

UMTRI-94-42

**Evaluation of a Comprehensive Community Traffic Safety
Effort: The Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety
Program**

**Lisa J. Molnar, M.H.S.A.
Fredrick M. Streff, Ph.D.**

December 1994



**The University of Michigan
Transportation Research Institute**

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. UMTRI-94-42		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Evaluation of a Comprehensive Community Traffic Safety Effort: The Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Program			5. Report Date December 1994		
			6. Performing Organization Code		
7. Author(s) Lisa J. Molnar, Fredrick M. Streff			8. Performing Organization Report No. UMTRI-94-42		
9. Performing Organization Name and Address The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute 2901 Baxter Road Ann Arbor, MI 48109			10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)		
			11. Contract or Grant No. CP-94-01		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning 330 S. Washington Square, Suite 300 Lansing, MI 48913			13. Type of Report and Period Covered 10/1/93-9/30/94		
			14. Sponsoring Agency Code		
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract <p>In 1987, Jackson County was selected by the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) as the pilot site for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program. OHSP identified two complementary goals for the pilot study: 1) to initiate and sustain a well-planned traffic safety effort designed to reduce the personal and economic consequences of traffic crashes in Jackson County and 2) to enable OHSP to increase its capabilities to assist other communities in undertaking similar endeavors in the future. OHSP provided financial support for the pilot study for five years. At the end of that time, an evaluation was conducted of the pilot—the Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Program (JCCTSP). This report presents findings from the evaluation.</p> <p>The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether and to what extent the comprehensive program has been implemented in Jackson County and is functioning as designed. Therefore, the major focus of the evaluation is examination of the JCCTSP in light of the requirements initially set forth by OHSP for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program. A second focus of the evaluation relates to understanding how well the program addressed priority areas resulting from problem identification work. Problem identification was accorded a high priority and was undertaken shortly after the program began. This work resulted in establishing priority areas, and the intent of the evaluation is to determine whether these priority areas were addressed.</p> <p>Information for the evaluation was collected primarily through interviews with key players involved in the JCCTSP and review of the OHSP-JCCTSP files for the five-year period that OHSP funded the program. Crash data for Jackson County were also examined to determine if the JCCTSP had an impact on crash or crash-related injury in the county.</p>					
17. Key Words evaluation, community traffic safety, traffic safety program			18. Distribution Statement Unlimited		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 43	22. Price

Reproduction of completed page authorized

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning nor the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Prepared in cooperation with the
Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning
and
U.S. Department of Transportation
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
through Highway Safety Project #CP-94-01

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS	3
FINDINGS	7
Findings Related to OHSP Requirements for Establishment of a Comprehensive Community Traffic Safety Program	7
Findings Related to the Problem Identification Process and How Priority Areas Resulting from that Process Were Addressed	27
DISCUSSION	30
REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX A	
ATTENDANCE AT COMMISSION MEETINGS	34
APPENDIX B	
REPRESENTATIVES ON COMMISSION	36
APPENDIX C	
JCCTSP JOB DESCRIPTION FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR	38
APPENDIX D	
JACKSON TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM PROJECTS	40

INTRODUCTION

In 1987, Jackson County was selected by the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) as the pilot site for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program. Before awarding the grant for the pilot study, OHSP established a set of characteristics desired in the pilot site and compared all Michigan communities with those characteristics. Genesee, Jackson, and Muskegon Counties were considered best suited to participate in the pilot study and were each invited to submit a competitive proposal. The proposals were evaluated by OHSP primarily on the basis of several requirements related to program implementation and interaction with OHSP. Jackson County was judged best able to meet the requirements for a comprehensive community traffic safety program and OHSP awarded them the grant with the intent of providing financial support for five years.

OHSP identified two complementary goals for the pilot study: 1) to initiate and sustain a well-planned traffic safety effort designed to reduce the personal and economic consequences of traffic crashes in Jackson County and 2) to enable OHSP to increase its capabilities to assist other communities in undertaking similar endeavors in the future. To facilitate evaluation of the program, OHSP funded development of an evaluation plan by the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI) with input from OHSP and the Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Program (JCCTSP; see Filkins, 1990).

The plan identified several purposes for the evaluation. The overall purpose was to improve the JCCTSP and similar programs that may be undertaken in the future. A second purpose was to determine whether the concept, goals, and objectives for comprehensive community traffic safety programs, as established by OHSP, were sound. In this sense, Jackson County was seen as serving as a test bed, and judgements needed to be made about whether the county had implemented the OHSP concept effectively. The final purpose was to establish whether the program reduced the frequency or severity of traffic crashes in Jackson County.

A three-part evaluation strategy was recommended in the plan including: 1) performance evaluations of each of the individual grants funded through the program, 2) a performance evaluation of the entire program to determine whether the overall goals of the program (other than reduction in frequency and severity of crashes) had been achieved, and 3) an effectiveness evaluation of the entire program to determine the long-term, bottom-line impact on crashes. The JCCTSP evaluation plan addressed only the performance and effectiveness evaluations for the entire program, leaving performance evaluations of individual grants to their respective grant managers.

To better meet the objectives of the pilot study, the evaluation plan recommended that evaluation activities be ongoing throughout the life of the study and that program management have primary responsibility for their execution. However, the plan was never implemented during the five years that OHSP financially supported the program, and no performance evaluation of the entire program was undertaken, although a modified effectiveness evaluation was completed. In 1994, after OHSP funding for the program had ended, an evaluation was conducted of the entire program, based on the evaluation plan. This report presents findings from that evaluation.

METHODS

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether and to what extent the comprehensive program has been implemented in Jackson County and is functioning as designed. Therefore, the major focus of the evaluation is examination of the JCCTSP in light of the requirements initially set forth by OHSP for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program. It was these requirements that Jackson County responded to in its original proposal and that OHSP used as the primary basis for evaluating the competing proposals and awarding the grant. The requirements include the following:

- An effective and efficient management structure will be implemented.
- Overall program management and the management of agencies that will subsequently implement countermeasure activities, understand and are committed to creating and exercising the highway safety management process (planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and review, and evaluation).
- Agencies and organizations traditionally concerned with traffic safety, such as law enforcement and traffic engineering, support the program concept and possess capabilities to implement likely program activities arising during the planning phase of the program.
- Program management is willing to work toward creating and maintaining a long-term traffic safety program that continues beyond the period when direct OHSP financial assistance is available.
- Program management is willing to conduct thorough, regularly scheduled, performance (administrative) evaluations of all significant program activities throughout the life of the program and will use their results to improve performance.
- There exists substantial community and media support in undertaking a community traffic safety program. Letters of endorsement from key community leaders and traffic safety specialists should be included as evidence of such support.
- Program management will collaborate with OHSP throughout the life of the program, particularly during planning and programming activities.

- Program management will participate in and provide evidence for effectiveness (impact) evaluations and will report the results of its performance (administrative) evaluations to OHSP on a quarterly basis.
- Program management is willing to make its program experience and materials available to OHSP and other communities.

A second focus of the evaluation relates to understanding how well the program addressed priority areas resulting from problem identification work. Problem identification was accorded a high priority and was undertaken shortly after the program began. This work resulted in establishing priority areas, and the intent of the current evaluation is to determine whether these priority areas were addressed.

Information for the evaluation was collected primarily through interviews with key players involved in the JCCTSP. The basis for conducting the evaluation was the evaluation plan described earlier. The following methods were used. First, OHSP-JCCTSP files for the five-year period that OHSP funded the program (FY1988/89-FY1992/93) were reviewed and information related to issues identified in the evaluation plan was extracted and documented. Among the files reviewed were all JCCTSP administrative grants for the five-year period, as well as all individual grants funded through the program.

Second, the list of issues identified in the evaluation plan was expanded upon, based on review of the files and preliminary discussions with OHSP and UMTRI staff involved in the JCCTSP. The expanded list of issues was then used to develop a general interview guide that contained over 100 questions related to the program. The questions focussed on OHSP requirements for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program and the problem identification process.

Third, program participants over the five-year period were identified and an attempt was made to contact each of them so they could be interviewed. Some program participants had passed away, others had moved out of the area or could not be reached and were therefore not interviewed. A total of 29 interviews were conducted (see Table 1). The majority of these were face-to-face interviews. A few interviews were conducted over the telephone at the request of the interviewee or because of scheduling constraints. The face-to-face interviews were tape recorded and the tapes were later transcribed.

The final step involved reviewing the interview notes and transcriptions, synthesizing the information contained in the interviews, and making judgements about the program based on the interview information, as well as the information compiled from the program files. Much of this assessment was necessarily a matter of judgement and reasoned conclusion rather than application of a rigorous statistical methodology. Judgements about program performance are intended to provide constructive insights into what worked well

and what didn't work well so that future efforts in establishing comprehensive community traffic safety programs can benefit from the experience of the JCCTSP.

