This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO EXAMINE THE INFLUENCE OF REGIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY CONFERENCES ON THE OPINIONS AND KNOWLEDGE OF SELECTED LOCAL OFFICIALS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

presented by

Thomas Owen Reel

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Secondary Education and Curriculum

Robert E. Gustafson
Major professor

Date February 22, 1980

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO EXAMINE THE INFLUENCE OF REGIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY CONFERENCES ON THE OPINIONS AND KNOWLEDGE OF SELECTED LOCAL OFFICIALS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

By

Thomas Owen Reel

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1980

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO EXAMINE THE INFLUENCE OF REGIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY CONFERENCES ON THE OPINIONS AND KNOWLEDGE OF SELECTED LOCAL OFFICIALS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

By

Thomas Owen Reel

The major purpose of this study was to identify the opinions and knowledge of selected local officials and community leaders on traffic safety, as expressed through their participation in a local traffic safety conference. A questionnaire technique was employed to determine whether exposure to this type of meeting resulted in any changes in the opinions or knowledge of the participants.

A related, subordinate problem also addressed concerned the overall effectiveness of these conferences as a process for better identifying local problems and needs related to traffic safety.

This study represented the evaluation component of a federally-sponsored highway safety project initiated by the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning in March, 1977.

A total of 652 pre-conference (Pre-Q) questionnaires were mailed to those persons invited to each local conference; 232 or 35.6% were completed and returned. A somewhat higher return rate was noted for the post-conference (Post-Q) questionnaire--46.1% overall. A total of nine questionnaires were returned by 20 state officials resulting in a 45% rate of return.

Four geographical areas were selected for the conferences: a single county (Muskegon); two tri-county areas (Cass, Van Buren and Berrien; Bay, Midland and Saginaw) and a five-county area in northern Michigan (Grand Traverse, Antrim, Leelanau, Benzie and Kalkaska).

Data from the questionnaires were generally summarized on the basis of two variables--by conference location and by occupation or profession of the respondent. Frequency tables were prepared which indicated the number and percentage of respondents selecting each type of response.

Analysis of the data led to several conclusions as follows:

1. The study did identify the opinions and knowledge of selected local officials and community leaders on a number of traffic safety related issues and concerns.

2. Exposure to a one-day local traffic safety conference generally did not produce any overall noticeable changes in the opinions or knowledge of the participants. Respondents generally selected the same answers on both the pre-conference and post-conference questionnaires.

3. Since most participants indicated a favorable response to the forums, and further stated that this concept was most valuable as a method for "providing for an exchange of views and opinions of state officials and local leaders," it can be concluded that the process of periodically conducting local traffic safety conferences may be useful to continue, especially if state officials are interested in better identifying local problems and needs. Additionally,

the technique of utilizing some type of pre-conference and post-conference questionnaire as an evaluation or planning tool is also important to this process if overall effectiveness is expected.

4. The perceptions (opinions and knowledge) of local community leaders concerning the nature of the traffic crash problem were not generally the same as those views held by state officials. Specifically, state officials disagreed with local officials and leaders on those questions dealing with the nature of the local crash problem and the most critical local area traffic safety needs. Further, most state officials indicated that they believed their perceptions concerning local traffic safety problems were different from those of local officials.

5. There appears to be only slight differences in the perceptions of local community leaders on major safety issues from one area of the state to another. However, it would still have to be concluded that, with a few exceptions, local community officials and leaders generally had the same or quite similar perceptions about the nature of the local crash problem.

6. The most apparent differences between occupation groups were in the perceptions of local traffic safety problems or needs. On other issues, the differences were generally not as pronounced.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this study would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of a number of individuals and organizations.

The author wishes first to express his sincere appreciation to the chairman and members of the doctoral guidance committee: Dr. Robert E. Gustafson, chairman; Dr. Robert O. Nolan, Dr. Donald L. Smith and Dr. Keith P. Anderson.

A special note of thanks is due also to the staff of the Office of Highway Safety Planning for their efforts in planning and conducting the local conferences, and to the Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County, and especially Mr. Bruce Madsen, TIA executive director, for their assistance. Mr. Frank Churley, consultant, should also be recognized for the excellent job he did in planning and arranging all the details involved at each conference site.

The author also wishes to acknowledge the contribution of his secretary, Mrs. Raymond Bennett, for her assistance with this project.

Last, but not least, to my family, for their patience and understanding. This study would not have been completed without the help and encouragement of my wife, Nancy, and the interest and support of my children, Jeff, Kristin and Karin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In spite of recent progress toward reducing traffic fatalities and the mileage death rate, this nation still records nearly fifty thousand highway crash deaths annually. In Michigan, the figure has approached or exceeded some two thousand persons each year, although the mileage death rate has shown steady improvement (Table 1). Nonetheless, this problem continues to represent one of the most costly societal problems facing this country today, both in terms of personal human loss and suffering and staggering economic costs which affect nearly every citizen.

Recognizing the serious and pervasive nature of the traffic crash problem the Congress, in September of 1966, enacted the Highway Safety Act of 1966. The intent was clear--federal government assistance to the states in dealing with the problem was necessary.

Prior to this time, state and local highway safety program efforts were largely disjointed and were seldom based on any sort of empirical knowledge or reliable data. For the most part, state agencies followed past traditions in administering their statutory responsibilities; and there was little attempt to coordinate program efforts at either the state or local level, or perhaps even more importantly, between state and local jurisdictions.

TABLE 1.--Comparative Accident Trends--United States and Michigan--1968-1978.

	United States[a]		Michigan[b]	
Year	Fatalities	Mileage Death Rate[c]	Fatalities	Mileage Death Rate[c]
1968	54,862	5.40	2,392	4.97
1969	55,791	5.21	2,487	4.89
1970	54,633	4.88	2,177	4.09
1971	54,381	4.57	2,152	3.89
1972	56,278	4.43	2,258	3.91
1973	55,511	4.24	2,213	3.78
1974	46,402	3.59	1,875	3.36
1975	46,000	3.45	1,811	3.22
1976	47,100	3.40	1,955	3.16
1977	49,500	3.35	1,950	3.00
1978	51,500	3.39	2,076	3.10

[a]Accident Facts, 1978-79 editions, National Safety Council.

[b]Michigan Traffic Accident Facts, Michigan State Police, 1978.

[c]Deaths per 100 million vehicle miles of travel.

Even with the very formal and direct involvement of the federal government with the states through the Highway Safety Act and various program standards and requirements, it was evident that program planning was accomplished largely without any significant local or community level input. This situation has generally held true throughout the eleven year life of the state-federal program in spite of the fact the law has continued to require that at least 40% of the federal funds a state receives each year must be spent at the local government level. It is also apparent that the traffic accident problem is largely local in nature and therefore, solutions, to be most effective, must be applied directly at this level.

Presently, each state is required to develop annually a planning-funding document (Annual Work Program) in order to receive their allotment of federal funds under the various Highway Safety Act(s). The Annual Work Program (AWP) or Highway Safety Plan (HSP), as it is now being termed, sets forth certain requirements which the states are expected to meet in carrying out their responsibilities under the state and community grant program (Section 402).

Recent concern was expressed by the Congress because of the lack of local involvement in the state planning process and in the development of locally-oriented countermeasure programs in the AWP. As a result, the U.S. Department of Transportation adopted a requirement which states that "political subdivisions must have an active voice in the initiation, development and implementation of those

safety activities so credited to assure that the local participation in highway safety intended by Congress is achieved."[1]

Since the language of this new policy did not specify the method or procedures which a state should or could follow in fulfilling the requirement, a variety of approaches seemed possible.

In the Spring of 1967, while employed by the Missouri Auto Club, the author was involved in the planning and implementation of a series of three local traffic forums for the State of Missouri. The purpose of these meetings, held primarily for state and local officials, was to review and discuss the Highway Safety Act of 1966 which was then still less than a year old. These meetings generated a good deal of interest on the part of local government, and it seemed to the author that a similar approach could prove to be a useful process for securing local level input in Michigan.

Prior to the promulgation of the federal requirement, however, the State of Michigan, as well as most other states, had not established any procedure by which local officials and community leaders could indicate their major concerns and needs to state officials, or vice versa.

Although several states, including Michigan, had conducted traffic safety conferences over the past several years, they had generally been held in the state capitol and served primarily to indoctrinate local officials and others on subjects of general interest rather than provide any real opportunity for discussion on

---

[1]NHTSA/FHWA Order No. 462-8/7510.2 Political Subdivision Participation in State Highway Safety Programs (June 23, 1976).

local level problems. In addition, little if any, substantive evaluation was ever performed on these efforts.

Given this frame of reference, the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP), being the state office responsible for the state-federal highway safety program, determined that a series of local or regional traffic safety conferences would provide a viable process for better identifying local needs and problems. The conferences could also provide a vehicle for bringing information to local officials and community leaders as to successful program efforts in other areas of the state. It was felt that this approach would serve to meet the intent of the DOT policy by explaining federal assistance through the OHSP and new programs being proposed for these areas.

Statement of the Problem

When contrasted with other governmental programs, highway safety has seldom enjoyed high visibility or support and is not, generally, a politically sensitive or emotion-provoking issue. The lack of public awareness of the magnitude of the traffic crash problem, particularly at the local level, has caused many communities to fail to appropriate adequate funds to initiate or sustain effective, comprehensive highway safety programs.

In addition, state-level traffic safety officials need to become more acutely aware of local problems as perceived by community officials and leaders. Direct input is required if state-level programs are to be developed which are truly responsive to the needs of local citizens.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to identify the opinions and knowledge of selected local officials and community leaders on traffic safety, as expressed through their participation in a one-day local traffic safety conference, and further, to determine through a questionnaire technique, whether exposure to this type of meeting produced any noticeable changes in their opinions or knowledge.

A related, subordinate problem also addressed in this investigation concerned the overall effectiveness of these local (or regional) conferences as a process for better identifying local problems and needs related to traffic safety. Specifically, the author was interested in determining whether such meetings could produce a meaningful exchange of views and information between state and local officials on specific problems and active or potential countermeasure programs. Within this context, the study also sought to identify any important differences between state and local officials, and among local officials themselves, insofar as the perception of local problems was concerned.

The author was of the opinion that an annual series of statewide local (or regional) traffic safety conferences can be, if properly structured and conducted, an effective process for securing meaningful input and information on local needs and problems. However, without careful pre-planning and unless some appropriate method for feedback and evaluation is provided, such meetings will have scant importance in the overall state planning process.

Importance of the Study

The effective planning of successful highway safety programs requires significant expenditures of time and money at all levels of government. Traditionally, a general lack of concern, especially on the part of local officials about traffic accidents, their causes and possible remedies, has frustrated state level efforts to impact this problem. As a result, many resources which have been directed to the local level have not typically or necessarily considered the views and opinions of local officials or community leaders. Obviously, there is dialogue on specific project proposals, but there is seldom any formal discussion on broad-scale traffic safety problems between local leaders and state officials. The only process which corresponds, in any remote way, is the typical public hearing on the location of a proposed highway or freeway.

This study, therefore, was designed primarily to provide an analysis of the effectiveness of local or regional traffic safety conferences as a process for securing local input to the state level planning process. The results of the study should be particularly important to those state level officials charged with the responsibility for planning and administration of the state highway safety program, and who may be considering this type of approach to improved state-local relations in this area.

Scope of Study

This study project was designed to identify four sites which would meet the following criteria:

1. Is the area or region experiencing a disporportionately large share of traffic crashes?

2. Have there been any major federally-funded traffic safety programs implemented in the area?

3. Does the area "fit" within an appropriate geographical distribution?

4. Will the locations provide a mixture of governments and regional areas?

5. Is the location reasonably convenient, and are suitable facilities available for such a conference?

Utilizing these basic criteria as a general frame of reference, four locations were selected: (1) Benton Harbor (three-county area); (2) Muskegon (one county); (3) Saginaw (three-county area); and (4) Traverse City (five-county area). Meetings were conducted at each of these sites during the month of May, 1977.

Limitations of Study

There were three major limitations of the study. First, no pilot study was conducted. The time constraints involved in scheduling and conducting the four local conferences precluded any opportunity for an initial pilot conference. However, under other circumstances this would have been most desirable.

Second, the opinions of the non-respondents on either the pre-conference or post-conference questionnaires were unknown.

Third, since few respondents chose to identify themselves by name on either the pre-conference or post-conference questionnaires, it was not possible to determine whether individual opinions or attitudes on local traffic safety issues were changed as a result of the conferences.

Study Design

The project utilized a two-group pre- post-test type design. The two groups questioned were: (1) a group drawn from the State Safety Commission, staff members of its Operating Committee and other state level officials with highway safety-related responsibilities; and (2) a group of community opinion leaders (government and business) invited to one of the local traffic safety conferences. Their responses represented community leader opinion.

Each invitee was asked to complete a short questionnaire, designed to identify his/her concerns about traffic safety matters both before and after the conference. For invitees completing the pre-conference questionnaire (Pre-Q), but not attending the conference, their questionnaires were discarded from further analysis.

Representatives of the State Safety Commission and their operating committee representatives and advisors were also asked to complete a similar pre-conference questionnaire prior to the conduct of the local traffic safety conferences.

The state officials noted above were not given the post-conference questionnaire (Post-Q) since it was assumed that their opinions and knowledge would be unchanged as a result of the local conferences. It was the author's belief that any significant differences between these two groups could likely be observed by comparing the results of the pre-conference questionnaires alone. Since a major purpose of this study was to determine whether or not the beliefs, opinions and knowledge of local leaders changed after being exposed to one of the local conferences, the primary emphasis

was placed on comparisons of this group's pre- and post-conference questionnaires.

The questionnaire included items in the following general categories:

1. The scope and cost of traffic accidents (statewide and locally).
2. Traffic problems and possible solutions at the local level.
c. Value of the conference to local officials.
d. Suggestions for improvement of subsequent conferences.
e. Items of interest not considered at the conference.
f. Items included in the conference which were not applicable to the local area.
g. General attitude or awareness questions.

The OHSP retained the services of a consultant to act as coordinator for the regional forums. It was this individual's responsibility to initially contact local public officials and business leaders to arrange for a local chairperson for each conference.

As a guide to these preliminary discussions, a list of questions was prepared relative to the objectives of the forums and traffic safety concerns generally.

The initial questionnaire (Pre-Q) as finally developed was mailed during the week of April 18th to participants in the Benton Harbor and Muskegon meetings. The questionnaire (Pre-Q) for the Saginaw and Traverse City meetings was mailed during the week of May 9th.

Definition of Terms

To assist the reader in understanding the nature and scope of this study, the following definitions are offered:

Annual Work Program: The name given to the state highway safety planning document prepared by teh OHSP. Required by the U.S. Department of Transportation, this plan describes both state and local program activity anticipated during the year. Federal funding under Section 402 of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 is specifically identified. Sometimes abbreviated AWP.

Highway Safety Act of 1966: This was the initial federal highway safety act passed by the Congress in September 1966. There have been several subsequent acts, each providing funds for state and local community programs to improve highway safety.

Highway Safety Plan: This document is gradually replacing the AWP as the state's annual program plan. Like the AWP, it identified federal funding at both the state and local level and is oriented to a problem-identification approach. It is sometimes abbreviated HSP.

Highway Safety Standards: The 18 federal (DOT) standards which provide the framework for a state's highway safety program as delineated in the AWP or HSP. (Examples of standard areas are: Driver Education, Motor Vehicle Inspection, Traffic Courts and Emergency Medical Services.)

Traffic Safety Program or Countermeasure: A specific planned activity to impact the traffic crash problem. It may have local or state emphasis.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

In this chapter a statement of the problem was presented, along with narrative background on the scope of the study and its importance as a research topic. In Chapter II, appropriate literature is reviewed in the area of interest specific to this subject, but will include literature in related fields where public forums have been utilized in program planning efforts.

Chapter III deals with the details of the methodology applied in conducting the study. In Chapter IV, the data which were collected and analyzed are presented, including pertinent research results and findings.

The final chapter summarizes the results of the study, considers implications and the need for further study and research on the topic.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Most of the literature dealing with the subject of public attitudes or opinions on traffic safety described the results of various studies or public opinion polls conducted in conjunction with some type of special emphasis program. For the most part, these kinds of studies were not helpful as references for this particular project, although they did serve to indicate the general level of knowledge and concern that the public has about the problem of traffic accidents. Several sources were reviewed in this area in order to better understand anticipated public official reactions or support of the proposed local traffic safety conferences.

The Illinois Town Hall Meetings for Traffic Safety

In February and March of 1976, the Illinois Department of Transportation initiated a series of five regional "Town Hall" Meetings for Traffic Safety. This effort, which was structured at least in part to develop local citizen support for safety improvements, very closely paralleled the purpose and structure of the Michigan Traffic Forums. There was, however, no formal report of the results of these meetings.

Some of the priority issues addressed included emergency medical services (response capabilities), improved driver education (motorcycle safety and evasive action), alcohol awareness (adjudication and rehabilitation), roadside hazards, transportation of hazardous materials and local safety projects (federal funding). At least three of these same topics were also covered in the Michigan program.

Although participants in the Illinois meetings were not asked to complete a questionnaire as was done in Michigan, local officials and citizens were encouraged to participate actively in the discussions. It was reported that "A board of state and local officials also met with area residents to review local problems, make suggestions as to disposition, and motivate a progressive community program with the strength to influence legislation through citizen information and education."[2]

DOT - NHTSA Town Meetings

In a desire to secure public input on various concerns and issues affecting traffic safety, and specifically motor vehicle safety problems, the U.S. Department of Transportation (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) conducted a series of "town meetings" in various parts of the country. The meetings were held in September and October, 1978, and in March, 1979. The locations were noted as follows: Miami, Florida; Cleveland, Ohio; Portland,

---

[2]"Town Hall Meetings Slated in Illinois," Traffic Safety, (November, 1975), p. 31.

Oregon; Paramees, New Jersey; Hartford, Connecticut; Houston, Texas; Boulder and Denver, Colorado.

In a summary document provided by NHTSA (the formal report of the meetings is still in preparation), it was learned that the purpose of the local meetings was "to provide a forum for individuals to express their views, ask questions, or describe problems in the areas of motor vehicle safety, repair, defects, fuel economy, and emissions."[3] The agency further stated that the meetings tended to break down into three categories of public involvement--

1. Citizens who participated provided significant information which the agency believed useful in the development of motor vehicle safety standards and in the determination of the existence of motor vehicle defects;

2. Citizens received considerable information on subjects about which they knew relatively little. For example, they were given statistics on motor vehicle issues; given cost information on safety standards; told of the importance of child restraints, etc.; and

3. Citizens were able to obtain immediate counseling and assistance with motor vehicle related problems.

Since the meetings were designed principally to secure local citizen input, they should be regarded as a rather unique effort insofar as traffic safety meetings are concerned. It was reported that personal complaints or problems, again largely vehicle-related, were handled directly during the course of the meeting. In a couple of cases, NHTSA had defect experts, safety standard engineers, and a

---

[3]Letter and attachments from Ms. Karen K. Marcus, Chief, Consumer Participation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, December 18, 1979.

former car dealer maintain a counseling room for those with specific problems for the duration of the town meeting.

The agency indicated that many things were accomplished by conducting these meetings. Most notable perhaps was the fact that "strong lines of communication have been developed between the agency and local consumer organizations and offices as a result of the town meeting."[4]

Although the essential purpose and nature of these meetings was different from that of the local Michigan conferences, both were concerned with attempting to generate increased public attention to traffic safety issues. The four Michigan meetings were "invitational," and aimed primarily at local officials, whereas the NHTSA meetings were open to any persons who had the desire to attend.

Public Opinion in Michigan on Traffic Accident Prevention

The first organized effort to learn more about the attitudes and knowledge of Michigan citizens on traffic safety took place in 1965. In November and December of that year, sixteen hundred persons of driving age, living throughout the state, were personally intereviewed in their homes by staff from Market-Opinion Research, Inc. The study was conducted by Michigan State University. Funding for the project was provided by the Chrysler Corporation Fund.

The intent of the MSU-MOR study was "to obtain precise estimates of how serious Michigan residents judge the state's traffic and accident problem, and what they think should be done

---

[4] Ibid.

about the situation."[5] Within this context, the study dealt with six areas of traffic safety:

1. The driving experience of Michigan residents.
2. How important people think traffic safety is relative to other governmental programs.
3. The methods seen as most effective in controlling the traffic and accident problem.
4. The judged effectiveness of present traffic safety programs, including driver licensing, driver education, traffic law enforcement, and vehicle safety maintenance.
5. The public's reaction to each of several ideas that have been proposed for possible future traffic legislation.
6. Who should have the primary responsibility for controlling the traffic and accident problem.

