

# Community-Wide Youth Impaired Driving Program: Summary of Enforcement Activity

**Fredrick M. Streff  
Lisa J. Molnar  
Michelle L. Hopp  
Lidia P. Kostyniuk**

**The University of Michigan  
Transportation Research Institute**

**September 1995**



### Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.  <b>UMTRI-95-26</b>	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle  <b>Community-Wide Youth Impaired Driving Program: Summary of Enforcement Activity</b>		5. Report Date  <b>September 1995</b>	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s)  <b>Fredrick M. Streff, Lisa J. Molnar, Michelle L. Hopp, Lidia P. Kostyniuk</b>		8. Performing Organization Report No.  <b>UMTRI-95-26</b>	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address  <b>The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute 2901 Baxter Road Ann Arbor, MI 48109</b>		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address  <b>Michigan Department of State 208 N. Capitol Lansing, MI 48918</b>		13. Type of Report and Period Covered  <b>Final 10/1/94-9/30/95</b>	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract  <p>This report describes enforcement activity recorded by Delta, Gladwin, Lapeer, Marquette, and Washtenaw Counties between April 1993 and March 1995, as part of the Community-Wide Youth Impaired Driving Program. Enforcement data were recorded by each county and submitted to the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute. The data have been summarized and presented in a descriptive format, by county, to provide information about the general enforcement activity that occurred as part of the program.</p> <p>Three forms were used by most of the counties to record enforcement activity. An event planning form identified and described enforcement activities and actions associated with specific events. A monthly activity report described overall enforcement actions such as project hours, traffic stop activity, and criminal arrest activity on a monthly basis. Finally, an impaired driving enforcement report provided information about the use of videotape in impaired driving arrests and convictions. Marquette County also developed a form to record information about sting operations conducted between July 1993 and February 1995.</p> <p>Data from the forms were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) package. Summaries of enforcement activity are organized by county and by data collection form. All five participating counties completed enforcement planning forms and monthly enforcement activity reports. While all counties except Delta County submitted impaired driving enforcement reports, only Marquette County had videotaped enough arrests to make analysis of the impaired driving form meaningful.</p>			
17. Key Words  <b>enforcement, alcohol-impaired driving, youth, community programs</b>		18. Distribution Statement  <b>Unlimited</b>	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) <b>Unclassified</b>	20. Security Classif. (of this page) <b>Unclassified</b>	21. No. of Pages  <b>35</b>	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 #MHB-93-003

## **Background and Methods**

This report describes enforcement activity recorded by Delta, Gladwin, Lapeer, Marquette, and Washtenaw Counties between April 1993 and March 1995, as part of the Community-Wide Youth Impaired Driving Program. Enforcement data were recorded by each county and submitted to the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI). The data have been summarized and presented in a descriptive format, by county, to provide information about the general enforcement activity that occurred as part of the program.

Three forms were used by most of the counties to record enforcement activity. An event planning form identified and described enforcement activities and actions associated with specific events (including events such as underage parties and cruising by minors). A monthly activity report described overall enforcement actions, such as project hours, traffic stop activity, and criminal arrest activity, on a monthly basis. Finally, an impaired driving enforcement report provided information about the use of videotape in impaired driving arrests and convictions. Marquette County also developed a form to record information about sting operations conducted between July 1993 and February 1995.

After the data forms were submitted to UMTRI, a database was created to systematically capture information from all the forms. Data from the forms were entered into the database and checked for errors. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) package. While most of the data had been recorded by the counties in a numeric format, there were some open-ended categories with narrative responses. These responses were reviewed and coded into numeric categories and added to the dataset. The recoding involved reviewing each form, listing all responses, compiling a set of all-inclusive numeric response categories, and coding each individual response to fit into the appropriate category. A description of codes used in this report is presented on the following page.