To determine if the JCCTSP had an impact on crashes or crash-related injury, an analysis of crash data was performed following the guidelines set forth in Filkins (1990). However, due to a change in Michigan's crash report form, UD-10, in 1992, eliminating the essential data fields for drivers' county of residence, the analysis included data only through 1991.

Table 1. JCCTSP Participants Interviewed

Name	Role in JCCTSP	Agency
Scott Ames	Grant manager/coordinator	Region 2 Planning
Leslie Austin	Grant manager	Michigan State Police
Ron Blake	Commissioner, coordinator	City engineering
Mike Dillon	Commissioner, grant manager	Jackson County 12th District Court
Mike Dermeyer	Coordinator, grant manager	Brooklyn Police Department
Laureen Dowling	Grant manager	American Red Cross
Robert Dubois	Coordinator	Napoleon Schools
Steve Duke	Coordinator	Region 2 Planning
Maggie Easterbrook	Program coordinator	Office of Highway Safety Planning
Allen Eichenberg	Commissioner	Jackson County Road Commission
Jack Esterline	Coordinator	Spring Arbor College
Lyle Filkins	Consultant	University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute
Mary Jo Flenner	Grant manager	Jackson County Health Department
Robert Groner	Program Coordinator	Office of Highway Safety Planning
Eugene Harvey	Commissioner	Jackson City Commission
Dan Heynes	Commissioner	Jackson County Sheriff Department
Kent Maurer	Commissioner, coordinator	Jackson City Police Department
John Midgley	Commissioner, grant manager	Jackson County Road Commission
Bill Navarre	Coordinator	Enforcement
Michael Rand	Commissioner	Jackson County Commission
Judy Rhoads	Program Coordinator	Office of Highway Safety Planning
Karl Schmidt	Commissioner	Local Units of Government
Lisa Scott	Grant manager	Jackson County Intermediate School District
Eva Studley	Commissioner	Citizen at large
Milo Thompson	Grant manager	Jackson Fire Departments
Walt Vaclavik	Commissioner, grant manager	Jackson City Commission
Bev Ward	Project director	Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Program
Vernon Webster	Commissioner	Jackson County Commission
Hank Zavislak	Grant manager	Jackson County Sheriff Department

FINDINGS

Findings from the evaluation are presented in two parts. In the first part, findings are discussed as they relate to the specific requirements identified by OHSP for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program. For each requirement identified, the discussion begins with a summary of how Jackson County proposed to meet that requirement (i.e., the program objectives laid out in the original proposal). Findings from the interviews and review of the JCCTSP files are then presented as they relate to implementation of the objectives in the JCCTSP proposal and completion of the OHSP requirements. In the second part, findings are discussed as they relate to the problem identification process and how priority areas resulting from that process were addressed.

Findings Related to OHSP Requirements for Establishment of a Comprehensive Community Traffic Safety Program

Requirement One: An effective and efficient management structure will be implemented.

A key element of the Jackson proposal was their unique approach to administration and management. A four-tiered management structure was proposed, modelled after organizational structures claimed to have been successful in other programs in Jackson County.

The first tier, the policy-making body, was described as a comprehensive traffic safety commission comprised of ten representatives from the following: education (chosen by and from school district superintendents), medical (chosen from emergency medicine interests), engineering (chosen from Jackson County Road Commission, City of Jackson Engineering Department, and other local street managers or Department of Public Works managers), law enforcement (chosen from and by all police chiefs), Jackson County Board of Commissioners, Jackson City Commission, local units (chosen from and by all township supervisors and village managers/presidents), criminal justice (chosen by and from members of the courts, prosecuting attorneys, etc.), OHSP, and a citizen at large (appointed by Jackson County Board of Commissioners). The commission was described as having responsibility for setting traffic safety policy and giving final approval to all grants, programs, and countermeasures determined by the process used to identify problems.

The second tier was to consist of a funded project director position. The director was to implement commission policy and serve as the overall coordinator for the program.

The third tier was to consist of voluntary coordinators from the criminal justice, engineering, and education/medicine fields. They were chosen from agencies eligible to receive OHSP program funds and were intended to act as information sources and liaisons for the local implementing agencies and the project

director. The coordinators were to assist local agencies in filing grant applications and monitoring the progress of each selected countermeasure.

The fourth tier of the management structure was to consist of managing directors of the actual implementing agencies (i.e., the grant managers). The agencies had responsibility for applying for funds from the commission to implement traffic safety programs and for monitoring their progress.

Findings from the interviews indicate that, for all practical purposes, the management structure implemented in Jackson County constituted a three-tiered structure rather than a four-tiered structure, comprised of the commission, the project director, and the grant managers. Descriptions of each of the management tiers that emerged from the interviews and review of the files are presented below.

The primary role of the commission was seen as one of oversight for the grant application and grant management processes. The commission decided what grants to fund and at what level, within OHSP guidelines, and also reviewed the objectives and activities of individual grants to ensure that traffic safety efforts in the county were being coordinated to avoid duplication. Thus, the commission represented the decision-making body for the overall program, although it was noted that OHSP, as the provider of funding for the program, had ultimate authority in determining how those funds were distributed.

Other roles of the commission mentioned less often had to do with seeking continuation funding to replace OHSP funding once it ended and serving as spokespersons in the community. However, one criticism raised about the commission was that efforts to obtain continuation funding were begun relatively late in the evolution of the program and only when the program was confronted with the need to come up with matching funds for the administrative grant. This issue is addressed more fully under requirement 4.

A major strength of the commission was seen to be its diverse makeup, with members representing a broad spectrum of the traffic safety arena. Such broad-based representation in the program provided the opportunity to reach a wide audience in marketing the program to the traffic safety and larger community. The multidisciplinary nature of the commission was also considered a strength in terms of making available a range of traffic safety expertise for assessing potential traffic safety projects.

However, it appears that apart from attending monthly commission meetings organized by the project director and participating in the problem identification process, commissioners were not perceived as being active advocates for the program. There were suggestions that most commissioners engaged in few program-related activities outside of monthly meetings and relied on the project director to carry out most of the oversight responsibilities for the program. There was also some concern that commissioners had limited

backgrounds in traffic safety and did not always represent the "powerhouses" of their respective agencies, reducing their ability to effectively forge support for a comprehensive traffic safety program.

Attendance at monthly commission meetings and in the problem identification process varied widely among commissioners and the agencies they represented. A review of commission meeting minutes, for example, indicated that attendance was highest among commissioners representing engineering, local units, the Jackson County Board of Commissioners, citizens, and OHSP (with commissioners generally missing no more than one or two meetings in any given year between FYs 1988/89 and 1992/93; see Appendix A). Attendance was also relatively high among commissioners representing law enforcement (with commissioners missing between one and four meetings in each of the five fiscal years).

Meeting attendance was much less stable among the remaining commissioners. For example, commissioners representing education and the Jackson City Commission missed between four and six meetings in most years (Appendix A). Commissioners representing the courts and medical had the lowest meeting attendance, with commissioners missing more than half of all meetings in at least three of the five years reviewed. In fact, meeting minutes indicated that there was no representation by the courts at any of the commission meetings during FY 1991/92.

There was some indication from the interviews that the level of participation among commissioners was influenced by the likelihood of funding for their respective projects (with those commissioners having a greater chance of funding being more active). Participation also appeared to be higher when a commissioner's activities in the program were considered part of the commissioner's regular work duties—that is, the commissioner was able to perform them during work hours without loss of compensation. The downside of having commissioners who were also grant recipients was that commissioners were sometimes seen as trying to protect their own interests at the expense of objectively assessing program needs and building consensus on strategy development.

In addition to differences in meeting attendance, the continuity of representation varied across areas represented on the commission (Appendix B). In each of the areas of education, engineering, and citizens, the same individual served as commissioner throughout the entire five-year period. The greatest turnover occurred among representatives of the Jackson County Board of Commissioners, OHSP, law enforcement, and the courts.

Greater turnover did not necessarily result in lower meeting attendance and was not a problem in and of itself. Turnover became a problem when the appointment of a replacement became difficult or delayed. The ease of reappointing or replacing commissioners was influenced by whether there was a clearly designated agency associated with the area being represented on the commission. For example, if the term

of the commissioner representing the Jackson County Board of Commissioners was about to expire, the project director for the JCCTSP simply informed the chairperson of the board that the current commissioner needed to be reappointed or a replacement selected. Thus, the Jackson County Board of Commissioners, which had six representatives during the five-year period, had among the highest meeting attendance.