Questions in several of the above areas were also included on the pre- and post-conference questionnaires utilized in connection with the Michigan regional traffic safety conferences. Following is a summary of findings with respect to items 2, 3, and 6 above. These topics related most closely to the concerns addressed on the subject questionnaires.

Public Concern About Traffic Safety

In the MOR-MSU Study, respondents were asked to answer a series of questions designed to determine their overall feelings about the importance of traffic safety and their general awareness

---

[5] V. D. Troldahl and R. V. Farace, Public Opinion in Michigan on Traffic Accident Prevention (East Lansing: Michigan State University, Highway Traffic Safety Center, 1966), p. iv.

of traffic safety activity. When asked first, "What do you see as major problems facing the State of Michigan today?" traffic safety was the second most frequently mentioned topic. Crime was named most frequently and a number of other problems were tied for third place.[6]

A second question concerned the seriousness of the traffic accident problem. The survey results indicated that about half or 46% of the respondents considered it "somewhat out of control."

Another question asked in this subject are was what was being done to cut down accidents. Those responding to this question stated that most was done in the areas of "driver competency" (53%), "highway improvements" (48%), and "traffic enforcement" (38%).

Relative Usefulness of Different Traffic Safety Programs

In an effort to determine which of a number of traffic safety programs the public was most aware of, respondents were asked to provide two answers (opinions) on what they thought would be the best way to reduce accidents. "Driver licensing," "Roads," "Police Enforcement" and "Courts" were noted most frequently. Answers as distributed are displayed in Table 2.[7]

For the second part of this item, respondents were provided with a list of nine possible methods for reducing traffic crashes. From this list of nine they were asked first to pick three things

---

[6]Ibid., p. 13.

[7]Ibid., p. 19.

TABLE 2.--Relative Usefulness of Different Traffic Safety Programs.

Program Area	Percentage of Respondents
Driver Licensing	32
Roads	27
Police Enforcement	26
Court Enforcement	24
Lower Speed Limits	14
Driver Education	13
Vehicle Safety Design	10
Vehicle Inspection	8
Miscellaneous	14
"Responsibility rests with the driver"	15

which they believed to be effective countermeasures; then they were asked to choose the one single item judged to be most effective. Answers were found to be similar to those noted on the previous question (Table 2). However, the authors pointed out that with respect to driver education, "[it] ranked higher than when respondents were not reminded of [other] traffic programs available." They went on to point out that "This suggests that driver education is not readily recalled by members of the public, but when they think of it, they consider it highly effective in cutting accidents. In fact, almost half of the respondents picked driver education among their top three choices of effective accident reducers."[8]

[8]Ibid., p. 20.

Responsibility for Traffic Safety

The MSU-MOR Study also sought to determine who people felt were responsible for traffic safety. In this instance, respondents were provided again with a list of possible choices and were asked to pick a top choice and to indicate their top two choices. The results are indicated in Table 3.

TABLE 3.--Responsibility for Traffic Safety.

	Percent Selecting as Top Choice	Percent Selecting as One of Top Two Choices
U.S. Government	3	6
Departments of Michigan Government	6	19
Michigan State Legislature	7	18
County Government	1	6
City or Township Government	7	28
Industrial Firms Concerned with Automobiles	5	21
High Schools, Colleges and Universities	4	21
Car Drivers Themselves	66	79
Miscellaneous	1	2
	100%	100%

This table indicates that two-thirds of the respondents selected "Car drivers themselves" as the primary or top choice; and 79% (nearly four out of five) picked this item as the primary or secondary source.[9]

What North Carolina Drivers Suggest for Improving Highway Safety in Their State

A state-wide survey of driver license applicants in North Carolina was conducted in January of 1973. The main purpose of the survey was to determine what drivers felt would improve highway safety in their state.[10]

In addition to other information requested (age, sex, education and accident experience), each applicant was asked to answer the following open-ended question: "Have you any suggestions for what North Carolina could do to cut down on the death and injury caused by highway accidents? If so, please write below."

Although persons were not required to answer the question about one-fourth did respond. Specifically, 21,680 questionnaires were collected and of these, 5,550 (25.6%) had a suggestion(s) to make regarding the problem.

The two areas of concern noted most frequently were "alcohol" and "enforcement." Other responses are as noted in Table 4.

---

[9]Ibid., p. 37.

[10]Patricia F. Waller, What North Carolina Drivers Suggest for Improving Highway Safety in Their State (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, January 1974), p. 1.

TABLE 4.--North Carolina Survey.

Areas of Concern and Proportion of Respondents Mentioning Them	Percent
Alcohol	48.3
Enforcement	30.6
Driver	11.0
Roads	9.7
Administrative/Legal	5.4
Vehicle	5.3
Signs, Signals, Pavement Markings	4.5
Education	4.1
Courts	3.9

The study report also provided several tables comparing the variables of age, sex, education and accident experience with responses to the open-ended question.

This study is probably most useful from the perspective of public support or "grass roots" support for particular countermeasures in North Carolina. The overall purpose of the study was not clearly stated and comparisons with certain elements of the MSU-MOR Study were not especially useful to the topic in question.

Questionnaire Method Testing Project (QMT)

The QMT Project, initiated in June of 1969 by the Highway Traffic Safety Center at Michigan State University, was a project

designed to assess the highway safety programs of selected cities in Michigan. As stated in the introduction to the study, "The intent . . . was to determine whether a data collection instrument can be relied upon to provide sufficient and valid information as to the status and nature of local highway safety activities as they relate to the National Highway Safety Standards."[11] The project took two years to complete (June 1969 to June 1971), and involved the development of 12 questionnaires containing some 590 questions. The study sample consisted of 65 Michigan cities with from 10,000 to 100,000 populations. Forty of the cities received their questionnaire packets by mail; the remaining 25 were personally hand-delivered. Mayors and city managers were selected as the initial point of contact for completion and distribution for the various questionnaires. Overall, a total of 715 individual questionnaires were routed to the 65 cities in the study. Final tabulations indicated that 434 questionnaires were completed and returned for a 61% response rate.[12]

This study was of particular interest because it was concerned with determining how local (city) officials dealt with the issue of traffic safety and specifically, how existing safety programs were organized and administered. It represented a unique and

---

[11]James Carnahan, QMT Project, Technical Report (East Lansing: Michigan State University, Highway Traffic Safety Center, June, 1971), p. 1.

[12]James Carnahan, QMT Project, Data Report (East Lansing: Michigan State University, Highway Traffic Safety Center, April, 1972), p. 1.

important effort to assess the problems and needs of the major municipalities in Michigan.

Summary

In addition to the references described above, a search of the available literature on the topic of local meetings and conferences on highway safety and related subjects was conducted utilizing the library resources of both the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. Specifically, a computer-directed search using key words associated with the topic in question was conducted through the Continuing Education Library at Michigan State University. This program (MSU Husler 2) produced no additional useful references although some 70 sources were considered. Subsequently, a manual search of potentially helpful references available at the Highway Safety Research Institute Library at the University of Michigan was conducted. This effort produced several additional documents that were not in the Michigan State Library. However, the 14 items checked dealt principally with state level public opinion polls and proved to be of limited value to the thesis topic. It should be noted that there were a number of published sources on state public opinion surveys. Most dealt with topics such as public attitudes on the 55 mph speed limit, alcohol abuse, motorcycle helmets and safety belts.

When meetings or public forums such as the one in Michigan were conducted, little or no evaluation was made to determine the overall effectiveness or usefulness of such efforts.

CHAPTER III

STUDY DESIGN

The first part of this chapter is intended to provide a summary description of the federally-sponsored project which provided for the series of local traffic safety conferences. This dissertation, representing the focus of these remaining sections of this chapter, deals with the evaluation methodology and research questions which were proposed.

Background Description of the Project

During the months of May and June, 1977, four regional-local traffic safety conferences were held at various locations throughout Michigan. A brief overview of the goals and activities associated with the conduct of these meetings is provided here for the reader as background to the subject study.

Preliminary Planning

Prior to the actual structuring of the conferences and the evaluation procedures, an ad hoc planning-advisory committee was established. The purpose of this planning group was to assist the Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) in determining the overall purpose and direction of the meetings, persons to be invited, site locations, program content and general administrative details. The

committee itself was formulated in early December, 1976, under the direction of the OHSP and included state officials, representatives of local government and private sector organizations.

Members were selected by the OHSP based on their organizations' responsibilities or interest in traffic safety programs and their representativeness of local level interest groups. No attempt was made to include all groups or organizations at the local level who were concerned to varying degrees with traffic-related activities. State agency staff made up the majority of the membership on the committee.

After the initial meeting of the committee in December, two additional planning sessions were held in January and a final meeting was held in March. At the December meeting committee members were asked to submit program topics to the OHSP for consideration at subsequent sessions. From those items a proposed agenda was eventually formulated.

Early in the initial planning stages it was determined that due to the many administrative details that would be involved, a full-time project coordinator should be hired. Furthermore, since existing agency staff were not available for this assignment, the planning group suggested that a consultant be retained on a subcontractural basis as a component of the overall project to be administered jointly by the OHSP and Oakland County (Traffic Improvement Association). At this point the planning group was asked to submit names of possible candidates for this key position.

On March 4, 1977, the OHSP entered into a project agreement with Oakland County and the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA) to conduct the series of regional meetings. The project was funded directly with Oakland County; the Traffic Improvement Association provided staff services and overall project administration. Shortly thereafter, the planning committee reviewed several of the names that had been suggested as potential project coordinators, and Mr. Frank Churley was subsequently selected to fill this position.

The input and advice of this committee proved to be invaluable to the eventual successful development and conduct of the regional seminars. Several members of the committee also later served as resource staff for all or some of the meetings.

Project Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of the project, as stated in the project application was:

> To obtain from community leaders, an insight into their perception of the traffic safety problems in their areas and to provide to these community leaders information related to the various resources available to assist them in solving local traffic safety problems.

In addition, two specific objectives were also proposed as follows:

1. To conduct a series of four local traffic safety conferences in varying geographical locations throughout the state which will;

a. Inform community leaders of the annual scope and cost of Michigan's traffic accident experience and identify the specific problems in the region where these leaders resided.

b. Aid state authorities in obtaining greater insight into the real traffic problems and possible solutions at the local level.

2. To determine by pre- and post-attendee questionnaire if the local traffic safety conference is an effective medium in which to address the local-state coordination of traffic safety programs.[13]

Site Selection

Several variables were considered in determining the areas and sites for the conferences. First, each county in Michigan was analyzed in terms of its trend of injury accidents, registered vehicles and road mileage (IA/RV/RM). In this instance, the question attempted to be answered was: Is the area or region experiencing a disproportionately large share of traffic crashes? For the three variables noted above (IA/RV/RM), county data was reviewed by OHSP staff for the five year period (1970-1975), and trend-line calculations were produced reflecting the rate of change in the data from year to year. (The actual slope of the line, or "beta," indicated the rate of change for the data. The term "alpha" was used to designate the point at which the line started.) In other words, "beta" was the descriptive measure utilized to demonstrate the change and was represented by the term bxy. With one exception, all of the counties of southern lower Michigan eventually

[13]Application for Highway Safety Grant," Local Traffic Safety Conferences," MPA 77-002A (available through the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning, Lansing, Michigan), p. 1+.

selected for inclusion in the projects met this criterion. None of the counties in the Grand Traverse region were noted as having an unusually poor experience, but were selected for other reasons.

Secondly, each county or region was reviewed within the context of previous federal programs, i.e., were there any major federally-funded traffic safety programs implemented within the area in recent years? The list of possible candidate counties was compared against the list of previous and current federal projects throughout the state. It had been determined that any area or county which had previously received substantial federal funds for one or more local highway safety programs should not be given priority consideration. The primary intent was to identify problem areas or counties which had received little or no federal funding assistance.

A third major question was: Does the area "fit" within an appropriate geographical distribution? Early in the planning stages it had been determined that the conferences should be held in various parts of the state and reflect as equitable distribution as possible. Travel times to the conference sites were also considered, as was the availability of suitable, reasonably convenient facilities.

Finally, each potential conference site was analyzed in terms of the number and variety of government agencies which could be represented. Thus, in the four locations eventually selected, a variety of approaches were attempted--in one instance, a single county (Muskegon); in two other cases, a tri-county area (Cass, Van-Buren and Berrien; and Bay, Midland and Saginaw) and a five county

area in the northern part of the state (Grand Traverse, Antrim, Leelanau, Benzie and Kalkaska).

Program Development

The task of formulating the program and agenda for the conferences was the joint responsibility of the OHSP staff, the consultant and the planning committee. Each member of the committee was requested to submit program topics which would be appropriate to the perceived needs and interests of local officials.

Each topic, including suggestions for possible resource staff and speakers, was considered in terms of the overall goals and objectives for the conferences. From these general suggestions, the following topics were subsequently selected:

- The Highway Safety Problem
  Statewide
  Regional (local)
- Where Accidents are Occurring
  (Michigan Accident Location Index)
- Legal Responsibilities of Local Officials
- Traffic Engineering Services for Your Community
- Educational and Rehabilitation Programs covering driver improvement, alcohol rehabilitation, high school driver education and bus driver training programs.
- Police Manpower and Selective Enforcement
- Putting CB Radios to Work for Traffic Safety
- Legislative Concerns and Priorities
- Organizing for Community Action
- Technical and Funding Assistance

From these topics an agenda (see Appendix A) was formulated and speakers were selected. After each major presentation, a discussion period was provided. Generally, the subject matter was the same for each of the conferences, although several modifications were made in the agenda between the first two meetings and the final sessions in an attempt to encourage more audience participation.

Participant Selection

As program details were being completed, attention was focused on developing a list of local officials and leaders who were to be invited to each of the conferences. In each area, community leaders and officials were identified to receive letters of invitation. Generally, the following types of persons were invited to attend.

1. County Officials
    a. Commissioners
    b. Road Commission members
    c. Sheriffs
2. City Officials
    a. Mayors
    b. City Managers/Village Presidents
    c. Councilmen/Commissioners
    d. Police Chiefs
    e. City Engineers
3. Township Officials
4. District Judges
5. State and Federal Officials (local)

6. Businessmen

    a. Chamber of Commerce Officials
    b. Local Industrial Leaders
    c. Owners of Local Retail Businesses
    d. News Media Personnel
    e. Utilities Managers.

7. Public School Officials

8. Private Citizens

The letters of invitation, personally signed jointly by the Secretary of State (as Chairman of the State Safety Commission) and the Director of the Office of Highway Safety Planning (see Appendix B), were sent to key individuals in each of the categories noted above. Generally, names were provided by the local Chamber of Commerce, from various membership directories, government sources and from other lists obtained during advance trips to the areas for this purpose. These field visits not only produced names of businessmen, but identified a number of concerned citizens known locally to be active in traffic safety matters. In addition, local representatives of statewide safety groups such as Students for Michigan Attaining Safer Highways (SMASH) and Michigan Women for Highway Safety (MWFHS) were included.

In all, some 652 invitations were extended, with approximately 300 acceptances and 217 persons actually in attendance. Analysis of those attending the four conferences on the basis of occupational groups is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5.--Occupation or Profession of Conference Attendees.

Occupational Group	Number Attending				
	Benton Harbor	Muskegon	Saginaw	Traverse City	Totals
Education Profession	2	0	8	2	12
Engineering/Planning	7	4	9	20	35
Enforcement	10	13	16	12	51
Business	16	7	26	5	54
City-County (Township) Officials	9	10	9	14	42
Courts/Health Care	6	3	9	1	19
Private Citizens	1	1	1	1	4
TOTALS	51	38	78	50	217

Field Visitations

An early activity of the project coordinator was to visit the conference areas to discuss local traffic safety issues with local officials and community leaders. The purpose of these visits were four-fold:

1. To obtain a feeling for localized issues to aid in programming.
2. To obtain names of businessmen and other leading citizens for invitation lists.
3. To identify community leaders who would be suitable chairpersons.
4. To stimulate interest in and enthusiasm for the conferences.

The top staff executives of the chambers of commerce in the four areas were contacted by the project coordinator as starting points in every instance, and they proved to be extremely helpful. All had facts and opinions to express about local traffic safety problems; all were cooperative in furnishing names of their members for invitation purposes; all were helpful in suggesting names for chairmen, and in some instances, made the initial approach to the prospective chairmen.

Finally, the simple process of informing the local officials and community leaders about the forums and their intended purposes stimulated interest and undoubtedly led to larger attendance than might otherwise have happened.

Statistical Data Books

For each of the areas where the conferences were held, the OHSP staff prepared a statistical data report which provided a basic profile of the local crash situation. These reports or "data books" were utilized predominately during the initial presentations dealing with the nature and extent of the highway safety problem. Each attendee received a copy of the report.

The reports themselves included trend information on population characteristics, motor vehicle registrations, number of fatal, personal injury and property damage crashes, ages of persons killed and the extent of alcohol involvement in fatal crashes. More detailed statistics covering additional crash factors were also provided from reproductions of computer printout forms supplied by the Michigan State Police, Safety and Traffic Division.

Evaluation of the Project

This section describes the process by which the project was evaluated, including study design and methodology, preparation of research questions to be answered and development of questionnaire items.

Study Design

The effort to identify changes in the level of knowledge or opinions concerning traffic safety problems involved the development of a pre- and post-conference questionnaire. These questionnaires included items relevant to the topics which were addressed during

the subsequent conferences and will be described in more detail in the last section of this chapter.

Several weeks prior to the time when a local conference was to be held, persons invited to the conference were mailed a pre-conference questionnaire (Pre-Q; see Appendix C) with a cover letter (see Appendix D) asking that the items be answered and the questionnaire form be returned to the OHSP prior to their participation in the meeting. A similar questionnaire (see Appendix E) was also distributed to selected state-level officials, specifically members of the OHSP staff, the State Safety Commission and the Operating Committee of the Commission for completion prior to the meetings.

Shortly after all the local conferences were concluded, a post-conference questionnaire (Post-Q; see Appendix F) was mailed to all local officials and others from the local area who had participated in one of the meetings. Again, a brief cover letter (see Appendix G) was attached with instructions for completing the questionnaire. In this case, as with the pre-conference questionnaire, a stamped, self-addressed return envelope was provided for use by each respondent.

As was noted in Chapter I, state officials were not given the post-conference questionnaire on the assumption that their particular opinions and knowledge would be largely unchanged as a result of the local conferences. In some instances, several of the state officials participated to only a minor extent in the meetings or not at all. For the purpose of this study, therefore, it was determined that any significant differences between these two groups

could be readily observed by comparing the results on the pre-conference questionnaires alone. It should again be emphasized that since the primary purpose of this study was to determine whether the beliefs, opinions and knoweldge of local leaders changed after their participation in one of the local conferences, major emphasis was placed on comparisons of their pre- and post-conference questionnaires.

Research Questions

In addition to the general statistical techniques and analyses which were applied to the questionnaire instruments, the following research questions were proposed as a part of the overall study design:

1. What are the perceptions (knowledge and opinions) of local community leaders concerning the nature of the traffic crash problem?

2. Do the perceptions of local community leaders generally agree with those of state officials and/or local leaders in other areas of the state?

3. Do different groups of community officials and leaders have different perceptions of local problems? (For example, do police officials hold different views than traffic engineers and vice versa?)

4. Did exposure to a local one-day traffic safety conference produce any measurable or noticeable changes in the opinions or knowledge of the participant?

Questionnaire Development

Since the major purpose of this evaluation effort was to identify changes in opinions or knowledge of the participants in the

traffic safety conferences, a series of questions was prepared on various aspects of traffic safety. Both the pre- and post-conference questionnaires included the same items; however, two new items were added to the post-conference form which related to the overall value of the conference to the respondent.

The questions on both forms fell generally into the following categories:

- The scope and cost of traffic accidents (statewide and locally)
- Traffic problems and possible solutions at the local level
- Value of the conference to local officials
- Suggestions for improvement of subsequent conferences
- Items of interest not considered at the conference
- Items included in the conference which were not applicable to the local area
- General attitude or awareness items

From these categories a number of preliminary questions were drafted. Using this initial series of items, further refinements were made in language and design; however, no pilot testing was conducted.

