



2011 HIGHWAY SAFETY FUNDING GUIDELINES

**South Carolina Department of Public Safety
Office of Highway Safety
January 6, 2010**

**Mark Sanford, Governor
Mark A. Keel, Director
Phil Riley, Director, Office of Highway Safety**

Table of Contents

Purpose of the Funding Guidelines	3
Highway Safety Grant Cycle FFY 2011	4
Description of South Carolina's Traffic Collision Problem	5
Assistance in Developing Grant Proposals	11
Responsibilities of Funded Applicants	12
Overview and General Funding Requirements/Limitations	15
Priority Emphasis Areas Eligible for Funding in FFY 2011	21
Priority Emphasis Area Program Descriptions	22
Enforcement Projects	22
Adjudication/Prosecution Projects	26
Education/Outreach Projects	28
Criteria for Grant Application Review	30
Highway Safety Application Review Checklist	31

PURPOSE OF THE FUNDING GUIDELINES

The purpose of this manual, prepared by the Office of Highway Safety of the South Carolina Department of Public Safety, is to outline the specific criteria to be followed in the preparation of Highway Safety grant applications and to assist potential applicants in determining whether a proposed traffic safety activity is eligible for funding in Federal Fiscal Year 2011. The manual provides direction for the state's highway safety planning process and presents concise guidelines to assist state and local agencies in obtaining federal funding support for highway safety programs. Highway Safety Funds are received on an annual basis from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of the U. S. Department of Transportation.

Those interested in applying for Highway Safety funding are strongly encouraged to attend the Funding Guidelines workshop to be held January 6, 2010. Information on the registration and location of the workshop can be found on page 2 of this manual. The deadline for registering for this workshop is December 31, 2009. **Please note that only the following entities are eligible for consideration for Highway Safety funding: 1) State agencies; 2) private, non-profit organizations listed as 501(c)3; 3) political subdivisions (city/county governments); and 4) State, local and federally recognized Indian tribal governments.**

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2011 Highway Safety Grant Applications must be received electronically in the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 5, 2010. The application must be submitted to the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 p.m. on March 5, 2010. Applications received after 5:00 pm on March 5, 2010, will not be considered. The grant application must be completed using the Office of Highway Safety's Grants Management Information System (GMIS), which is an online application process. The GMIS can be accessed through the South Carolina Department of Public Safety website at <http://www.scdps.org/ohs> beginning January 6, 2010.

The application must be fully complete and submitted via the GMIS. Supporting documents and appendices relating to the application may be uploaded as an attachment to the application on the GMIS or hard copies may be forwarded to the following address:

**Amy Caldwell, Grants Administration Manager
SC Department of Public Safety
Office of Highway Safety
Post Office Box 1993
Blythewood, SC 29016**

All supporting documents and appendices mailed in must reflect an application number and must be received in the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 PM on March 5, 2010. The application form plus required attachments constitute the total proposal. A multi-level review process will be used to determine the approval or disapproval of grant projects submitted. Grant award announcements will be mailed shortly before the beginning of the FFY 2011 grant funding cycle, which is **October 1, 2010.**

HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANT CYCLE
FFY 2011

- December 11, 2009: Notification of Solicitation of Applications and Availability of Funding Guidelines Mailed to Potential Applicants
- December 23, 2009: Posting of FFY 2011 Highway Safety Funding Guidelines on the SC Department of Public Safety's web site: www.scdps.org/ohs/
- December 31, 2009: Deadline for Registering for OHS Funding Guidelines Workshops. **Please contact Ms. Glenda Millaudon of the Office of Highway Safety at (803) 896-9965 or toll free at 1-877-349-7187 by no later than 5:00 pm on December, 31, 2009, to register for the Highway Safety Funding Guidelines workshop. Seating is limited.**
- January 6, 2010:** Highway Safety Funding Guidelines Workshop for Grant Applicants at the following location and time:
- 1:00 - 4:00 pm at the SC Department of Archives and History Center, 8301 Parklane Rd, Columbia, SC
- March 5, 2010: 5:00 p.m. Due Date for Grant Applications. In order to be considered for funding, all grant applications **must be received electronically in the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 5, 2010. Applications received after 5:00 pm on March 5, 2010, will not be considered. The grant application must be completed using the Office of Highway Safety's Grants Management Information System (GMIS), which is an online application process. The GMIS can be accessed through the South Carolina Department of Public Safety website at [www.scdps.org/ohs.](http://www.scdps.org/ohs/)**
- Late September 2010: FFY 2011 Grant Awards Issued with Funding Beginning October 1, 2010. Notification of Applicants Not Approved for Funding

DESCRIPTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA'S TRAFFIC COLLISION PROBLEM

Statistics based on 2008 calendar year (CY) (01/01/08-12/31/08) Data: Statistics for South Carolina indicate that during 2008, 107,252 traffic collisions were reported; this is a 4.3% decrease from 2007 totals when 112,067 collisions were reported. Collisions in CY 2008 resulted in an estimated 921 fatalities and 46,923 injuries. The number of traffic deaths was 14.5% lower than in 2007, when 1,077 persons were fatally injured in South Carolina traffic collisions. The estimated economic loss to the state from traffic crashes in 2007 was \$2,840,000,000, and is estimated to reach \$2.80 billion in 2008. This total, however, does not reflect the human toll of pain and suffering.

Mileage Death Rate: The state's mileage death rate (MDR), traffic fatalities per 100 million miles of travel in 2008 was 1.9. The national mileage death rate in 2008 was 1.3. Based on these figures, South Carolina's mileage death rate was 48% higher than the national average in 2007. The MDR for 2008, decreased to an historic low of 1.9, an 11.8% decrease from 2007.

2008 Collision Statistics: Breaking collision statistics down by time in CY 2008 indicated the following:

- * 1 Traffic Collision was reported every 4.8 minutes.
- * 1 Traffic Death was reported every 9.4 hours.
- * 1 Non-fatal Traffic Injury was reported every 10.7 minutes.
- * 1 Property-Damage-Only Collision was reported every 6.8 minutes.

In 2008, South Carolina had 3,312,200 licensed drivers who operated 3,901,718 registered motor vehicles on a roadway system of 66,261 miles of streets and highways. South Carolina has the fifth largest state-maintained highway system in the nation. Licensed driver numbers and vehicle numbers for 2009 are not yet available.

DUI Involvement in Collisions: According to the SC Department of Public Safety's statistics for 2008, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs was a contributing factor in 386 fatal collisions, resulting in the deaths of 425 persons. Statistics for 2008 indicate that 5,487 alcohol-related collisions were reported with more than 3,752 persons injured. Of the 5,487 total DUI collisions, 7% were fatal crashes, 46% were injury crashes, and 47% were property-damage-only crashes. In 2008, the state experienced a 4% decrease in the number of alcohol-related crashes as compared to 2007.