For areas such as medical that did not have a clearly designated agency, it was more difficult to ensure continuity on the commission. In fact, there is currently no one on the commission representing the medical area because, according to the JCCTSP project director, she has been unable to establish communication with someone from the medical area to name a replacement for the currently designated representative who has not been active on the commission for some time.

Once representatives were appointed to the commission, they received orientation materials compiled by the project director that included the original proposal submitted by Jackson County. Although there was not a formal training or orientation process, there were mixed reactions among commissioners interviewed about whether a more formal process could have prepared them better to assume their duties. Many pointed out that because it was a pilot program, it was still evolving and therefore they were all learning as they went along. While this may have been true, there were definite objectives that had been established for program. A more formal training process could have helped focus commissioners' attention on those objectives and built commitment to the broader concepts underlying the comprehensive program.

The primary role of the project director was essentially seen as one of coordination. She served as the major link between the commission, the grant managers, other traffic safety agencies in the community, and OHSP; as such, the project director was the only player who had direct contact with every other tier of the program. Her perceived centrality to the program is illustrated by some of the descriptions used by interviewees to define her role in the program—e.g., the hub of the wheel, the main cog in the wheel, the center of the hub, the glue that held the whole thing together, and the clearinghouse for information. However, these descriptions also indicate that a clear vision of her role by players in the program was lacking in that interviewees had difficulty providing specific descriptions of the nature of the project director's role in the project.

The job description for the project director (Appendix C) described the project director as being responsible for the day-to-day management of the program and an agent to the commission. While many specific activities related to these responsibilities were mentioned by interviewees (e.g., setting up meetings, providing financial and other information to commission, carrying out the policies of the commission), a major focus of her efforts was clearly seen as the coordination of the individual grants. She served as the link between grant managers and OHSP to ensure that state and federal requirements were met during the application process and that project goals and objectives were being carried out during grant implementation. She served as the link between grant managers and the commission to ensure that information about grant activities and progress was made available in a timely manner and shared with commissioners.

The project director's attention to grant coordination was clearly supported by most commissioners who saw her as an effective liaison between OHSP and the grants managers, and someone who could oversee the coordination of traffic safety efforts in the community. Support among the grant managers themselves was more mixed. Those who were new to the OHSP grant process were generally more likely to see her as a resource. Those who had had grants with OHSP prior to the JCCTSP and were already familiar with the grant process tended to see her involvement as an unnecessary layer of administration. This was particularly true in the first year when the project director was new and, lacking a background in traffic safety, required time to get up to speed.

In the project director's relationship with the commission, there was, in a sense, a built-in conflict or at least cause for confusion. On the one hand, she was given the role of agent of the commission (based on her job description), which implied a subordinate position to the commission with the commission taking the leadership role. On the other hand, because she was at the center of the program and so heavily relied upon by the commission for program oversight, she was sometimes in a stronger position to provide the kind of leadership and direction that the commission needed to really make the program effective in the community.

This conflict had important implications for at least two key issues affecting the JCCTSP--finding continuation funding for the program and marketing the comprehensive traffic safety concept to the community. Neither the commission nor the project director took the lead in these efforts, and as a result, little was done to secure continuation funding until late in the evolution of the program when the JCCTSP learned it would need to come up with matching funds for the administrative grant. To some extent, the inactivity in these key areas was due to uncertainty about how to proceed, but it's also clear that the lack of clarity about whose role it was to initiate these efforts was a contributing factor.

The three coordinators who comprised the third tier in the proposed management structure attended commission meetings and participated in meeting discussions, but clearly did not fulfill their intended function as information sources and liaisons for the local implementing agencies and the project director, and as resources to local agencies in filing grant applications and monitoring grant progress. In fact, most grant managers were not aware of who the coordinators were and what their role was supposed to be.

Several reasons were mentioned by interviewees for why this tier of management was essentially nonfunctional. Most related to a lack of need for involvement by the coordinators because the project director was already handling the coordination role and there were not enough grants in any one area to require additional support. Initially, it was thought that the program would include many small and nongovernment grantees who would need outside expertise. However, because of state and federal funding restrictions, this did not occur and the coordinators' role as liaisons to the grantees became unnecessary.

On one hand, the inactivity of the third tier of management was not seen as particularly troublesome because it meant one fewer layer in what was considered by many grantees to be an already cumbersome administrative process. It also meant that there was one person--the project director--who served as liaison with OHSP and all grantees, resulting in greater continuity and consistency for all participants. On the other hand, by not having an active third tier, the project director had to assume sole responsibility for facilitating all grant-related activities, giving her less time to pursue other program goals and objectives (such as marketing the program to the community and seeking continuation funding). Thus, there were very real opportunity costs associated with not implementing the third tier of management as originally proposed.

In summary, the effectiveness and efficiency of the JCCTSP management structure was undermined in several ways. First, only three-fourths of the management structure was actually functional, with the third tier, the coordinators, never fulfilling their intended function. Second, and more importantly, the commission never took on the leadership role that was necessary to build a strong and effective program. Instead, commissioners confined most of their activities to attending commission meetings and making decisions about grant selection and funding. Third, the project director also focussed most of her efforts on grant administration, serving primarily as a coordinator for the individual grants. Thus, there was no one in the management structure to attend to the broader objectives required to sustain a comprehensive community program and the JCCTSP became, in a sense, just another layer of administration for implementing OHSP-funded grants.

Requirement Two: Overall program management and the management of agencies that will subsequently implement countermeasure activities, understand and are committed to creating and exercising the highway safety management process (i.e., planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and review, and evaluation).

The original Jackson County proposal did not specifically mention the highway safety management process in response to this requirement. Instead, it focused on the role of the project director as manager of the overall program. Specific responsibilities of the project director were described as monitoring and reporting on the status of all program activities to the commission and OHSP, reviewing financial records of grantees, developing an orientation process to educate local agencies, coordinators, new commissioners, and the general public about the program, and measuring the effectiveness of each selected countermeasure in cooperation with grantees.

In subsequent grants for the administrative component of the program, however, the JCCTSP was described as a pilot project to test the five stage highway safety management process and the process was used as the framework for presenting goals and objectives. Yet, few interviewees recognized the term "highway safety management process" or could describe the process. When the process was described for interviewees, many were quick to point out that it sounded simply like good management and therefore must have been used in managing the program even if they were not explicitly aware of it. Many could speak to specific parts of the process—for example, problem identification was a familiar concept and was considered to be a key part of the program. However, to the extent that OHSP's intent was to make the highway safety management process explicit and to get participants in the program to buy into the process in its entirety, as a comprehensive approach to management, this clearly did not occur.

Part of the problem seemed to be that little or no training was provided on the highway safety management process, particularly as the program evolved and new participants came aboard who had no connection with the original proposal. However, even among those who were aware of the process (e.g., the project director and some of the original commissioners), there did not appear to be a sense that it was a high priority. Rather, it was seen as the way good management should naturally work and therefore did not require special attention to bring it about. Given this perspective, it's not surprising that it never became institutionalized in the program.

In summary, OHSP's requirement that program management and grant managers have an understanding of and commitment to the highway safety management process was not met. In fact, most participants in the program were not even aware of the process. Further, while objectives and activities in the JCCTSP administrative grant were presented within the framework of the process (i.e., objectives and activities were grouped under different components of the process), this did little to integrate the process into the actual day-to-day operation of the program or the management of individual grants.

Requirement Three: Agencies and organizations traditionally concerned with traffic safety, such as law enforcement and traffic engineering, support the program concept and possess capabilities to implement likely program activities arising during the planning phase of the program.

Jackson County's original proposal cited a tradition of coordinated efforts by law enforcement agencies in the county including the Michigan State Police (MSP), the Jackson County Sheriff's Department, the City of Jackson Police Department, and several smaller township police departments. A close working relationship with nonenforcement agencies, such as the courts, probations departments, county prosecutors office, county road commission, Michigan Department of Transportation, and Region 2 Planning Commission, as well as numerous private agencies and informal citizens groups was also noted. Several initiatives involving both law enforcement and nonenforcement agencies were discussed to illustrate Jackson County's history of cooperation and commitment to traffic safety.

In the first full year of the JCCTSP, ten agencies in Jackson County received grants through the program (see Appendix D). Eight of those agencies were refunded in the following year, most for continuation of the previous grant activities. During the five-year period that the JCCTSP received financial support from OHSP, 15 agencies participated in the program as grant recipients.

Among those agencies that did participate, the interviews indicate fairly widespread support for the program concept, especially among commissioners and the project director. Having a comprehensive, countywide program was generally seen as the best way to increase communication and coordination among agencies, bring in funding for traffic safety initiatives that would not otherwise be available, and ensure effective allocation of those funds.