In all, three questionnaire forms were prepared; for the pre-conference items, two separate forms were printed, one for each two locations. These two forms were identical, except for the item which indicated the location of the conference. The respondent was

asked to check the box which corresponded to the location of the meeting he had been invited to attend. (One form indicated Benton Harbor or Muskegon and the other Traverse City or Saginaw.) One form could no doubt have been used with a box to be checked for one of the four locations, but site locations were still somewhat indefinite for the last two meetings when it was necessary to mail out the pre-conference questionnaires on the first two meetings. For the post-conference questionnaire, only one form was utilized; the respondent could indicate on it which of the four meetings he had attended. It was also printed on a light green stock to distinguish it from the white pre-conference form. The only other additional information called for in the heading was the respondent's occupation or profession; the respondent's name was optional. No other information was deemed necessary.

The eighteen questionnaire items represented a variety of types of construction; two required a rank ordering; nine were yes/no/don't know style; five were multiple-choice type; and two were open-ended. In some cases, additional information was requested on the yes/no/don't know items to determine whether or not the respondent had indicated they knew where the community's high accident locations were (by a "yes" answer), they were asked to list some of these areas or locations in part (b) of that item.

Data from those types of questions requiring a yes/no/don't know response were summarized on the basis of occupational groups and by location of the conference; and separate frequency

tables were developed on this basis which indicated the number and percentage of respondents selecting each type of response.

Those items which called for a multiple-choice answer (one or more) were summarized in a similar manner; again, frequency tables were developed on the two variables--occupation and location.

In the case of the two questions which asked the respondent to rank-order a number of items, the reporting method was somewhat different. For analytical purposes, the total number of choices for each indicated area were assigned an overall weighted rank value (RV) according to the following procedure: (1) a "first" choice was given a weight of "8"; a "second" choice a weight of "7", etc.; an item ranked last or 8th received a weight of only "1"; (2) the N under each rank was then multiplied by this weighted number. For example, in Chapter IV, Table 7, the N of 21 noted under Rank 1--"Lack of traffic law enforcement" was multiplied by 8 (N = 168), etc. These weighted "scores" were then totaled across and divided by the total N (in this case, 738 - 146 = 5.05) to obtain the overall rank value (RV). In each table, for questions one and three, the total N for each ranked "problem" or "need" area is indicated as well as the overall N for that item and its RV on both a Pre-Q and Post-Q basis.

Comments provided by respondents on open-ended questions were presented on the basis of occupation and location.

In Chapter IV, which follows, the results of the analysis of the questionnaires and other pertinent data will be presented.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter provides, in tabular and narrative form, a summary of the various responses to the questions asked of the participants in the local traffic safety conferences. The responses were analyzed from both the pre-conference and post-conference questionnaires (expressed as Pre-Q and Post-Q). Two variables were considered, location and occupation or profession of the respondent.

As can be observed from Table 6, 652 pre-conference questionnaires (Pre-Q) were mailed to those persons invited to one of the four conferences and 232 or 35.6% were completed and returned. The highest percentage of returns were from the Saginaw and Traverse City areas (both at 38.7%). The lowest rate of return was Muskegon at 38.0%.

A somewhat higher rate of return was achieved for the post-conference questionnaires (Post-Q)--46.1% overall. Specifically, 95 questionnaires were returned from a mailing of 206. This latter figure also represented the total number of local participants in the forums. In this case, the highest rate of return was from the Muskegon area (52.8%) and the lowest was from Traverse City (42.4%).

Although the figures are not indicated in Table 6, nine questionnaires (pre-conference only) were returned by 20 state officials resulting in a 45% rate of return for this sub-group.

TABLE 6.--Pre-Conference and Post-Conference Questionnaires: Number Mailed and Returned.

Location	Pre-Conference-Q			Post-Conference-Q		
	N Mailed	N Returned	% Returned	N Mailed	N Returned	% Returned
BENTON HARBOR (Berrien, Cass, and Van Buren Counties)	167	58	34.7	51	25	49.0
MUSKEGON (Muskegon County)	131	37	28.0	36	19	52.8
SAGINAW (Bay, Midland and Saginaw Counties)	217	84	38.7	74	32	43.0
TRAVERSE CITY (Grand Traverse, Benzie, Antrim, Kalkaska and Leelanaw Counties)	137	53	38.7	45	19	42.2
TOTALS	652	232	35.6	206	95	46.1

Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems

In Tables 7 through 14 the responses to question one are presented. This was a rank-order type item in which the respondent was asked, "Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?" Six different traffic accident "problems" were listed on the questionnaire. In addition, spaces were provided whereby respondents could also list one or two additional "problems" of their own choice. The purpose of this item was to determine how well the respondent understood the nature of the traffic crash problem generally, and also how well they perceived the relative importance of each of several elements of the problem.

From Table 7 it can be observed that overall, on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q, the problem of "drinking drivers" was judged by local officials and community leaders to be the most serious local problem. This issue received the highest rank values, 6.47 and 6.85, respectively, on the Pre-Q and Post-Q. "Untrained, discourteous drivers" was ranked second at 6.32 (Pre-Q) and 6.19 (Post-Q). On the Pre-Q, the "Lack of traffic law enforcement" received the lowest rank value--5.05; on the Post-Q, the "Lack of good data on problem" was in last position with an RV = 4.76.

Table 8 presents the results of this question by the "Engineering/Planning" professions. This group, on the Pre-Q, ranked the problem of the "Lack of funds for programs" as the most critical local issue (RV = 6.09). On the Post-Q, they ranked "Drinking drivers" as the most important local problem (RV = 7.17). "Poor

TABLE 7.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems: Combined Occupational Groups.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	21	11	21	5	14	8	25	6	26	8	33	19	5	1	1	1	146/5.05	59/4.96
Poor Traffic Engineering	33	9	18	17	32	10	29	10	20	19	26	6	1	1	1	0	160/5.55	72/5.37
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	45	15	39	19	26	10	20	14	15	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	155/6.32	67/6.19
Lack of Funds for Programs	32	5	32	15	30	22	27	14	23	10	16	3	1	0	2	0	163/5.76	69/5.74
Lack of Good Data on Problems	14	4	25	9	35	6	22	8	26	10	19	15	7	3	0	0	148/5.28	55/4.76
Drinking Drivers	49	34	44	16	20	8	14	5	13	2	9	5	2	0	1	0	152/6.47	70/6.85

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 8.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems by Engineering-Planning Professions.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	2	1	3	0	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	16/5.19	9/4.89
Poor Traffic Engineering	3	1	5	0	2	1	5	2	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	21/5.57	9/4.67
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	4	2	4	4	2	0	4	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	18/5.94	10/6.00
Lack of Funds for Programs	5	1	3	2	8	5	3	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	22/6.09	11/6.00
Lack of Good Data on Problems	2	1	4	2	1	0	4	1	4	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	18/5.27	9/4.78
Drinking Drivers	6	6	5	3	4	2	2	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	24/5.92	12/7.17

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value

traffic engineering" as a local problem was ranked fourth and fifth, respectively, on the Pre-Q (RV = 5.57) and Post-Q (RV = 4.67).

The problem of "Drinking drivers" was ranked highest on both the Pre-Q (RV = 6.88) and Post-Q (RV = 6.75) by the "Education" group (Table 9). "Untrained, discourteous drivers" as a local problem was ranked second and third, respectively, with rank values of 6.44 and 5.33. "Lack of good data on problems" was ranked as the lowest problem on both questionnaires (Pre-Q RV = 4.22; Post-Q RV = 3.50).

Table 10 indicates that the "Enforcement" group felt that the problem of "Untrained, discourteous drivers" was, in their view, the most important local issue. This was true on both the Pre-Q (RV = 6.10) and Post-Q (RV = 6.71). "Enforcement" officials also ranked the problem of "Lack of traffic law enforcement" last on the Pre-Q (RV = 4.89) and fourth in criticality on the Post-Q (RV = 5.55).

The "Business" group ranked the problem of "Drinking drivers" as the most serious local problem on both questionnaires (see Table 11). This issue received a rank value of 6.71 on the Pre-Q and 7.62 on the Post-Q. The "Lack of traffic law enforcement" was ranked lowest on both questionnaires (4.88 on the Pre-Q and 4.58 on the Post-Q).

Table 12 shows that "City-county officials" on the pre-Q believed that "Untrained, discourteous drivers" was the most important local problem (RV = 6.19). However, on the Post-Q, "Poor traffic engineering" was judged to be the most serious local problem (RV = 6.25). "Lack of good data on problems" was ranked last by this group on both the Pre-Q (RV = 4.91) and the Post-Q (RV = 4.60).

TABLE 9.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems by Education Profession.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	8/5.38	5/4.00
Poor Traffic Engineering	2	0	2	0	1	0	3	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	10/5.80	5/3.80
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	3	0	3	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	9/6.44	6/5.33
Lack of Funds for Programs	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8/5.25	6/6.17
Lack of Good Data on Problems	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	9/4.22	4/3.50
Drinking Drivers	3	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	8/6.88	8/6.75

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value

TABLE 10.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems by Enforcement Officials.
Question 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q N/RV	Post-Q N/RV
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q		
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	3	4	8	3	3	4	7	2	3	3	11	4	1	0	1	0	37/4.89	20/5.55
Poor Traffic Engineering	11	4	4	2	5	3	4	4	5	5	7	5	1	0	1	0	38/5.53	23/5.17
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	13	8	5	5	8	4	5	2	3	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	39/6.10	21/6.71
Lack of Funds for Programs	7	3	11	5	5	7	7	6	8	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	42/5.74	24/5.96
Lack of Good Data on Problems	6	1	5	2	11	3	3	1	7	5	5	7	3	0	0	0	40/5.33	19/4.53
Drinking Drivers	5	7	9	7	8	3	7	4	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	37/5.86	22/6.64

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value

TABLE 11.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems by Business Professions.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N/RV	N/RV
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q		
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	7	3	4	0	1	0	9	1	7	2	11	6	2	0	0	0	41/4.88	12/4.58
Poor Traffic Engineering	14	3	4	3	9	3	8	2	4	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	44/6.00	15/5.93
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	11	3	14	6	6	3	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	38/6.55	15/6.53
Lack of Funds for Programs	6	0	5	3	9	5	8	3	7	1	6	2	0	0	1	0	42/5.33	14/5.43
Lack of Good Data on Problems	0	1	10	2	10	2	6	3	6	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	36/5.44	11/5.27
Drinking Drivers	16	9	11	3	4	1	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	38/6.71	13/7.62

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value

TABLE 12.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems by City-County Officials.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	7	2	2	1	2	2	2	0	6	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	24/5.42	6/6.17
Poor Traffic Engineering	3	1	1	1	7	1	5	0	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	25/5.16	4/6.25
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	7	0	4	2	7	0	5	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	27/6.19	6/5.50
Lack of Funds for Programs	8	1	6	2	4	1	5	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	28/6.07	7/5.86
Lack of Good Data Problems	1	0	3	1	5	1	5	0	2	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	22/4.91	5/4.60
Drinking Drivers	6	3	9	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	5	2	0	0	1	0	24/6.00	7/5.86

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

"Drinking drivers" was indicated as the most serious local problem by the "Courts/Health" professions (see Table 13). This issue received a rank value (RV) of 7.78 on the Pre-Q and 7.00 on the Post-Q.

The "Private Citizen" group also placed the problem of "Drinking drivers" on the top of the "problem" list on both questionnaires (see Table 14). It received a rank value of 6.80 on the Pre-Q and 6.67 on the Post-Q. "Lack of traffic law enforcement" was the problem area ranked last on the Pre-Q (RV = 4.20) and the problem of "Lack of funds for programs" was ranked last on the Post-Q (RV = 3.67).

Awareness of High Accident Locations

The responses to Question two, "Are you generally aware of the high accident locations in your community?" are indicated in Tables 15 and 16.

Table 15 shows that 80% (or 185 out of 232 respondents) answered yes to this question on the Pre-Q. This increased to 81% (or 77 out of 95 respondents) on the Post-Q. Only 2% on the Pre-Q (or 4 out of 232) said they didn't know (or did not respond), a figure which increased to 3% (or 3 out of 95) on the Post-Q.

Table 15 also indicates that at the Benton Harbor meeting, 86% (N = 50) stated on the Pre-Q that they were aware of the high accident locations. This was the highest percentage of any location. However, on the Post-Q only 72% (N = 18) responded with a yes answer to this item.

TABLE 13.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems by Courts and Health Professions.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	6/5.00	4/3.50
Poor Traffic Engineering	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	8/5.00	4/5.25
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6/6.83	4/5.25
Lack of Funds for Programs	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6/5.00	4/6.00
Lack of Good Data on Problems	0	1	1	1	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8/5.00	4/6.00
Drinking Drivers	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9/7.78	4/7.00

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 14.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems by Private Citizens.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems?

Problem Area	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5/4.20	3/5.00
Poor Traffic Engineering	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7/5.14	3/6.00
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	3	1	2	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9/6.78	3/5.67
Lack of Funds for Programs	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	6/5.50	3/3.67
Lack of Good Data on Problems	2	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7/5.86	3/6.00
Drinking Drivers	3	0	4	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10/6.80	3/6.67

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 15.--Awareness of High Accident Locations by Location.
QUESTION 2: Are you generally aware of the high accident locations in your community?

Location	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	50	86	18	72	6	10	6	24	1	2	1	4
Muskegon	37	19	29	78	16	84	7	19	3	16	1	3	1	5
Saginaw	84	32	65	77	26	81	18	21	5	16	1	1	1	3
Traverse City	53	19	41	77	17	89	10	19	2	11	1	2	0	0
TOTAL	232	95	185	80	77	81	41	18	16	17	4	2	3	3

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire

In Muskegon, 78% (N = 29) answered yes to question 2 on the Pre-Q; this increased to 84% (N = 16) on the Post-Q.

At the conference in Saginaw, some 77% (N = 65) answered yes to this question on the Pre-Q, a figure which increased to 81% (N = 26) on the Post-Q.

Finally, in Traverse City, again 77% (N = 41) answered that they were aware of the high accident locations in their area on the Pre-Q; this increased to 89% (N = 17) on the Post-Q. This was the largest percentage increase of any location.

In Table 16 it is noted that of those occupational groups responding, the enforcement group had the highest percentage of yes responses--94% (N = 48) on the Pre-Q and 100% (N = 29) on the Post-Q. Further, the education and engineering groups were next with scores of 93% (N = 13) and 89% (N = 240), respectively, on the Pre-Q. Their scores decreased somewhat to 91% (N = 10) and 82% (N = 9) respectively, in the Post-Q. The group with the lowest percentage scores was the Courts-Health professions with 57% (N = 8) on the Pre-Q and 33% (N = 2) on the Post-Q. The n's are relatively small, however.

Only five respondents on both the pre- and post-questionaires indicated that they didn't know or had no response to this item.

Although part b of Question 2 asked each respondent to list some of the local high accident areas or locations, this information was not tabulated due to the large number and variety of answers that were indicated. A meaningful summary was not possible.

TABLE 16.--Awareness of High Accident Locations by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 2: Are you generally aware of the high accident locations in your community?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	27	11	24	89	9	82	3	11	2	18	0	0	0	0
Education Profession	14	11	13	93	10	91	1	7	1	9	0	0	0	0
Enforcement	51	29	48	94	29	100	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Business	54	19	37	69	14	74	17	31	5	26	0	0	0	0
City-County Official	37	13	29	78	11	85	6	16	2	15	2	5	0	0
Courts-Health	14	6	8	57	2	33	6	42	3	50	0	0	1	17
Private Citizen	11	2	9	82	1	50	1	9	0	0	1	9	1	50

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire

Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs

Question three was a rank-order type item which was designed to determine how local officials and leaders perceived their local needs in terms of traffic accident reduction. Specifically, each respondent was asked, "What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?" Six areas of "need" were listed on both the pre- and post-questionnaires. This question was included as a follow-up to Question one to identify any possible relationships between major "problems" (Q1) and "needs" (Q3). It should also be noted that the "problem areas" listed on Question one, with one exception, were directly related to the stated "needs" in Question three. The results are noted in Tables 17 to 24.

Table 17 presents the data on Question three across all occupational groups on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q. As can be observed, the need for "Improved driver education" was judged to be the most critical need on both questionnaires. This item received a rank value (RV) of 6.14 on the Pre-Q and an RV of 6.35 on the Post-Q. "Improved traffic engineering" was ranked as the second most critical need on both the Pre-Q (RV = 5.93) and the Post-Q (RV = 6.17). "Better data on problem" was ranked last on both questionnaires with an RV = 5.28 on the Pre-Q and RV = 4.60 on the Post-Q.

In terms of specific occupational groups, the "Engineering/ Planning group (Table 18) ranked the need for "Improved driver education" as the most important local need on the Pre-Q (RV = 6.53). The need for "More funds to implement programs" was ranked first on

TABLE 17.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs: Combined Occupational Groups.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	43	17	30	19	41	10	28	10	22	11	15	3	3	0	0	0	182/5.93	70/6.17
Improved Driver Education	52	26	35	10	23	13	21	8	21	3	12	8	3	0	1	0	168/6.14	68/6.35
More Traffic Law Enforcement	31	12	33	14	27	16	24	13	21	6	28	12	0	0	0	0	164/5.66	73/5.68
Better Management of Problem	27	11	33	9	38	13	32	14	17	10	18	4	2	1	0	0	167/5.75	62/5.69
Better Data on Problem	19	5	23	6	27	7	28	6	34	16	21	19	2	0	1	1	155/5.28	60/4.60
More Funds to Implement Programs	35	13	42	17	23	11	22	9	18	11	26	5	0	1	1	0	167/5.83	67/5.89

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 18.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs by Engineering-Planning Professions.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	3	2	1	2	5	2	5	1	2	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	19/5.37	12/5.50
Improved Driver Education	6	4	6	0	0	1	1	2	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	17/6.53	10/5.80
More Traffic Law Enforcement	3	1	3	3	4	2	3	3	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	19/5.42	11/5.73
Better Management of Problem	3	2	2	1	2	4	7	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	19/5.32	11/5.91
Better Data on Problem	0	1	5	2	4	0	2	0	6	1	2	5	1	0	0	0	20/5.05	9/4.56
More Funds to Implement Programs	6	2	6	4	5	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	22/6.36	11/6.36

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

the Post-Q (RV = 6.36). The need for "Improved traffic engineering" was ranked fourth and fifth, respectively, on the Pre-Q (RV = 5.37) and the Post-Q (RV = 5.50).

The "Education" group (Table 19) ranked the need for "Better management of the problem" as the most critical local problem on the Pre-Q (RV = 6.22), and both the need for "Improved driver education" and the need for "More traffic law enforcement" as the most urgent problems on the Post-Q. Each of these received a rank value (RV) of 6.50.

The "Enforcement" group (Table 20) ranked first on the Pre-Q (RV = 6.34) the need for "Improved traffic engineering." However, on the Post-Q the need for "Improved driver education" was ranked first (RV = 6.52). The need for "More traffic law enforcement" was ranked third and fourth, respectively, on the Pre-Q (RV = 5.85) and Post-Q (RV = 5.71) by this occupational group.

Members of the "Business" occupational group (see Table 21) on the Pre-Q felt that the need for "Improved driver education" was the most pressing local need (RV = 6.31). This also held true for the Post-Q results and the rank value actually increased somewhat (RV = 7.00). The need for "More funds to implement programs" received the lowest rank value on both the Pre-Q (RV = 5.13) and the Post-Q (RV = 4.92).

