

use at night were substantially greater. Baseline seat belt use at night was 35%; this figure rose to 45% just after the start of the program. The use rate continued to rise to 59% in spring 1990 and then dropped to 49% in fall 1990.

There were significantly fewer injury-producing crashes, and significantly fewer late-night crashes, during months when checkpoints were held. The Binghamton officers found the passive alcohol sensor to be an effective screening device at checkpoints but were less enthusiastic about using it on routine patrols.

Surveys indicated that Binghamton drivers' awareness of changes in the enforcement of New York's alcohol-impaired driving law, and their estimates of the likelihood of being caught driving with illegal BACs, was highest soon after the program's implementation. The response to this program suggests that checkpoints may have to be both constant and visible features of enforcement for their benefits to be lasting.

THE MASSACHUSETTS SAVING LIVES PROGRAM: SIX CITIES

Widening the Focus from Drunk Driving to Speeding, Reckless Driving, and Failure to Wear Seat Belts

R.H. Hingson, J. Howland, T. Schiavone, M. Damiata

[From *Journal of Traffic Medicine*, 18:3:123-132, 1990]

During the 1980's in the United States, highway safety attention focused on reducing drunk driving. Over 700 new laws were passed nationwide accompanied by considerable activity by local citizen groups, such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving, MADD [sic] and Remove Intoxicated Drivers, RID, intensified media coverage, and increased police enforcement. Single vehicle, night fatal crashes (those most likely to involve alcohol) declined 20% between 1980 and 1985.

However, since 1986, total fatal crashes in the U.S. have begun to increase. In Massachusetts, where similar attention has focused on drunk driving, single vehicle, night fatal crashes declined 32% from 1980 - 1984, but since then fatal crashes have risen 10%, and injury crashes increased 17%.

Six Massachusetts communities have initiated comprehensive traffic safety programs in their communities to reverse the increase in fatal and injury crashes. The programs include: education about traffic safety issues in the schools, public education targeting all age groups, increased police enforcement, and a business for safety program to reduce drunk driving and increase safety belt use. A coordinator in the Mayor's office and a set of community task forces with public officials and

private citizens oversee the programs. An evaluation program is assessing traffic safety problems in each city at the outset of the program and community progress in reducing those problems.

An initial evaluation indicated that speeding and related risky driving behaviors at intersections, such as accelerating at yellow lights and running red lights, were much more common behaviors than drunk driving, and that these behaviors were increasing in program cities and were disproportionately found in drivers who rarely wear safety belts. The program has expanded its initiatives beyond drunk driving reduction to include these other behaviors as well.

COMMUNITY SYSTEMWIDE RESPONSE TO PREVENTING SUBSTANCE USE AND IMPAIRED DRIVING BY YOUTH

James Wright, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

In 1985, a juvenile court judge from Lucas County, Ohio (Toledo) decided he had seen enough. Too many young people in his county were dying in crashes or drug overdoses or suffering the other drastic effects of drug use, including alcohol. He decided to take action, to become "pro-active." Becoming "pro-active" for a judge meant that he had to step away from the bench and talk about prevention with other key people in the community. Action such as this is not without risks for a judge who is comfortable with the power, and protection, of the court. But something had to be done for the young people in his community, and it had to be done before they became involved with his court.

One of the first steps the judge took, after he assembled the rudiments of a community action team, was to get the support of the local school boards. Support from a school board is not automatic, especially when the subject involves drug use of students from that school district. The judge addressed each school board and brought with him a pile of case folders which he laid next to him on the witness table. He never referred to the case files as he made his pitch for the active cooperation of the board members - and they never asked about them. Each and every school board he addressed in this manner gave him full endorsement to proceed with their blessing. He would then pick up his unopened files and go home.

The judge in this instance, Andy Devine, wanted to establish a community response, a systemwide response, to the substance use problem. He employed his power as a judge to convince the community of the extent of the problem and convene community leaders to develop

an action plan. Judge Devine's "pro-action" resulted in a community-wide program that had many positive outcomes, not the least of which was many successive years without one teenage alcohol-related crash fatality in the county.

Impressed by Judge Devine's success, and other similar successes from pro-active judges, two Federal agencies collaborated on the development of a model to promote judge-led community action teams. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Department of Justice, initiated a program entitled "Youth Drug and Alcohol Abuse: The Introduction of Effective Strategies Systemwide", known as Effective Strategies for short. Effective Strategies actually encompassed a number of initiatives, the most important of which was the development of the model mentioned above. This model was developed for the Federal agencies by the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) and called "Systemwide Response Planning Process (SRPP). PIRE also developed "TeamSpirit," a student leader training program that can be used in conjunction with the SRPP.

Many organizational schemes exist with the end result intended to encourage communities to develop a plan of action to address a pressing problem. The goal of Effective Strategies was to develop a model that 1) was judge-led, 2) dealt with the problem of youthful substance use and impaired driving, 3) was systemwide in that it involved all aspects of a community's youth "system" (schools, courts, enforcement, treatment, recreation, etc.), and 4) resulted in an action plan with parties responsible for implementation identified. Most important of all, the game plan had to be relatively simple to follow.

After the generally encouraging signs from the pilot sites, the sponsoring agencies contemplated "phase two" for the SRPP. It was determined that phase two had to begin to address a national focus for this program. One of the participating judges offered an idea that was innovative and identified an existing mechanism to disseminate this program nationwide. Every county in

the United States has a Department of Agriculture extension agent. These agents, generally working out of the state land grant university, are highly trained in community organizing skills. It was theorized that if county extension agents could be linked up with county juvenile court judges to implement the SRPP, they could form an effective team - the judge providing the convening power and commitment of the court, the extension agent providing the process know-how and organizational skills.

NHTSA and OJJDP awarded a grant to the National 4-H Council to develop this concept, select five states to test the project, and to train teams of judges and extension agents. The SRPP materials were updated to include information learned from the test sites, SRPP was changed to CSR - Community Systemwide Response, and a manual of the same name was produced by the National 4-H Council. Five states - Indiana, Michigan, Florida, Arizona, and Montana were selected to conduct the CSR in twenty communities. These projects are now underway.

The Community Systemwide Response is comprised of a five-step or five-meeting process:

- Setting the Context for the CSR,
- Problem Identification and Resource Inventory,
- Analysis of Needs,
- Developing the Implementation Plan, and
- Conference and Training Session.

This briefly describes the five-step process in terms of meetings. Of course, depending upon the community, each step could take more or less time. The program stresses, however, that each step is necessary and must be completed either before or during this process.

As we proceed with this program and it is conducted in more communities, we will acquire more data as to its effectiveness. As for now, we know anecdotically of success stories and of the willingness of these teams to work together. The expectations are substantial as is the support from the three sponsoring departments -- Transportation, Justice, and Agriculture.