Grant managers also saw benefit in a comprehensive program, although a few managers would have preferred to receive funding directly from OHSP rather than having to go through the project director of the comprehensive program. Reduced support for the project director seemed to be tied to a perception of the project director as being little more than a grant coordinator. So, as the program evolved and grantees became more experienced at writing and implementing grants and their need for a grant coordinator diminished, so, too, did their support for having such a position. If the project director's role had not been seen as so limited, then maybe there would have been stronger support for the administrative component of the program.

There was fairly strong opposition to the level of funding for the administrative component of the program by one particular participant in the program. Although this individual expressed support for the program concept overall, a number of other interviewees volunteered their opinion that this was not the case. Because this participant was a powerful member of the community, the conflict that his opposition produced

proved to be quite distracting to program implementation. Although the conflict was apparently resolved to an extent, it did undermine the effectiveness of the administration of the program.

One of the clearest benefits of the program that became evident during the interview process was increased communication and cooperation among participating agencies. Several interviewees recounted the program's success in strengthening bonds between agencies, particularly between law enforcement and traffic engineering and between law enforcement and education. Although there were some interviewees who did not see evidence of increased cooperation or saw such cooperation as resulting from past interaction among agencies rather than the program itself, these individuals were in the minority.

The strengthening of bonds between agencies was initially motivated by specific grants that required interagency coordination. However, it appears that, in many cases, cooperation continued because of informal traffic safety networks that were established during the course of projects, but extended beyond the scope and life of those projects. The establishment of these networks was facilitated by monthly project director meetings and several task forces, each of which brought together representatives of different agencies.

Two of the task forces, the safety belt task force and the drunk and drugged driving task force, were organized as part of the Jackson County Health Department traffic safety education grant. The safety belt task force not only provided opportunities for networking, but also for direct participation in the implementation of numerous traffic safety activities. There was widespread support for the various task forces and their role in bringing together different players in the traffic safety arena. The concern raised about the task forces was that because they were sponsored by a specific grant, they would lose their administrative support and cease to function if funding for that grant ended.

The best example of interagency coordination is probably the clearinghouse for traffic records. The clearinghouse was developed as part of a multiyear grant and involves the central processing and dissemination of traffic crash information from the UD-10s (with other types of traffic safety information to be added in the future). Although clearly not without its problems, particularly early on in the project when some agencies were reluctant to come aboard, the clearinghouse now encompasses at least 14 agencies in Jackson County and has been expanded to Hillsdale and Lenawee Counties.

Participants in the monthly JUMP meetings (now part of the Jackson Traffic Enforcement Engineering Program) were seen as representing a task force that has contributed to increased cooperation, particularly among law enforcement agencies. The task force includes representatives from all law enforcement agencies in the county and the courts and has recently sought participation from grant managers and representatives from the traffic records clearinghouse and the education area.

In summary, improved communication and cooperation among program participants was arguably one of the best results of the program. At the same time, it was seen almost as a side product rather than a central focus of the program. The central focus of the program was seen as the funding of individual grants and the success of the JCCTSP was, in fact, measured by how well each of the individual grants performed. This implies that although program participants were committed to implementing individual grant activities and, in the course of that implementation, increased communication and cooperation with other agencies, they lacked a true understanding of or commitment to the overall program concept for the JCCTSP.

Requirement Four: Program management is willing to work toward creating and maintaining a long-term, traffic safety program that continues beyond the period when direct OHSP financial assistance is available.

Jackson County responded in its proposal that the commission and project director would work to ensure the continuation of the traffic safety programs generated by the project. It was indicated that because the commission would be comprised of key individuals from all aspects of the community, commissioners would want to ensure the continuation of successful programs affecting their area of interest. The proposal noted the ability of the county to obtain funding for beneficial community projects in the past and the ability of law enforcement to develop projects using existing or private funding as an indication of the high priority afforded traffic safety efforts. The county proposed to report efforts to secure continuation funding as part of the administrative evaluation process.

The JCCTSP was successful in securing continuation funding for the program through a five dollar increase in court costs for civil traffic infractions and misdemeanor citations issued in Jackson County on or after January 1, 1993. Funds generated from the increased court costs first go to the Jackson County General Fund and then must be earmarked by the Jackson County Board of Commissioners for the JCCTSP. In June 1992, an agreement was reached by the Jackson County Board of Commissioners to fund 50 percent of the JCCTSP FY 1992/93 administration grant to meet OHSP's requirement for a 50 percent local match. Beginning in FY 1993/94, when all OHSP funds were withdrawn from the JCCTSP, the Jackson County Board of Commissioners began earmarking all of the funds generated from the five dollar increase to the program.

This source of continuation funding is expected to bring in between \$80,000 and \$100,000 per year for the program. Revenue generated by traffic tickets is less than initially expected because early projections were based on estimates of citations issued rather than citations paid and did not exclude certain citations for which money does not go to the program (e.g., citations requiring a court appearance and those for alcohol-impaired driving). It is also considerably less than the amount of funding received from OHSP annually (which exceeded \$350,000 in most years).

Because of the reduced funding, the program has scaled back somewhat. The project director's position has been decreased to two days per week, fewer grants are being funded, and matching funds are required for all grants except the administrative grant. Grants for agencies other than law enforcement require a 50 percent match, while grants for law enforcement agencies require a 25 percent match. The rationale for the reduced match for law enforcement is that they write the citations and therefore generate the continuation funds. Therefore, it's important to ensure they are in a position to continue writing citations. In FY 1993/94, seven grants in addition to the administrative grant were funded through the program. All were essentially continuation grants for previously funded agencies.

Despite the reduced scope of the program, the JCCTSP is one of only a few comprehensive community traffic safety programs to have survived after federal or state funds were withdrawn. Thus, it represents a major accomplishment that should not be underrated and this sentiment was certainly voiced during the interview process. At the same time, there were concerns and criticisms raised about the timing and effectiveness of the efforts undertaken to secure continuation funding for the program. Specifically, it was felt by many that efforts were undertaken too late and focussed on too few alternative sources of funding.

There appear to be several reasons for the delay in seeking continuation funding. As mentioned earlier, consensus was lacking about who should take the lead in such efforts. In addition, there did not appear to be a clearly conceived plan or strategy for undertaking such efforts. For example, although identification of nonfederal sources of funding was recognized as an objective in an early administrative grant, the activities to achieve this objective focussed primarily on public relations. Further, these limited activities did not get off the ground very quickly because the project director, hired after the grant was written, was, in her own estimation, not that comfortable in a public relations role and had limited success in establishing a public relations committee that could implement the ideas that were developed.

Early in the program there was also a misconception by a number of participants that OHSP had guaranteed full funding for the program over five years totalling \$5,000,000. Thus, there was little sense of urgency felt to find other sources of funding. The real push for continuation funding seems to have come when the program learned that it would have to come up with a 50 percent match for the administrative component in the fourth year if OHSP funding were to continue. Although OHSP eventually agreed to postpone the required match until the fifth and final year, the program was sufficiently motivated to begin the search in earnest.

While many interviewees saw the current source of funding as a long term solution to program continuation, they also saw it only as a partial solution. That is, the citation fees were not seen to be an adequate source of funding to maintain a traffic safety program that is comprehensive in scope, as the JCCTSP was intended to be. There was also some concern raised about the reliance on law enforcement to generate all program funds. However, there does not appear to be a concerted effort underway to find other sources of funding for the program.

In summary, the requirement that program management be willing to work toward creating and maintaining a long-term, traffic safety program that has continued beyond the period of direct OHSP financial assistance was partially met. Program management did secure continuation funding for the program. However, their efforts were undertaken late in the process and with much prompting from OHSP. In addition, the current level of continuation funding is not sufficient to maintain a truly comprehensive program. Finally, the source of funding is problematic in that it creates financial incentives for issuing traffic citations, therefore undermining law enforcement's emphasis on enforcement efforts as a means to improve traffic safety.

Requirement Five: Program management is willing to conduct thorough, regularly scheduled performance (administrative) evaluations of all significant program activities throughout the life of the program and will use their results to improve performance.

Jackson County's response to this requirement focussed primarily on evaluation of individual grants. The proposal noted that as each program was developed, specific goals and objectives would be outlined. The project director would ensure that program coordinators conducted quarterly evaluations of these goals and objectives, as well as several general factors including cost maintenance, cost effectiveness, ability to move funding to local entities, community support, and transferability to other counties. A quarterly evaluation of these programs was to be conducted by the project director and the commission, as well. The proposal also focussed on evaluation of the project director, noting that the commission would conduct performance evaluations, discuss them with the project director, and submit them to OHSP on a semiannual basis.