"City-county officials" (see Table 22) indicated on the Pre-Q that the need for "More funds to implement programs" was the most critical local need (RV = 6.10). This issue was ranked second

TABLE 19.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs by Education Profession.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	1	1	0	2	3	1	2	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9/5.33	5/6.20
Improved Driver Education	2	2	1	0	4	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10/6.00	6/6.50
More Traffic Law Enforcement	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9/6.00	6/6.50
Better Management of Problem	3	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	9/6.22	4/6.00
Better Data on Problem	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	9/5.67	4/3.50
More Funds to Implement Programs	0	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	7/5.71	5/6.20

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 20.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs by Enforcement Officials.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	12	4	10	6	13	4	2	6	5	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	44/6.34	24/5.96
Improved Driver Education	10	10	6	4	8	4	6	1	7	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	42/5.79	23/6.52
More Traffic Law Enforcement	8	5	9	4	7	6	8	2	4	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	41/5.85	24/5.71
Better Management of Problem	3	3	8	2	7	6	7	3	5	4	7	1	0	2	0	0	37/5.35	21/5.33
Better Data on Problem	6	2	3	1	5	0	6	4	10	6	7	6	0	0	0	1	37/5.14	20/4.30
More Funds to Implement Programs	11	4	11	9	4	4	8	3	4	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	44/5.98	23/6.30

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 21.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs by Business Professions.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N			
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	15	3	11	5	8	2	10	1	2	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	50/6.28	13/6.46
Improved Driver Education	19	8	7	2	4	2	5	3	6	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	45/6.31	15/7.00
More Traffic Law Enforcement	8	2	10	4	3	3	3	2	7	0	11	3	1	0	0	0	43/5.35	14/5.79
Better Management of Problem	10	5	10	2	13	2	5	3	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	45/6.13	13/6.46
Better Data on Problem	2	0	8	2	10	3	9	2	7	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	40/5.43	13/4.92
More Funds to Implement Programs	4	0	6	2	7	3	6	1	8	4	9	2	0	0	0	0	40/5.13	12/4.92

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 22.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs by City-County Officials.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	6	4	5	1	5	2	6	1	7	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	33/5.55	8/7.00
Improved Driver Education	6	1	7	3	5	0	4	1	3	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	30/5.73	6/6.17
More Traffic Law Enforcement	6	2	4	2	8	2	3	1	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	30/5.67	8/6.38
Better Management of Problem	3	0	4	0	7	0	6	2	4	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	26/5.62	5/4.20
Better Data on Problem	4	0	3	1	5	2	4	0	5	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	25/5.40	6/4.83
More Funds to Implement Programs	8	4	10	0	1	0	4	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	29/6.10	7/6.43

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

on the Post-Q with an RV = 6.43. On the Post-Q, this group ranked first the need for "Improved traffic engineering" (RV = 7.00). "Better management of the problem" was ranked last on the Post-Q (RV = 4.20). "Better data on the problem" was ranked last on the Pre-Q (RV = 5.40).

Table 23 indicates that on the Pre-Q the need for "Improved driver education" was identified as the most important local need by the "Courts/Health" professions (RV = 7.33). On the Post-Q, this group ranked the need for "Better data on problem" as the most critical need (RV = 6.25).

Finally, Table 24 shows the results of the responses to Question three by "Private citizens." This group, on the Pre-Q, indicated that "Improved driver education" was the most important local need (RV = 7.13). On the post-Q, "Improved traffic engineering" received the highest rank value (RV = 7.00). The need for "Better data on the problem" was ranked as the lowest priority need by this group on both questionnaires (Pre-Q RV = 4.67; Post-Q RV = 4.67).

Personal Awareness of Traffic Safety Problems/Needs

The purpose of question 4 was to secure information concerning the respondent's personal or actual awareness of local accident needs or problems. The item was worded in the following manner: "How aware are you personally of your community's major traffic safety problems or needs?" Three responses were possible. The results are noted in Tables 25 and 26.

TABLE 23.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs by Courts and Health Professions.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	7/5.14	4/5.75
Improved Driver Education	5	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	9/7.33	4/5.25
More Traffic Law Enforcement	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	8/5.63	4/4.00
Better Management of Problem	1	0	0	2	2	0	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8/5.25	4/6.00
Better Data on Problem	2	2	3	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8/6.63	4/6.25
More Funds to Implement Programs	2	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	9/5.67	4/5.75

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

TABLE 24.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs by Private Citizens.
QUESTION 3: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area?

Need	Rank 1 N		2 N		3 N		4 N		5 N		6 N		7 N		8 N		Pre-Q	Post-Q
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N/RV	N/RV
Improved Traffic Engineering	3	2	1	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9/6.44	3/7.00
Improved Driver Education	3	0	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8/7.13	3/5.33
More Traffic Law Enforcement	1	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7/6.29	3/5.67
Better Management of Problem	2	0	2	1	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9/6.56	3/5.00
Better Data on Problem	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6/4.67	3/4.67
More Funds to Implement Programs	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5/5.40	3/5.33

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire; RV = Rank Value.

Table 25 indicates that overall most persons felt that they were at least "somewhat aware" of local needs or problems. On the Pre-Q, for example, 54% (N = 125) selected this response; on the Post-Q, 51% (N = 47) answered in this manner. A large number also indicated they were "very aware" of local needs--38% (N = 88) on the Pre-Q and 46% (N = 43) on the Post-Q. Only 8% (N = 18) and 3% (N = 3) on the Pre-Q and Post-Q, respectively, said they were "not really aware."

The survey results in Benton Harbor reveal figures very close to the overall results. No one (on the Post-Q) said they were "not really aware" of local needs or problems.

In Muskegon, on the Pre-Q, 14% (N = 5) of the respondents stated they were "not really aware" of local problems. This was the highest percentage of any location. The other results were close to the overall figures.

In Saginaw, there was very little variation in the data from the overall results.

A somewhat higher percentage of persons in Traverse City selected the "somewhat aware" response. Specifically, on the Pre-Q, 58% (N = 30) and on the Post-Q, 61% (N = 11) answered in this manner.

In Table 26 the responses by occupational groups are presented. Again, the majority of responses in most groups were in the "somewhat aware" category. The law enforcement group revealed the highest percentage of responses in the "very aware" category--63% (N = 33) on the Pre-Q and 60% (N = 18) on the Post-Q. The

TABLE 25.--Personal Awareness of Traffic Safety Needs by Location.
QUESTION 4: How aware are you personally of your community's major traffic safety problems or needs?

	N		Not Really Aware				Somewhat Aware				Very Aware				No Response			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	24	5	9	0	0	29	50	13	54	24	41	11	46	-	-	1	-
Muskegon	37	19	5	14	1	5	21	57	8	42	11	30	10	53	-	-	-	-
Saginaw	84	32	4	5	2	6	45	54	15	47	35	42	15	47	-	-	-	-
Traverse City	52	18	4	8	0	0	30	58	11	61	18	35	7	39	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	231	93	18	8	3	3	125	54	47	51	88	38	43	56	-	-	-	-

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

TABLE 26.--Personal Awareness of Traffic Safety Needs by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 4: How aware are you personally of your community's major traffic safety problems or needs?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Not Really Aware				Somewhat Aware				Very Aware				No Response			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	12	2	8	0	0	11	42	6	50	13	50	6	50	-	-	-	-
Education Profession	13	9	3	23	0	0	8	62	5	56	2	15	4	44	-	-	-	-
Enforcement	52	30	1	2	0	0	18	35	12	40	33	63	18	60	-	-	-	-
Business	64	20	7	11	2	10	44	69	14	70	13	20	4	20	-	-	-	-
City-County Official	38	12	1	3	0	0	22	58	5	42	15	39	7	58	-	-	-	-
Courts/Health	13	6	1	8	1	17	7	54	4	67	5	38	0	0	-	-	1	16
Private Citizen	11	2	1	9	0	0	7	64	1	50	3	27	1	50	-	-	-	-

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

education group had the highest percentage of responses on the Pre-Q in the "not really aware" category--23% (N = 3). However, none of the respondents in this group chose this answer on the Post-Q. The business group had the highest percentage of responses in the "somewhat aware" category, i.e., 69% (N = 44) on the Pre-Q and 70% (N = 14) on the Post-Q.

Official Awareness of Problems/Needs

Question 5 asked the respondent, "Do you feel that state officials are generally aware of your community's problems or needs?" The responses to this item are presented in Tables 27 and 28.

Table 27 indicates that of a total of 232 responses on the Pre-Q, 85 or 37% indicated a yes answer; however, this figure increased to 57% (N = 55) on the Post-Q. Thirty-six percent (N = 84) checked a don't know (or no answer) response on the Pre-Q. The percentage decreased to 26% (N = 25) on the Post-Q.

Data from the Benton Harbor meeting, also presented in Table 27, shows that 45% (N = 26) answered yes on the Pre-Q; 52% (N = 13) responded in a similar manner on the Post-Q. Those responding with a no answer on the Pre-Q amounted to 22% (N = 13); 24% (N = 6) answered no on the Post-Q. The percentage not answering (or don't know) dropped from 33% (N = 19) to 24% (N = 6).

From the Muskegon conference, only 19% (N = 7) stated yes on the Pre-Q, but this figure increased to 42% (N = 8), or more than double, on the Post-Q. A high percentage also said they didn't know (or didn't answer)--54% (N = 20) on the Pre-Q and 47% (N = 9) on the Post-Q.

TABLE 27.--Official Awareness of Problems/Needs by Location.
QUESTION 5: Do you feel that state officials are generally aware of your community's problems or needs?

	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	26	45	13	52	13	22	6	24	19	33	6	24
Muskegon	37	19	7	19	8	42	10	27	2	11	20	54	9	47
Saginaw	84	32	31	37	22	69	19	23	4	13	34	40	6	19
Traverse City	53	20	21	40	12	60	21	40	4	20	11	21	4	20
TOTAL	232	96	85	37	55	57	63	27	16	17	84	36	25	26

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

In Saginaw, the yes responses increased from 37% (N = 31) on the Pre-Q to 69% (N = 22) on the Post-Q. The no responses dropped from 23% (N = 19) on the Pre-Q to 13% (N = 4) on the Post-Q. Again, a fairly large percent said they didn't know (or didn't respond)--40% (N = 34) on the Pre-Q and 19% (N = 6) on the Post-Q.

The last part of Table 27 shows the tabulated responses from the Traverse City questionnaires. It can be seen that there was an increase in yes responses--from 40% (N = 21) on the Pre-Q to 60% (N = 12) on the Post-Q. The percent of no responses was cut in half--from 40% (N = 21) on the Pre-Q to 20% (N = 4) on the Post-Q.

Table 28 summarizes the responses by occupation/profession and indicates that the education group (teachers, administrators, etc.) had the highest percent of yes answers on both questionnaires--54% (N = 7) on the Pre-Q and 80% (N = 8) on the Post-Q. The numbers are quite small, however.

It should also be noted that the two groups with the larger N's (enforcement and business) had fairly consistent responses, both groups indicating 38% yes on the Pre-Q and 57% and 60%, respectively, on the Post-Q. The yes responses from city-county officials were also closely in line with the engineering group.

Community Concern for Traffic Safety

Question 6 attempted to learn how the participants felt about the problem of traffic crashes in their community compared to other issues or concerns. The question asked, "How would you rank the problem of traffic accidents in your community compared

TABLE 28.--Official Awareness of Problems/Needs by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 5: Do you feel that state officials are generally aware of your community's problems or needs?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	27	12	9	33	8	67	8	30	3	25	10	37	1	8
Education Profession	13	10	7	54	8	80	2	15	2	20	4	31	0	0
Enforcement	52	30	20	38	17	57	17	33	5	17	15	29	8	27
Business	64	20	24	38	12	60	16	25	2	10	24	38	6	30
City-County Official	38	12	16	42	8	67	11	29	1	8	11	29	3	25
Courts-Health	13	6	2	15	2	33	4	31	1	17	7	54	3	50
Private Citizen	11	2	4	36	0	0	3	27	1	50	4	36	1	50

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

to other problems?" The respondent was directed to choose one of four possible answers. The results are presented in Tables 29 and 30.

Table 29 shows that overall most persons felt that the problem of traffic accidents in their area ranked "low" compared to other problems. Specifically, 57% (N = 130) chose this response on the Pre-Q and 53% (N = 49) on the Post-Q. The category receiving the next highest number of responses was "high" with 34% (N = 78) and 30% (N = 28), respectively, on the Pre-Q and Post-Q.

The results of the data tabulation in Benton Harbor indicate a pattern nearly identical to the overall figures. Very few persons indicated that they felt the problem ranked either "very low" or "very high." This latter pattern was also consistent with the overall results.

A somewhat higher percentage of respondents at the Muskegon conference chose the "low" answer--68% on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q. Also, fewer persons selected the "high" response, 27% (N = 10) on the Pre-Q and 16% (N = 3) on the Post-Q.

In Saginaw, a slightly higher number of persons selected the "very low" answer--7% (N = 6) and 9% (N = 3) on the Pre-Q and Post-Q, respectively. Other figures were fairly consistent with the overall results.

In Traverse City, the most discernible result was the high percentage of persons indicating they felt the problem of accidents was a "very high" priority, at least on the Post-Q, 24% (N = 4)

TABLE 29.--Community Concern for Traffic Safety by Location.
QUESTION 6: How would you rank the problem of traffic accidents in your community compared to other problems?

			Very Low				Low				High				Very High			
	N		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	57	24	2	4	2	8	32	56	13	54	20	35	7	29	3	5	2	8
Muskegon	37	19	1	3	1	5	25	68	13	68	10	27	3	16	1	3	2	11
Saginaw	83	32	6	7	3	8	48	58	15	47	26	31	13	41	3	4	1	3
Traverse City	51	17	2	4	0	0	25	49	8	47	22	43	5	29	2	4	4	24
TOTAL	228	92	11	5	6	7	130	57	49	53	78	34	28	30	9	4	9	10

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire

chose this response. The other figures were close to the overall results.

Considering the various occupational groups (Table 30), the law enforcement group had the highest number of "very low" responses--10% (N = 5) on the Pre-Q and 14% (N = 4) on the Post-Q. However, this group also had a nearly equal number choosing the "very high" response--12% (N = 6) on the Pre-Q and 10% (N = 3) on the Post-Q. The education group had the highest percentage response on this item with 33% (N = 3) on the Post-Q. This group also had the highest percentage response to the "high" category, 62% (N = 8) on the Pre-Q.

Most answers were in either the "low" or "high" category. There were also 17 questionnaires (combined) which fell into the "unknown" category where no occupation or profession was listed.

Comparison of Community Traffic Accident Problems

The responses to Question 7, "How would you compare your community's traffic accident problem with neighboring communities of similar size?" are displayed in Tables 31 and 32.

Table 31 shows overall that most respondents, 65% (N = 150) on the Pre-Q and 67% (N = 64) on the Post-Q, felt that their local traffic accident problems were "about the same" as in similar communities. Fourteen percent (N = 33) of the respondents on the Pre-Q stated they believed their problems were "worse than most," and 13% (N = 12) chose this response on the Post-Q. A nearly equal

TABLE 30.--Community Concern for Traffic Safety by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 6: How would you rank the problem of traffic accidents in your community compared to other problems (e.g., crime, housing, etc.)?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Very Low				Low				High				Very High			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	25	12	1	4	0	0	17	68	6	50	7	28	4	33	0	0	2	17
Education Profession	13	9	0	0	0	0	5	38	3	33	8	62	3	33	0	0	3	33
Enforcement	51	29	5	10	4	14	24	47	14	48	16	31	8	28	6	12	3	10
Business	64	20	3	5	1	5	42	66	11	55	19	29	8	40	0	0	0	0
City-County Official	38	12	2	5	0	0	22	58	9	75	12	32	3	25	2	5	0	0
Courts/Health	12	5	0	0	0	0	5	42	4	80	6	50	1	20	1	8	0	0
Private Citizen	11	2	0	0	0	0	6	55	1	50	5	45	0	0	0	0	1	50

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

TABLE 31.--Comparison of Community Traffic Accident Problems by Location.
QUESTION 7: How would you compare your community's traffic accident problem with neighboring communities of similar size?

			Worse Than Most				About the Same				Better Than Most				No Answer or Don't Know			
	N		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	10	17	2	8	36	62	17	68	11	19	4	16	1	2	2	8
Muskegon	37	19	2	5	1	5	29	78	12	63	5	14	5	26	1	3	1	5
Saginaw	84	33	11	13	5	15	53	63	24	73	12	14	3	9	8	10	1	3
Traverse City	53	18	10	19	4	22	32	60	11	61	6	11	2	11	5	9	1	6
TOTAL	232	95	33	14	12	13	150	65	64	67	34	15	14	15	15	7	5	5

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

number said they felt that their problems were actually "better than most."

The data from the Benton Harbor conference indicate a pattern similar to the overall results. Some 62% (N = 36) on the Pre-Q stated "about the same." This percentage increased to 68% (N = 17) on the Post-Q.

Table 31 also indicates that at the Muskegon location, a somewhat higher percent of respondents on the Pre-Q, 78% (N = 29), stated their problems were "about the same." However, this figure decreased to 63% (N = 12) on the Post-Q. The results of the Post-Q also indicated that 26% (N = 5) felt that their problems were "better than most." This was the highest percentage of any location.

In Saginaw, the results were also very close to the overall figures. Some 63% (N = 53) on the Pre-Q stated "about the same." This figure increased to 73% (N = 24) on the Post-Q.

The Traverse City results were also only slightly different from the overall totals. This location did, however, indicate the highest percentage, 22% (N = 4), of those stating they felt their area was "worse than most."

Considering this question on the basis of occupational groups (Table 32), on the Pre-Q, the courts-health group had the highest percentage of respondents stating they felt their problems were "worse than most," i.e., 43% (N = 6). However, no one in this group chose this response on the Post-Q. The engineering group had the lowest percentage of answers in this category, with 8% (N = 2) on the Pre-Q and 9% (N = 1) on the Post-Q. The majority of the

TABLE 32.--Comparison of Community Traffic Accident Problems by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 7: How would you compare your community's traffic accident problem with neighboring communities of similar size?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Worse Than Most				About the Same				Better Than Most				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	11	2	8	1	9	17	65	10	91	4	15	0	0	3	12	0	0
Education Profession	13	9	2	15	1	11	9	69	7	78	2	15	0	0	0	0	1	11
Enforcement	52	30	11	21	6	20	27	52	16	53	12	23	7	23	2	4	1	3
Business	64	20	9	14	3	15	42	66	15	75	8	13	1	5	5	8	1	5
City-County Official	38	13	1	3	0	0	29	76	9	69	7	18	4	31	1	3	0	0
Courts/Health	14	6	6	43	0	0	6	43	3	50	0	0	1	17	2	14	2	33
Private Citizen	11	3	2	18	1	33	8	72	2	67	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire

respondents in each group, with the exception of the courts/health group, stated they believed that their problems were "about the same" as those in other, similar-sized communities.

Perception of Local Traffic Safety Programs

Question 8 sought to obtain information on how thoroughly respondents perceived the nature and extent of local traffic safety efforts. The item asked, "Generally, how do you perceive the status of traffic safety activities or programs in your community?" Four possible choices were offered.

As can be seen in Table 33, overall most respondents felt that activities or programs were "quite limited." Specifically, on the Pre-Q, 56% (N = 130), indicated this choice and 59% (N = 56) on the Post-Q. Very few persons felt that programs were "comprehensive" (Pre-Q--3%, N = 6; Post-Q--2%, N = 2).

In Benton Harbor, 59% (N = 34) on the Pre-Q felt that programs were "quite limited," and on the Post-Q, 64% (N = 16) chose this response. Also, on the Pre-Q, 14% (N = 8) said there was "no visible effort" and only 2% (N = 1) stated that programs were "well developed" and "comprehensive." There was little change in these figures on the Post-Q.

Nineteen percent (N = 7) of those responding to this question on the Pre-Q in Muskegon stated that they saw "no visible effort." This was the highest percentage of any location. Also, 74% (N = 14) on the Post-Q stated that programs were "quite limited." This figure was also the highest of any location.

TABLE 33.--Perception of Local Traffic Safety Programs by Location.
QUESTION 8: Generally, how do you perceive the status of traffic safety activities or programs in your community?

	N		No Visible Effort				Quite Limited				Reasonably Adequate				Comprehensive			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	8	14	3	12	34	59	16	64	15	26	4	16	1	2	0	0
Muskegon	37	19	7	19	1	5	19	51	14	74	9	24	3	16	0	0	0	0
Saginaw	84	33	14	17	2	6	46	55	14	42	20	24	14	42	1	1	1	3
Traverse City	53	18	7	13	2	11	31	58	12	67	11	21	3	17	4	8	1	6
TOTAL	232	95	36	16	8	8	130	56	56	59	55	24	24	25	6	3	2	2

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

In Saginaw, on the Post-Q, 42% (N = 14) felt that programs were "quite limited," which was a decrease from 55% (N = 46) on the Pre-Q. This location also had the highest percent response to the third choice--"reasonably adequate"--with 42% (N = 14). Twenty-four percent (N = 20) had marked this answer on the Pre-Q.

Finally, in Traverse City, 58% (N = 31) on the Pre-Q felt that activities were "quite limited"--this figure increased to 67% (N = 12) on the Post-Q. The other figures were similar to the overall results, however, this location did show the highest percentage of responses to the last choice--i.e., "well developed . . . comprehensive."

Table 34 presents the results of the data with respect to occupational groups. It is noted that most persons felt that programs were "quite limited" on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q. The next highest response chosen was "reasonably adequate." The courts/health group had the highest percentage response to the choice--"no visible effort"--on the Pre-Q at 33% (N = 5). However, no one from this group chose this response on the Post-Q. The engineering group evidenced the highest percentage responses to the final item--"well developed . . . comprehensive" with 9% (N = 2) and 8% (N = 1), respectively, on the Pre-Q and Post-Q, choosing this answer.

