community leaders that recommended coordinated efforts between law enforcement agencies as a best practice for combating DWI, Bexar County law enforcement agencies formed a multi-agency task force involving prosecution and law enforcement agencies across San Antonio and the 25 incorporated cities surrounding San Antonio.

Over time, membership on the task force diversified as new organizations joined it. Within the last several years the original enforcement-based task force has developed a collaboration with a coalition of more than 40 community representatives, called the Circles of San Antonio (COSA), which is an initiative of the San Antonio Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse (SACADA). This merged partnership has expanded its focus and facilitated the task force’s involvement in education, prevention, rehabilitation, and community involvement in addition to law enforcement. As a result, the task force has more than 40 member organizations representing 22 cities in the county. In addition to 30 law enforcement and justice system agencies and COSA, other members of the task force include several health services agencies (University Health System, South Texas Injury Prevention and Research Center), institutions of higher education (the campus police departments of Trinity University, St. Mary’s University, University of Texas at San Antonio, and University of the Incarnate Word), local school districts, several military bases, and MADD. Anyone who is interested is invited to participate in the task force. Special efforts are made to ensure that the task force maintains its multidisciplinary nature.

The missions of the task force are to (1) reduce alcohol- and drug-related motor vehicle accidents, injuries, and deaths in Bexar County, (2) seek out and arrest those who disobey impaired-driving laws through law enforcement special operations, training, and community involvement; and (3) create a safer community through law enforcement and education of the public. The task force’s emphasis has evolved from DWI exclusively to a broader focus on all types of alcohol-related criminal incidents as well as efforts to address the entire continuum of care as a complement to its efforts with respect to enforcement.

Although originally started with grant money from the State DOT, the task force only received funding through this source for a few years. With no money for an operating budget, participation in enforcement operations is encouraged but ultimately must be conducted by individual police departments. Special programs, events, and media campaigns rely on contributions from member agencies or community partners. The organization that provides the most financial support to the task force is SACADA, which receives funding from the Texas Department of Health and is required to join with law enforcement to maintain its grant funding.

Over the past 25 years, the task force and its partners have made several achievements related to enhanced law enforcement to combat DWI. Collaboration on impaired-driving enforcement and changes in laws have been undertaken that should serve to increase general deterrence as well as provide additional tools to aid in prosecution of impaired drivers. These legal changes (Bexar County District Attorney's Office "No Refusals Accepted" initiative, which allows police officers to obtain blood evidence from a DWI suspect by applying for a search warrant; a new law that allows officers to obtain blood evidence without a warrant from select groups of impaired drivers (those arrested for a felony repeat DWI offense or DWI with a minor child in the vehicle) are considered successes because they facilitate law enforcement. Aside from enforcement, other accomplishments focus on prevention, education, and treatment and rehabilitation.

The task force has encountered some barriers. Lack of funding has constrained the ability to conduct multi-jurisdiction saturation patrols and limited the number of officers who have specialized training in DWI enforcement. A second constraint has been that being an all-volunteer group, it takes more time to accomplish things than if there were paid staff. Finally, some of the legislative initiatives the enforcement agencies would like to see adopted -- sobriety checkpoints and keg registration -- and that COSA's legislative committee has worked for have not been successful.

Since the task force has been in existence, Texas's national rank with respect to alcohol-related fatalities has probably changed little (the State may have dropped down from #1 to #2 nationwide in fatalities). On the other hand, fatalities have decreased in Bexar County.

FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE ON DRINKING AND DRIVING

After MADD was established in 1980, many States and communities began to pay attention to drunk driving and established local task forces to deal with the issue. Fairfax County, Virginia, did so in early 1982. In December 1982, following a comprehensive review of the DWI system in the county, the new Fairfax County Task Force on Drunk Driving recommended a series of sweeping changes in the ways that drinking and driving laws should be enforced, prosecuted, and adjudicated, as well as in the way offenders should be rehabilitated. The task force also recommended the establishment of a permanent oversight committee to monitor DWI activities and make recommendations as necessary. Thus, in 1983 the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors (BOS), in response to these recommendations, established the Fairfax County Oversight Committee on Drinking and Driving (OCDD).