Subsequent administration grants for the JCCTSP contained specific objectives for evaluating the overall comprehensive traffic safety program that included development of an evaluation technique for the program. An evaluation plan for the JCCTSP was completed in 1990 by UMTRI (with input from the JCCTSP and OHSP) and approved by OHSP and the JCCTSP commission. The plan outlined general procedures for both a performance evaluation and an effectiveness evaluation of the overall program.

The primary purpose of the performance evaluation, as described in the plan, was to assess whether and to what extent the comprehensive program had been implemented and was functioning as designed. The plan recommended that JCCTSP program management, OHSP, and the organization selected to conduct the effectiveness evaluation all participate in the performance evaluation, with JCCTSP program management assigned the principle responsibility for its execution. However, the evaluation plan was never implemented in Jackson County.

There appear to be several factors associated with the failure to implement the performance evaluation for the overall program. There was initial confusion by the project director about how the evaluation would be implemented (e.g., who would do what). The retirement of Lyle Filkins in 1991 (the author of the evaluation plan) and the subsequent reduction of UMTRI's role in program evaluation did little to dispel that confusion. However, as time went on, it appears that the project director was reluctant to take a leadership role in resolving the confusion and initiating the evaluation process.

Part of the inactivity appears to be due to a misunderstanding about whose responsibility it was to initiate implementation of the plan. The plan itself assigned the principle responsibility for its execution to JCCTSP program management. However, the project director indicated during the interview process that her understanding was that responsibility for implementing the plan was to be shared by the program, OHSP, and UMTRI. Consequently she waited for some direction from UMTRI and OHSP until she was informed that the performance evaluation would be conducted after OHSP involvement had ended. UMTRI, on the other hand, expected the project director to take a leadership role in initiating the evaluation as specified in the plan.

Aside from the confusion and miscommunication, part of the problem seemed to be a lack of understanding of the limitations of an informal evaluation. Several comments made by the project director conveyed the impression that she had already judged the program to be a success and was therefore not concerned about delays in implementing the formal evaluation process. She noted, for example, that they were doing a good job, that the commission was spending money wisely and not duplicating efforts, and that, if they hadn't been successful, they would not have been able to secure continuation funding. She also indicated that the real measure of success was that the people involved in the program felt they had done something worthwhile rather than what outsiders might conclude about the program.

In fairness to the JCCTSP, the original proposal contained little to suggest that regularly scheduled performance evaluations of the overall program would be conducted. Instead, the proposal talked about evaluating individual grants through quarterly progress reports by grant managers. This process, in fact, was a standard funding requirement by OHSP and did occur for all grants in the program. The process was

facilitated by the project director and, as the program evolved, copies went to commissioners for their review. The project director also required each grant manager to submit monthly reports of grant activities that she summarized and distributed to commissioners. Neither of these reports, however, provided insight into the performance of the overall program. In addition, even though quarterly progress reports contained information on specific grant-related goals and objectives, they did not generally address the larger grant issues such as cost maintenance, cost effectiveness, ability to move funding to local entities, community support, and transferability to other counties, that the original Jackson County proposal deemed to be important evaluation issues.

In summary, the requirement to conduct thorough, regularly scheduled performance evaluations of all significant program activities throughout the life of the program and use their results to improve performance was not met. The JCCTSP evaluation plan was never implemented and no performance evaluation of the overall program was conducted. Evaluation activities that occurred for the individual grants were essentially progress and activity reports, and provided little insight into broader performance issues.

Requirement Six: There exists substantial community and media support in undertaking a community traffic safety program. Letters of endorsement from key community leaders and traffic safety specialists should be included as evidence of such support.

The Jackson County proposal noted that prior to formally applying for the grant, a general information meeting was held with community leaders, including elected officials, police administrators, industrial leaders, union leaders, representatives from the media, and concerned citizens to request support for the program. Following the meeting, numerous letters of support for a pilot program in Jackson County were received and were included in the proposal. A video presentation detailing why Jackson County should receive the grant was developed in cooperation with Consumers Power, the Jackson County Board of Commissioners, the Region 2 Planning Commission, the Jackson 1990 Committee, the Jackson County Sheriff, and MSP.

The letters of endorsement contained in the original proposal and the video produced to promote the program concept clearly suggest broad-based support for the *idea* of a comprehensive community traffic safety program in Jackson County. OHSP was also interested in seeing community support once the program was actually implemented in the community. The evaluation plan, therefore, identified several factors by which to gauge ongoing community support, such as media coverage and the existence of new or expanded traffic safety initiatives by nongovernmental agencies.

The interviews indicate that, in general, there was adequate coverage by the news media (especially the print media) of program activities and events associated with individual grants. Although not seen as particularly proactive in promoting traffic safety, newspapers in the county were considered not unlike newspapers anywhere else--they would report news if they were made aware of it and if it contained an element of excitement.

What was noticeably absent in news coverage of program activities was attention to how each of these separate activities was part of a larger coordinated effort--the JCCTSP. In addition, there was little coverage of activities associated with the administrative component of the program, apart from the initial announcement of the awarding of the grant (which focussed primarily on the amount of money awarded). Consequently, the general public had little awareness of the JCCTSP as an entity apart from the individual projects associated with it.

Although early administrative grants proposed some specific activities related to public relations, the project director had little experience initiating public relations efforts and the public relations committee established by the program lacked the time to implement its ideas. Thus, a clearly focussed strategy for increasing public awareness of the program never emerged and little was accomplished in the first few years of the program. The program did have a policy requiring grant managers to recognize the overall program when providing information to the media. However, not all grant managers followed this policy and even when they did, the news media often chose to ignore this information in their coverage, preferring to focus on specific activities of the individual projects.

In the JCCTSP's third year, a media consultant was hired to promote the program. There was some feeling that publicity for the program did increase as a result of the public relations efforts of the consultant (through public service announcements, fliers in the local paper, bulletins posted in the schools, displays at shopping malls, information booklets, etc.). However, most interviewees agreed that the JCCTSP never attained widespread recognition or visibility in the community.

The failure of the JCCTSP to forge an identity of its own in the community was not surprising to many interviewees who pointed out that, in the face of so many public agencies and programs, people simply don't attend to how programs are financed or organizationally related. This lack of public awareness became problematic, however, as the JCCTSP sought to find continuation funding and the need to build a constituency for the program became increasingly important.

Although the participating agencies in the program represented a constituency of support for the program, it was a relatively small constituency because the program had never expanded much beyond the original grant recipients. That is, as the program evolved, the same agencies tended to get funding each year with few new players becoming involved in the program. This, in fact, was considered by many interviewees to be a major weakness of the program. While the relatively small size of the community certainly limited, to some extent, the available pool of potential participants, there appeared to be few efforts made to reach out to other government agencies eligible for program funding to identify new projects.

The JCCTSP did, however, assist a few nongovernmental agencies in the establishment or expansion of traffic safety activities. For example, through the support of the traffic safety education grant (managed by the Jackson County Health Department) a MADD chapter was reestablished in Jackson County. That chapter, in conjunction with the health department and the district court, established a victim's impact panel that remains active in the county under the auspices of MADD. The JCCTSP was also successful in increasing networking between existing SADD chapters in the county and other community organizations and providing opportunities for greater involvement by SADD in traffic safety initiatives.

In summary, although there was evidence of broad-based support among community organizations for the idea of a community traffic safety program, once established, the program was never able to forge an identity of its own in the community. Media and community attention focussed primarily on the individual grants that were funded through the program and the program never became integrated into the community's awareness as a unified entity. Thus, the intent of establishing a truly comprehensive program, one that was more than just a collection of individual projects, was never fully realized.

Requirement Seven: Program management will collaborate with OHSP throughout the life of the program, particularly during planning and programming activities.

In the original proposal, Jackson County indicated strong support for continuing interaction with OHSP throughout the program and indicated that an advisory position for OHSP personnel would be created on the commission. The county also expressed a willingness to provide office space for an OHSP advisor, if necessary, during the initial stages of program implementation.

Throughout the five-year period that OHSP funded the program, OHSP was represented on the commission by its program coordinator for the JCCTSP. There was also an OHSP financial coordinator for the program. The first OHSP program coordinator was replaced early on by a second OHSP staffer, who served as program coordinator until April 1991, when she left OHSP. After that time, there was a succession

of four OHSP program coordinators involved in the JCCTSP, with the program coordinator in the final year being the same person as the financial coordinator for the program.

The interviews indicate that turnover in the OHSP program coordinator position, after the second coordinator left, had a disruptive effect on the program because of the lack of continuity it created. The lack of continuity may not have been such a concern if subsequent coordinators had been seen as being knowledgeable about and committed to the program. Many interviewees expressed frustration at having to look to the coordinators for program advice and support when the coordinators, in their view, understood so little about the program. There was also a sense by some interviewees that interest in the program waned at OHSP after the second OHSP coordinator left.