Speed Involvement in Collisions: According to the SC Department of Public Safety's statistics for 2008, speed was a contributing factor in 97 fatal collisions, resulting in 107 deaths. Statistics for 2008 indicate that 1,353 speed-related crashes were reported, with 880 persons injured. Of the 1,353 total speed-related collisions, 7.2% were fatal collisions, 44.1% were injury crashes, and 43.9% were property-damage-only crashes. In 2008, the state experienced a 20.7% decrease in speed-related crashes when compared to 2007.

Five-Year Collision Data: In order to examine traffic collision trends over time, Office of Highway Safety staff reviewed collision data for the period 2004-2008. During this five-year period, the state's MDR rose to 2.2 in 2005, but saw a historic low of 1.9 in 2008. Collision statistics for the period are presented in the chart below.

**South Carolina Collision Statistics
2004 - 2008**

<u>Year</u>	<u># Collisions</u>	<u># Deaths</u>	<u># Injuries</u>	<u>Death Rate</u>
2004	110,029	1,046	51,226	2.1
2005	111,983	1,093	49,841	2.2
2006	112,949	1,044	50,144	2.1
2007	111,980	1,077	49,262	2.1
2008	107,252	921	46,923	1.9

Top Contributing Factors for CY 2008 Crashes

Injury Crashes:

- * Driving Too Fast for Conditions
- * Failure to Yield Right of Way
- * Driver Distraction/Inattention
- * Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol/Drugs
- * Disregarding Sign/Signal

Fatal Crashes:

- * Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol/Drugs
- * Driving Too Fast for Conditions
- * Running off Road
- * Exceeded Speed Limit
- * Failure to Yield Right of Way

Total Crashes:

- * Driving Too Fast for Conditions
- * Failure to Yield Right of Way
- * Driver Distraction/Inattention
- * Following Too Closely
- * Improper Lane Usage/Change

Location of Highest Numbers of Property-Damage-Only Crashes: During the five-year period from 2004-2008, the five counties with the highest number of property-damage-only collisions were Charleston, Greenville, Richland, Horry, and Spartanburg.

Location of Highest Numbers of Injury Crashes: The locations of the largest numbers of injury collisions during the five-year period 2004-2008 were Charleston, Richland, Greenville, Horry, and Spartanburg counties.

Location of Highest Numbers of Fatal Crashes: The locations of the largest numbers of fatal crashes during the five-year period 2004-2008 were Greenville, Horry, Charleston, Richland, and Spartanburg counties.

Driver Groups Involved in Crashes: During the five-year period, the age groups with the highest number of drivers involved in crashes included drivers ages 15–24 and 25-34. Drivers under the age of twenty-one continued to be over-represented in traffic crashes based on the size of the category of licensed drivers in this group. Males continued to be involved in a higher percentage and number of crashes than female drivers.

An analysis by the Office of Highway Safety, based on traffic data over a three-year period, shows counties in the state of South Carolina which lead the state in statistical categories regarding fatal and severe injury crashes (number alcohol-related, percentage alcohol-related, number speed-related, percentage speed-related, number alcohol and/or speed-related, and percentage alcohol and/or speed-related). Grant projects submitted for FFY 2011 impacting counties listed in red in the charts on Pages 8-10, which lead in the above-referenced statistical categories, will be given priority for federal funding.

All Fatal And Severe Injury Collisions

South Carolina 2006 - 2008

COUNTY	2006	RANK	2007	RANK	2008	RANK	Three Year Total	RANK	Average Rank
Abbeville	23	38	29	34	18	41	70	38	37.8
Aiken	134	10	126	10	106	12	366	10	10.5
Allendale	8	46	5	46	10	45	23	46	45.8
Anderson	181	8	168	7	146	7	495	8	7.5
Bamberg	16	44	17	43	13	43	46	44	43.5
Barnwell	14	45	28	35	25	35	67	41	39.0
Beaufort	129	12	109	12	108	11	346	12	11.8
Berkeley	190	6	175	6	154	6	519	6	6.0
Calhoun	20	39	15	44	12	44	47	43	42.5
Charleston	345	2	388	1	321	1	1054	1	1.3
Cherokee	63	21	60	25	58	22	181	22	22.5
Chester	18	40	28	35	40	28	86	31	33.5
Chesterfield	51	29	42	29	47	23	140	28	27.3
Clarendon	63	21	41	30	38	29	142	27	26.8
Colleton	81	18	81	18	83	14	245	16	16.5
Darlington	70	20	64	22	63	20	197	20	20.5
Dillon	25	35	19	41	30	33	74	36	36.3
Dorchester	104	14	102	14	105	13	311	13	13.5
Edgefield	26	34	22	39	32	32	80	34	34.8
Fairfield	17	41	33	31	23	38	73	37	36.8
Florence	134	10	115	11	117	10	366	10	10.3
Georgetown	63	21	72	20	46	25	181	22	22.0
Greenville	265	3	287	3	243	3	795	3	3.0
Greenwood	56	26	57	26	63	20	176	24	24.0
Hampton	17	41	33	31	20	39	70	38	37.3
Horry	353	1	345	2	273	2	971	2	1.8
Jasper	82	16	64	22	45	26	191	21	21.3
Kershaw	55	27	66	21	47	23	168	25	24.0
Lancaster	82	16	84	17	77	19	243	17	17.3
Laurens	61	24	79	19	79	17	219	19	19.8
Lee	25	35	19	41	19	40	63	42	39.5
Lexington	198	5	165	8	144	8	507	7	7.0
McCormick	17	41	13	45	9	46	39	45	44.3
Marion	32	31	33	31	18	41	83	33	34.0
Marlboro	28	32	25	37	24	37	77	35	35.3
Newberry	28	32	46	27	35	31	109	30	30.0
Oconee	60	25	63	24	45	26	168	25	25.0
Orangeburg	110	13	106	13	80	16	296	14	14.0
Pickens	85	15	88	15	79	17	252	15	15.5
Richland	246	4	270	4	220	4	736	4	4.0
Saluda	24	37	20	40	25	35	69	40	38.0
Spartanburg	188	7	205	5	172	5	565	5	5.5
Sumter	73	19	85	16	81	15	239	18	17.0
Union	35	30	25	37	26	34	86	31	33.0
Williamsburg	52	28	44	28	36	30	132	29	28.8
York	164	9	163	9	132	9	459	9	9.0
Total	4111		4124		3587		11,822		

Counties in red are ranked in the top 15 counties in the above categories 3 or more times.