### Code List for Event Type (from event planning form):

<i>College event</i>	Patrol of college sponsored or related function, event, or incident (e.g., sports games, dances, fraternity/sorority events, graduations, plays, move-in weekends/weeks).
<i>Community event</i>	Patrol of community event for alcohol and other violations (e.g., community festivals, theme weeks/days, community sponsored or approved events).
<i>Foot patrol</i>	Foot patrol of specific areas for alcohol and other violations.
<i>High school event</i>	Patrol of high school sponsored or related function, event, or incident (e.g., sports games, dances, graduations, plays, baccalaureate).
<i>LCC sting</i>	Sting operation for LCC operations--effort targeting establishments selling/furnishing/serving alcohol to minors and other LCC violations.
<i>License check</i>	License check of minors to determine age.
<i>Road patrol</i>	Patrol of specific roadways and areas for alcohol and other traffic violations (e.g., saturation patrols, street patrols, general patrols of designated roadways).
<i>Specific Party</i>	Patrol or breakup of a specific party or gathering, a party that has been identified as having minors possessing alcohol or other events that have been specifically identified for noise or other violations.
<i>Underage party</i>	Patrol looking for underage parties and gatherings including parties at residences, public properties, and other gatherings.

### Code List for Violations Generated (from event planning form):

<i>Disord</i>	Disorderly conduct.
<i>LCC</i>	LCC violation--violation of Liquor Control Commission regulations.
<i>MIP</i>	MIP--minor in possession of alcohol citation.
<i>Mov</i>	Other moving violations.
<i>Nonmov</i>	Other nonmoving violations.
<i>Open</i>	Open Intoxicants/Container--open intoxicants or open container in vehicle.
<i>OUIL</i>	OUIL violation--operating under the influence of liquor, with first, second, or third offenses.
<i>Pardis</i>	Party disbursement--specific party identified and broken up by police.
<i>Traf</i>	Traffic violation--speeding, running a stop sign, etc.
<i>VCSA</i>	VCSA violation--violation of Controlled Substances Act (drug possession).

Several factors complicated UMTRI's task of summarizing the enforcement activity. First, the three forms underwent significant revision during the data collection period, with the event planning form and the impaired driving enforcement form each being revised once, and the monthly enforcement activity report being revised three times. These revisions resulted in adding or deleting entire data categories or changing the format in which the data were recorded. While we were able to capture all of the data recorded over the 24-month data collection period in our dataset, we did not report some information that had limited utility because of the infrequency with which it was recorded.

Second, many of the data forms contained incomplete or inconsistent information. For example, totals were often not entered or did not correspond to the actual sums of the appropriate categories. Therefore, whenever possible, we calculated totals based on the sums of the appropriate categories rather than relying on the totals reported on the forms.

Because the monthly enforcement activity reports contained more information overall and more inconsistent information than the other forms used to record data, we have provided notes below on how we interpreted data from the monthly enforcement activity reports.

- The numbers presented in the tables summarizing monthly enforcement activity are taken directly from the monthly enforcement activity reports (with a few exceptions). We have reported these numbers even though, in some cases, they appear to be incompatible with other data items.
- Project hours (i.e., officer patrol, complaint, administrative, and other) include only project overtime hours. They do not include match hours.
- Within project hours, the project hours total was generated by summing the appropriate categories (i.e., officer patrol, complaint, administrative, and other hours) rather than taking the total reported on the monthly enforcement activity reports. This was done because many forms did not report the total or the total did not appear to be correct.
- Within traffic stop enforcement activity, the categories "minor in possession civil" and "minor in possession misdemeanor" were only included on the monthly enforcement activity reports beginning in March 1994 for Lapeer and Marquette Counties, May 1994 for Delta County, July 1994 for Washtenaw County, and October 1994 for Gladwin County. Lapeer County went back to an earlier form that did not contain these categories for May, July, August, and September 1994.

- Within criminal arrest activity, the totals for felony arrests, misdemeanor arrests, and criminal arrests were generated by summing the appropriate categories in the table rather than taking the totals reported on the monthly enforcement activity reports. This was done because many forms did not report totals or the totals did not add correctly.
- Within criminal arrest activity, the category "other misdemeanor arrests" includes the category "other alcohol misdemeanor arrests." This latter category was included as a separate category on early monthly enforcement activity reports, but was later collapsed into the former category.
- Within LCC violation activity, the categories "minor related LCC violation" and "other LCC violation" were only included on the monthly enforcement activity reports beginning in November 1993 for Lapeer and Marquette Counties, December 1993 for Washtenaw County, May 1994 for Delta County, and October 1994 for Gladwin County.
- Information from the categories "total civil infractions", MIP civil infractions", "other civil infractions" and "non traffic minor in possession" are not included in this report because these categories were included on relatively few forms, limiting the usefulness of the numbers.