While lack of continuity probably diminished the effectiveness of collaborative efforts between the program and OHSP, the interviews indicate that there was clearly a much larger issue that affected collaboration. That issue had to do with OHSP's role and expectations for the program. It is apparent from comments made by the interviewees that there was confusion and misunderstanding about what OHSP's role was supposed to be and what OHSP's expectations were for the program. Contributing to this confusion was the fact that some of key JCCTSP proponents who had drafted the original proposal left the area before the program was actually implemented and therefore could not clarify OHSP expectations for program participants.

From the beginning, there was confusion about OHSP funding of the overall program and conditions under which that funding was provided. Many interviewees were under the impression that OHSP had intended to fully fund the program (with no local matching requirements) for the full five years. In fact, many indicated that the program was to receive \$5,000,000 over the five years. Some interviewees with this view felt considerable frustration when this expectation was not fulfilled and seemed to have a sense that they never got as much as they had been promised. For other interviewees, there was a clear expectation that matching funds would be required at some point in the program, but there were different perceptions about when this would occur, what matches would be required, and which grants would be included.

Another area in which OHSP expectations were not clear to program management had to do with the conditions under which individual grants could be funded through the program. The interviews indicate that commissioners were not initially aware of state and federal restrictions on funding for individual grants. It was not until the commission had actively solicited letters of intent from more than 50 potential applicants in the first program year that they learned about the restrictions, making it necessary for them to inform all but about 12 applicants that they were ineligible for funding.

There was also some confusion about OHSP's role, in general, in relation to the program. Although most interviewees saw OHSP's role as one of oversight and guidance for the program, perceptions differed in regards to how much control OHSP exercised and how actively involved OHSP was in day-to-day program operations. A few saw OHSP's role as simply to give money, with decisions on how it would be spent left to the commission. Others saw OHSP primarily as a resource, providing guidance on state and federal funding requirements with little involvement in day-to-day grant operations. Still others saw OHSP as having much more control--providing the money, determining how it should be spent, and ensuring that projects stayed on track.

Interviewees who perceived OHSP to have a lot of control over the program did not necessarily see that as a bad thing. Some pointed out that, especially in the beginning, a high level of involvement by OHSP was needed because of the lack of expertise and experience in the county for such a program. However, one criticism that was raised about OHSP's involvement in the program was that the rules of the game seemed to change as the program went along, particularly in regard to funding. While many of these changes were seen as beyond the control of OHSP (e.g., changing requirements from NHTSA), they were still considered to have been disruptive to the program.

In summary, collaborative efforts between the program and OHSP were undermined by a lack of clear expectations regarding OHSP funding requirements and program oversight, as well as turnover among JCCTSP and OHSP personnel. Staff turnover and changing government requirements, however, are less the exception than the rule and will rarely be within the control of program management. What made these conditions particularly troublesome for Jackson County was that little was done from the program's inception to operationalize the concepts underlying the program concept. Thus, there was little chance to clarify and specify roles and responsibilities of program participants upfront before misunderstandings could arise. This is not to say that such a process would have eliminated all misunderstanding. However, there would have at least been a clearer understanding of what the program was intended to accomplish and what needed to be done.

Requirement Eight: Program management will participate in and provide evidence for effectiveness (impact) evaluations and will report the results of its performance (administrative) evaluations to OHSP on a quarterly basis.

Jackson County indicated strong support for impact and performance evaluations in their proposal and made a commitment to provide all necessary data as well as assist OHSP in the evaluation process. The county also proposed that trained evaluators be involved in the initial stages of the grant development to ensure that evaluations were successfully completed.

Several evaluation tools were proposed including quarterly administrative evaluations to inform OHSP of grant progress and provide the project director with an accurate ongoing perspective of the total grant, continual on-site evaluations by OHSP (and representatives from NHTSA) to help the program attain its overall grant objectives, and evaluations to monitor community involvement and attitudes regarding the grant.

After program implementation, quarterly progress reports were written for each grant and sent to OHSP as part of OHSP's standard funding requirements for grantees. These reports addressed progress in meeting grant goals and objectives. Onsite evaluations were conducted by OHSP as part of their grant monitoring process. Evaluations to monitor community involvement and attitudes regarding the program were not undertaken. The project director noted, however, that about midway through the program, she had the commission complete an evaluation of the overall program to assess the success of the program from the perspective of the commission. Results were shared with the commission and OHSP.

Apart from quarterly progress reports for the JCCTSP administrative grant and the evaluation of the JCCTSP by the commission, there was no evaluation of the overall program. Therefore, the requirement of reporting results of program performance (administrative) evaluations to OHSP on a quarterly basis was not met. Although progress reports for the administrative grant were sent to OHSP quarterly, these reports did not truly constitute an evaluation of the overall program. Rather, they focussed more narrowly on yearly goals and objectives and did not necessarily address the broader objectives that Jackson County initially identified for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program.

An effectiveness (impact) evaluation of the JCCTSP was conducted by UMTRI. Because the evaluation relied on police reported crash data, there was little need for the program to provide information for evaluation. Results of the evaluation were provided to program management and OHSP at each year's end. Unfortunately, this evaluation period extended only through 1991 because changes in the UD-10 crash report form eliminated the critical variable, county of driver residence. Without this key variable, the residence of crash-involved drivers could not be determined, thus making it impossible to determine the number and severity of crashes involving drivers travelling within their own county. The evaluation of available data found no evidence at the aggregate level of achievement of program goals related to reduced crashes, deaths, or injuries.

No individual project conducted an impact evaluation, although performance information about activities was compiled. There is a notable exception to this finding. Child safety seat and safety belt use surveys were conducted periodically through the combined efforts of the Jackson County Health Department, police agencies, the Boy Scouts, Red Cross volunteers, and UMTRI staff. UMTRI pushed strongly for more

emphasis on impact evaluations initially, but it became clear that project staff had little time, skill, or inclination to conduct these evaluations. To assist grant managers in evaluating their programs, a manual for assessing program effectiveness was developed by UMTRI (Streff, 1990) and supplemental assistance was offered. However, grant managers made little use of the manual.

In summary, the requirement that program management participate in and provide evidence for effectiveness evaluations and report the results of its performance evaluations to OHSP on a quarterly basis was met only to the extent that these activities were necessary to fulfill other OHSP requirements for funding or were initiated by parties other than program management. For example, an effectiveness evaluation of the overall program was conducted by UMTRI, but, with the exception of the safety belt group, none of the individual grants initiated their own impact evaluations. Progress reports for all grants were forwarded to OHSP on a quarterly basis, but these reports were a response to OHSP's general requirements for grant funding and did not actually constitute performance evaluations of the individual grants. Program management did not initiate a performance evaluation of the overall program.

Requirement Nine: Program management is willing to make its program experience and materials available to OHSP and other communities.

In response to this requirement, Jackson County proposed to share program successes and failures with OHSP and other communities, as well as to provide assistance to other counties in the development of similar programs. The proposal noted that materials produced by grant funds would not be copyrighted so that they could be used by other communities and that program transfer documents would be developed for all major efforts to facilitate the review and implementation of the program in other communities.

After the program was implemented, JCCTSP shared information in a number of ways. First, the project director responded to all requests for information by providing current program materials. These materials included the original Jackson County proposal and, in later years, a booklet about the JCCTSP put together to secure continuation funding. The booklet provided an overview of the program and highlighted grant accomplishments. Grant managers were also asked to develop a brochure that included a brief summary of their grant, information about its implementation, and who to contact for more information. These brochures provided program information but were not actually program transfer documents as described in the original proposal.

Involvement of the project director in a number of activities prompted interest in the experiences of the JCCTSP. For example, while serving as an instructor for community traffic safety training sponsored by NHTSA, the project director received and responded to many inquiries about the JCCTSP. She also attended numerous state and federal conferences (e.g., Lifesavers) where she spoke about the program and shared information. On a more local level, she has disseminated program information through activities of the Traffic Records Clearinghouse and through other activities within the Region 2 planning area.

In response to requests for information about the program from other organizations and individuals, materials were compiled on a case-by-case basis. There is no actual catalog or library of materials available for the program. The materials provided typically include the original proposal, the continuation booklet, and the grant brochures. Because of the type of materials sent out, copies are made of the originals and sent out rather than lending the original material.

In summary, program management has been willing to make its program experience and materials available to OHSP and other communities. However, there is not a systematic process in place for doing so, and the materials available for distribution do not include the transfer documents that Jackson County originally proposed for facilitating the review and implementation of the program in other communities.