Speed/Too Fast For Conditions Fatal & Severe Injury Crashes South Carolina 2006 - 2008

COUNTY	Speed Crashes 2006	RANK	Speed Crashes 2007	RANK	Speed Crashes 2008	RANK	Speed Crashes 06 to 08	RANK	ALL Fatal & Severe Crashes 06 to 08	RANK	% Speed Related 06 - 08	RANK	Average Rank
Abbeville	8	37	10	35	10	34	28	34	70	38	40.0%	16	32.3
Aiken	58	9	43	10	27	17	128	10	366	10	35.0%	26	13.7
Allendale	4	45	2	46	6	44	12	46	23	46	52.2%	1	38.0
Anderson	73	5	79	5	58	6	210	5	495	8	42.4%	6	5.8
Bamberg	8	37	7	40	4	46	19	43	46	44	41.3%	10	36.7
Barnwell	6	41	13	33	9	37	28	34	67	41	41.8%	8	32.3
Beaufort	35	12	36	13	36	9	107	11	346	12	30.9%	38	15.8
Berkeley	64	6	55	7	42	8	161	7	519	6	31.0%	37	11.8
Calhoun	4	45	6	42	5	45	15	45	47	43	31.9%	30	41.7
Charleston	79	2	100	3	76	1	255	2	1054	1	24.2%	46	9.2
Cherokee	25	19	22	25	21	21	68	21	181	22	37.6%	23	21.8
Chester	6	41	10	35	11	32	27	38	86	31	31.4%	33	35.0
Chesterfield	14	29	18	29	21	21	53	30	140	28	37.9%	21	26.3
Clarendon	21	23	16	30	21	21	58	26	142	27	40.8%	14	23.5
Colleton	34	13	28	18	34	12	96	15	245	16	39.2%	19	15.5
Darlington	32	16	22	25	27	17	81	18	197	20	41.1%	11	17.8
Dillon	13	30	7	40	11	32	31	33	74	36	41.9%	7	29.7
Dorchester	34	13	33	14	32	15	99	14	311	13	31.8%	32	16.8
Edgefield	12	31	11	34	13	30	36	31	80	34	45.0%	4	27.3
Fairfield	8	37	14	31	10	34	32	32	73	37	43.8%	5	29.3
Florence	34	13	32	15	34	12	100	13	366	10	27.3%	44	17.8
Georgetown	20	26	24	21	15	29	59	25	181	22	32.6%	29	25.3
Greenville	77	3	101	2	66	3	244	3	795	3	30.7%	39	8.8
Greenwood	23	20	25	20	19	26	67	23	176	24	38.1%	20	22.2
Hampton	6	41	14	31	8	40	28	34	70	38	40.0%	16	33.3
Horry	100	1	107	1	73	2	280	1	971	2	28.8%	42	8.2
Jasper	26	18	19	27	13	30	58	26	191	21	30.4%	41	27.2
Kershaw	22	22	31	16	23	20	76	19	168	25	45.2%	3	17.5
Lancaster	23	20	24	21	27	17	74	20	243	17	30.5%	40	22.5
Laurens	21	23	37	11	33	14	91	17	219	19	41.6%	9	15.5
Lee	12	31	6	42	7	42	25	41	63	42	39.7%	18	36.0
Lexington	63	7	48	8	35	11	146	9	507	7	28.8%	43	14.2
McCormick	5	44	4	44	7	42	16	44	39	45	41.0%	12	38.5
Marion	8	37	9	37	9	37	26	40	83	33	31.3%	35	36.5
Marlboro	10	34	8	39	10	34	28	34	77	35	36.4%	24	33.3
Newberry	12	31	24	21	20	25	56	28	109	30	51.4%	2	22.8
Oconee	21	23	28	18	19	26	68	21	168	25	40.5%	15	21.3
Orangeburg	38	11	31	16	36	9	105	12	296	14	35.5%	25	14.5
Pickens	30	17	37	11	28	16	95	16	252	15	37.7%	22	16.2
Richland	77	3	89	4	63	4	229	4	736	4	31.1%	36	9.2
Saluda	10	34	4	44	9	37	23	42	69	40	33.3%	27	37.3
Spartanburg	51	10	66	6	63	4	180	6	565	5	31.9%	31	10.3
Sumter	17	28	24	21	21	21	62	24	239	18	25.9%	45	26.2
Union	10	34	9	37	8	40	27	38	86	31	31.4%	33	35.5
Williamsburg	18	27	19	27	17	28	54	29	132	29	40.9%	13	25.5
York	61	8	47	9	44	7	152	8	459	9	33.1%	28	11.5
Total	1,333		1,399		1,181		3,913		11,822		33.1%		

Counties in red are ranked in the top 15 counties in the above categories 4 or more times.

Fatal & Severe Injury DUI Crashes

South Carolina 2006 - 2008

COUNTY	DUI 2006	R A N K	DUI 2007	R A N K	DUI 2008	R A N K	DUI 06 to 08	R A N K	ALL Fatal & Severe Crashes 06 to 08	R A N K	% DUI 06 - 08	R A N K	Average Rank
Abbeville	6:35		10:29		5:37		21:32		70:38		30.0%	10	30.2
Aiken	37:8		41:8		43:8		121:8		366:10		33.1%	7	8.2
Allendale	2:46		0:46		4:39		6:46		23:46		26.1%	17	40.0
Anderson	34:10		44:7		46:7		124:7		495:8		25.1%	19	9.7
Bamberg	4:38		3:41		2:44		9:44		46:44		19.6%	36	41.2
Barnwell	3:41		7:35		9:27		19:36		67:41		28.4%	13	32.2
Beaufort	16:19		17:21		19:17		52:20		346:12		15.0%	44	22.2
Berkeley	36:9		32:10		38:9		106:10		519:6		20.4%	34	13.0
Calhoun	6:35		8:33		3:41		17:39		47:43		36.2%	3	32.3
Charleston	48:5		46:6		49:6		143:6		1054:1		13.6%	45	11.5
Cherokee	18:15		17:21		14:23		49:22		181:22		27.1%	15	19.7
Chester	4:38		10:29		13:24		27:29		86:31		31.4%	8	26.5
Chesterfield	13:24		7:35		9:27		29:27		140:28		20.7%	33	29.0
Clarendon	15:20		12:27		8:30		35:26		142:27		24.6%	24	25.7
Colleton	12:28		13:26		19:17		44:23		245:16		18.0%	39	24.8
Darlington	22:14		26:12		21:15		69:14		197:20		35.0%	4	13.2
Dillon	3:41		3:41		6:35		12:42		74:36		16.2%	40	39.2
Dorchester	18:15		19:19		21:15		58:17		311:13		18.6%	38	19.5
Edgefield	8:30		9:32		7:32		24:31		80:34		30.0%	10	28.2
Fairfield	3:41		10:29		5:37		18:37		73:37		24.7%	23	34.0
Florence	25:12		25:13		33:11		83:11		366:10		22.7%	30	14.5
Georgetown	15:20		19:19		9:27		43:24		181:22		23.8%	26	23.0
Greenville	68:1		70:2		60:2		198:1		795:3		24.9%	20	4.8
Greenwood	13:24		15:24		12:25		40:25		176:24		22.7%	29	25.2
Hampton	4:38		7:35		3:41		14:40		70:38		20.0%	35	37.8
Horry	51:4		77:1		54:4		182:3		971:2		18.7%	37	8.5
Jasper	7:33		14:25		8:30		29:27		191:21		15.2%	43	29.8
Kershaw	15:20		30:11		17:20		62:15		168:25		36.9%	2	15.5
Lancaster	17:18		20:18		17:20		54:19		243:17		22.2%	31	20.5
Laurens	23:13		23:15		27:12		73:13		219:19		33.3%	5	12.8
Lee	9:29		5:38		7:32		21:32		63:42		33.3%	5	29.7
Lexington	64:2		68:3		61:1		193:2		507:7		38.1%	1	2.7
McCormick	8:30		2:45		1:46		11:43		39:45		28.2%	14	37.2
Marion	7:33		3:41		3:41		13:41		83:33		15.7%	42	38.5
Marlboro	3:41		3:41		2:44		8:45		77:35		10.4%	46	42.0
Newberry	3:41		12:27		12:25		27:29		109:30		24.8%	22	29.0
Oconee	14:23		23:15		15:22		52:20		168:25		31.0%	9	19.0
Orangeburg	30:11		24:14		26:13		79:12		296:14		26.7%	16	13.3
Pickens	18:15		17:21		24:14		59:16		252:15		23.4%	27	18.0
Richland	52:3		50:5		57:3		159:5		736:4		21.6%	32	8.7
Saluda	8:30		4:39		6:35		18:37		69:40		26.1%	17	33.0
Spartanburg	48:5		60:4		54:4		162:4		565:5		28.7%	12	5.7
Sumter	13:24		23:15		19:17		55:18		239:18		23.0%	28	20.0
Union	6:35		8:33		7:32		21:32		86:31		24.4%	25	31.3
Williamsburg	13:24		4:39		4:39		21:32		132:29		15.9%	41	34.0
York	38:7		41:8		35:10		114:9		459:9		24.8%	21	10.7
Total	880		981		913		2,774		11,822		23.5%		