## Results

Summaries of enforcement activity for the program are presented on the following pages. Results are organized by county and by data collection form. All five participating counties completed enforcement planning forms and monthly enforcement activity reports. While all counties except Delta County submitted impaired driving enforcement reports, only Marquette County had videotaped enough arrests to make analysis of the impaired driving form meaningful.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Video was not available for any arrest cases in Gladwin and Washtenaw Counties and for only three cases in Lapeer County.



## **Delta County**

## Delta County Event Planning Form

- Information was submitted for 13 events between April 1993 and March 1995.
- Each event involved a single enforcement agency:
  - 85% involved city/township police
  - 15% involved county sheriff department
- Events occurred during the following times:
  - 50% occurred from 9 pm-12 am
  - 33% occurred from 6 pm-9 pm
  - 17% occurred from 12 pm-3 pm
- Events were of the following type:
  - 62% were underage parties
  - 31% were road patrols
  - 8% were high school events
- The following violations were generated (by type of event and type of violation):

Type of Event	MIP	Open	OUIL	Pardis
Underage party (N=8)	1	2	1	2
Road patrol (N=4)	4	0	2	3
High school event (N=1)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5	2	3	5

## Delta County Monthly Enforcement Activity Report

- Information was submitted for 12 of the 24 months between April 1993 and March 1995.
- The following project hours were reported during the period:
  - 2,014 officer patrol hours
  - 136 complaint hours
  - 16 administrative hours
  - 2,166 total hours (sum of officer patrol, complaint, and administrative hours)

- The following traffic stop enforcement activity was reported during the period:

Type of traffic stop action	Under 21	All ages
Total traffic stops	189	294
OUIL/OUID/OWI violations	2	36
Open intoxicant violations	79	39
Minor in possession violations (civil)	35	21
Minor in possession violations (misdemeanor)	24	22
Safety belt violations	58	77
Other moving violations	109	188
Other nonmoving violations	66	112

- The following criminal arrest activity was reported during the period:

Type of criminal arrest action	Under 21	All ages
Fugitive felony arrests	1	8
VCSA felony arrests	0	0
Other felony arrests	0	0
<u>Total felony arrests</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>
Fugitive misdemeanor arrests	3	14
Minor in possession misdemeanor arrests	71	75
VCSA misdemeanor arrests	0	4
Other misdemeanor arrests	7	23
<u>Total misdemeanor arrests</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>116</u>
<u>Total criminal arrests</u> (felonies & misdemeanors)	<u>82</u>	<u>124</u>

- The following Liquor Control Commission (LCC) violation activity was reported during the period:

Type of LCC violation action	Under 21	All ages
Minor related LCC violation	0	0
Other LCC violation	9	35
<u>Total LCC violations</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>35</u>

## **Gladwin County**

## Gladwin County Event Planning Form

- Information was submitted for 130 events between April 1993 and March 1995.
- 85% of events involved multiple enforcement agencies:
  - 79% involved city/township police
  - 85% involved county sheriff department
  - 93% involved state police
- Events occurred during the following times:
  - 73% occurred from 6 pm-9 pm
  - 14% occurred from 9 pm-12 am
  - 6% occurred from 12 pm-3 pm
  - 6% occurred from 3 pm-6 pm
  - 1% occurred from 6 am-12 pm
- Events were of the following type:
  - 58% were road patrols
  - 14% were underage parties
  - 10% were community events
  - 8% were Liquor Control Commission (LCC) stings
  - 5% were high school events
  - 3% were specific party events
  - 1% were unknown or missing
- The following violations were generated (by type of event and type of violation):

Type of Event	Disord	LCC	MIP	Mov	Open	OUIL	Pardis	VCSA
Road patrol (N=76)	0	0	111	5	136	19	161	1
Underage party (N=18)	0	0	6	1	5	6	35	0
Community event(N=13)	0	0	5	0	8	3	34	1
LCC sting (N=11)	9	16	1	0	0	4	9	0
High school event (N=7)	0	0	0	0	3	0	28	0
Specific party (N=4)	0	0	101	0	88	1	1	0
TOTAL	9	16	224	6	240	33	268	2