Findings Related to the Problem Identification Process and How Priority Areas Resulting from that Process Were Addressed

The evaluation plan indicated that problem identification was accorded a high priority for the JCCTSP and therefore was undertaken shortly after the program began. The problem identification process resulted in the establishment of priority areas. The intent of this part of the evaluation is to determine whether these priority areas were addressed.

The problem identification process was first initiated by a committee formed for that purpose. The committee was comprised of selected commissioners and grant managers, the project director, and other traffic safety professionals in the community. The committee identified five priority areas--alcohol countermeasures, occupant protection, engineering, emergency medical services, and public awareness projects. Education, enforcement, traffic records, and school bus safety were later added by a subsequent problem identification committee and public awareness was eliminated as a priority area (with a public information and education component to be included in all projects).

Because of difficulties encountered by the first problem identification committee in understanding the problem identification process and formulating clearly focussed goals, a new problem identification committee was established in 1989, with more direct guidance from OHSP. In February 1989, that committee submitted a report to the JCCTSP commission that outlined traffic safety problems in Jackson County and potential solutions to those problems developed during the problem identification process. Based on the report, specific goals were developed for the JCCTSP that included yearly goals. The statement of goals became the basis for development of traffic safety priorities in subsequent years, with priorities in subsequent years representing an updating and refinement of those initial goals.

For the first four years of the program (FYs 1988/89-1991/92), the goals (called priorities in some years) that came out of the problem identification process were presented in essentially the same format, with goals broken out by year. In the first three years, goals were identified for each year through 1993. In the fourth year, goals were identified for each year through 1994. In each year there was also a set of ongoing goals developed that was not tied to any particular year (e.g., reduce traffic crashes in Jackson County by 10 percent each year).

The statement of goals developed in the fifth year of the program (FY1992/93) represented a departure from earlier years in that goals were broken out by problem area (e.g., increase occupant protection in Jackson County, reduce incidence of impaired driving in Jackson County, reduce hazardous violations in Jackson County). In addition, goals were identified for only one year—1994. The changes in format made the statement of goals easier to use as a tool for program planning. The problem identification process used to develop goals in the final year was described by the project director as probably the most efficient of the program's duration. It involved wide representation, a one day concentrated effort, and ample time for review and revisions by the committee and the commission, and produced a simple yet complete document to guide the commission.

The intended purpose of generating the goal statements each year was to provide a basis for project selection by the commission—that is, to ensure that projects being funded through the program were those that would address key traffic safety problems in Jackson County by helping to achieve the goals identified to overcome those problems. The real challenge in the problem identification process was twofold: 1) the goals had to be specific enough so that they could actually be used to discriminate among potential grant applicants and so that progress in meeting the goals could be determined each year, and 2) the goals had to address not only the problem areas in Jackson County, they also had to be attainable through efforts that would be eligible for state and federal funding.

The JCCTSP commission was not aware of state and federal requirements for grant funding when it solicited potential grant applicants in the first year of the program. Consequently, out of the 50 or more letters of intent received by the commission in response to their active solicitation, only about 12 potential grantees were eligible for state and federal funding. As a result of that experience, the commission became more restrictive in soliciting grant applications in subsequent years to ensure that all potential applicants would be eligible for funding. Solicitation was essentially limited to placing an announcement in the local newspaper and notifying past grant recipients of a new round of grant awards. Program management also tried to integrate the funding requirements into the problem identification process itself so that the goals that came out of the process focussed on areas that would be eligible to receive state and federal funding.

By tailoring the solicitation process and the problem identification process in this way, they were successful in ensuring that potential grant applicants would actually be eligible to receive funding through the program. The problem was that they were also successful in restricting the number of participants in the program. That is, the grants funded each year were essentially the same grants that had been funded in prior years, with few new players becoming involved in the program. So, even though funded projects did address the priority areas identified in the problem identification process, and even though the process did improve considerably over the life of the program, the process did not foster the kind of comprehensive and community-based program that was originally envisioned.

DISCUSSION

While findings from the evaluation point to a number of strengths and weaknesses of the program, the real value of the findings lies in what they tell us about how to build on the strengths, and overcome or minimize the weaknesses, in undertaking similar efforts in the future. There are several lessons to be learned.

It's instructive to think about some of the elements that contribute to the establishment and continuation of successful programs in general. First, there needs to be a clear and shared vision of what the program is intended to be and to accomplish. Second, there needs to be a way to operationalize that vision; that is, to translate the abstract concepts underlying the program into specific objectives and activities that can be achieved and attended to on a day-to-day basis. Third, there need to be people involved in the program who are committed to the vision and have the expertise to carry it out. People may already have that commitment and expertise coming into the program, but these need to be nurtured and developed continually. Finally, there needs to be some mechanism for assessing program progress so that problems can be identified and attended to effectively.

OHSP had a vision for the JCCTSP that was based on considerable thought. That vision was spelled out in several requirements set forth by OHSP for establishment of a comprehensive community traffic safety program. Jackson County proponents for attracting the study to their community seemed to buy into that vision and their proposal reflected strong support for it. Based on their response, the grant was awarded to Jackson County.

The proposal, however, was still at the level of the vision. Although it responded to each of OHSP's requirements, it spoke in fairly general terms about how the requirements would be met. Given that OHSP was seeking to pilot an essentially untried program concept, it was not unreasonable that the original proposal lacked more specific objectives for establishing and sustaining a comprehensive community traffic safety program.

The problem was that after the grant was awarded, little was done to operationalize the vision for the JCCTSP. That is, the OHSP requirements that spelled out that vision and the JCCTSP's response to those requirements were never again used as the starting point for the development of objectives and activities. Subsequent administrative grants presented objectives and activities for each grant year within the framework of the highway safety management process (i.e., objectives and activities were developed for each component

of process--planning, programming, implementing, monitoring and reviewing, and evaluating). While commitment to the highway safety management process was one of OHSP's original requirements, the vision for the program was clearly much broader.

Because the original requirements (and resulting objectives) for the overall program were not systematically addressed in subsequent administrative grants, there was never the opportunity to translate them into more clearly focussed objectives and activities that could be undertaken by the program. Thus, it was not surprising that clearly focussed strategies for achieving many of the original program objectives were never formed (e.g., creating and maintaining a long term traffic safety program). Had administrative grants been more closely tied to the original requirements for the program, there would have been greater motivation as well as a mechanism for developing such strategies.

By not building the overall program objectives into each administrative grant, attention to those objectives became an ad hoc and individual effort. That is, because the objectives were not made explicit, it was left to individuals to identify and respond to them. Given the turnover in participation that occurred within the JCCTSP and at OHSP and the tremendous amount of program information that participants had to deal with, it's not surprising that these larger program objectives often got lost along the way.

The failure to operationalize the comprehensive community traffic safety program concept hindered success of the program both directly and indirectly through its affect on the program's ability to build commitment and expertise among participants and to monitor program progress. Given the comprehensive nature of the program and given that it was a pilot project, it is not surprising that many program participants lacked experience and expertise in important areas. In addition, the departure of several original proponents of the project from the area before the program was implemented reduced the number of program participants committed to the original vision.

Because of these factors, it became increasingly important to build commitment among participants and develop the expertise needed to manage the program. Building the original program objectives into the administrative grant could have facilitated this process in several ways. It would have kept the overall program objectives continually on the table, forcing program management to confront them, to develop strategies to achieve them, and to measure their progress in achieving them. More importantly, it would have provided the opportunity for program management to incorporate learning into the program. That is, each year strategies could have been changed to reflect the successes and failures of the previous year.

Translating OHSP's general program requirements into specific objectives and activities would have also facilitated communication between program management and OHSP in several ways. OHSP would have had to reexamine its vision and make it explicit to ensure that it was being adequately captured by the objectives and activities. By agreeing on specific objectives and activities up front, there would have been less room for misunderstanding about what was expected of program management. Also, as the program evolved, there would have been a framework in place for OHSP to continually assess whether the program was meeting its requirements, enabling OHSP to work with program management to make the necessary changes to keep them on track.

This last point is especially important because it means that a process for evaluating performance of the overall program would have already been in place. That is, there would have been an opportunity to evaluate program performance through the existing OHSP grant monitoring process (e.g., the quarterly progress reports and the onsite reviews) because objectives and activities being monitored would have included the major elements that OHSP envisioned for a comprehensive community traffic safety program. Linking performance evaluation activities to the grant monitoring process would not have eliminated the need for a separate, more comprehensive performance evaluation of the program. However, it would have helped to compensate for program management's failure to initiate a separate performance evaluation by ensuring that there was at least some information available for instituting changes to improve the program.

REFERENCES

Filkins, L. D. (1990). *Evaluation Plan: Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Program*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute.

Streff, F.M. (1990). *Evaluating Traffic Safety Programs: A Manual for Assessing Program Effectiveness*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute.