Counties in red are ranked in the top 15 counties in the above categories 4 or more times.

ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPING GRANT PROPOSALS

Research Assistance

Applicants are encouraged to visit the following web sites for a wealth of research information (including, but not limited to, crash statistics) for developing Highway Safety grant applications:

- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA): www.nhtsa.dot.gov
- Statistical Services Section of the SC Department of Public Safety's Office of Highway Safety: www.scdps.org/ohs/stat_services.asp
- State Budget and Control Board's Office of Research and Statistics: www.ors2.state.sc.us/sccodes/default.php

While a list of eligible projects has been provided in the individual program areas outlined in the remainder of this manual, applicants are encouraged to visit the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) web site for ideas and specific examples of other projects that have been successfully implemented in other states. These projects are outlined in NHTSA's Traffic Safety Digest section of its web page. Funding consideration may be given for such projects in South Carolina. The web address is: www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/outreach/safedige/

Assistance from Office of Highway Safety

Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Office of Highway Safety (OHS) for assistance and guidance in completing and submitting grant applications (e.g., forming appropriate project goals, objectives, evaluation measures, etc.). Listed below are contact names and program area(s) of expertise. OHS staff can be reached toll free at 1-877-349-7187.

Stuart Litman: Police Traffic Services/Speed Enforcement

Cothea Scott: Impaired Driving Countermeasures

Dr. Ed Harmon: Traffic Records

Amie Hudson: Occupant Protection, Pedestrian Safety, Two-wheel Vehicle Safety

Daphne Shook: Questions regarding the completion of the budget pages (pp. 1 – 5 of the Highway Safety Grant Application)

All other questions can be directed to Amy Caldwell, Grants Administration Manager of OHS.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF FUNDED APPLICANTS

When a project is funded, the authorized official of the recipient agency enters into a written contractual agreement with the Department that outlines specific responsibilities. A few conditions of the agreement are:

Reporting Requirements

- Progress Reports –programmatic (due February 1st, May 1st, and August 1st)
- A Final Narrative Report (due November 1st)

Claims

Claims for reimbursement are to be submitted on designated forms as issued by the SC Department of Public Safety, Office of Grants Accounting. Claims may be submitted no more than once each month and no less than once a quarter; however, claims are held if the grant recipient is delinquent in the submission of required reports. Failure to submit claims as required may result in project termination.

Procurement

Proper bidding procedures as required by OMB Circular A-102, Attachment O, or OMB Circular A-110 (as applicable) are to be followed. In addition,

- * Bid specifications/requests for proposals for purchases over \$10,000 must be reviewed and approved by Office of Highway Safety staff prior to issuance; once bids/proposals are received, subgrantees must submit bids/proposals for review and approval prior to acceptance of any bid.
- * All contracts for services must be submitted for review and approval prior to execution. **Only under exceptional circumstances are sole source contracts approved.**
- * Purchases in excess of \$10,000 in the unit or aggregate and requiring approval of specifications/bid awards must be submitted through the standard approval process prior to August 1 of the grant year.
- * All grant-funded purchases must be requested, purchased, and invoiced on or before September 30. As such, any purchases made under this grant must be documented with purchase requisitions/purchase orders dated on or before September 30.

Agencies failing to follow these procedures will not receive reimbursement for such procurements. Purchases for items, which are on a state contract, do not require prior approval, unless they have a value of \$5,000 or more. An item with a value of \$5,000 or more must be approved by NHTSA prior to beginning the purchasing process. Recipient agency staff should verify contract dates, however, prior to purchase, to ensure that the contract is in existence at the time of purchase and includes both the contract number and expiration date on documentation submitted when reimbursement is requested.

Written Requests

- * Requests for grant revisions after a grant is awarded must be made in writing to the Office of Highway Safety prior to the implementation of the change. Revisions cannot be implemented until written approval is granted by the Office of Highway Safety. Retroactive approval of revisions will not be granted, and costs incurred in such situations will not be reimbursed.
- * Specific out-of-state travel not identified in the Travel Section of the approved grant application budget must receive prior written approval from the Office of Highway Safety. Without such approval, costs for the travel will not be reimbursed.

Personnel

- * Time sheets must be maintained for all grant-funded personnel, reflecting the hours worked on and charged to the project. If personnel are funded 100% through the grant, their activity must be 100% in support of activities agreed upon in the grant award. Costs for grant-funded personnel performing tasks outside the grant will not be reimbursed.
- * All personnel funded under a grant must be identified by name and date of hire. Any changes in grant personnel, reassignments, or terminations must be reported in writing. Costs for personnel services may only be reimbursed for work performed within the dates of hire. Work performed prior to the documented hire date or after the documented termination date under the grant cannot be reimbursed. Personnel costs can only be reimbursed for personnel specifically identified in the approved grant budget. If the budget specifies, for example, one (1) traffic officer at 100%, reimbursement of personnel expenses cannot be made for two officers, each working 20 hours of a 40-hour shift. Reimbursement can only be made for the one officer.