## Gladwin County Monthly Enforcement Activity Report

- Information was submitted for 19 of the 24 months between April 1993 and March 1995.
- The following project hours were reported during the period:
  - 678 officer patrol hours
  - 116 complaint hours
  - 16 administrative hours
  - 810 total hours (sum of officer patrol, complaint, and administrative hours)

- The following traffic stop enforcement activity was reported during the period:

Type of traffic stop action	Under 21	All ages
Total traffic stops	237	500
OUIL/OUID/OWI violations	0	48
Open intoxicant violations	17	41
Minor in possession violations (civil)	0	0
Minor in possession violations (misdemeanor)	1	0
Safety belt violations	16	53
Other moving violations	49	131
Other nonmoving violations	44	104

- The following criminal arrest activity was reported during the period:

Type of criminal arrest action	Under 21	All ages
Fugitive felony arrests	1	4
VCSA felony arrests	0	0
Other felony arrests	0	3
<u>Total felony arrests</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Fugitive misdemeanor arrests	0	11
Minor in possession misdemeanor arrests	27	24
VCSA misdemeanor arrests	2	4
Other misdemeanor arrests	3	19
<u>Total misdemeanor arrests</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>Total criminal arrests</u> (felonies & misdemeanors)	<u>33</u>	<u>65</u>

- The following Liquor Control Commission (LCC) violation activity was reported during the period:

Type of LCC violation action	Under 21	All ages
Minor related LCC violation	0	0
Other LCC violation	0	3
<u>Total LCC violations</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>



## **Lapeer County**

## Lapeer County Event Planning Form

- Information was submitted for 178 events between April 1993 and March 1995.
- 62% of events involved a single enforcement agency, 38% involved multiple agencies:
  - 88% involved city/township police
  - 45% involved a county sheriff department
  - 14% involved state police
  - 2% involved university police
- Events occurred during the following times:
  - 65% occurred from 6 pm-9 pm
  - 31% occurred from 9 pm-12 am
  - 4% occurred from 12 am-6 pm
- Events were of the following type:
  - 68% were road patrols
  - 12% were high school events
  - 9% were underage parties
  - 3% were specific parties
  - 2% were LCC stings
  - 1% were foot patrols
  - 1% were community events
  - 3% were unknown or missing
- The following violations were generated (by type of event and type of violation):

Type of Event	Disord	LCC	MIP	Mov	Nonmov	Open	OUIL	Pardis
Road patrol (N=121)	0	6	90	6	10	10	18	115
High school event (N=21)	0	0	25	1	1	0	1	5
Underage party (N=16)	0	0	56	1	10	2	1	7
Specific party (N=6)	0	1	64	0	3	0	0	0
LCC sting (N=4)	75	23	0	0	0	0	0	10
Community events(N=2)	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Foot patrols (N=2)	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	75	30	250	8	24	12	20	137

## Lapeer County Monthly Enforcement Activity Report

- Information was submitted for 23 of the 24 months between April 1993 and March 1995.
- The following project hours were reported during the period:
  - 3,712 officer patrol hours
  - 1,778 complaint hours
  - 84 administrative hours
  - 5,574 total hours (sum of officer patrol, complaint, and administrative hours)

- The following traffic stop enforcement activity was reported during the period:

Type of traffic stop action	Under 21	All ages
Total traffic stops	421	1,509
OUIL/OUID/OWI violations	33	158
Open intoxicant violations	44	112
Minor in possession violations (civil)	15	12
Minor in possession violations (misdemeanor)	36	52
Safety belt violations	132	252
Other moving violations	226	550
Other nonmoving violations	144	325

- The following criminal arrest activity was reported during the period:

Type of criminal arrest action	Under 21	All ages
Fugitive felony arrests	5	26
VCSA felony arrests	5	1
Other felony arrests	13	2
<u>Total felony arrests</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>29</u>
Fugitive misdemeanor arrests	9	26
Minor in possession misdemeanor arrests	309	248
VCSA misdemeanor arrests	7	9
Other misdemeanor arrests	44	68
<u>Total misdemeanor arrests</u>	<u>369</u>	<u>351</u>
<u>Total criminal arrests (felonies &amp; misdemeanors)</u>	<u>392</u>	<u>380</u>