The purpose of the OCDD is to ensure that the BOS is adequately and appropriately informed about drinking-and-driving-related conditions in the county that may affect public safety and mobility. The delineated objectives of the OCDD include: (1) monitor local, State and national drinking-and-driving-related activity and policy, including community action, legislation, education, enforcement, adjudication, treatment, and rehabilitation; (2) identify issues that have an impact on the illegal and unsafe use of alcohol and drugs and develop recommendations for appropriate action by the BOS; and (3) provide timely and pertinent information and recommendations concerning the drinking-and-driving situation in the county. The OCDD is strictly advisory, with no authority or budget to implement any recommendations.

With the exception of a representative from each of seven major county agencies with responsibility within the DWI system, membership on the OCDD is voluntary and has 20 to 25 members at any given time. There are representatives of each of the 10 supervisors on the board (selected by the supervisors), a Chairman (independent citizen), 2 or 3 interested members of the public, the president of Northern Virginia MADD, the president of the Washington Regional Alcohol Program, the director of the Fairfax County ASAP, an assistant commonwealth attorney, the chief magistrate of the 19th Judicial District, a captain in the Sheriff's Department, the deputy chief of police investigations/operations support in the Fairfax County Police Department, the youth director of the county's Alcohol and Drug Services agency, the coordinator of the Safe & Drug Free Youth in the Fairfax County Public School system, and the county DWI coordinator. The chairman periodically establishes short-term ad hoc sub-committees to address certain issues and report back to the full OCDD.

Although no funding is provided to the OCDD, in 1983 the BOS created a new county position, DWI coordinator, located in the Fairfax County Police Department.

This person is a member of the public, not a sworn police officer. The DWI coordinator schedules the OCDD meetings, collects and analyzes DWI-related data, coordinates special DWI enforcement activities and ensures that the members have information that they request or need.

OCDD's achievements over the past 25 years have largely been measured in terms of impaired-driving outcomes. As a result of efforts by the OCDD and all the stakeholders in the county to reduce DWI, Fairfax County has realized significant reductions in the number of impaired drivers and in the number and percentage of alcohol-related crashes. Data from the Department of Motor Vehicles for the most recent 5-year period shows that Fairfax County has consistently had a lower rate (%) of alcohol-related crashes to all crashes when compared to the same rates for Northern Virginia, Virginia, and the Nation. Although Fairfax County has more than twice the number of registered drivers than the next largest community (Virginia Beach), it continues to have the lowest rate for alcohol-related crashes, the lowest alcohol crash death rate, and the lowest alcohol crash injury rate per 1,000 drivers. The county is also the only one showing a downward trend over the past five years.

Other accomplishments include its impact on the policy agenda of the BOS. Letters to the BOS are sent periodically by the OCDD recommending support for legislation or for some DWI program. OCDD has submitted 25 major recommendations resulting in a 60 percent implementation rate.

The OCDD has also experienced several challenges and limitations. Over the years, the committee has attempted to be more involved in carrying out projects, as opposed to only recommending they be done, in an effort to facilitate more timely action. Those efforts, for the most part, were unsuccessful, primarily due to lack of operational authority, funding sources, or interest and time available on the part of committee members. Another challenge faced by OCDD is the difficulty obtaining consensus on any issue because of the broad representation of the membership and because of the political leanings by some of the supervisors' citizen representatives. Some consider this wide variability as a strength, but it can also be a barrier to the timely delivery of products such as letter or reports to the BOS. As noted above, more than half of the recommendations of the OCDD have been implemented.

However, because the OCDD has no real authority, many recommendations cannot be implemented without BOS approval. This takes an inordinate amount of time in some cases. Finally, there is very little visibility of the OCDD – most of the general public in the County are not aware of its existence.