Special Activities

- * All agencies receiving Highway Safety Grant funds will be expected to assist the Office of Highway Safety in promoting the observance of National Child Passenger Safety Week (September); Buckle Up, America! Week (May); Drunk and Drugged Driving (3D) Prevention Month (December) as requested; all agencies receiving Highway Safety Grant funds will also participate in the statewide safety belt and DUI enforcement and public information and education campaigns and the Law Enforcement Network.

Equipment Purchased with Grant Funds

- * All equipment purchased with Highway Safety grant funds must be used for the originally authorized grant purposes for as long as needed for those purposes. Agencies receiving funds to purchase equipment must notify the Office of Highway Safety and request disposition instructions when (1) equipment becomes obsolete, and the agency desires to sell or dispose of the equipment; or (2) the equipment is no longer needed for the original purpose. No disposition of property can be made by the subgrantee until written instructions are provided by the Office of Highway Safety.

- * Property Control records must be submitted for all equipment purchased with Highway Safety funds. The equipment is subject to a biennial property inventory to verify use in accordance with the original grant-funded activities.

OVERVIEW AND GENERAL FUNDING REQUIREMENTS/LIMITATIONS

The Office of Highway Safety of the South Carolina Department of Public Safety is charged with the administration of highway safety programs throughout the state. Highway safety programs in South Carolina originated under the Highway Safety Act of 1966 and have promoted safety in a variety of areas through state and local projects. This guide provides an overview of each of the areas eligible for federal funding during the FFY 2011 funding cycle.

The following program guidelines and list of fundable items have been developed to focus federal funding assistance in those areas that have a maximum probability of reducing death and injury on the highways. The approved program areas were selected on the basis of the magnitude of identified problems, the impact of existing countermeasures, and the potential for further impact on specific problems. To be eligible for federal funds, each traffic safety problem must be substantiated through appropriate data analysis, and the proposed solutions must possess a potential for impact.

General Requirements:

All proposals submitted should demonstrate:

1. A highway safety problem/need exists;
2. A measurable impact on highway and traffic safety;
3. Cost effectiveness;
4. A comprehensive and systematic approach implemented in a well-defined geographic area;
5. A method for project evaluation (both performance and impact evaluation); and
6. All cost items are an integral part of an approved highway safety program and have been justified accordingly.

Special Note Regarding Supplanting:

The replacement of routine and/or existing State or local expenditures with the use of Federal grant funds and/or the use of Federal grant funds for costs of activities that constitute general expenses required to carry out the overall responsibilities of a State or local agency is considered to be supplanting and is not allowable.

General Allowable Costs:

To be allowable, an applicant's costs must be necessary, reasonable, allocable, and used in accordance with appropriate statutes and implementing grant regulations. Highway Safety grant funds are to be used to support state problem identification, planning and implementation of a program to address a wide range of highway safety problems that are related to human factors and the roadway environment and which contribute to the reduction of crashes, deaths, and injuries.

1. The following are some examples of eligible items for Highway Safety grant funding:
 - * Implementation of educational and promotional efforts to increase public compliance with occupant protection laws.
 - * Implementation of a comprehensive enforcement program for detecting, investigating, arresting, and convicting impaired drivers.
 - * Development and administration of countermeasures programs to correct identified problems.
 - * Program coordination for impaired driving prevention public information and education activities.
 - * Necessary mission-related equipment, training and travel.
 - * Program management and administration.
 - * Evaluation of the effectiveness of program or project improvements.
 - * The cost of training is allowable using DOT/NHTSA developed, equivalent, or endorsed curriculums.
 - * Purchase of child restraint devices is allowable if they are in compliance with NHTSA performance standard FMVSS #213 for these devices.
 - * Development costs of new training curriculum and materials are allowable if they will not duplicate materials already developed for similar purposes by DOT/NHTSA or by other states. This does not preclude modifications of present materials necessary to meet particular state and local instructional needs.
2. Costs are allowable for highway safety consultant services from universities, public agencies, non-government organizations and individuals for State or local highway safety support services or products consistent with the applicable OMB Circular, provided applicable State procurement purchasing procedures are followed.
3. Costs are allowable to support a specific highway safety project with educational activities that offer specific educational items and/or appropriate printed materials. Documentation must be available to show that such activities do not violate State law. Educational items, activities, and any printed materials must directly relate to the project objectives.
4. Costs of meetings and conferences, where the primary purpose is the documentable dissemination of technical information, are allowable including meals, transportation, rental of meeting facilities, and other incidental costs.

Specific Examples of Allowable/Non-Allowable Costs:

The provisions stated in the following sections are not intended to deny flexibility in supporting potential traffic collision and injury reduction activities; however the conditions do serve as a guide in describing costs that **are allowable or not allowable for highway safety funding.**

1. Personnel

Grant-funded personnel are allowable and must expend 100% of their time in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the activities specified in the approved grant application. Grant-funded traffic officers, for example, are provided to increase the level of traffic law enforcement in a jurisdiction. As such, they are prohibited from providing funeral escorts or parade duty. In addition, since the primary function of grant funded-officers is to prevent and reduce collisions, injuries and fatalities by proactive enforcement measures, these officers should only respond to traffic collisions **in emergency situations**, such as when no other officer is available to respond, or during inclement weather when proactive enforcement is hindered. Special DUI prosecutors are provided solely for the purpose of increasing DUI and other dangerous driving case convictions and relieving the backlog of such cases; they are prohibited from prosecuting or handling other cases, such as burglary, aggravated assault, etc., while they are grant funded.