- The following Liquor Control Commission (LCC) violation activity was reported during the period:

Type of LCC violation action	Under 21	All ages
Minor related LCC violation	0	0
Other LCC violation	3	32
<u>Total LCC violations</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>60</u>

## **Marquette County**

## Marquette County Event Planning Form

- Information was submitted for 132 events between April 1993 and March 1995.
- 81% of events involved multiple enforcement agencies:
  - 92% involved city/township police
  - 56% involved a county sheriff department
  - 28% involved state police
  - 30% involved university police
- Events occurred during the following times:
  - 52% occurred from 6 pm-9 pm
  - 16% occurred from 9 pm-12 am
  - 13% occurred from 12 pm-3 pm
  - 12% occurred from 3 pm-6 pm
  - 7% occurred from 6 am-12 pm
- Events were of the following type:
  - 45% were road patrols
  - 28% were community events
  - 8% were LCC stings
  - 8% were high school events
  - 5% were underage parties
  - 4% were college events
  - 2% were license checks
- The following violations were generated (by type of event and type of violation):

Type of Event	Disord	LCC	MIP	Mov	Nonm	Open	OUIL	Pardis	Traf	VCSA
Road patrol (N=60)	3	16	113	19	28	66	82	275	22	3
Community event (N=37)	0	1	56	3	9	17	20	33	0	0
LCC sting (N=11)	46	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
High school event (N=10)	0	0	6	0	1	1	3	4	0	0
Underage party (N=7)	0	3	21	0	6	6	4	26	0	0
College event(N=5)	0	0	10	1	4	3	3	3	1	1
License check (N=2)	10	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>

## Marquette County Monthly Enforcement Activity Report

- Information was submitted for 23 of the 24 months between April 1993 and March 1995.
- The following project hours were reported during the period:
  - 5,715 officer patrol hours
  - 1,079 complaint hours
  - 14 administrative hours
  - 123 other hours
  - 6,931 total hours (sum of officer patrol, complaint, administrative, and other hours)
- The following traffic stop enforcement activity was reported during the period:

Type of traffic stop action	Under 21	All ages
Total traffic stops	444	879
OUIL/OUID/OWI violations	11	89
Open intoxicant violations	47	67
Minor in possession violations (civil)	65	65
Minor in possession violations (misdemeanor)	6	6
Safety belt violations	63	151
Other moving violations	196	524
Other nonmoving violations	85	221

- The following criminal arrest activity was reported during the period:

Type of criminal arrest action	Under 21	All ages
Fugitive felony arrests	0	0
VCSA felony arrests	1	2
Other felony arrests	11	20
<b>Total felony arrests</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>
Fugitive misdemeanor arrests	8	20
Minor in possession misdemeanor arrests	156	101
VCSA misdemeanor arrests	3	12
Other misdemeanor arrests	74	223
<b>Total misdemeanor arrests</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>356</b>
<b>Total criminal arrests (felonies &amp; misdemeanors)</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>378</b>

- The following Liquor Control Commission (LCC) violation activity was reported during the period:

Type of LCC violation action	Under 21	All ages
Minor related LCC violation	6	44
Other LCC violation	5	14
<u>Total LCC violations</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>58</u>



## **Marquette County Impaired Driving Enforcement Report**

- Video was available in 28% of reported arrest cases (216 of 766).
- Video was used in 81% of arrest cases in which it was available (175 of 216).
- Video was admitted in 4% of court cases in which it was used in the arrest (7 of 175).
- Video was a factor in 14% of court cases in which it was admitted (1 of 7).
- A memorandum of support for the use of video is contained in the Appendix. However, we have insufficient data to verify scientifically the value of video in arrest cases.

**Marquette County**  
**Project MCTV Enforcement Operation of Licensed Beverage**  
**Establishments**

The objective of this project was to reduce the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons under age 21 in Marquette County. The project was a two-phase intervention program consisting of an educational program and an enforcement operation. Sales of alcoholic beverages to minors by licensed establishments were measured before and after the intervention programs. On December 1, 1992, a press conference announced the start of the program.

