SURVEY
OF THE STATES
SPEEDING
The Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) is the states’ voice on highway safety. GHSA represents the highway safety programs of states and territories on the human behavioral aspects of highway safety. Such areas include occupant protection, impaired driving, speed enforcement, aggressive driving, and pedestrian and bicycle safety, as well as highway safety issues relating to older and younger drivers, drowsy driving and distracted driving. In addition to the behavioral aspects of driving, GHSA also represents other aspects of highway safety, such as traffic records and training. GHSA's mission is to provide leadership in the development of national policy to ensure effective highway safety programs. For more information, please visit www.ghsa.org or call (202) 789-0942.
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Executive Summary

Executive Summary
Speeding is cited as a major factor in nearly one-third of motor vehicle crashes annually in the United States. Setting speed limits has traditionally been the responsibility of states, except for the period 1973-1994. During that period the federal government enacted mandatory speed limit ceilings on interstate highways and so-called interstate look-alike roads through the National Maximum Speed Limit (NMSL) policy. The NMSL was repealed in 1995. Most states raised speed limits after the repeal of NMSL.

In 1999, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) funded a research project to study the effects of the repeal of NMSL. In that study, and in a special issue on speeding released in 2003, researchers reiterated concern about the societal cost of speeding in the U.S. According to the most recent IIHS report, higher travel speeds on rural interstates are responsible for an average 35 percent increase in death rates.

In an effort to understand the continued role speeding plays in highway fatalities, the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) with financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Transportation, convened a national forum focusing on excessive speed. The outcome of the June 2005 forum will be recommendations for a national speed strategy in which federal, state and local actions to control speeding can be identified, coordinated and implemented.

This Survey of the States report provides background information for the National Forum in reducing speeding-related fatalities and also provides a snapshot of state countermeasures.

To gauge what speeding reduction efforts states and territories are undertaking, GHSA asked state highway safety agencies to complete a questionnaire on the issue. Forty-seven states plus Guam, the District of Columbia and the Indian Nations responded. Individual responses are provided in Appendix A.

GHSA’s Survey of the States found:

- While all jurisdictions have developed and use a state-specific standardized crash report form, forms vary from state to state, making regional comparisons difficult. Some states are able to isolate speeding-related fatal and injury crashes while others are not.
- Speeding-related crash data, if available, is available statewide in most instances. Speeding-related citation and/or conviction data is not as frequently collected or maintained in a statewide database.
- Aggressive driving is rarely defined in state statutes. Ten states reported as having enacted legislation specifically defining aggressive driving. Some states use informal definitions, some use federal definitions, and some states use other statutes such as reckless driving. It does appear that the number of states defining aggressive driving in state statutes is increasing, however. In January 2001, GHSA published a Survey of the States on the subject of aggressive driving. At that time only four states reported having enacted specific aggressive driving legislation.
- Geographic and demographic data isolated to speeding (crashes or citations) is not readily available in a statewide database format.
- Most jurisdictions did not isolate speeding in terms of targeting federal highway safety funding. Rather, speeding was most often included as one of several components of funded activities.
- Nearly all respondents reported a public perception that there exists a cushion above a posted speed limit in which officers will not cite offenders. The range most often reported was 5-10 miles per hour above the posted limit.
Background

Speeding is one of the most prevalent factors in motor vehicle crashes. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) lists speeding as the third leading contributing factor in traffic fatalities. Speeding continues to be cited as a major factor in almost one-third (31 percent) of traffic fatalities nationally and is estimated to cost $40 billion each year. State crash data for local roadways and collector roads also points to speeding as a contributing factor in a significant number of fatal and injury crashes.

Speeding is often defined in code or policy in terms such as driving too fast for conditions or driving in excess of the posted speed limit. Responsibility for setting speed limits rests with state and local governments. However, in 1973 Congress preempted state and local authority and enacted a national speed policy entitled the National Maximum Speed Limit (NMSL). The provision was authorized during the energy crisis and was intended to conserve fuel and decrease the nation’s reliance on petroleum. The NMSL limited speeds on interstates and limited access roadways to 55 mph. In 1987 and again in 1991, Congress allowed states to raise the maximum speed limits to 65 mph outside urban areas. Following years of controversy over the NMSL, Congress repealed the national speed policy in 1995. The repeal meant state and local governments once again controlled speed limits on all state and local roadways.

After federal controls were removed on the interstate system, many states also increased speed limits on local roadways, particularly on rural freeways. Not surprisingly, state crash data since 1995 is showing continuing increases in the number of deaths and injuries attributed to speed.

In 1999, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) funded a study of the effects of the repeal of the national maximum speed limit law. Researchers compared the number of motor vehicle deaths in 24 states that raised speed limits with corresponding fatality counts in the 6 years prior to the repeal. Researchers also compared fatality counts from 7 states that didn’t change speed limits. In 1999, IIHS estimated a 15 percent increase in fatalities on interstates and freeways in states that raised speed limits. In 2003, in a special issue on speeding, the Institute reiterated concern about speeding in the U.S. and the related societal cost in terms of increased death and injury rates. In the most recent report, IIHS found when states increased the speed limit to 75 mph, a 38 percent increase in the number of deaths per million vehicle miles of travel occurred, compared to states that did not increase the speed limit. States that increased speed limits to 70 mph experienced a 35 percent increase, resulting in approximately 1,100 more deaths.