2. Facilities

- a. The cost of land is not allowable.
- b. The cost of construction or reconstruction of driving ranges, towers, and skid pads is not allowable.
- c. The cost of construction, rehabilitation, remodeling, or office furnishings and fixtures for state, local, or private buildings or structures is not allowable. The following are some examples of those items considered as furnishings or fixtures, for which costs are not allowable:

Desk	Coat Rack	Floor Covering	Picture/Clock
Chair	Credenza	Storage Cabinet	Draperies
Table	Book Case	Portable Partition	Fixed Lighting
Filing Cabinet	Shelving	Office Planter Lamp	

3. Equipment

- a. Costs for major (\$5,000 or more) equipment purchases require specific prior approval of NHTSA.
- b. Costs shall be allocated and pro-rated based on utilization for highway safety purposes where major multi-purpose equipment is a planned purchase.
- c. Purchase of the following equipment items is allowable only if they are part of a comprehensive traffic enforcement program:
 - 1. Vehicle Light Bar Package, 8-light strobe, takedown lights

2. Vehicle Passenger Transportation Cage or Safety Barrier for use between front seat and back seat to prevent rear seat occupants from injuring law enforcement front seat occupants
3. Vehicle Mobile Radio Unit
4. In-Car Mobile Video Unit
5. Videotapes for in-car video unit
6. Power Control Center
7. Hand-held radar units/LIDAR units. Devices must meet federal standards.
8. Siren-Speaker
9. Traffic Cones (SCDOT specification -Not to exceed \$25 each)
10. Push Bumpers
11. Fire Extinguishers
12. Electronic Siren
13. Cellular Phone-Basic Service
14. Passive alcohol sensors
15. Stop sticks
16. Police vehicle (not to exceed \$24,000) – **Please note that vehicles must be color schemed and marked as indicated by the Office of Highway Safety.**
17. Alcohol testing devices (Devices must be on the Conforming Product List issued by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.)
 - d. Purchase of mainframe computers is not allowable.
 - e. Purchase of weapons, uniforms, and badges is not allowable.
 - f. Purchase of Mobile Data Terminals is not allowed at this time.

4. Travel

- a. The cost of international travel is not allowable, except as separately approved by NHTSA and the state.

- b. The Office of Highway Safety must approve all requests for out-of-state travel in writing and in advance, unless the specific travel destination has been previously approved and is specifically listed in the Travel section of the approved application budget.
- c. The cost of day-to-day patrol mileage for a grant-funded officer is allowable based on the approved grant mileage rate.

5. Training

- a. Costs are allowable to pay for a grant-funded employee's salary while pursuing OHS approved training.
- b. **The purchase of portable alcohol breath testing devices is allowable, but the devices may be used only in a training context.**

6. Alcohol Treatment Services

The cost of counseling and other alcohol and drug abuse treatment services, the cost of the promotion of such services, and the cost of any materials related to treatment services are not allowable.

Letters of Support:

Letters of support are requested with the grant application *only* if funds are requested for multi-agency traffic enforcement projects and other projects involving multiple partners.

Matching Requirements:

Grant applications are 100% federally funded for FFY 2011. No cash match is required for any eligible applicant.

Limitations of Federal Funding:

Federal funding is limited to the support of new highway safety activities or the upgrading/expansion of established highway safety activities, or continuation of projects having a statewide impact.

Grant applications are 100% federally funded for FFY 2011. It should be noted that in FFY 2011 **no cash match is required** for any eligible applicant.

However, as in previous years, grant projects are awarded on a year-to-year basis. Grant projects showing significant progress in improving highway safety *may* be renewed up to two additional years, for a total of three years of funding. After three years of continuous funding, subgrantees are expected to assume the entire cost of sustaining the project. **The exception to this involves projects that the OHS deems necessary to recommend funding in order to complement or support statewide enforcement, training, and/or public information and education campaign efforts and which show high levels of performance and effectiveness.**

Indirect Cost Rates:

State Agencies: All indirect cost recoveries should be credited to the general fund with the exception of recoveries from research and student-aid grants and contracts. Each state agency receiving grants or contracts to which indirect costs may be charged must have an approved indirect cost rate. Agencies must prepare an indirect cost proposal, and submit it to the State Indirect Cost Officer for review and approval. The OHS reserves the right to negotiate indirect cost rate charges to a grant prior to award.

Local Agencies and Private, Non-Profit Organizations: Local agencies and Private, Non-Profit Organizations receiving federal funds are not authorized to recover indirect costs.

PRIORITY EMPHASIS AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING IN FFY 2011

Impaired Driving Countermeasures: The enforcement, adjudication, education, and systematic improvements necessary to impact impaired driving. This includes programs focusing on youth alcohol traffic safety issues.

Occupant Protection: The development and implementation of programs designed to increase usage of safety belts among all age groups and proper usage of child restraints.

Police Traffic Services: The development or enhancement of traffic enforcement programs necessary to directly impact traffic crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Speeding programs are a priority; however, these programs should also include attention to DUI enforcement, occupant protection and other traffic violations. Components of grant proposals may also include efforts to educate and improve the driving skills, attitudes and behaviors of young drivers, ages 15-24.

Traffic Records (Statewide Emphasis): The continued development and implementation of a statewide program (the South Carolina Collision and Ticket Tracking System, or SCCATTS) designed to enhance the collection, analysis, and dissemination of collision data, increasing the capability for identifying and alleviating highway safety problems.

Other Potential Funding Areas

Other program areas may be eligible for funding in FFY 2011 which include Motorcycle Safety and Pedestrian Safety. Please contact Amy Caldwell of the Office of Highway Safety at 1-877-349-7187 for information on applying for a grant in potential funding areas.

PRIORITY EMPHASIS AREA PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS

The following projects are eligible for funding in FFY 2011:

1. **Specialized DUI Enforcement Unit/Team**

In order for impaired driving enforcement programs to be considered for funding, state and local crash data and traffic records analyses must be available to fully justify the requirement for an impaired driving enforcement team. Jurisdictions must have a high incidence of alcohol and/or drug-related crashes or a significant increase over the previous year in order to justify a proposal. Collision data and analyses, along with citation data, should be used to clearly indicate a major impaired driving problem and to demonstrate that increased enforcement will have a major impact on the reduction of drug and/or alcohol-related traffic crashes. The traffic officers assigned to such programs must be highly trained and skilled in order to detect a potential DUI. They must be able to administer proper field sobriety tests, videotape the suspect, supervise administration of the breath test during booking proceedings, and provide adequate case documentation for court presentation.

Proposals for either statewide or community Impaired Driving Enforcement Programs must:

- a. Describe your department's traffic records data information system;
- b. Describe how the enforcement effort will be initiated to increase DUI arrests and to reduce alcohol/drug-related crashes, to include an enforcement plan detailing specific days/nights of the week and hours the specialized impaired driving enforcement will be conducted. Provide an enforcement plan and a sample monthly schedule of the grant-funded officers;
- c. List the enforcement tools, such as video equipment, needed to implement the project and cost projections. Explain how these tools will be utilized in furthering project objectives;
- d. Demonstrate/discuss the department's commitment to the program. Include a detailed description as to how the department intends to provide continuing support, both programmatic and financial, after the end of the grant period;
- e. Describe the public information and educational program to be implemented as a part of the program. Such a program should focus on the risks of drinking and driving and the likelihood of apprehension through the program. These programs should focus on certain groups that

have been identified as being at high-risk for driving under the influence (i.e., males ages 25 - 34) and repeat offenders;

- f. Describe the need for this specialized program, based on the number of DUI-related crashes, injuries, and fatalities now occurring in the area to be covered by the program; and
- g. Demonstrate and document the increase in manpower and man hours planned for impaired driving enforcement.
- h. Include a plan for SFST training for enforcement and supervisory personnel assigned to the project, including the number of officers to be trained and the anticipated results.