Annual Costs of Accidents

Question 9 asked each respondent, "Have you ever seen an estimate of the annual cost of traffic accidents to your community?"

TABLE 34.--Perception of Local Traffic Safety Programs by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 8: Generally, how do you perceive the status or traffic safety activities of programs in your community?

Occupation/ Profession	N		No Visible Effort				Quite Limited				Reasonably Adequate				Comprehensive			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	22	12	4	18	1	8	13	59	7	58	7	32	3	25	2	9	1	8
Education Profession	12	10	2	17	1	10	6	50	4	40	3	25	5	50	1	8	0	0
Enforcement	52	30	7	13	3	10	32	62	21	70	9	17	5	17	1	2	0	0
Business	65	19	9	14	2	11	41	63	13	68	14	22	4	21	0	0	0	0
City-County Official	37	12	5	14	0	0	18	49	4	33	12	32	6	50	1	3	1	8
Courts/Health	15	6	5	33	0	0	5	33	3	50	4	27	1	17	0	0	0	0
Private Citizen	11	3	1	9	0	0	7	64	3	100	2	18	0	0	1	9	0	0

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

Table 35 presents the summary of responses by location. From 230 responses, only 10% (N = 24) answered that they had seen such an estimate. This increased to 27% (N = 26) on the Post-Q, however. A very low percent failed to answer the question or marked that they didn't know--2% (N = 4) and 3% (N = 3), respectively.

In Benton Harbor, responses were quite consistent with the overall figures, i.e., 10% (N = 6) answered yes on the Pre-Q and 24% (N = 6) answered yes on the Post-Q.

Likewise, responses tabulated from Muskegon indicated 11% (N = 4) yes responses on the Pre-Q and 21% (N = 4) on the Post-Q.

In Saginaw, 17% (N = 14) answered yes on the Pre-Q, a figure that increased to 47% (N = 15) on the Post-Q. These were the highest percentage figures of any location for this item.

In Traverse City, no one responded yes to this question on the Pre-Q; thus, 100% (N = 53) answered no. On the Post-Q one respondent checked yes (5%) and 89% (N = 17) answered no.

Considering this item on the basis of occupational group (Table 36), on the Pre-Q the enforcement group lead all others with the largest percent of yes answers--17% (N = 9). The engineering group had the smallest percentage responses on the Pre-Q--4% (N = 1).

On the Post-Q, the business group had the highest percent of yes responses--40% (N = 8). Again, the engineering group had the lowest percentage of yes responses--8% (N = 1).

Question 9 also asked the respondent to state an estimate of accident costs. A fill-in blank was provided following the statement, "If yes, give figure ___." Initially, the purpose of asking for this

TABLE 35.--Annual Cost of Accidents by Location.
QUESTION 9: Have you ever seen an estimate of the annual cost of traffic accidents to your community?

Location	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	6	10	6	24	52	90	18	72	0	0	1	4
Muskegon	37	19	4	11	4	21	32	86	15	79	1	3	0	0
Saginaw	82	32	14	17	15	47	65	79	16	50	3	4	1	3
Traverse City	53	19	0	0	1	5	53	100	17	89	0	0	1	5
TOTAL	230	95	24	10	26	27	202	88	66	69	4	2	3	3

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire

TABLE 36.--Annual Costs of Accidents by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 9: Have you ever seen an estimate of the annual cost of traffic accidents to your community?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	12	1	4	1	8	25	96	11	92	0	0	0	0
Education Profession	13	9	1	8	3	33	12	92	6	66	0	0	0	0
Enforcement	52	30	9	17	7	23	42	81	21	70	1	2	2	7
Business	64	20	6	9	8	40	58	91	12	60	0	0	0	0
City-County Official	38	12	2	5	4	33	34	89	8	66	2	5	0	0
Courts/Health	14	6	1	7	2	33	13	93	3	50	0	0	1	17
Private Citizen	11	3	1	9	1	33	10	91	2	66	0	0	0	0

Key: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

additional information was to have a measure for determining whether the respondent really had knowledge of this figure. Overall, on the Pre-Q, only 5 respondents actually provided an answer to this item, and all were from the Saginaw area; and on the Post-Q, seven responses were noted. However, it should be pointed out that local accident costs were not provided at any of the meetings. Thus, respondents should not be expected to know this information. Table 37 presents the individual responses to this item by location.

Local Expenditures for Accident Prevention

The responses to Question 10, which asked, "Do you have any idea how much is spent on an annual basis for accident prevention and traffic safety in your community?" are presented in Tables 38 and 39. A yes or no response was possible.

Table 38 shows that overall, on the Pre-Q, 90% (or 209 of 232 total responses) stated they did not know how much was spent; 6% (N = 15) answered yea. A few of those who responded with a yes answer also indicated, in a space provided, what they thought the amount was. No attempt was made to check these figures with the "official" estimate. On the Post-Q, only 6% (N = 6) answered yes; 89% (N = 84) stated no.

Table 38 also shows that at the Benton Harbor conference, on the Pre-Q, 90% (N = 52) responded with a no answer; 7% (N = 4) checked no. However, 96% (N = 23) stated no on the Post-Q and no one checked yes; one person failed to answer the item.

TABLE 37.--Annual Costs of Accidents: Estimates Provided by Respondents.
QUESTION 9: Have you ever seen an estimate of the annual cost of traffic accidents to your community?

Questionnaire	Benton Harbor	Muskegon	Saginaw	Traverse City
Pre-Conference	N = 58 Not Stated = 58 Responses: None	N = 37 Not Stated = 37 Responses: None	N = 84 Not Stated = 79 Responses: 1. $1.3 million 2. $ 25,000 3. $200,000 4. $821 million 5. $1.1 million	N = 53 Not Stated = 53 Responses: None
Post-Conference	N = 25 Not Stated = 23 Responses: 1. $417,210 2. $50 million	N = 19 Not Stated = 18 Responses: 1. $20,000	N = 32 Not Stated = 29 Responses: 1. $100,000 2. $80 million 3. $2 million	N = 19 Not Stated = 18 Responses: 1. $18,900,000

TABLE 38.--Local Expenditures for Accident Prevention by Location.
QUESTION 10: Do you have any idea how much is spent on an annual basis for accident prevention and traffic safety in your community?

	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	24	4	7	0	0	52	90	23	96	2	3	1	4
Muskegon	37	19	3	8	1	5	32	86	18	95	2	5	0	0
Saginaw	84	32	6	7	4	13	74	88	26	81	4	5	2	6
Traverse City	53	19	2	4	1	5	51	96	17	89	0	0	1	5
TOTAL	232	94	15	6	6	6	209	90	84	89	8	3	4	4

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire

TABLE 39.--Local Expenditures for Accident Prevention by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 10: Do you have any idea how much is spent on an annual basis for accident prevention and traffic safety in your community?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	12	2	8	2	17	23	88	10	83	1	4	0	0
Education Profession	13	9	1	8	0	0	12	92	8	89	0	0	1	11
Enforcement	52	30	2	4	0	0	47	90	28	93	3	6	2	7
Business	64	20	1	2	2	10	63	98	18	90	0	0	0	0
City-County Official	38	12	8	21	2	17	27	71	10	83	3	8	0	0
Courts-Health	14	6	1	7	0	0	13	93	5	83	0	0	1	17
Private Citizen	11	3	0	0	0	0	10	91	3	100	1	9	0	0

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

Data tabulated from the Muskegon meeting shows that, on the Pre-Q, 86% (N = 32) persons said they had no idea of local expenditures and only 8% (N = 3) stated yes. The percent of no answers increased to 95% (N = 18) on the Post-Q, with 5% (N = 1) answering yes.

The responses compiled from the Saginaw questionnaires showed only slight changes from the norm. Some 88% (N = 74) answered no on the Pre-Q and 7% (N = 6) checked yes. On the Post-Q, 81% (N = 26) stated no, with 13% (N = 4) providing a yes answer. This was the highest percentage of yes responses of any location on the Post-Questionnaire.

In Traverse City, on the Pre-Q, 96% (N = 51) answered no to this question. This was the highest percentage of no responses from any location. On the Post-Q, this figure dropped to 89% (N = 17).

In Table 39 the responses by occupational groups are presented. It is evident from the results that most respondents were not aware of local expenditures for traffic safety. The business profession had the highest percentage of "no" responses on the Pre-Q with 98% (N = 63). On the Post-Q, the private citizen group had the highest percentage of "no" responses--100% (N = 3). City/county officials ranked highest on the "yes" scale with 21% (N = 8) on the Pre-Q and 17% (N = 2) on the Post-Q. The engineering/planning group also had 17% (N = 2) "yes" responses on the Post-Q.

As in question 9, the respondent was asked to provide an estimate of local spending for accident prevention and traffic safety. A fill-in blank was provided--"If yes, give estimate_____."

Very few respondents completed this part of item 10--11 on the Pre-Q and 5 on the Post-Q. Answers ranged from $0 to $600,000.

Ease and Expense of Solving Accident Problems

Tables 40 and 41 present the data from question 11 which asked the respondent, "Do you believe that most traffic accident problems (or potential problems) can be identified and solved rather easily and at minimal cost?" The item could be answered "yes," "no," or "don't know."

Of 232 overall responses on the Pre-Q, some 48% (N = 111) checked a no answer. The rest of the responses tabulated were nearly equally split between the yes response (25%, N = 57) and don't know (28%, N = 64). (Refer to Table 40.)

Table 40 also presents the total responses (N = 95) to this question from the Post-Q. The figures tabulated closely corresponded to those from the Pre-Q. The percent of no responses increased to 52% (N = 49), whereas the other categories decreased somewhat.

The Benton Harbor results are similar to the overall Pre-Q results. Forty-eight percent (N = 28) answered no; 19% (N = 11) answered yes; and 33% (N = 19) stated don't know. On the Post-Q, 40% (N = 10) answered no; 28% (N = 7) answered yes; and 32% (N = 8) answered don't know.

In Muskegon, on the Pre-Q, the percentage of no responses was 62% (N = 23), the highest of any location. The percent of yes responses was also highest in Muskegon--32% (N = 12). On the Post-Q, however, the percentage answering no dropped to 37% (N = 7) which was the lowest of any location.

TABLE 40.--Ease and Expense of Solving Accident Problems by Location.
QUESTION 11: Do you believe that most traffic accident problems (or potential problems) can be identified and solved rather easily and at minimal cost?

	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	11	19	7	28	28	48	10	40	19	33	8	32
Muskegon	37	19	12	32	6	32	23	62	7	37	2	5	6	32
Saginaw	84	32	18	21	5	16	37	44	20	63	29	35	7	22
Traverse City	53	19	16	30	3	16	23	43	12	63	14	26	4	21
TOTAL	232	95	57	25	21	22	111	48	49	52	64	28	25	26

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

TABLE 41.--Ease and Expense of Solving Accident Problems by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 11: Do you believe that most traffic accident problems (or potential problems) can be identified and solved rather easily and at minimal cost?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	12	5	19	1	8	16	62	9	75	5	19	2	17
Education Profession	13	8	3	23	2	25	4	31	5	63	6	46	1	13
Enforcement	52	31	16	31	8	26	21	40	15	48	15	29	8	26
Business	63	20	17	27	5	20	26	41	11	55	20	32	4	20
City-County Official	38	12	8	21	2	17	21	55	6	50	9	24	4	33
Courts/Health	15	6	3	20	1	17	9	60	0	0	3	20	5	83
Private Citizen	11	3	4	36	1	33	5	45	1	33	2	18	1	33

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

The conference in Saginaw produced the results also shown in Table 40. On the Pre-Q, 44% (N = 37) answered no; 21% (N = 18) answered yes; and 35% (N = 29) stated don't know. The percentage of no responses increased to 63% (N = 20) on the Post-Q and the percent of yes and don't know answers both decreased.

Finally, in Traverse City, on the Pre-Q, 30% (N = 16) answered yes; 43% (N = 23) answered no; and 26% (N = 14) stated don't know. On the Post-Q, only 16% (N = 3) answered yes; but 63% (N = 12) stated no (equal to the high percent noted in the Saginaw results).

Table 41 indicates that of the occupational groups, the private citizen group had the highest percent of yes responses on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q, 36% (N = 4) and 33% (N = 1), respectively. The numbers (N) were very small, however.

The engineering group had the highest percent of no responses on the Pre-Q with 62% (N = 16); they also had the highest percentage on the Post-Q at 75% (N = 9).

The question also asked the respondents to indicate how they felt local traffic accident problems could be solved. A fill-in blank was provided.

On the Pre-Q, 49 persons indicated their thoughts on this issue. This was 21% of the total number of respondents. On the Post-Q, 16 persons or 17% of the total number of respondents answered this part of question 11.

For the most part, the responses on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q indicated that "more," "better," or "increased" enforcement or "improved" traffic engineering were the most appropriate ways of dealing with local accident problems. Several related examples were: "educate the police on the problem"; "eliminate yield signs"; "strict enforcement and lower speed limits in problem areas." Several respondents made the comment that the solution(s) to the problem was known, but that costs for correcting were too high.

Awareness of Federal Program Assistance

In an attempt to obtain information regarding the participants' knowledge of federal programs in the area of traffic safety, question 12 asked, "Are you aware of federal assistance programs for dealing with local traffic safety problems?" The results are indicated in Tables 42 and 43.

As Table 42 shows, most persons were unaware of assistance programs. Overall, on the Pre-Q, only 30% (N = 69) answered yes on this item; 69% (N = 159) stated no. There was some increase in the percent of yes responses on the Post-Q, however, with 39% (N = 37) answering in this manner; 56% (N = 53) still said they were not aware.

Those completing the Pre-Q in Benton Harbor and answering yes to this question represented 29% (N = 17); 71% (N = 41) checked a no answer. On the Post-Q, those answering yes represented 33% (N = 8); again, however, 63% (N = 15) stated no on this question.

TABLE 42.--Awareness of Federal Program Assistance by Location.
QUESTION 12: Are you aware of federal assistance programs for dealing with local traffic safety problems?

Location	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	24	17	29	8	33	41	71	15	63	0	0	1	4
Muskegon	37	19	7	19	6	32	29	78	13	68	1	3	0	0
Saginaw	84	32	31	37	15	47	51	61	15	47	2	2	2	6
Traverse City	52	19	14	27	8	42	38	73	10	53	0	0	1	5
TOTALS	231	94	69	30	37	39	159	69	53	56	3	1	4	4

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

In Muskegon, on the Pre-Q, only 19% (N = 7) stated yes--the lowest percentage of any location; 78% (N = 29) stated no, the highest percent of no answers. The Post-Q results were quite different, however, with 32% (N = 6) yes answers and 68% (N = 13) no responses.

Data from the Saginaw conference indicates that there was a higher awareness of federal programs. Some 37% (N = 31) answered yes to this item on the Pre-Q and 61% (N = 51) answered no. On the Post-Q, 47% (N = 15) answered yes--the highest percentage of any location; likewise the percent of persons answering no was the lowest at 47% (N = 15).

Observing the responses from the Traverse City meeting it is noted that on the Pre-Q, 27% (N = 14) checked a yes answer; 73% (N = 38) stated no. There was some improvement on the Post-Q with 42% (N = 8) answering yes and 53% (N = 10) responding with a no answer.

Insofar as occupational groups are concerned, it is apparent from the data shown in Table 43 that, on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q, the "engineering" group was most aware of federal assistance programs. Their yes responses represented 73% (N = 19) and 83% (N = 10), respectively, on the two questionnaires. The "business" and "courts-health" groups had the lowest percent of yes answers on the Pre-Q with 14% in each instance.

This question also provided the respondent with an opportunity to indicate where information on funding was obtained. A

TABLE 43.--Awareness of Federal Program Assistance by Occupational Groups.
QUESTION 12: Are you aware of federal assistance programs for dealing with local traffic safety problems?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	12	19	73	10	83	7	27	2	17	0	0	0	0
Education Profession	13	9	3	23	3	33	10	77	5	56	0	0	1	11
Enforcement	52	30	17	33	13	43	34	65	15	50	1	2	2	7
Business	65	20	9	14	4	20	56	86	16	80	0	0	0	0
City-County Official	37	12	11	30	5	42	24	65	7	58	2	5	0	0
Courts-Health	14	6	2	14	0	0	12	86	5	83	0	0	1	17
Private Citizen	11	3	2	18	1	9	9	82	2	67	0	0	0	0

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

fill-in space was provided following the statement--"If yes, from whom? _____."

Thirty-nine persons completed this part of question 12 on the Pre-Q (17% of the total N); likewise, 28 persons (29%) completed the fill-in on the Post-Q. Combining the responses from both questionnaires, several sources were indicated as noted in Table 44.

TABLE 44.--Sources of Federal Program Assistance as Indicated by Conference Participants.

Source	Number (N)
Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning	21
Michigan Department of Transportation	11
U.S. Department of Transportation	12
Michigan State Police	3
All Other	22

As can be observed, 21 persons stated that they became aware of federal programs assistance through the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning. This choice was indicated more than any of the others on both the Pre-Q and the Post-Q.

Awareness of Specific Local Projects

Question 13 related very closely to the previous question. The participants were asked, "Are you aware of any local traffic safety projects or programs which have received federal assistance?"

As noted in Tables 45 and 46, on the Pre-Q, 29% (N = 68) stated that they were aware of such a local project. Some 68% (N = 157) answered no. Only 3% (N = 7) did not answer the question. When the Post-Q results were examined, a slight increase in the percentage of yes answers was evident--32% (N = 30). The percentage of no answers dropped to 63% (N = 59).

The Benton Harbor results on the Pre-Q closely paralleled the overall figures, i.e., 29% (N = 17) answered yes and 69% (N = 40) stated no on this item. On the Post-Q, there was a slightly lower percent of yes answers at 25% (N = 6). The no responses increased to 71% (N = 17).

In Muskegon, 33% (N = 12) answered yes to this question on the Pre-Q--higher than any other location. However, 69% (N = 25) also stated no, which was one percentage point higher than the overall percentage. The number of non-respondents on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q was zero.

The results from the Saginaw conference, at least on the Pre-Q, were also close to the overall results. Twenty-nine percent (N = 24) stated yes and 64% (N = 54) answered no. However, on the Post-Q, 41% (N = 13) indicated a yes answer, the highest percentage of any of the conferences; just half, 50% (N = 16) answered no. Saginaw also had the largest number and percent of "no answer" responses.

The Traverse City data was most similar to the overall results. On the Post-Q in particular, the results were exactly parallel to the overall figures in each category.

TABLE 45.--Awareness of Specific Local Projects by Location.
QUESTION 13: Are you aware of any local traffic safety projects or programs which have received federal assistance?

	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	24	17	29	6	25	40	69	17	71	1	2	1	4
Muskegon	36	19	12	33	5	26	25	69	14	74	0	0	0	0
Saginaw	84	32	24	29	13	41	54	64	16	50	6	7	3	9
Traverse City	53	19	15	28	6	32	38	72	12	63	0	0	1	5
TOTAL	231	94	68	29	30	32	157	68	59	63	7	3	5	5

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

TABLE 46.--Awareness of Specific Local Projects by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 13: Are you aware of any local traffic safety projects or programs which have received federal assistance?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	13	17	65	8	62	8	31	5	38	1	4	0	0
Education Profession	14	9	4	29	3	33	10	71	5	56	0	0	1	11
Enforcement	52	29	18	35	11	38	33	63	17	59	1	2	1	3
Business	65	19	6	9	2	11	58	89	15	79	1	2	2	11
City-County Official	38	12	15	39	2	17	20	53	10	83	3	8	0	0
Courts-Health	14	7	3	21	2	29	11	79	4	57	0	0	1	14
Private Citizen	9	3	1	11	1	33	7	78	2	67	1	11	0	0

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

In Table 46, which displays these data by occupation, it is seen that the engineering group was "most aware" of specific local projects with 65% (N = 17) and 62% (N = 8) yes answers respectively on the Pre- and Post-Q. The "business" group had the lowest percentage of yes answers with only 9% (N = 6); this percentage did increase to 11% (N = 2) on the Post-Q, however.

Fifty-five (55) persons, or 24% of the total number of respondents on the Pre-Q, also completed the fill-in section of this item. To support their answer, respondents were asked to describe any local traffic safety projects or programs which had received federal assistance. On the Post-Q, 24 persons, or 25% of the total N completed this part of Question 13.

For purposes of summarizing the data, the responses on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q were arranged into three categories--engineering related projects, enforcement programs, and "other" types of local highway safety programs. Table 47 indicates the number of responses in each category (all locations combined).

TABLE 47.--Categorical Identification of Local Federal Assistance Programs.