KENT'S SOUTH KING COUNTY TARGET ZERO TRAFFIC SAFETY TASK FORCE

Kent's Drinking Driver Task Force was started in 1983 as a result of community awareness and concern regarding fatalities caused by traffic collisions in which alcohol impairment was identified a key factor. A group of residents began looking at the data on alcohol-related collisions, fatalities, injuries, and property loss; the statistics indicated that the city had one of the highest alcohol-involved motor vehicle crash injury rates among cities its size in Washington State. Kent applied to the Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC), which funded special projects throughout the State that focused on impaired driving. When it was established more than 20 years ago, the primary goal of the task force was to significantly reduce the incidence of excessive drinking and driving in Kent through education, public relations, and enhanced enforcement. Currently, the task force encompasses many traffic safety issues including speeding, occupant protection, school zone issues, pedestrian and cyclist safety, child passenger safety, and automobile racing along with impaired driving. In general, the mission of the task force is to move people safely throughout Kent by supporting numerous programs that seek to promote informed and healthy decision making and the modeling of positive life skills among the citizens of Kent.

The task force is guided by an 11-member steering committee representing organizations including the city council, local law enforcement, private businesses, parents, the school district, the liquor control board, prevention specialists, victims, and other advocacy groups such as chaplain program and the PTA. In addition to the steering committee members who guide its activities, the task force is also supported by people and community organizations that are invited to its meetings and actively work with the task force on specific projects. These community partners include officials representing several local government departments, NHTSA regional staff, members of the Kent Police Department, private businesses such as insurance companies, a local reporter, a teen clinic, and local youth.

The task force receives funding from both government and private sectors. The majority of funding for the task force comes from the WTSC, a State agency that directs programs and resources to traffic safety areas in Washington. Kent's local government continues to support the goals of the task force with supplemental funding. In addition to these core funding streams, the task force receives support in the form of grants, goods and services, in-kind donations, community organizations, donations of cash/fees, and volunteer workers. These funding sources provide partial support for specific programs and events.

The biggest accomplishment of the task force has been a reduction over the past decade and a half in Kent in the percentage of collisions that are alcohol-related (i.e., involving a driver with a BAC equal to or greater than .08 g/dL). In 1993, Kent had a population of 41,000 and 4.2 percent of motor vehicle crashes were alcohol-related; in 2005, Kent's population was estimated at 86,600 and only 2.3 percent of traffic

crashes involved alcohol (a 45% reduction). Additionally, although the population more than doubled between 1993 and 2005, total DUI arrests increased by only 30 percent. The less rapid increase in DUI arrests compared to population growth occurred while enhanced collaboration between city police and other law enforcement agencies resulted in increased police manpower for conducting traffic emphasis patrols. Other issues successfully addressed by the task force include reducing the frequency of racing activities and reducing barriers between immigrant populations and law enforcement personnel.

These accomplishments have been facilitated by several factors, including enhanced relationships (pooling of talent, expertise, and resources) among government and private organizations, State and local partners, and members of the task force and their community neighbors; dramatic increases in communication and cooperation among neighboring law enforcement agencies that support activities such as multijurisdiction emphasis patrols; direct links to the mayor's office (which nominates steering committee members) and the city council (where the task force chair has historically come from); and considerable media exposure provided by WTSC.

Perhaps the greatest challenge the task force has faced involves its efforts to redefine the message on impaired driving – to refocus from an emphasis on not driving when *drunk* or “hammered,” to the importance of not driving when *impaired* by alcohol. This has also meant moving away from the .08 message (as impairment can occur at lower BAC levels such as .05 g/dL or even .03 g/dL), which has met with some resistance.