**Initial Measurement**

On February 25, 1993, a "baseline" survey of establishments licensed to sell alcoholic beverages in Marquette County was carried out. The "baseline" survey was a non-enforcement activity intended to provide information on the extent of the existing problem of the sale of alcohol to minors against which the results of the program could be compared. On that evening, 12 teams, each consisting of two plain-clothed police officers and two underage decoys, visited 146 of the approximately 160 licensed establishments in Marquette County. The establishments were classified into "on-premise" and "off-premise" categories, depending on whether alcohol could be bought to take out or to be consumed on the premises. There were 82 "on-premise" and 64 "off-premise" establishments in the "baseline survey". The decoys ranged in age from 17 to 20. All were clean shaven, neatly dressed and groomed, and had their own valid Michigan driver's licenses. They were instructed to enter the establishments and attempt to purchase alcohol either to take out or to consume on the premises. The decoys were to answer any questions truthfully and to produce their identification if asked. In response to the specific question, "are you over 21", the decoys were instructed not to answer verbally but to show their driver's licenses.

The decoys were able to purchase alcohol in 45 percent of the 146 licenses establishments. Of the "on-premise" establishments, 48 percent sold

alcohol to the decoys as did 41 percent of the "off-premise" establishments. Statistical tests, however, indicate that the difference in these proportions is not significant at  $p < .05$ . Identification of the decoys was checked at 40 percent of the establishments that sold them alcohol. The total funds spent at the establishments was \$ 166.33 or an average of \$ 1.14 per establishment. The salient results of the baseline survey are shown in Table A.

### **Education Phase**

The education phase ran from March through the end of June, 1993. It included a press conference in early May where the results of the "baseline survey" were announced. The press conference was well attended by area media and the information enjoyed wide dissemination including front page headlines and lead story status in newspapers, as well as stories on local television and radio news programs. Additionally, the project coordinator took part in several Technique of Alcohol Management (TAM) server training sessions informing local alcohol handlers of the sting operations. She also participated in educational efforts to curb the sales of alcohol to minors. Letters were sent to all licensees in the county showing the results of the baseline survey, informing them that enforcement efforts would soon begin, encouraging participation in TAM sessions, and offering any other assistance they would like. Finally, packets consisting of Century Council materials (poster, buttons, stickers, etc.,) with the "No ID, No Sale, No Way" message printed on them, driver license guides, and a letter from the project coordinator extending an offer of assistance and informing them of the forthcoming enforcement efforts were distributed.

### **Enforcement Phase**

The enforcement phase of the project consisted of sting operations conducted from July 1993 to February, 1995. In the sting operations, pairs of decoys attempted to buy alcoholic beverages at establishments licensed to sell alcohol. Undercover police officers from the Marquette County Sheriff's Office acting as customers in stores or patrons in taverns/bars were positioned to

observe the interactions with the decoys. Uniformed officers from the County Sheriff's office and appropriate Township Police departments served as "back-up" and cited the violators.

In the first sting operation on July 2, 1993, the decoys were videotaped going into and out of the establishments. On that date the decoys also wore audio-transmitters. The transmission was of poor quality and the officers outside could not understand the conversations. However, the transmitters worked well enough to serve as safety monitors in case the decoys ran into problems. The records of the sting operations do not indicate whether subsequent operations were also videotaped or whether the conversations were monitored.

Table B summarizes the sting operations of the MCTV Enforcement program between July 1993 and February 1995. During that time there were eight operations and 249 establishments were visited. Approximately, an equal number of "on-premise" and off-premise" establishments were visited. Each operation occurred on one or two days and usually consisted of six sorties. A sortie is defined here as the activity of one team of officers and decoys on one day. The average number of establishments visited in an operation was 31.1 and the average number of establishments visited in one sortie is 6.2.

The funds expended by the decoys and undercover officers posing as customers/patrons averaged \$ 72.40 per operation, \$ 14.48 per sortie or \$ 2.33 per establishment.

Overall, 23.7 percent of the establishments sold alcoholic beverages to the decoys. This percentage was 20.8 percent and 24.4 percent for "on-premise" and "off-premise" establishments, respectively. As in the baseline survey, the difference between the proportions of establishments that sold alcohol to decoys by type of establishment was not statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Of the cases where alcohol was sold to decoys, identification was checked

in 54.2 percent of the cases. In cases where sales were not made, identification was checked 97 percent of the time.