Category	Pre-Q	Post-Q	Total (N)
Engineering	39	13	52
Enforcement	9	7	16
Other	7	4	11

Key: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire;
Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire

As can be observed, the largest number of responses fell into the "traffic engineering" area; a total of 52 persons provided an answer which indicated their knowledge about traffic safety projects related most directly to some type of engineering function. Several examples of responses were: "pavement markings," "TOPICS" programs, "traffic control signs," and "intersection improvements."

Responsibility for Local Traffic Safety Programs

Question 14 was an open-ended item which asked the respondent, "In your opinion, who do you feel has major responsibility for traffic safety programs in your community?" The question appeared on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q conference questionnaires. The purpose of including this question was to identify any group, profession or agency believed by most respondents to be chiefly responsible for accident prevention or traffic safety at the local level.

Because of the wide variety of responses to this question, a method of categorizing the answers was developed and tables were prepared on the basis of location (and total responses). This was also done on the basis of occupational groups (see Tables 48-51).

The data indicate that most respondents felt that law enforcement officials were primarily responsible for traffic safety programs (Tables 48 and 49). This was evident on both the pre-conference and post-conference questionnaires. Most also felt that it was the responsibility of the local police department. "Government" in general, and local government in particular, received the next highest number of votes on this item.

TABLE 48.--Responsibility for Local Traffic Safety Programs by Location.
QUESTION 14: In your opinion, who do you feel has major responsibility for traffic safety programs in your community?

	Law Enforcement						Government								Highway-Road Dept.					Other			
Location	Local Police	Sheriff	State Police	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL L.E.	Local	County	State	Federal	Courts	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL GOVERNMENT	Traffic Engineer	Local Roads	Co. Road Comm.	State DOT	TOTAL HIGHWAY	Schools	Safety Council	Business/Industry	OTHER
Benton Harbor (N = 57)	25	4	8	2	0	39	16	3	1	1	1	3	2	27	0	0	5	1	6	3	6	1	7
Muskegon (N = 31)	17	2	3	0	0	22	4	1	2	0	0	1	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	4
Saginaw (N = 73)	20	3	7	0	8	38	23	2	3	0	0	2	0	30	12	0	1	5	18	1	2	1	13
Traverse City (N = 46)	13	8	5	4	4	34	6	2	1	0	1	6	0	16	0	1	3	7	11	2	0	0	2
TOTALS	75	17	23	6	12	133	49	8	7	1	2	12	2	81	12	1	10	13	36	7	8	2	26

Pre-conference Questionnaire

TABLE 49.--Responsibility for Local Traffic Safety Programs by Location.
QUESTION 14: In your opinion, who do you feel has major responsibility for traffic safety programs in your community?

	Law Enforcement						Government								Highway-Road Dept.					Other			
Location	Local Police	Sheriff	State Police	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL L.E.	Local	County	State	Federal	Courts	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL GOVERNMENT	Traffic Engineer	Local Roads	Co. Road Comm.	State DOT	TOTAL HIGHWAY	Schools	Safety Councils	Business/Industry	OTHER
Benton Harbor (N = 21)	9	3	4	0	0	16	3	0	2	0	1	1	0	7	2	0	2	1	5	0	2	1	3
Muskegon (N = 17)	12	1	2	1	0	16	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3
Saginaw (N = 29)	13	0	1	0	2	16	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	8	3	0	2	3	8	1	1	0	3
Traverse City (N = 16)	3	5	3	0	1	12	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	3
TOTALS	37	9	10	1	3	60	10	3	4	0	3	2	4	26	6	0	6	5	17	4	3	2	12

Post-conference Questionnaire

On the basis of occupational groups (Tables 50 and 51), most respondents felt that "law enforcement" was primarily responsible for traffic safety. Only the education group and the courts/health group did not rank law enforcement first; on both questionnaires each indicated that "government" was principally responsible.

Need for Improved Management

Question 15 required a yes/no/don't know response to the question, "Do you feel that there is (or may be) a need for improved management or coordination of your community's traffic safety efforts?" The results are shown in Tables 52 and 53.

As can be observed from Table 52, most persons, 60% (N = 139) overall felt that there was (or may be) need for better management; moreover, 35% (N = 78) didn't answer or stated they didn't know. These percentage figures changed only slightly on the Post-Q. Only 6% (N = 15) and 12% (N = 11) respectively answered no to this question.

The highest percent of yes responses was observed in the Benton Harbor data. Here, 71% (N = 41) answered yes on the Pre-Q; 24% (N = 14) stated don't known and 5% (N = 3) said there was no need for improved management. On the Post-Q, 56% (N = 14) said yes; 8% (N = 2) said no, and 36% (N = 9) said they didn't know. This last figure was the highest percent of don't know responses.

Almost half of those individuals who responded to this item on the Pre-Q from the Muskegon area stated that they believed there was room for improved management, although at 49% (N = 18),

TABLE 50.--Responsibility for Local Traffic Safety Programs by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 14: In your opinion, who do you feel has major responsibility for traffic safety programs in your community?

	Law Enforcement						Government								Highway-Road Dept.					Other			
Occupation/ Profession	Local Police	Sheriff	State Police	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL L.E.	Local	County	State	Federal	Courts	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL GOVERNMENT	Traffic Engineer	Local Roads	Co. Road Comm.	State DOT	TOTAL HIGHWAY	Schools	Safety Council	Business/Industry	OTHERS
Engineering / Planning	3	3	0	3	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	1	1	4	1	7	0	2	0	3
Education	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	1
Enforcement	20	2	9	6	0	37	4	2	1	0	0	2	0	9	2	1	1	2	6	0	2	1	4
Business	15	3	2	10	0	30	11	2	0	0	0	10	2	14	3	1	2	4	10	2	3	0	5
City-County Official	14	6	6	0	0	26	7	2	0	0	0	2	0	11	3	0	3	3	9	0	0	0	6
Courts/Health	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Private Citizen	2	1	2	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	2

Pre-conference Questionnaire

TABLE 51.--Responsibility for Local Traffic Safety Programs by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 14: In your opinion, who do you feel has major responsibility for traffic safety programs in your community?

	Law Enforcement						Government								Highway-Road Dept.					Other			
Occupation/ Profession	Local Police	Sheriff	State Police	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL L.E.	Local	County	State	Federal	Courts	Joint Resp.	Not Specified	TOTAL GOVERNMENT	Traffic Engineer	Local Roads	Co. Road Comm.	State DOT	TOTAL HIGHWAY	Schools	Safety Council	Business/Industry	OTHERS
Engineering/ Planning	3	2	1	0	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
Education	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Enforcement	8	0	3	8	1	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	4
Business	5	3	3	0	2	13	0	0	1	0	1	6	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	2
City-County Official	4	3	2	0	1	10	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	1
Courts/Health	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private Citizen	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Post-conference Questionnaire

TABLE 52.--Need for Improved Management by Location.
QUESTION 15: Do you feel that there is (or may be) a need for improved management or coordination of your community's traffic safety efforts?

Location	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	41	71	14	56	3	5	2	8	14	24	9	36
Muskegon	37	19	18	49	10	53	3	8	4	21	16	43	5	26
Saginaw	84	32	50	60	19	59	5	6	4	13	29	35	9	30
Traverse City	53	19	30	57	13	68	4	8	1	5	19	36	5	26
TOTAL	232	95	139	60	56	59	15	6	11	12	78	34	28	29

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

this was the lowest percentage of yes answers. This same group also producted the highest percent of "don't know" answers at 43% (N = 16) on the Pre-Q. On the Post-Q, this group also had the lowest percent of yes answers--53% (N = 10) and, in turn, the highest percent of no answers--21% (N = 4).

In Saginaw, 60% (N = 50) of the respondents on the Pre-Q answered yes to this question. This was the same as the overall figure of yes responses. In the other two categories, the results were similar to the overall totals. There was little change observed in the Post-Q results.

Finally, in considering the results from the Traverse City conference, it was apparent from the table that there was little variation from either the Pre-Q or Post-Q results overall at this location.

Table 53 indicates little variation among the various groups in the percent of yes responses on the Pre-Q. The "lowest ranking" groups were the engineering and private citizens, both at 50%; the courts/health group was high at 71% (N = 10). On the Post-Q, the "city-county official" group demonstrated the most noticeable change from the Pre-Q; from 62% (N = 23) yes responses to 25% (N = 3); from 5% (N = 2) to 25% (N = 3) no responses.

The second part of Question 15 also asked the respondent to suggest how the management or coordination of local traffic safety efforts might be improved. On the Pre-Q, 99 respondents completed this part of Question 15; and, on the Post-Q, 42 respondents had

TABLE 53.--Need for Improved Management by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 15: Do you feel that there is (or may be) a need for improved management or coordination of your community's traffic safety efforts?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	12	13	50	8	67	2	8	1	8	11	42	3	25
Education Profession	13	9	9	69	6	67	0	0	1	11	4	31	2	22
Enforcement	52	30	33	63	21	70	5	10	4	13	14	27	5	17
Business	64	20	40	63	15	75	4	6	1	5	20	31	4	20
City-County Official	37	12	23	62	3	25	2	5	3	25	12	32	6	50
Courts-Health	14	6	10	71	1	17	0	0	0	0	4	29	5	83
Private Citizen	10	3	5	50	3	100	1	10	0	0	4	40	0	0

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

specific suggestions to offer. These numbers represented 43% and 44%, respectively, of the total number of respondents.

From a review of the comments, it was apparent that many persons felt that there was a need for better planning and coordination of scarce resources at the local level. Some suggested that this could best be accomplished through a local safety council or a working committee of some sort to deal with accident problems. It was also frequently noted that both engineering and law enforcement officials should be involved. Typical comments were "more selective enforcement is needed"; "a method is needed to make the public more aware of our problems"; "establish a board with all agencies involved"; and "[we] should work through the local safety council."

Value of Local Traffic Safety Conferences

Question 16 asked each respondent, "Do you feel that a local 'forum-type' discussion of traffic safety issues with state officials can be a beneficial and effective process for developing appropriate preventative measures?" Tables 54 and 55 indicate the results of the data tabulation.

Table 54 shows overall that most persons felt that a local "traffic forum" was a beneficial process--81% (N = 188) responded with a yes answer on the Pre-Q. A similar percentage (N = 77) answered yes to this item on the Post-Q.

TABLE 54.--Value of Local Traffic Safety Conferences by Location.
QUESTION 16: Do you feel that a local "forum-type" discussion of traffic safety issues with the state officials can be a beneficial and effective process for developing appropriate preventative measures?

			Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
	N		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
Location	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	58	25	47	81	22	88	9	16	2	8	2	3	1	4
Muskegon	37	19	29	78	16	84	6	16	2	11	2	5	1	5
Saginaw	84	32	69	82	26	81	9	11	5	16	6	7	1	3
Traverse City	53	19	43	81	13	68	4	8	2	10	6	11	4	21
TOTAL	232	95	188	81	77	81	28	12	11	12	16	7	7	7

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

In Benton Harbor, 81% (N = 47) answered yes on the Pre-Q, a figure which increased to 88% (N = 22) on the Post-Q. This was the highest percentage response on the Post-Q of any location.

Table 54 also indicates that at the Muskegon conference, 78% (N = 29) stated yes to this question on the Pre-Q; 16% (N = 6) answered no. Both figures were slightly above the overall percentages. The Post-Q results were also very similar to the overall results.

At the conference in Saginaw, most respondents, 82% (N = 69), answered yes to this item on the Pre-Q; on the Post-Q, 16% (N = 5) checked a no answer which was the highest percentage of any of the conference locations.

In Traverse City, the most evident change was the decrease in yes responses between the Pre- and Post-Q, from 81% (N = 43) to 68% (N = 13). This location also reported the highest percentage of non-responses, 11% (N = 6) on the Pre-Q and 21% (N = 4) on the Post-Q.

In considering the information in Table 55, it is noted that most persons, in every category, felt that the meetings were useful. In three instances, the percentages increased on the Post-Q; in four categories, however, the percentages actually declined. The "education" group had the highest percent of no answers on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q, at 31% (N = 4) and 22% (N = 2), respectively.

On this question, the respondent was also given the opportunity to explain his "yes" or "no" choice (why or why not). Specifically, on the pre-conference questionnaire 36 (16%)

TABLE 55.--Value of Local Traffic Safety Conferences by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 16: Do you feel that a local "forum-type" discussion of traffic safety issues with state officials can be a beneficial and effective process for developing appropriate preventative measures?

Occupation/ Profession	N		Yes				No				No Answer or Don't Know			
			Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q		Pre-Q		Post-Q	
	Pre-Q	Post-Q	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	26	11	22	85	9	82	2	8	1	9	2	8	1	9
Education Profession	13	9	8	62	6	67	4	31	2	22	1	8	1	11
Enforcement	52	30	45	87	25	83	3	6	5	17	4	8	0	0
Business	64	21	55	86	17	81	6	9	3	14	3	5	1	5
City-County Official	38	12	30	79	11	92	7	18	0	0	1	3	1	8
Courts-Health	14	6	11	79	4	67	2	14	0	0	1	7	2	33
Private Citizen	11	2	9	82	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	18	0	0

KEY: Pre-Q = Pre-conference Questionnaire; Post-Q = Post-conference Questionnaire.

respondents chose to explain their answer. On the Post-Q, 11 (12%) respondents completed this part of question 16. A majority of the comments were positive. Examples were: "the exchange of ideas was good"; "a step forward"; and "[the forum] should enlighten state officials to local problems." Some of those who responded negatively stated such things as: "this type of discussion usually does not get any follow-up action"; "the state doesn't listen"; and "people recognize the problem, but don't know how to organize to accomplish changes."

Overall Value of Forum

Question 17 was included on the post-conference questionnaire (only) in an attempt to identify the participants' attitudes regarding the overall value of the meeting. Six possible responses were provided. One or more of the responses could be checked.

Overall, the greatest number (N = 67) and highest percentage (35%) of respondents chose the answer which indicated that the forum was most valuable as a method for "providing for an exchange of views and opinions of state officials and local leaders." The item checked next most frequently was (N = 46) (24%), "[the forum] increased knowledge about the accident problem." Other summary results were as indicated in Table 56. Only three persons or 2% stated that, "The meeting was not worthwhile." These percentages generally held true for each of the individual meeting locations.

On the basis of occupational groups (Table 57), it can be observed that the highest number and percentages across all groups

TABLE 56.--Overall Value of Forum by Location.
QUESTION 17: Do you believe that the forum which you recently attended was at all valuable in terms of . . . (check one or more).

Location	Total N	Increasing Knowledge About the Accident Problem		Providing Information on Traffic Safety Programs		Increasing Awareness of Federal Funding		Organizing for Community Support and Action		Providing for an Exchange of Views		The Meeting was not Worthwhile	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Benton Harbor	40	7	18	8	20	2	5	4	10	18	45	1	3
Muskegon	42	10	24	10	24	4	10	1	2	16	38	1	2
Saginaw	64	17	27	15	23	10	16	3	5	18	28	1	2
Traverse City	44	12	27	10	27	4	9	3	7	15	34	0	0
TOTAL	190	46	24	43	23	20	11	11	6	67	35	3	2

Post-conference Questionnaire only.

TABLE 57.--Overall Value of Forum by Occupational Group.
QUESTION 17: Do you believe that the forum which you recently attended was at all valuable in terms of . . . (check one or more).

Occupation/ Profession	Total N	Increasing Knowledge About the Accident Problem		Providing Information on Traffic Safety Programs		Increasing Awareness of Federal Funding		Organizing for Community Support and Action		Providing for an Exchange of Views		The Meeting was not Worthwhile	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering/ Planning	21	4	19	7	33	1	5	1	5	7	33	1	5
Education Profession	17	5	29	3	18	2	12	0	0	7	41	0	0
Enforcement	55	6	11	12	22	9	16	1	2	26	47	1	2
Business	40	14	35	10	25	4	10	2	5	9	23	1	3
City-County Official	35	10	29	9	26	3	9	4	11	9	26	0	0
Courts/Health	10	4	40	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	50	0	0
Private Citizen	7	2	29	1	14	0	0	1	14	3	43	0	0

Post-conference Questionnaire only.

TABLE 58.--Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems (Local Level): State Officials Responses.
QUESTION 1: Generally, what do you feel are the major traffic accident problems at the local level?

	Rank								Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Problem Area	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	RV
Lack of Traffic Law Enforcement	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	0	8	4.63
Poor Traffic Engineering	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	7	4.00
Lack of Coordinated Management	3	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	9	6.67
Untrained, Discourteous Drivers	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	7	2.71
Lack of Funds to Implement Programs	0	0	5	1	1	1	0	0	8	5.25
Lack of Good Data on Problems	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	7	6.43
Drinking Drivers	3	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	8	6.00

KEY: RV = Rank Value

were indicated for the following three items: (1) "Increasing knowledge about the accident problem"; (2) "Providing for an exchange of views . . . "; and (3) "Providing information on traffic safety programs."

Comments from Participants

Question 18 was included as a final item on the Post-Q (only) to give participants a further opportunity to express their thoughts about the forums. It was an entirely open-ended item, stating, "Please note below any other comments you have about the meeting: "_____"

A tabulation of the number of responses revealed that 36 persons completed the item, representing approximately 38% of the number of respondents (N = 95).

In Benton Harbor, nine persons completed this item which was 36% of the total. In Muskegon, the number was seven or 37%; in Saginaw, the number was 13 or 41%; and, finally, in Traverse City, the figure was seven or 37% of the total number of respondents.

Figure 1 presents a summary of the responses to question 18 on the basis of location.

Figure 2 presents the comments on this item on the basis of occupation or profession.

Analysis of State Officials Questionnaires

In an attempt to determine the perceptions of selected state-level government officials on local traffic safety issues, a separate questionnaire was developed. This instrument was an abbreviated and

BENTON HARBOR	MUSKEGON	SAGINAW	TRAVERSE CITY
Sec. Austin's speech was most useful part	Some parts were repeats of earlier meetings	Covered quite a lot of information--I was impressed at extent of accident analysis	Will what was said result in positive action . . . ?
Good beginning--too many speakers, too many topics	A good beginning	Low level of meeting was shocking--didn't have top decision-makers there--went through motions only	Well worthwhile
Entertaining, not that informative	Want more details on federal funding	Liked to have broken into smaller discussion groups	Well conducted and organized
Not useful for substance abuse people	Obtained some information--met responsible individuals	Well run. Comprehensive. Jokes in bad taste	Enjoyed meeting--should have had better news media coverage
Community organization session was most useful	Information was exchanged--merely a formality	No real input from local people	Felt MSP-MALI presentation was effective
Very informative	More city councilmen should be at meeting	Jokes were a little rank	One of the most informative, comprehensive, best organized meetings I have attended
Thanks to MSP	Need more contact with better informed traffic and safety engineers	Can't remember information on federal funding	Great--keep going
Worthwhile meeting--should be on a regular basis		Good program . . .	
MSP not enforcing the 55 mph speed limit		Generally worthwhile	
		Opportunity to participate with others concerned about traffic safety	
		Information could have been more specific	
		Was made aware of information sources	
		Not enough specifics as to what industry can do	

FIGURE 1.--Summary of Respondent Comments About the Local Traffic Safety Forums--By Location (Post-Q only).
QUESTION 18: Please note below any other comments you have about the meeting_____."

BUSINESS LEADERS	ENFORCEMENT	ENGINEERING/PLANNING
Good beginning--too many speakers and topics	Secretary Austin's speech was most useful part	Thanks to Michigan State Police . . .
Entertaining--not that informative	Worthwhile meeting--should be on regular basis	Covered quite a lot of information . . . I was impressed at extent of accident analysis
Michigan State Police not enforcing the 55 mph speed limit	Some parts were repeats of earlier meetings	Felt MSP-MALI presentations were effective
Information was exchanged--merely a formality	A good beginning . . .	
No real input from local people	More city councilmen should be at meeting	
Can't remember information on federal funding	Jokes were a little rank	
Good program	Obtained some information--met responsible individuals	
Generally worthwhile	Well run. Comprehensive. Jokes were in bad taste	
Information could have been more specific	Will what was said result in positive action . . . ?	
Low level of meeting was shocking--didn't have top decision-makers there--went through motions only		
Not enough specifics as to what industry can do		

FIGURE 2. Comments About the Local Traffic Safety Forums by Occupation.