2. Establishment/Enhancement of Traffic Enforcement Division

In order for traffic enforcement proposals to be considered for funding, state and local crash data and traffic records analyses must be available to fully justify the requirement for increased traffic enforcement. Jurisdictions must have a high incidence of crashes or a significant increase over the previous year in order to justify a proposal. Collision data and analyses, along with citation data, should be used to clearly indicate a major problem and to demonstrate that increased enforcement will have a major impact on the reduction of traffic crashes.

- a. Provide traffic records, citations or arrest data, and other information to adequately identify a traffic problem;
- b. Develop a plan for increased training for all traffic officers, including the type of training, the number to be trained, and the anticipated results;
- c. The purchase of equipment will not be considered unless the equipment is required to develop a new traffic enforcement unit, to improve an on-going traffic enforcement program, or to support a statewide enforcement campaign. **Refer to Pages 17-18 of this document for a sample listing of allowable equipment.** Support equipment required to implement an enforcement program must be fully justified and must have a direct effect upon the apprehension and conviction of traffic offenders.
- d. Describe how a public information program will be initiated/implemented to inform the general public of the program, to provide them with basic traffic safety education, and to secure support for the increased enforcement effort;
- e. Demonstrate and document a need to increase personnel hours for traffic enforcement;
- f. Demonstrate/discuss the department's commitment (and that of the city/county/state governing body) to a comprehensive traffic enforcement program;

- g. Demonstrate a well developed, comprehensive plan for enforcement including specific days of the week and hours the selective traffic enforcement will be conducted. Provide a sample monthly schedule for the grant-funded officer(s); and
- h. Provide and establish specific objectives that are clear, achievable, measurable, and time-specific. These statements must reflect the activities needed to fully implement the project. Be sure that enforcement goals are achievable, taking into account factors such as manpower constraints and seasonal population fluctuations. Include any other tasks that are relevant to achieving Project Goals.
- i. Priority will be given to those agencies actively participating in the South Carolina Law Enforcement Networks (SCLLEN). Agencies applying for and receiving funding for police traffic services/speed enforcement programs must agree to continue or begin participation in the SCLLEN.
- j. All applications should address how funding will serve to decrease the number of collisions, injuries, and fatalities in respective jurisdictions through increased enforcement and educational efforts. Subgrantees funded for traffic safety enforcement units must ensure that the level of enforcement for traffic-related offenses is increased above and beyond enforcement levels experienced prior to the establishment of the grant-funded unit.
- k. All police traffic services/speed enforcement programs must include educational, media, and training components to support the enforcement program.

3. Selective Traffic Enforcement Program

Selective traffic enforcement programs should follow established traffic enforcement methods in which personnel and equipment are concentrated at high collision locations. To maximize effectiveness, selective enforcement must be based on accurate data and data analysis; therefore, adequate traffic records must be maintained in order to justify the use of valuable personnel and equipment resources at the selected sites. Traffic records data provided in the grant application must contain a minimum of three years of data regarding the number and types of crashes that occurred, the violations and citation data for various traffic offenses, and the locations of collisions/traffic arrests. Crash records and citation data must provide such vital information as time of day; day of week; weather conditions and roadway conditions; and number of speed, DUI, safety belt, and child restraint citations issued. This data, when properly analyzed, can be used to identify the locations to which and the times when a selective traffic enforcement program should be deployed. In developing a selective traffic enforcement program on either a statewide or community level, applicants must:

- a. Demonstrate how traffic collision, citation and other related data will be used in the deployment of personnel;

- b. Provide a plan for the training of the traffic supervisor and the traffic officers assigned to the project;
- c. Provide information about the program to local judges and magistrates to acquaint them with the need for increased enforcement;
- d. Discuss a method, including both qualitative and quantitative components, for determining the outcome and effectiveness of the selective traffic enforcement program;
- e. Include an appropriate and aggressive public information component to educate the public as to the program's purpose and to encourage its support for increased traffic enforcement to address the identified problems;
- f. Indicate that support for increased traffic enforcement has been received from the city/county governing bodies and that the traffic program has the approval of all command level personnel within the department. The proposal should discuss the department's commitment to a comprehensive selective traffic enforcement program;
- g. Demonstrate and document an increase in manpower and man-hours for selective traffic enforcement; and
- h. Provide a comprehensive plan to alleviate, through selective traffic enforcement, the identified state or community traffic safety problem. The plan should include specific days of the week and hours the selective traffic enforcement will be conducted. Provide a sample monthly schedule for the grant-funded officer(s).

AJUDICATION / PROSECUTION PROJECTS

The following projects are eligible for funding in FFY 2011:

1. Special DUI Prosecutors for Local Areas

The goal of this project category is to increase the conviction rate of DUI offenders in judicial circuits where there exists a backlog of DUI cases. Project applications requesting a special DUI prosecutor must:

- a. Demonstrate an increase in DUI arrests within the judicial circuit, providing at least three years of DUI arrest data for the project impact area;
- b. Provide the number of *nolle prosequere* cases, or the number of cases dismissed over the past three years, and the average age of these cases;
- c. Demonstrate that the judicial circuit has a substantial backlog of DUI cases. Comparisons with the backlogs of other circuits would be helpful. The age of backlogged cases should also be provided;
- d. Outline DUI-related training to be provided for the assigned prosecutor;
- e. Establish special goals for increasing the conviction rate of DUI offenders and for decreasing the DUI case backlog;
- f. Discuss how the project will be evaluated;
- g. Discuss how DUI cases are currently being handled with existing staff;
- h. Provide a sound approach for project implementation; and
- i. Provide the conviction rate for the previous three years, by county, in the judicial circuit.

2. Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor

A Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) project would provide critical support to enhance the capability of the States' prosecutors and law enforcement to effectively prosecute traffic safety violations. Proposals for projects that establish a Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor must:

- a. Assess training needs, and develop and provide training programs for prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and other traffic safety professionals with an emphasis on the effective prosecution of impaired driving cases;
- b. Provide technical assistance and legal research to prosecutors on a wide variety of legal issues, including probable cause; Standardized Field

Sobriety Testing (SFST); implied consent; breath/blood testing; accusatory instruments; pre-trial procedures; trial practice; and appellate practice;

- c. Serve as a resource to prosecutors in the State on impaired driving and other traffic cases;
- d. Prepare briefs, legal memoranda and other pleadings for use at hearings, trials or on appeal of such cases;
- e. Train and provide technical assistance to State, local and county law enforcement in methods of evidence gathering, especially newly emerging technology and trial techniques, which will improve the ability of prosecutors to effectively prosecute impaired driving cases;
- f. Coordinate with the Office of Highway Safety to serve as the liaison with additional prosecutors to enable them to become more involved in traffic safety initiatives;
- g. Respond to written and verbal inquiries made by prosecutors concerning criminal law, associate administrative issues, procedure or special problems, and offer competency and expertise in providing a broad range of technical assistance and support services for prosecuting traffic safety offenses;
- h. Meet regularly with law enforcement agencies to explain prosecutorial policy, answer questions, and receive suggestions; foster improved law enforcement/prosecutor cooperation; strengthen effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies; and regularly apprise prosecuting attorneys on evolving areas of traffic safety law;
- i. Serve as a regular and full participant in the State's Impaired Driving Prevention Council.
- j. Provide consultation on and prosecute, or serve as second chair on, difficult impaired driving cases at various locations around the State.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH PROJECTS

1. Education for Young People

Projects with a specific focus on young drivers ages 15-24 with education on alcohol and/or drugs, safety belt usage, and speeding will be given consideration. Educational projects are more focused on the young drivers and provide a longer exposure to the alcohol/drug and highway safety messaging than public awareness (media) campaigns. Educational projects could include the conducting of mock DUI trials in schools, the conducting of actual DUI trials in high schools and the implementation of victim impact panels. Parameters for an educational program include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Projects must accurately define the focus population. Young (15 - 24 years old) drivers or young people who have not yet reached driving age are appropriate groups, or both;
- b. Projects must specify a methodology for reaching the defined population. The methodologies designed should clearly outline the manner in which the group will be accessed and the projected number to be impacted by the project;
- c. Projects eligible for funding should be located in school districts, colleges, universities, and city or county agencies that deal with safety education or recreation;
- d. Educational projects should provide in-depth education to a specific population, measuring and evaluating that impact; and
- e. Applicants should identify in their proposal what existing highway safety education is now being done in the community by other organizations (MADD, SADD, ENCARE, etc.) and within the school system.

2. Statewide Occupant Protection Training and Outreach Program

A need exists to implement community projects that include minority groups, rural populations and young drivers, to encourage and promote safety belt and passive restraint use. Priority will be given to community-wide initiatives using innovative and creative approaches to encourage/promote the proper use of occupant restraints and to increase usage rates. While limited public information and education efforts may be a component of a community safety belt project, the primary focus should not be media centered.

Schools are an important arena in which to reach students, parents and others who transport students. Studies have indicated that children can be very influential in promoting safety belt usage in families. Studies have also shown that teenagers and young males are over-represented in fatal and injury crashes. Traditionally, belt usage rates among these groups have been low.

Projects in this category should be comprehensive in scope to include the medical and business community in promoting highway safety in the schools. Projects should also be educational or promotional programs designed to measurably increase usage of safety belts among this population group. Projects should also focus on entire school districts involving students, parents, teachers, and administrators and should be tied into all school activities.

3. Specialized Training for Law Enforcement (Statewide)

Projects in this category should provide comprehensive traffic safety training to law enforcement personnel throughout the state. Law enforcement training projects should include:

- a. The focus group to be trained;
- b. The learning goals and objectives of the training;
- c. A method for measuring the effectiveness of the training;
- d. The ultimate impact on traffic collisions, deaths, and injuries;
- e. A narrative of the methodology to be used in the training; and
- f. A course outline of information to be covered.

CRITERIA FOR GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW

Applications for proposed highway safety activities from qualified applicants will be reviewed by Office of Highway Safety (OHS) staff in accordance with the review criteria listed below. Recommendations by the OHS staff will then be forwarded to the SC Public Safety Coordinating Council for its review/approval pursuant to Section 23-6-520, SC Code of Laws, 1976, as amended. Applications for funding will be reviewed on the following basis:

1. The degree to which the proposal addresses a national or state identified problem area. Priority consideration will be given to applicants proposing major alcohol countermeasures, motorcycle safety, occupant protection, pedestrian safety, speed enforcement, and traffic records programs within the counties identified previously as having the highest numbers and percentages of alcohol and/or speed-related traffic collisions, deaths, and injuries during the last three years.
2. The extent to which the proposal meets the published criteria within the specific guidelines.
3. The degree to which the applicant identifies, analyzes, and comprehends the local or state problems. **Applicants who do not demonstrate a traffic safety problem/need will not be considered for funding.**
4. The extent to which the proposal seeks to provide a realistic and comprehensive approach toward problem solution, including documenting coordination with local and State agencies necessary for successful implementation.
5. The assignment of specific and measurable objectives with performance indicators capable of assessing project activity.
6. The extent to which the estimated cost justifies the anticipated results.
7. The ability of the proposed efforts to generate additional identifiable highway safety activity in the program area; the ability of the applicant to become self-sufficient and to continue project efforts once federal funds are no longer available.
8. The ability of the applicant to successfully implement the project based on the agency's past experience in implementing similar projects; the capability of the agency to provide necessary administrative support to the project.
9. For continuation projects, the quality of work and the responsiveness to grant requirements demonstrated in past funding years; current or past grant performance, results of past monitoring visits, and the timeliness and thoroughness of required reports.

HIGHWAY SAFETY APPLICATION REVIEW CHECK LIST

ALL APPLICATIONS SHOULD BE REVIEWED PRIOR TO SUBMISSION USING THE CHECK LIST PROVIDED BELOW. IF THERE ARE ANY NEGATIVE ANSWERS, PLEASE REVISE YOUR APPLICATION TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE IN PROVIDING THE NECESSARY INFORMATION.

Yes	No	
—	—	1. Is the problem statement clear and concise?
—	—	2. Is sufficient information regarding the problem provided?
—	—	3. Has sufficient data been provided in the problem analysis to prove the problem?
—	—	4. Has adequate information on the current situation been provided in the problem analysis?
—	—	5. Is the stated project term more than one year and does it indicate changes or outcomes anticipated?
—	—	6. Are the objectives consistent with the problem statement?
—	—	7. Are the objectives stated in measurable terms for specific time periods?
—	—	8. Does the narrative describe the project and discuss the tasks and activities proposed to correct the identified problem?
—	—	9. Will the performance indicators listed measure the attainment of stated objectives?
—	—	10. Has the source or method of collecting data to measure effect been identified?
—	—	11. Will the indicators listed measure the impact of program goals?
—	—	12. Has an evaluation plan been included in the application?
—	—	13. Has the subject of continuation of project activity for future years been adequately discussed?
—	—	14. If a continuation project, has a thorough analysis of the results of the previous year's project been included in the narrative?
—	—	15. Does the application fall under one of the program areas identified for funding?

— —

16. Have all costs been satisfactorily justified according to the approach proposed? Has sufficient budget detail been given and all figures checked for accuracy?

— —

17. Were travel costs included in the project budget for staff to attend the Project Management course?