Observations recorded in the latter operations indicate that the clerks and servers at the establishments were developing skills for spotting an enforcement operation and had also developed a telephone warning system to warn other establishments of a sting operation in progress.

### **Final Survey**

A survey similar to the "baseline" survey was carried out on September 29, 1995. This was a large scale, one-day, non-enforcement operation intended to give a measure of effectiveness of the interventions. On that day, 135 licensed establishments, 75 of which were "on-premise" and 60 "off-premise" were visited by nine teams. The procedures followed were similar to those used in the "baseline" survey except that each team had only one decoy. The decoys were instructed to try to make a take-out purchase whenever possible. If the establishment was not licensed for take-out sales, the decoy was to try to buy a drink for consumption on the premises.

In all, only 13.3 percent of the establishments sold alcohol to the decoys. Of those establishments that sold alcohol to decoys, 39 percent had first checked identification. Of the 75 "on-premise" establishments, 10.6 percent sold alcohol to decoys and of these 62 percent first checked identification. Of the 60 "off-premise" establishments, 16.7 percent sold alcohol to decoys and of these, 20 percent first checked identification. Again, the difference by type of establishment was not statistically significant at  $p < .05$ . A total of \$ 77.09 or an average of \$ 0.57 per establishment was spent in the course of this operation. The organizers of the MCTV project suspect that the decoy operation was identified and that establishments were warned of a sting operation via the telephone warning network. The salient results of the final survey are shown in Table C.

## **Conclusion**

At the start of the project, 44 percent of the establishments sold alcohol to underage decoys. After the education intervention and during the enforcement intervention, 24 percent of the establishments sold alcohol to the decoys. The decrease is statistically significant at  $p < .05$  and indicates that the efforts of the operation were successful in decreasing the sale of alcohol to minors.

During the final survey carried out at the end of the project, only 13 percent of the establishments sold alcohol to the underage decoys. This second decrease in the proportion of establishments selling alcohol to the decoys is most likely attributable to the skills developed by the clerks and bartenders in spotting a sting operation and in their telephone warning system used to inform other establishments of their suspicions.

The analysis of the results of the initial and final surveys and of the sting operations shows that close to half of the sales to underage decoys were made after the clerk or server examined their identification, which clearly showed the decoys to be under age 21. This indicates that determining the age from the birth date may be a problem for many clerks and servers at establishments that sell alcohol.

The analysis of the data also indicate that there is no real difference in the propensity to sell alcohol to minors by the "on-premise" and "off-premise" classification of licensed establishments.

<b>Table A. Baseline Survey</b>					
Date	Number of Sorties	Number of Sites	Sale to Decoy		% Who Sold to Decoy
			No ID	ID	
Feb 25 1993	12	146	39	26	44.5

<b>Table B. Enforcement Operations</b>					
Date	Number of Sorties	Number of Sites	Sale to Decoy		% Who Sold to Decoy
			No ID	ID	
Jul 2, 3 1993	3	22	1	4	22.7
Sep 18 1993	6	43	8	7	34.9
Dec 9, 11 1993	6	33	4	4	24.2
Jan 20, 29 1994	6	36	2	3	13.9
Mar 17, 19 1994	6	41	4	5	21.9
Aug 18, 19 1994	6	36	3	4	19.4
Sep 22 1994	1	4	1	1	50.0
Jan 19, Feb 2 1995	6	34	4	4	23.5
Total	40	249	27	32	23.7

<b>Table C. Final Survey</b>					
Date	Number of Sorties	Number of Sites	Sale to Decoy		% Who Sold to Decoy
			No ID	ID	
Sep 29, 1995	9	135	11	7	13.3

## **Washtenaw County**



## Washtenaw County Event Planning Form

- Information was submitted for 24 events between April 1993 and March 1995.
- 96% of events involved multiple enforcement agencies:
  - 96% involved city/township police
  - 100% involved county sheriff department
  - 63% involved state police
  - 79% involved university police
- Events occurred during the following times:
  - 52% occurred from 3 pm-6 pm
  - 39% occurred from 6 pm-9 pm
  - 9% occurred from 9 pm-12 am
- Events were of the following type:
  - 29% were college events
  - 25% were LCC stings
  - 21% were road patrols
  - 8% were community events
  - 8% were foot patrols
  - 8% were high school events
- The following violations were generated (by type of event and type of violation):