EDUCATION PROFESSION	CITY-COUNTY OFFICIALS	COURTS/HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	PRIVATE CITIZENS
Liked to have broken into smaller discussion groups	Very informative	Not useful for substance abuse people	Well conducted and organized
Enjoyed meeting--should have had better news media coverage	Want more details on federal funding	Community organization session was most useful	Great, keep going
Opportunity to participate with others concerned with traffic safety	Need more contact with better informed traffic and safety engineers	Was made aware of information sources	
	Well worthwhile		
	One of the most informative, comprehensive, best-organized meetings I have attended		

FIGURE 2.--Continued.

somewhat modified version of the pre-conference questionnaire utilized for local officials and community leaders distributed prior to their participation in the local conferences. The eight items on the questionnaire were specifically designed to elicit the opinions of state officials on the nature and status of local traffic safety issues and programs.

Of twenty questionnaires mailed to state officials, nine were returned. This resulted in a return rate of 45% which approximated the return rate from the local participants. Tables 58 through 64 present the results of these questionnaires.

Ranking of Major Traffic Accident Problems (Local Level)

Table 58 presents the results of the questionnaire responses on Question one (1) which asked the respondent to rank a series of seven local traffic accident problems. As can be observed, state officials ranked "Lack of coordinated management" as the number one traffic accident problem at the local level. This issue received a rank value of 6.67. "Lack of good data on problems" (RV = 6.43), and "Drinking drivers" (RV = 6.00) were ranked second and third, respectively. The problem of "Untrained, discourteous drivers" received the lowest rank value (2.71).

Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs (Local Level)

Question 2 (Table 59) was also a ranking type item. The respondents were asked to rank order a series of seven traffic safety needs (as applicable to the local government level).

TABLE 59.--Ranking of Major Traffic Safety Needs (Local Level): State Officials Responses.
QUESTION 2: What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs at the local level?

	Rank								Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Need	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	RV
Improved Traffic Engineering Practices	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	0	7	3.71
Improved Driver Education	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	7	2.43
More Enforcement of Traffic Law Violations	1	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	8	4.63
Better Management of Total Problem	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	7.13
Better Data on Problem	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	8	6.63
More Funds to Implement Programs	0	2	3	2	0	1	0	0	8	5.63
Better Enforcement on Drinking Drivers	1	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	8	5.50

KEY: RV = Rank Value

Table 59 indicates that state government officials felt that "Better management of the total problem" was the most important local traffic safety need. This item received a rank value of 7.13. This was also consistent with the responses to Question one which indicated that the "Lack of coordinated management" was the number one local level traffic accident problem. State officials ranked in second priority the need for "Better data on the problem" (RV = 6.63). "Improved driver education" was ranked last with an RV = 2.43.

Local Awareness of Traffic Safety Problems

Question three asked, "Do you feel local officials or leaders are generally aware of their community's traffic safety problems?" Respondents could answer "yes," "no" or "don't know." The summary of the responses to this item are as noted in Table 60.

TABLE 60.--Local Awareness of Traffic Safety Problems--Responses by State Officials.
QUESTION 3: Do you feel local officials or leaders are generally aware of their community's traffic safety problems?

Number			
Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer
2	5	1	1

A majority of state officials (N = 5) felt that local officials were not generally aware of their local problems.

Local Priority for Traffic Safety

In this item (Question 4) state officials were asked, "Do you feel that local officials or leaders are placing a high priority on traffic safety problems?" This was also a yes-no type item. The results are noted in Table 61.

TABLE 61.--Local Priority for Traffic Safety--Responses by State Officials.
QUESTION 4: Do you feel that local officials or leaders are placing a high priority on traffic safety problems?

Number		
Yes	No	No Answer
0	8	1

State officials unanimously (N = 8) indicated that traffic safety was not being given a high priority at the local level.

Need for Improved Local Management

Question 5 was a two-part item which was stated as follows: "Do you feel that there is a general need for improved management or coordination of traffic safety programs at the local level?" The respondent could answer "yes," "no" or "don't know." The second part of this question requested an explanation of a "yes" response. Refer to Table 62 for the results on Question 5.

TABLE 62.--Need for Improved Local Management--Responses by State Officials.
QUESTION 5: Do you feel that there is a general need for improved management or coordination of traffic safety programs at the local level?

Number			
Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer
7	1	0	1

Table 62 shows that a majority of state officials (N = 7) indicated that there is a need for better management or coordination of local safety programs.

In addition, the following three comments were noted:

1. YES -- "Generally speaking . . . there are exceptions."
2. YES -- "Need all to work for same goals."
3. YES -- "Local agencies are too autonomous; they don't interrelate enough."

Perceptions of Local Safety Problems and Needs

Question six was included to determine if there were differences in the perceptions of state-level officials vis-a-vis local-level officials on traffic safety issues. The question was phrased as follows: "Do you feel that your perceptions of local traffic safety problems and needs are similar to those of local officials and leaders?" The results are noted in Table 63.

Most state officials believed (5 vs. 2) that their perceptions concerning local traffic safety problems were different from those of local officials.

TABLE 63.--Perceptions of Local Safety Problems and Needs--Responses by State Officials.
QUESTION 6: Do you feel that your perception of local traffic safety problems and needs are similar to those of local officials and leaders?

Number			
Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer
2	5	1	1

Awareness of Federal Assistance Programs

In Question seven respondents were asked, "Do you feel that local officials and leaders are generally aware of federal assistance programs for traffic safety?" This item which could be answered "yes," "no" or "don't know," was designed to find out whether state officials felt that local officials had been made aware of the relatively new (since 1967) federal program for community level traffic crash prevention. Results obtained are indicated in Table 64.

TABLE 64.--Awareness of Federal Assistance Programs--Responses by State Officials.
QUESTION 7: Do you feel that local officials and leaders are generally aware of federal assistance programs for traffic safety?

Number			
Yes	No	Don't Know	No Answer
3	4	1	1

In this item opinion was nearly divided, although a majority (N = 4) did indicate that they felt local officials were not "generally aware" of the financial assistance program.

Usefulness of Local Traffic Safety Forums

The final item (Question 8) asked state officials, "Do you believe that a local "forum-type" discussion of traffic safety issues with local officials and leaders can be an effective and beneficial process for state-wide program planning?" This question was particularly important in terms of the perceived usefulness of such local meetings as a "planning tool." A "yes" or "no" response was possible. A brief explanation could also be indicated. Table 65 presents the results on Question 8.

TABLE 65.--Usefulness of Local Traffic Safety Forums--Responses by State Officials.
QUESTION 8: Do you believe that a local "forum-type" discussion of traffic safety issues with local officials and leaders can be an effective and beneficial process for state-wide program planning?

Number			
Yes	No	Don't Know (Written in)	No Answer
6	0	2	1

Although two respondents indicated a "don't know" answer, the majority (N = 6) responded with a "yes" answer to this item.

The following (verbatum) explanations were also noted:

1. YES -- "Information exchange is extremely important. Make locals aware of available assistance and program help."

2. YES -- "Periodic meetings of those involved in various disciplines is necessary."

3. YES -- "Stimulate action and coordinate efforts."

4. YES -- "If properly handled, a forum can provide an excellent two-way interchange of ideas and problems."

Summary

In this chapter were presented, in tabular and narrative form, the data from the questions from both the pre-conference and post-conference questionnaires.

In Chapter V, the summary, conclusions, recommendations and discussion are presented.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the opinions and knowledge of selected local officials and community leaders on traffic safety as expressed through their participation in a one-day local traffic safety conference, and further, to determine through a questionnaire technique, whether exposure to this type of meeting produced any noticeable changes in their opinions or knowledge.

A related question concerned the overall effectiveness of these local (or regional) conferences as a process for better identifying local problems and needs related to traffic safety.

The study sought to identify, again through a questionnaire method, any important differences between state and local officials, and among local officials themselves, insofar as the perception of local problems was concerned.

A review of the literature revealed that there were no published sources which described the results of local conferences on traffic safety. Only the state of Illinois (Office of Traffic Safety) and the U.S. Department of Transportation (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) have held similar conferences, and no formal (or even informal) written evaluation was conducted.

Sources in NHTSA have indicated that the agency does intend to prepare a report of the accomplishments of their "Town Hall" meetings. The review of literature also indicated that there were a number of published sources on state-level public opinion surveys; however, these proved to be of limited value to the thesis topic.

This study represents, within the framework of the goals and objectives noted above, the evaluation component of a federal highway safety project initiated by the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning in March, 1977.

The overall goal of the project was stated as follows:

> To obtain from community leaders an insight into their perception of traffic safety problems in their areas and to provide to these community leaders information needed to assist them in solving local traffic safety problems.

In addition, two specific objectives were also proposed:

1. To conduct a series of four local traffic safety conferences in varying geographical locations throughout the state which will:

   a. Inform community leaders of the annual scope and cost of Michigan's traffic accident experience and identify the specific problems in the region where these leaders resided.

   b. Aid state authorities in obtaining greater insight into the real traffic problems and possible solutions at the local level.

2. To determine by pre- and post-attendee questionnaires if the local traffic safety conference is an effective medium in which to address the local-state coordination of traffic safety programs.[14]

---

[14]Application for Highway Safety Grant, "Local Traffic Safety Conferences," MPA 77-002A, approved March 4, 1977.

Several questions were considered in determining the geographical areas and sites for the conferences. Four locations were eventually selected: a single county (Muskegon); two tri-county areas (Cass, Van Buren and Berrien; and Bay, Midland and Saginaw) and a five county area in northern Michigan (Grand Traverse, Antrim, Leelanau, Benzie and Kalkaska).

The task of formulating the program and agenda for the conferences was the joint responsibility of the Office of Highway Safety Planning staff, the project consultant and the planning committee. A broad range of topics, generally designed to address local problems and needs (at least as perceived by state officials) was selected for inclusion on the agenda. Generally, the subject matter was the same for each of the conferences, although several modifications were made in the agenda between the first two meetings and the final two sessions in an attempt to encourage more audience participation.

A total of 652 pre-conference questionnaires (Pre-Q) were mailed to those persons invited to each of the four conferences; and 232 or 35.6% were completed and returned. A somewhat higher return rate was noted for the post-conference questionnaires (Post-Q)--46.1% overall (N = 95). A total of 9 questionnaires were returned by 20 state officials resulting in a 45% rate of return for this sub-group.

The responses to each question were tabulated and summarized on the basis of number (N) and percentage (%). Frequency tables were prepared for each item indicating the results on the basis of

(1) location and (2) occupation/profession. The response to questions 1 and 3, both rank-order type items, were also assigned a weighted rank value (RV) for purposes of determining the overall rank order of the issues listed in the question.

The major findings of the study were as follows:

1. The problem of "drinking drivers" was identified by most local officials and community leaders as the most critical local traffic accident problem. This concern received the highest overall rank value (RV) on both the Pre-Q (6.47) and the Post-Q (6.85). On the Pre-Q, however, the engineering/planning group along with enforcement officials and city-county officials selected other problem areas. On the Post-Q, enforcement officials and city-county officials indicated other local problems ahead of "drinking drivers." State officials ranked this problem third from a list of six problem areas (RV = 6.00), and indicated that they believed the most important local problem was the "lack of coordinated management" (RV = 6.67). Most state officials (N = 5) also stated that local officials were generally unaware of local problems.

2. "Improved driver education" was identified as the most important need at the local level by a majority of local officials and community leaders. This was evident on both questionnaires (Pre-Q, RV = 6.14; Post-Q, RV = 6.35). It was also noted that, on the basis of individual occupational groups, there were several exceptions to the overall ranking of "improved driver education" as the most important local traffic safety need. "Improved driver

education" was ranked last by state officials (RV = 2.43) who indicated that "better management of the total problem" was the most important local traffic safety need. This choice received a rank value (RV) of 7.13.

3. Most respondents stated that they were generally aware of the high accident locations in their community. On the Pre-Q, 80% (N = 185) answered yes to this question; on the Post-Q, this percentage increased slightly to 81% (N = 77). Law enforcement officials had the highest percentage of yes responses on both questionnaires (Pre-Q = 94%; Post-Q = 100%). Although those responding from the Benton Harbor conference indicated the highest percentage of yes answers on the Pre-Q (86%), this same group had the lowest percentage of yes answers on the Post-Q (72%).

4. Most respondents indicated that they were personally at least "somewhat aware" or "very aware" of local needs and problems related to traffic safety. This was evident on both questionnaires. There were only slight variations among occupational groups or locations. However, law enforcement officials, as a group, revealed the highest percentage of responses in the "very aware" category on both questionnaires (60% and 63%, respectively).

5. Although on the Pre-Q only 37% (N = 85) of the respondents felt that state officials were aware of local problems or needs, this percentage increased substantially on the Post-Q, to 57%

(N = 55). This positive change was consistent across all occupational groups, with the only exception being "private citizens."

6. Most respondents felt that the problem of traffic accidents in their local area ranked "low" compared to other community problems. Specifically, 57% (N = 130) chose this response on the Pre-Q and 53% (N = 49) on the Post-Q. Although this finding was true across all locations, on the Pre-Q both the education and courts/health groups indicated they would rank the traffic accident problem "high" contrasted to other community problems. Most state officials (N = 8) also indicated they felt that traffic safety was not being given a high priority at the local level.

7. In answering the question, "How would you compare your community's traffic accident problem with neighboring communities of similar size?" most respondents, 65% (N = 150) on the Pre-Q and 67% (N = 64) on the Post-Q, indicated that their local traffic accident problems were "about the same" as in similar communities. This result was evident in all locations. On the basis of occupational groups, on the Pre-Q, only the courts/health group did not have a majority to indicate this response; as a group, they were evently split between indicating their problems were "worse than most" (43%, N = 6) or "about the same" (43%, N = 6).

8. On the Pre-Q, most respondents indicated that local traffic safety activities or programs were "quite limited" (56%). On the Post-Q, 59% indicated a "quite limited" response. The only

exception to this overall pattern was Saginaw where on the Post-Q 42% (N = 14) stated that programs were "reasonably adequate."

9. Few persons indicated that they had ever seen an estimate of the annual cost of traffic accidents to their community (10% on the Pre-Q; and 27% on the Post-Q). A negative answer on this question was evident across all occupational groups and locations. Moreover, very few respondents had any knoweldge of how much was spent annually for traffic safety in their community (only 6% on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q). In another related finding, it was evident that most persons believed that most traffic accident problems (or potential problems) were not subject to easy solutions or minimal corrective costs (48% on the Pre-Q; and 52% on the Post-Q). For the most part, the "written in" responses on this item indicated that "more," "better" or "increased" enforcement or "improved" traffic engineering were the best ways to deal with the problem.

10. Most respondents on both questionnaires, and across all locations, stated that there was (or may be) need for "improved management or coordination" of local traffic safety efforts (60% on the Pre-Q; and 59% on the Post-Q). The only major exception was the courts/health group which indicated a high percentage of "don't know" responses (83%, N = 5) on the Post-Q. Most state officials (N = 7) agreed that there was "a general need for improved management or coordination" of local programs. On a related question, most state officials (N = 5) also indicated that they believed their perceptions

concerning local traffic safety problems were different from those of local officials.

11. Most persons were unaware of federal assistance programs for dealing with local traffic safety problems. On the Pre-Q, 69% overall responded no on this item; this percentage decreased somewhat on the Post-Q--56%. The engineering/planning group, however, was the exception; they indicated a very high awareness of federal assistance programs (73% on the Pre-Q; 83% on the Post-Q). The opinions of state officials on this issue were nearly divided, although a majority (four out of seven who answered) did indicate that they felt local officials were not "generally aware" of available financial assistance. In addition, most respondents, 68% (N = 68) on the Pre-Q and 63% (N = 59) on the Post-Q, across all locations, stated they were unaware of any specific local traffic safety projects which received federal assistance. However, most of the respondents in the engineering/planning group indicated that they were aware of specific local projects which had received federal assistance (65% on the Pre-Q; 62% on the Post-Q).

12. Most local officials and community leaders felt that law enforcement officials were primarily responsible for community traffic safety programs. This was evident on both the pre-conference (N = 133) and post-conference (N = 60) questionnaires. Only the education group and the courts/health group did not rank law enforcement first; on both questionnaires each indicated that "government" was principally responsible.

13. Most respondents, across all locations and occupational groups, indicated they felt a local traffic safety forum could be a "beneficial and effective process for developing appropriate preventive measures." Some 81% indicated a yes answer to this item on both the Pre-Q and Post-Q. State officials (N = 6) also agreed that the local forums could be a useful process for state-level program planning.

14. In terms of the overall value of the forum, the largest number (N = 67) and highest percentage (35%) of respondents (Post-Q only) indicated that the meeting was most valuable as a method for "providing for an exchange of views and opinions of state officials and local leaders." This was true across all locations. However, the business group and city-county officials indicated that the meeting was most valuable to them in terms of "increasing knowledge about the accident problem." Only three persons, or 2% overall, stated that "the meeting was not worthwhile."

Conclusions

Conclusions in this section, based on the stated purposes of the study, the conditions under which it was conducted and the findings reported in the previous section are as follows:

1. The study did identify the opinions and knowledge of selected local officials and community leaders on a number of traffic safety related issues and concerns. Specifically, the participants identified "drinking drivers" as the most critical local traffic

crash problem; however, some differences were apparent among the various occupational groups on this issue. In addition, most respondents indicated that "improved driver education" was the most important local level need; however, again there were some exceptions on the basis of occupational groups. Most local participants also indicated that they were generally aware of the high accident locations in their area; that the problem of traffic accidents ranked "low" compared to other local problems; that their local problems were generally "about the same" as in similar communities; that most local safety programs were "quite limited"; that they were largely unaware of the costs of accidents or crash prevention efforts in their area; that there was a need for "improved management or coordination" of local programs; that they were mostly unaware of federal assistance programs; and that law enforcement officials were principally responsible for community traffic safety programs. There were some exceptions in each of the above areas on the basis of either: (1) geographic location, or (2) occupation/profession.

2. Exposure to a one-day local traffic safety conference generally did not produce any overall noticeable changes in the opinions or knowledge of the participants. Respondents usually selected the same answers on both the pre-conference and post-conference questionnaires.

3. Since most participants indicated a favorable response to the forums, and further stated that this concept was most valuable as a method for "providing for an exchange of views and

opinions of state officials and local leaders," it can be concluded that the process of periodically conducting local traffic safety conferences may be useful to continue, especially if state officials are interested in better identifying local problems and needs. Additionally, the technique of utilizing some type of pre-conference and post-conference questionnaire as an evaluation or planning tool is also important to this process if overall effectiveness is expected.

4. The perceptions (opinions and knowledge) of local community leaders concerning the nature of the traffic crash problem were not generally the same as those views held by state officials. Specifically, state officials disagreed with local officials and leaders on those questions dealing with the nature of the local crash problem and the most critical local area traffic safety needs. Further, most state officials indicated directly that they believed their perceptions concerning local traffic safety problems were different from those of local officials.

5. There appears to be only slight differences in the perceptions of local community leaders on major safety issues from one area of the state to another. However, it would still have to be concluded that, with a few exceptions, local community officials and leaders generally had the same or quite similar perceptions about the nature of the local crash problem.

6. The most apparent differences between occupation groups were in the perceptions of local traffic safety problems or needs. On other issues, the differences were generally not as pronounced.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations based on the findings and conclusions of the study:

1. That the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning continue to periodically conduct local traffic safety conferences to assist the agency in identifying the nature and trends of the local accident problem. Further, these conferences should be rotated to various geographical areas of the state to insure that the broadest possible perspective be obtained.

2. That subsequent conferences be evaluated utilizing a questionnaire technique similar to that which was employed in this study.

3. That the Office of Highway Safety Planning include as a part of any subsequent evaluation of similar local conferences some of the same questions and occupational sub-groups that were utilized for this study. This process would permit the identification of trends or changes in the perceived nature of the local traffic accident problem.

4. That subsequent conferences be designed to permit a maximum of local level input and participation. The initial four

conferences were too structured and did not provide enough opportunities for questions and comments from the audience. Formal presentations by state officials should be held to a minimum.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study represented an attempt to evaluate the overall usefulness of one approach to better identification of local level traffic safety problems and needs. The review of the literature indicated that several other types of approaches have been utilized. However, there was little evaluation of the processes used, and there seemed to be a very clear need for additional and continuing effort to refine a process so that, hopefully, resources directed to the local level will ultimately be applied to the most critical problems and needs. Within this context, the following recommendations for further research are offered:

1. That a study be done comparing the views of local officials and community leaders exposed to a similar one-day local traffic safety conference with a sub-sample not exposed to such a conference.

2. That a replication of this study be done utilizing an evenly distributed sample size on the basis of both (1) location and (2) occupational group.

3. That a follow-up study be conducted to determine whether any noticeable changes have occurred in the attitudes and knowledge

of the participants since the last (Post-Q) questionnaire was completed.