APPENDIX A
ATTENDANCE AT COMMISSION MEETINGS

Attendance at Commission Meetings

Representative	FY88/89	FY89/90 (no Jun meeting)	FY90/91	FY91/92 (no Aug meeting)	FY92/93 (no may minutes)
Education Representative:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Feb, Apr, May, Jul (7/12)*	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, May, Jul, Sep (8/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Apr, Sep (7/12)	Oct, Nov, Mar, Apr, Jul (5/11)	Oct, Dec, Mar, Apr, Jul, Sep (6/11)
Engineering Representative:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Sep (10/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Mar, Apr, May, Jul, Aug, Sep (10/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (11/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (11/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, Jul, Sep (9/11)
JC Board of Commissioners Representative:	Oct, Nov, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug (10/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Aug, Sep (10/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug (11/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul (9/11)	Nov, Dec, Feb, Mar, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (8/11)
Local Unit Representative:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (11/12)	Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, May, Jul, Aug, Sep (9/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (12/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (11/11)	Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, Jun, Aug, Sep (9/11)
Courts Representative:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, May, Jun, Jul (9/12)	Nov, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Sep (6/11)	Nov, Dec, May, Aug, Sep (5/12)	(0/11)	Jan, Feb, Mar, Jun, Aug (5/11)
Medical Representative:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jul, Aug (10/12)	Oct, Mar, Apr (3/11)	Dec, Jan, Feb, Jul (4/12)	Nov, Dec, Sep (3/11)	Nov, Feb, Mar, Jul, Aug, Sep (6/11)
Law Enforcement Representative:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul (9/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, Jul, Aug, Sep (10/11)	Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jul, Aug (8/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (11/11)	Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Apr, Jun, Jul, Aug (8/11)
Jackson City Commission representative:	Oct, Nov, Apr, May, Jul, Aug, Sep (7/12)	Nov, Jan, Feb, May, Aug (5/11)	Oct, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Aug, Sep (9/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (10/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr (7/11)
Citizens:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (12/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jul, Aug, Sep (11/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (11/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (10/11)	Oct, Nov, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, Aug, Sep (8/11)
OHSP:	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, May, Jun, Jul, Aug (10/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Mar, Apr, May, Jul, Aug, Sep (10/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (11/12)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (10/11)	Oct, Nov, Jan, Feb, Mar, Jun, Aug, Sep (8/11)
Project Director	12/12	11/11	12/12	11/11	11/11
Criminal Justice Coordinator:	Oct, Nov, Mar, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (8/12)	Jan, Mar, Apr, Jul, Aug (5/11)	Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar (5/12)	Nov, Jan, Feb (3/11)	Oct, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, Aug (6/11)
Engineering Coordinator:	Nov, Dec, Feb, Mar, Apr, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (9/12)	Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jul, Aug, Sep (10/11)	Oct, Dec, Jan, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (10/12)	Nov, Dec, Jan, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Sep (9/11)	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep (11/11)
Education Coordinator:	Oct, Nov, Mar, Jun (4/12)	Nov, Dec, Mar, May, Jul, Aug, Sep (7/11)	Nov, Jan, May (3/12)	Oct, Jan, Feb (3/11)	Feb, Mar (2/11)

* Number of meetings attended out of total meetings for year.

**APPENDIX B
REPRESENTATIVES ON COMMISSION**

REPRESENTATIVES ON COMMISSION

Education:	Van eyck
Engineering:	Midgley
JCBoard of Commissioners:	McDivitt, Webster, Parrot, Rowlison, Rand, Webster
Local Units:	Schmidt, Lincoln
Courts:	Hall, Wells, Truchan, Dillon
Medical:	Smith, Monaghan
Law Enforcement:	Eichenberg, Heynes, Griffis, Maurer
City Commission:	Stevens, Vaclavik
Citizens:	Studley
OHSP:	Girard, Berman, Groner, Powell, Easterbrook, Huffman
Criminal Justice Coordinator:	Seckler, Dermeyer, Navarre
Engineering Coordinator:	Blake
Education Coordinator:	Esterline, Hard, Dubois

APPENDIX C
JCCTSP JOB DESCRIPTION FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR

JCCTSP JOB DESCRIPTION FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR

The project director is responsible for the day to day management of the Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Program. General duties include assisting in the development of projects, monitoring all related project activities, maintaining an accurate accounting system, promoting the comprehensive concept within the county, insuring proper evaluation criteria are established, and meeting all reporting requirements as established by the Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Commission and the Office of Highway Safety Planning. An explanation of each responsibility follows.

The project director is required to report to and take direction from the nine member commission. Assistance to the project coordinators and local agencies in the development of traffic safety projects will also be provided. This assistance may include but not be limited to advising how a grant request should be prepared. Insuring that clear and identifiable project are established. Coordinating project development discussions between involved agencies. developing an inter relationship between projects of differing disciplines.

The responsibility to monitor will include but not be limited to insuring reporting procedures are met by the agency/agencies holding a specific grant. Reviewing ongoing projects to insure that commitment to previously established goals is maintained. assisting agencies overcome unanticipated problems during the project period.

Maintaining an accurate accounting system for the overall project will be the direct responsibility of the project director. The project director will also oversee the individual projects.

Promotion of the comprehensive concept within Jackson County will also be coordinated by the project director. The director will act as or select a spokesperson to represent the project at meetings within and outside the county. The director shall be able to provide advice regarding the development of media efforts to the various projects.

Effective evaluation criteria is an essential part of the program. The project director will work with OHSP, the University of Michigan Traffic research Institute, and the project developers to insure the development of suitable evaluation criteria.

It will be incumbent upon the project director to meet all reporting requirements as established by the Office of Highway Safety Planning and the Jackson County Comprehensive Traffic Safety Commission. These reporting requirements will be determined jointly by the project director, OHSP, and JCCTSP.

In summary, the JCCTSP is a nine-member board that has the exclusive responsibility for establishing policies, goals, and objectives for the JCCTSP. The project director will function as the commission agent.

Adopted by the JCCTSP Commission on October 12, 1989.

APPENDIX D
JACKSON TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM PROJECTS

JACKSON TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM PROJECTS*

YEAR	AGENCY/PROJECT	FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED
<u>COURTS</u>		
1989	12th District Court Purchase of FAX Machines	\$12,100
1990-93	Probation Department Intensive Supervision Program	
<u>EDUCATION/TRAINING</u>		
1989	Jackson Transportation Authority Emergency bus evacuation training video	\$11,200
1989-93	Jackson Intermediate School District K-12 Model Traffic Safety Curriculum	\$194,000
1992-93	JTA/ISD/County Schools School Bus Routing	
<u>E.M.S.</u>		
1990-91	Jackson Fire Department First Responder Training	\$14,550
<u>ENFORCEMENT</u>		
1989	Sheriff Department M-60 Task Force	\$38,500
1990-93	Sheriff Department JUMP-Cooperative Enforcement with MSP, Villages and Townships	\$360,818
1990-93	Michigan State Police JUMP-Cooperative Enforcement	\$172,200

YEAR	AGENCY/PROJECT	FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED
1991-93	Jackson Police STEP-Cooperative Enforcement with JUMP	\$114,978
1989-90	Henrietta Police Enforcement/Education-Henrietta/Waterloo	\$28,400
1989	Napoleon Police Enforcement/Education	\$18,000
1989-90	Napoleon Police Traffic Safety Education with Columbia and Norvell	\$7,900
<u>ENGINEERING</u>		
1990	Village of Springport Enforcement/Engineering Study (Co-op Project with City of Jackson)	\$7,000
1989-93	Jackson County Road Commission Traffic counters, computers and seasonal employees Sign inventory/pavement marking inventory and seasonal employees (Co-op Project with City of Jackson) SMART Trailer/Seasonal Employees Seasonal employees/contracted services	\$223,245
1989-93	City of Jackson Engineering Traffic counters, computers and seasonal employees Enforcement/Engineering Study SMART Trailer Pedestrian Accident Study and Education Traffic Signal Enhancement	\$108,600

YEAR	AGENCY/PROJECT	FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED
<u>OCCUPANT PROTECTION</u>		
1989-92	Jackson County Red Cross KISS Car Seat Loaner/Preschool Program	\$61,019
1989-92	Jackson County Health Department Traffic Safety Education (Seatbelt Usage - Adults & High School Buckle Up Contest & Designated Driver Program)	\$152,300
<u>TRAFFIC RECORDS</u>		
1990-93	Region 2 Planning Traffic Records Clearinghouse	\$155,505
<u>ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION</u>		
1988-93	Jackson Traffic Safety Program Administration/Coordination/Support	\$373,668
TOTAL FEDERAL DOLLARS		\$2,186,058