Type of Event	LCC	MIP	Mov	Open	Pardis
College event (N=7)	0	0	0	0	0
LCC sting (N=6)	54	0	0	0	0
Road patrol (N=5)	0	0	0	0	0
Community event (N=2)	0	0	0	0	0
Foot patrol (N=2)	0	12	1	10	2
High school event (N=2)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

## Washtenaw County Monthly Enforcement Activity Report

- Information was submitted for 20 of the 24 months between April 1993 and March 1995.
- The following project hours were reported during the period:
  - 2,140 officer patrol hours
  - 0 complaint hours
  - 0 administrative hours
  - 2,140 total hours (sum of officer patrol, complaint, and administrative hours)
- The following traffic stop enforcement activity was reported during the period:

Type of traffic stop action	Under 21	All ages
Total traffic stops	155	226
OUIL/OUID/OWI violations	7	38
Open intoxicant violations	61	73
Minor in possession violations (civil)	3	2
Minor in possession violations (misdemeanor)	7	17
Safety belt violations	21	78
Other moving violations	83	113
Other nonmoving violations	28	41

- The following criminal arrest activity was reported during the period:

Type of criminal arrest action	Under 21	All ages
Fugitive felony arrests	7	5
VCSA felony arrests	5	10
Other felony arrests	0	7
<u>Total felony arrests</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>22</u>
Fugitive misdemeanor arrests	3	9
Minor in possession misdemeanor arrests	60	17
VCSA misdemeanor arrests	8	10
Other misdemeanor arrests	23	66
<u>Total misdemeanor arrests</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>102</u>
<u>Total criminal arrests (felonies &amp; misdemeanors)</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>124</u>

- The following Liquor Control Commission (LCC) violation activity was reported during the period:

Type of LCC violation action	Under 21	All ages
Minor related LCC violation	10	23
Other LCC violation	15	0
<u>Total LCC violations</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

## Appendix



GARY L. WALKER  
MARQUETTE COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

PETER L. PLUMMER  
Chief Assistant Prosecutor

County Building  
Marquette, Michigan 49855  
(906) 228-1545  
FAX (906) 228-1649

Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys:  
DAVID A. PAYANT  
SCOTT K. HANSON  
MATTHEW J. WIESE  
TERRENCE E. DEAN

April 13, 1995

RECEIVED  
APR 17 1995  
Marquette County Sheriff's Dept.

Lt. Bruce Belisle  
Marquette County Sheriff Dept.  
W. Baraga Avenue  
Marquette, MI 49855

RE: Road Patrol OUIL Investigations

Dear Lt. Belisle:

As you are well aware, I will call or write when I am not satisfied with the way an investigation was handled. Often times the old saying of no news is good news seems to be how the prosecutor's office operates when it comes to a job well done by the Road Patrol. I know I wrote to you late last year concerning another OUIL investigation, however, I feel compelled to write again to emphasize a job well done.


Specifically, I am referring to the cases of People v Thill and People v Mell. Both of these cases went to trial in the last month and resulted in a finding of guilty by the jury. It is my opinion that these convictions were the result of hard work on behalf of Deputies Derocher and Kapla on both cases and Deputy Hanes and Cpl. Lampi on the Mell case. In both cases, all of the officers conducted themselves professionally and did a very thorough investigation. I am certain that the strength of the cases was enhanced by the use of the video camera patrol car. The video camera has been crucial in many of the recent OUIL cases that I have prosecuted.

I also wish to acknowledge that all of these officers were very professional in their courtroom appearance and testimony. Not only did they appear for court, but they also provided input and showed genuine interest in the case. When requested to conduct follow-up investigation, these officers responded promptly and effectively.

Lt. Bruce Belisle  
Page 2  
April 13, 1995

I just wanted you to know of the fine work done by members of  
your Road Patrol. Keep up the good work!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew J. Wiese". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath.

MATTHEW J. WIESE, Assistant  
Prosecuting Attorney

MJW/slg