4. That if subsequent local conferences are held, every effort be made to obtain a higher response rate as well as a truly representative sample of local officials, community leaders and private citizens. While this may be difficult to accomplish, it would greatly enhance the validity of the evaluation and questionnaire results. Also, specific individuals, having completed a questionnaire should be identified on a pre-conference and post-conference basis for the purpose of analyzing the results in more detail. This further refinement of the evaluation methodology would pinpoint specific changes in individual participant opinions resulting in their having attended one of the conferences. This procedure was not possible in the present study since most respondents chose not to identify themselves.

Discussion

Traffic accidents are a local problem. Yet, with few exceptions, planning for accident prevention is done almost entirely at the state level. While it is true that a substantial share of state and federal resources are being directed at local problems, it is difficult to find any real evidence of local level input to remedial programs which are typically implemented.

Although the results were not particularly surprising, it was somewhat discouraging to find that most state officials held a rather dim view of the efforts of local community leaders in

attempting to deal effectively with their traffic crash problems. This probably says something about the need for some sort of dialogue on a regular basis between local leaders and state officials. However, both "official" and "citizen" input are needed. A serious weakness in the approach utilized in conducting the conferences was the failure on the part of state officials to follow up on issues and problems raised during the meetings. This could probably be accomplished through the designation of an appropriate staff person who would become an official point of contact for local officials once a conference had been concluded.

Another problem which became apparent as the conferences were being concluded was the role of the local chairperson. These individuals, although well known in their communities, were not familiar enough with the local accident problem(s) to be really effective moderators. Although they undoubtedly helped to attract other community leaders to the meetings, they very often had to rely on support and assistance from the state or local people in attendance in order to adequately answer questions or handle the discussion that arose during the conference.

Since the process of planning and conducting any type of conference is a time consuming and expensive process, state officials should give serious consideration to some sort of alternative method for securing local level input to the state planning process. An approach using an instrument similar to that employed in the Michigan State University QMT Project would appear to be a feasible and less

costly approach. Adoption of an approach of this nature with the addition of an annual "public opinion poll" of the type recently utilized by the Michigan Office of Highway Planning would give state officials a useful profile of the views and opinions of local citizens and officials.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carnahan, James. QMT Project, Technical Report. (The Design and Testing of a Questionnaire Method for Assessment of Local Highway Safety Programs in Cities with 10 to 100 Thousand Populations). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Highway Traffic Safety Center, June 1971.

_____. QMT Project. Data Report. (The Design and Testing of a Questionnaire Method for Assessment of Local Highway Safety Programs in Cities with 10 to 100 Thousand Population). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Highway Traffic Safety Center, April 1972.

Market Opinion Research. A Survey of Driver and Motorcyclists' Attitudes Toward Highway Safety Issues. Detroit: Market Opinion Research. Job #8848. September 1978.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. Personal correspondence (with attachments) between Ms. Karen K. Marcus, Chief, Consumer Participation, and the writer. December 18, 1979.

"Town Hall Meetings Slated in Illinois," Traffic Safety, November 1975, p. 31.

Troldahl, V. C., and Farace, R. V. Public Opinion in Michigan on Traffic Accident Prevention, Final Report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Highway Traffic Safety Center, April 1966.

Waller, Patricia F. What North Carolina Drivers Suggest for Improving Highway Safety in Their State. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, January 1974.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE PROGRAM AND AGENDA

LOCAL TRAFFIC SAFETY FORUM

FOR MUSKEGON COUNTY

CO-SPONSORED BY: Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning
& Michigan State Safety Commission

8:00 Registration and Coffee

8:30 Introduction of Chairman
Tom Reel, Executive Director
Office of Highway Safety Planning

8:35 Chairman's Opening Remarks
Marshall W. Graves, President
Muskegon Federal Savings & Loan Association

8:40 The Highway Safety Problem
(1) STATEWIDE
Capt. Paul Ruge, Commanding Officer
Safety and Traffic, Michigan State Police

(2) REGIONAL
Phil Haseltine, Chief, Program Planning and Analysis Section
Office of Highway Safety Planning

9:05 Traffic Engineering Programs
(1) LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY OF LOCAL OFFICIALS
Richard Blost, Supervising Engineer of Safety Programs Unit
Department of State Highways and Transportation

(2) UNIFORM STANDARDS OF DESIGN AND CONTROL
Michael Jones, District Traffic Safety Engineer
Department of State Highways and Transportation

9:45 Discussion

10:15 Break

10:30 Police Traffic Services
(1) SELECTIVE ENFORCEMENT
Bill Siewertsen, Senior Program Specialist
Office of Highway Safety Planning

(2) MICHIGAN ACCIDENT LOCATOR INDEX (MALI)
Tom Krycinski, Chief, Traffic Engineering Services
Office of Highway Safety Planning

MUSKEGON-MAY 12, 1977

(3) CITIZENS BAND MONITORING PROGRAM
Lt. Rod LaMore, Assistant Division Commander
Safety and Traffic, Michigan State Police

11:05 Educational and Rehabilitation Programs

(1) DRIVER IMPROVEMENT
George Stevens, Driver and Vehicle Administrator
Department of State

(2) ALCOHOL REHABILITATION
Lee Juenker, Alcohol-Highway Safety Education Coordinator
Department of Public Health

(3) HIGH SCHOOL AND BUS DRIVER PROGRAMS
Phil O'Leary, Safety and Traffic Education Supervisor
Department of Education

Sheridan Rhoads, Coordinator, Program Development
Office of Highway Safety Planning

11:50 Discussion

12:30 Luncheon

1:30 Luncheon Address
"MICHIGAN STATE SAFETY COMMISSION'S CURRENT LEGISLATIVE CONCERNS"
Tom Reel, Executive Director
Office of Highway Safety Planning

2:00 Organizing for Community Action
Bruce Madsen, Managing Director
Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County

2:30 Discussion on Above

2:45 Closing Comments
Tom Reel

Programmed with the assistance of . . . . . .

Automobile Club of Michigan
Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE LETTERS OF INVITATION

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR

STATE SAFETY COMMISSION

DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE

1976

A conference that will address itself to the traffic safety problems of southwestern Michigan will be held in the Benton Harbor/St. Joseph area on May 10. The conference will have a dual purpose: to give local citizens an opportunity to express their needs to state government, and to increase local awareness of the financial and technical resources available to them to assist in resolving these problems.

Participants will include local government leaders, traffic officials, and outstanding citizens from other fields of interest. In this sense, we feel it is important to have a solid representation from the business community and for this reason, we sincerely hope you will be able to join us and provide the benefit of your views on the traffic safety needs in your area.

The conference will be one of four local Traffic Safety Forums to be held in key areas of the state. Not only will it deal with ongoing concerns such as driver improvement, alcohol rehabilitation and enforcement programs, but a number of new trends and developments will be presented. We believe you will be particularly interested in such things as the new, computerized accident locating system that is being introduced in your area, the legal responsibilities now faced by your local officials--and consequently the taxpayers--for proper roadway design and control, and the utilization of a citizens band radio network by the State Police to reduce traffic fatalities.

The Forum will be held at the Benton Harbor Holiday Inn beginning with a reception/registration from 8-8:30 a.m. and ending by mid-afternoon. If you are unable to attend personally, please feel free to send a ranking member of your staff to represent you. We hope you will at least join us for lunch at 12:30 and remain for a brief address by the Chairman of the State Safety Commission, on legislative developments and concerns in the field of traffic safety.

Please use the enclosed card to let me know that you will be joining us. There is no charge for the conference or the luncheon.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. AUSTIN
Secretary of State

and

THOMAS O. REEL
Governor's Representative
for Highway Safety

7150 HARRIS DRIVE, GENERAL OFFICE BLDG., LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913

TELEPHONE (517) 373-1610

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE
OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PLANNING
7150 HARRIS DRIVE, GENERAL OFFICE BLDG., LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
PHONE: (517) 373-2930

This office, in cooperation with the State Safety Commission, is preparing a series of Local Traffic Safety Forums in four key areas in Michigan next month. These meetings will have a dual purpose: to give local officials an opportunity to express their needs to state government, and to increase local awareness of the financial and technical resources available to them to assist in resolving these mutual problems.

One of the areas chosen includes Bay, Midland and Saginaw Counties. We hope that you, as a leading citizen dedicated to the welfare of your community, will be able to join us and contribute your thinking to the objectives we share in common. Topics to be discussed will include:

- Current data on the highway safety problem for your area and statewide.
- Uniform engineering standards for highway design and control, along with a review of the legal responsibilities of local officials.
- State Police traffic safety services, including selective enforcement techniques, progress on the MALI programs, and citizens band radio monitoring activities.
- Educational and rehabilitation programs covering driver improvement, alcohol rehabilitation and high school driver and bus programs.
- Means by which local traffic jurisdictions may increase their effectiveness through coordinated action and citizen involvement.

Presentations will be made by the most knowledgeable people obtainable in these fields and ample time will be provided to express your views. Additionally, Mr. John P. Woodford, Vice Chairman of the State Safety Commission and Director of the Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation will deliver a luncheon address covering current legislative concerns in highway safety.

The Forum will be held on May 24 at the Bay City Holiday Inn beginning with a reception/registration from 8-8:30 a.m. and concluding by mid-afternoon. There will be no cost to you for the conference or the luncheon.

Sincerely,

THOMAS O. REEL
Governor's Representative
for Highway Safety

MICHIGAN
THE GREAT LAKE STATE

APPENDIX C

PRE-CONFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE

OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PLANNING

7150 HARRIS DRIVE, GENERAL OFFICE BUILDING
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
PHONE: (517) 322-1942

4-18-77
(Pre-Conf.)

Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

Location: ☐ Benton Harbor ☐ Muskegon

Occupation/profession: _____

Name: _____
(optional)

Directions: Please answer the following items to the best of your knowledge. Check only one answer to each question unless otherwise stated. Return in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

1. Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems? (Please number in rank order - with 1 equal highest, 2 next, etc.)

   ☐ Lack of traffic law enforcement

   ☐ Poor traffic engineering

   ☐ Untrained, discourteous drivers

   ☐ Lack of funds to implement programs

   ☐ Lack of good data on problems

   ☐ Drinking drivers

   ☐ Other: _____

   ☐ Other: _____

2. a. Are you generally aware of the high accident locations in your community?

      ☐ Yes ☐ No

   b. List some of these areas or locations:

      _____ _____

      _____ _____

Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

3. What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area? (Please number in rank order - with 1 highest, 2 next, etc.)

- ☐ Improved traffic engineering practices (i.e. better signing, signal systems, etc.)
- ☐ Improved driver education/retraining programs
- ☐ More enforcement of traffic law violations
- ☐ Better management of total problem
- ☐ Better data on specifics of problem
- ☐ More funds to implement programs
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Other: _____

4. How aware are you personally of your community's major traffic safety problems or needs?

- ☐ Not really aware
- ☐ Somewhat aware
- ☐ Very aware

5. Do you feel that state officials are generally aware of your community's problems or needs?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

6. How would you rank the problem of traffic accidents in your community compared to other problems? (e.g. crime, housing, etc.)

- ☐ Very low (no concern)
- ☐ Low (some concern)
- ☐ High (occasionally receives top priority)
- ☐ Very high (always a top priority item)

Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

7. How would you compare your community's traffic accident problem with neighboring communities of similar size?

   /_/ Worse than most

   /_/ About the same

   /_/ Better than most

8. Generally, how do you percieve the status of traffic safety activities or programs in your community?

   /_/ No visable effort

   /_/ Programs appear quite limited

   /_/ Programs appear reasonably adquate

   /_/ Well developed, well organized, comprehensive

9. Have you ever seen an estimate of the annual cost of traffic accidents to your community?

   /_/ Yes /_/ No

   If yes, give figure _____

10. Do you have any idea how much is spent on an annual basis for accident prevention and traffic safety in your community?

    /_/ Yes /_/ No

    If yes, give estimate: _____

11. Do you believe that most traffic accident problems (or potential problems) can be identified and solved rather easily and at minimal cost?

    /_/ Yes /_/ No /_/ Don't Know

    If yes, state how _____

12. Are you aware of federal assistance programs for dealing with local traffic safety problems?

    /_/ Yes /_/ No

13. Are you aware of any local traffic safety projects or programs which have received federal assistance?

    /_/ Yes /_/ No

    Describe: _____

14. In your opinion, who do you feel has major responsiblility for traffic safety programs in your community?

    _____

    _____

Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

15. Do you feel that there is (or may be) a need for improved management or coordination of your community's traffic safety efforts?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

If yes, what suggestions would you make. _____

_____

16. Do you feel that a local "forum-type" discussion of traffic safety issues with state officials can be a beneficial and effective process for developing appropriate preventative measures?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Why or why not? _____

_____

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER FOR PRE-CONFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE
OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PLANNING
7150 HARRIS DRIVE, GENERAL OFFICE BLDG., LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
PHONE: (517) 373-2930

May 5, 1977

Dear Conference Participant:

You were recently invited to participate in a local one-day conference on traffic safety.

Since the meeting which you will be attending is one of only four to be held throughout the state this year, we are quite anxious to determine whether these "pilot" conferences are serving their intended purpose, and in fact whether the proposed structure provides for the best interchange of ideas between state authorities and local leaders.

As an essential part of our overall effort to evaluate the productivity or effectiveness of this process, we have developed a brief questionnaire which we would like you to complete for us prior to your actual attendance at the conference. Frankly, we feel that the opinions and attitudes of local leaders and officials are often not solicited when state-wide program planning takes place. Thus, your answers on this questionnaire, plus your participation in the forthcoming meeting, are essential to the success of this effort. You may also be asked to complete a similar questionnaire after the meeting to help us determine whether the program was useful to you.

We need to have the enclosed questionnaire completed and returned prior to the actual meeting, since your comments will help us to determine how best to answer your specific concerns. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is also provided for your use. Questions may be directed to Thomas O. Reel at OHSP (517) 373-2930.

Thank you for your assistance in this most important matter. We look forward to your early response.

Sincerely,

Thomas O. Reel

THOMAS O. REEL
Executive Director

Enclosure

MICHIGAN
THE GREAT LAKE STATE

APPENDIX E

STATE OFFICIALS QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE
OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PLANNING
7150 HARRIS DRIVE, GENERAL OFFICE BUILDING
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
PHONE: (517) 322-1942

4-18-77
(Pre-Conf.)

Questionnaire for State Officials on Local Traffic Forums

Name: _____

Position: _____

Directions: Please mark only one answer to the following items unless otherwise stated. Return this form in the enclosed envelope.

1. Generally, what do you feel are the major traffic accident problems at the local level? (Please number in rank order - with 1 highest, 2 next, etc.)

   ☐ Lack of traffic law enforcement
   ☐ Poor traffic engineering
   ☐ Lack of coordinated management
   ☐ Untrained, discourteous drivers
   ☐ Lack of funds to implement programs
   ☐ Lack of good data on problems
   ☐ Drinking drivers
   ☐ Other: _____
   ☐ Other: _____

2. What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs at the local level? (Please number in rank order)

   ☐ Improved traffic engineering practices (i.e. better signing, signal systems, etc.)
   ☐ Improved driver education/retraining programs
   ☐ More enforcement of traffic law violations
   ☐ Better management of total problem
   ☐ Better data on specifics of problem
   ☐ More funds to implement programs
   ☐ Better enforcement on drinking drivers
   ☐ Other: _____
   ☐ Other: _____

Questionnaire for State Officials on Local Traffic Forums

3. Do you feel local officials or leaders are generally aware of their community's traffic safety problems?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

4. Do you feel that local officials or leaders are placing a high priority on traffic safety problems?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do you feel that there is a general need for improved management or coordination of traffic safety programs at the local level?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

If yes, explain why _____

6. Do you feel that your perceptions of local traffic safety problems and needs are similar to those of local officials and leaders?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

7. Do you feel that local officials and leaders are generally aware of federal assistance programs for traffic safety?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

8. Do you believe that a local "forum-type" discussion of traffic safety issues with local officials and leaders can be an effective and beneficial process for state-wide program planning?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Why or why not? _____

_____

APPENDIX F

POST-CONFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE

OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PLANNING

7150 HARRIS DRIVE, GENERAL OFFICE BUILDING
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
PHONE: (517) 322-1942

6-10-77
(Post-Conf.)

Follow-up Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

Location: ☐ Benton Harbor ☐ Muskegon ☐ Saginaw ☐ Traverse City

Occupation/profession: _____

Name: _____
(optional)

Directions: Please answer the following items to the best of your knowledge. Check only one answer to each question unless otherwise stated. Return in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

1. Generally, what do you think are your community's major traffic accident problems? (Please number in rank order - with 1 equal highest, 2 next, etc.)

   ☐ Lack of traffic law enforcement

   ☐ Poor traffic engineering

   ☐ Untrained, discourteous drivers

   ☐ Lack of funds to implement programs

   ☐ Lack of good data on problems

   ☐ Drinking drivers

   ☐ Other: _____

   ☐ Other: _____

2. a. Are you generally aware of the high accident locations in your community?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

   b. List some of these areas or locations:

   _____ _____

Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

3. What do you feel are the major traffic safety needs in your area? (Please number in rank order - with 1 highest, 2 next, etc.)

☐ Improved traffic engineering practices (i.e. better signing, signal systems, etc.)

☐ More driver education/retraining programs

☐ More enforcement of traffic law violations

☐ Better management of total problem

☐ Better data on specifics of problem

☐ More funds to implement programs

☐ Other: _____

☐ Other: _____

4. How aware are you personally of your community's major traffic safety problems or needs?

☐ Not really aware

☐ Somewhat aware

☐ Very aware

5. Do you feel that state officials are generally aware of your community's problems or needs?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

6. How would you rank the problem of traffic accidents in your community compared to other problems? (e.g. crime, housing, etc.)

☐ Very low (no concern)

☐ Low (some concern)

☐ High (occasionally receives top priority)

☐ Very high (always a top priority item)

Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

7. How would you compare your community's traffic accident problem with neighboring communities of similar size?

   ☐ Worse than most
   ☐ About the same
   ☐ Better than most

8. Generally, how do you perceive the status of traffic safety activities or programs in your community?

   ☐ No visable effort
   ☐ Programs appear quite limited
   ☐ Programs appear reasonably adequate
   ☐ Well developed, well organized, comprehensive

9. Have you ever seen an estimate of the annual cost of traffic accidents to your community?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No

   If yes, give figure _____

10. Do you have any idea how much is spent on an annual basis for accident prevention and traffic safety in your community?

    ☐ Yes ☐ No

    If yes, give estimate: _____

11. Do you believe that most traffic accident problems (or potential problems) can be identified and solved rather easily and at minimal cost?

    ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

    If yes, state how _____

12. Are you aware of federal assistance programs for dealing with local traffic safety problems?

    ☐ Yes ☐ No

    If yes, from whom _____

13. Are you aware of any local traffic safety projects or programs which have received federal assistance?

    ☐ Yes ☐ No

    Describe: _____

14. In your opinion, who do you feel has major responsibility for traffic safety programs in your community?

    _____

    _____

Questionnaire for Participants in Local Traffic Forums

15. Do you feel that there is (or may be) a need for improved management or coordination of your community's traffic safety efforts.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

If yes, what suggestions would you make. _____

_____

16. Do you feel that a local "forum-type" discussion of traffic safety issues with state officials can be a beneficial and effective process for developing appropriate preventative measures?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Why or why not? _____

_____

17. Do you believe that the forum which you recently attended was at all valuable in terms of: (check one or more)

☐ Increasing your knowledge about the accident problem in your community?

☐ Providing information about successful traffic safety programs?

☐ Increasing your awareness of federal funding programs?

☐ Knowing how to approach the problem of organizing for community support and action?

☐ Providing for an exchange of views and opinions of state officials and local leaders?

☐ The meeting was not really worthwhile?

18. Please note below any other comments you have about the meeting:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX G

COVER LETTER FOR POST-CONFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE
OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PLANNING
7150 HARRIS DRIVE, GENERAL OFFICE BLDG., LANSING, MICHIGAN 48913
PHONE: (517) 373-2930

June 10, 1977

Dear Conference Participant:

As we indicated to you prior to your attendance at the local Traffic Safety Forum last month, we are sending along a follow-up questionnaire (very similar to the first one we sent) in an effort to measure the value of the meeting.

We sincerely hope you will take just a few minutes to complete the form and give us your impressions of the meeting (there is space for this at the end of the questionnaire).

Your attendance and participation in the meeting was appreciated.

We look forward to working with you to make your community a safer place to work and live.

Sincerely,

THOMAS O. REEL
Executive Director

Enclosures

P.S. We have again provided a self-addressed stamped envelope for your use in returning the questionnaire.