References

Fell, J., Fisher, D., & McKnight, A. S. (2010, in press). *A Guide for Local Impaired-Driving Task Forces*. (Final Report). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Fell, J. C., & Langston, E. (2009, September). *A Guide for Statewide Impaired-Driving Task Forces*. (DOT HS 811 203). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Appendix A: Local Task Force Contacts

The people listed below can be contacted for further details and information on starting and operating a task force:

For the nine local task forces included in the case studies:

Jenna Caplette, Coordinator
Gallatin County DUI Task Force
104 East Main St., Suite 313
Bozeman, MT 59715
406-585-1492
Jenna.Caplette@gallatin.mt.gov

Det. Cpl. Mike Davis, Chairman
Bexar County DWI Task Force
6116 Broadway
San Antonio, TX 78209
210-832-2248
mdavis@dwikills.org
www.dwikills.org

James Fell, Chair
Fairfax County Oversight Committee
on Drinking and Driving
4313 Guinea Road
Annandale, VA 22003
703-978-4727
fell@pire.org

Maile Gray,
Pikes Peak Region DUI Task Force
Colorado Springs Police Department
705 S. Nevada Ave.
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
719-444-7534
GRAYMA@ci.colospgs.co.us

Kathryn Kendrick, Facilitator
Alcohol Impaired Driving Task Force
of Costa Mesa
Orange County Health Care Agency,
ADEPT
405 West 5th Street, Suite 211
Santa Ana, CA 92701
714-834-3294
kkendrick@ochca.com
www.ochealthinfo.com/adept

James May, Coordinator
Broome County Stop DWI
Broome County Courthouse
Collier Street
Binghamton, NY 13902
607-778-2056
bcstopdwi@co.broome.ny.us

Maj. Jim Russell, Chairman
Leon County DUI Strike Force
Florida State University Police
Department
830 West Jefferson Street
Tallahassee, FL 32306
850-644-2900
jlrussell@admin.fsu.edu

J. J. Williams, Chairperson
Southeastern Louisiana DUI Task
Force

Louisiana District Attorneys
Association

1645 Nicholson Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70802
225-343-0171
JJ@ldaa.org

Cesi Velez, Public Education Specialist
Support Services Division, City of
Kent Police Department
220 Fourth Ave. South
Kent, WA 98032
253-856-5884
CVelez@ci.kent.wa.us
www.ci.kent.wa.us/police

For information regarding local task
forces not included in the case studies:

Genata Bishop
Butte-Silver Bow DUI Task Force
Butte-Silver Bow Law Enforcement
Department
225 Alaska Street
Butte, MT 59701
406-497-1127

Jim Blaine
Springfield DWI Task Force
1355 East Crystal Hill Lane
Springfield, MO 65803
417-833-3831

Carl Booth
Franklin County DUI Task Force
1427 Bellflower Ave
Columbus, OH 43204
614-906-4799

Michael Colangelo
Oneida County STOP-DWI Program
200 Base Rd., Suite. 3
Oriskany NY 13424
315-736-8943

Tami Dunehew
2323 Mariposa Mall
Fresno CA 93721
559-621-5067

Delaney Heston
Traffic Safety Task Force
Cowlitz County Sheriff's Office
312 SW 1st Avenue
Kelso, WA 98626
360-577-3092 ext. 2361

Joyce Housden
Rio Grande County DUI Task Force
925 Sixth Street, Room 101
Del Norte CO 81132
719-657-0222

Larry Iager
Beaverhead County DUI Task Force
2825 Highway 278
Dillon, MT 59725
406-596-6622

Jeff Kaufman
Houston-Galveston Area Council DWI
Subcommittee
3555 Timmons St.
Houston, TX 77027
832-681-2533

Drusilla Malavase
Ontario County STOP-DWI Program
20 Ontario Street
Canandaigua, NY 14424
585-396-4308

Cheryl Reid
Pueblo County DUI Task Force
509 East 13th St.
Pueblo, CO 81001
719-546-6666 x150

Paul Stoner
Oswego County STOP-DWI Program
Public Safety Center
39 Church Hill Rd.
Oswego, NY 13126
315-349-3210

Dr. Sharon Vitousek
North Hawaii Outcomes Project
Hawaii County
65-1241 Pomaikai Pl. Suite 7
Kamuela HI 96743
808-887-1665

Glenda Wiles
Ravalli County DUI Task Force
215 S. 4th Street, Suite A
Hamilton, MT 59840
406-375-6200

DOT HS 811 460A
October 2011



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