Today, despite the substantial social and technological changes that have occurred in the past decade, speeding remains an important public policy and traffic safety issue. States are becoming increasingly concerned that gains made in the areas of safety restraint usage and impaired driving have been offset by increased fatalities and injuries due to higher speeds. In an effort to understand the continued role speeding plays in highway fatalities, the Governors Highway Safety Association, with assistance from several federal agencies and private organizations, organized a national forum focusing on excessive speeding. The outcome of the June 2005 forum will be recommendations for a national speed strategy in which federal, state and local actions to control speeding can be identified, coordinated and implemented.

Effect of Speed in Crashes

Speed limits are typically set based on roadway design. A curving two-lane rural road will have a different speed limit allowance than a modern controlled access freeway. Road characteristics that contribute to an assigned speed limit include sight distance (how far ahead the driver can see), road curvature, number of lanes, surface condition, the number of intersections, access to nearby commercial developments, whether the roadway is within city limits and so forth.

However, while road characteristics determine what is physically possible for a vehicle, adding the human element to the equation changes the out-
come. Actual driving speed is strongly influenced by what seems appropriate to the driver at the time. The perception of risk, i.e. whether the driver perceives that he/she will be caught speeding, is also a factor in how well a posted speed limit is followed.

The relationship between vehicle speed and crash severity is based on the laws of physics. Excessive vehicle speed (speed above that for which the roadway was designed, exceeding posted limits or speed too fast for conditions) has severe and often times disastrous effects in a crash, because speed:

- Reduces a driver’s ability to negotiate curves or maneuver around obstacles in the roadway
- Extends the distance necessary for a vehicle to stop
- Increases the distance a vehicle travels while the driver reacts to a hazard
- Compromises the integrity of the vehicle structure
- Decreases the effectiveness of vehicle design features such as airbags and restraint systems
- Decreases the ability of roadway hardware such as guardrails, barriers and impact attenuators to protect occupants
- Increases tread wear on tires and wear on braking systems
- Increases the risk of crashes because other vehicles and pedestrians may not be able to judge distance accurately

Survey of the States: Speeding
To better understand speeding as a highway safety issue at the state level, GHSA asked state highway safety offices to complete a questionnaire on the speeding issue. Forty-seven states plus Guam, the District of Columbia and the Indian Nations responded. Individual responses are provided in Appendix A.

Highway safety jurisdictions were asked to provide the following information:

1. Comparison of speed limits between 1994 (just before the repeal of NMSL) to 2004. States/territories were also queried about different speed limits for trucks.

2. What type of speeding-related data each state/territory maintains, including any data about aggressive driving, and whether and how the state/territory defines “aggressive driving.”

3. Proportion of fatal and injury crashes attributed to speeding, and annual number of speeding citations or speeding convictions.

4. Description of efforts to reduce excessive speeding, including educational, engineering and enforcement efforts. Respondents were asked to isolate measurable efforts that addressed only speeding, if possible.

5. Percentage of federal highway safety dollars committed to reducing incidences of speeding, as well as identifying amounts and sources of state funding.

6. Impact of speeding and/or aggressive driving programs in the last two years.

7. Opinion survey question about whether the motoring public believes police give a cushion above the posted speed limit before issuing a citation.
Summary of Key Results

Table 1: Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>55 55-65</td>
<td>55 55-65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>60 60</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55/65 55/65</td>
<td>65/65 65/70</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>55 55-65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>45 45</td>
<td>45 45</td>
<td>25 25</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>55 55/65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 55 or 55</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 55-70</td>
<td>55 55-70</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>50 55-60</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 55-65</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 55 to 70</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>50-55 50 to 70</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>65+ 70</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>55 75</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>55 65/70</td>
<td>55 55/65</td>
<td>55 55/65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>None None</td>
<td>None None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>50/55/60</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>45-55 45-55</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>D 65/N 55</td>
<td>D 75/N 65</td>
<td>D 70/N 65</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>NR 55</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>65 65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 55-60-65</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>65 70</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>55 70</td>
<td>55 60</td>
<td>U 50/R 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>55 65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>65 75</td>
<td>65 65/75</td>
<td>50/55 55/65</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = Day    N = Night    U= Urban    R = Rural

Eighteen respondents indicated a different speed limit for trucks (AR, CA, Guam, ID, IL, IN, LA, MD, MI, MT, ND, OH, OR, SD, TN, TX, VA and WS.) Differential speed limits for trucks were in place for a variety of reasons, with the most common being urbanized areas, mountainous areas, certain interstates or sections of interstates, primary/secondary/state roads, truck size/weight, roadway type and day/night.
## Summary of Key Results

To date, 10 states have either enacted aggressive driving legislation or have modified existing reckless driving statutes to include aggressive driving. Aggressive driving laws typically stipulate that a driver must be observed demonstrating more than one action included in a series of driver actions that are defined as “aggressive.”

### Table 2  Aggressive Driving Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td>Speeding and at least two of the following: failure to obey traffic control device, passing on the right out of regular lanes of traffic, unsafe lane change, following too closely, or failure to yield right of way; and the person's driving is an immediate hazard to another person or vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delaware</strong></td>
<td>At least 3 of the following: speeding, running red lights or stop signs, failure to yield right-of-way, making unsafe lane changes, passing on the shoulder, following too closely and passing stopped school buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida</strong></td>
<td>At least two of the following: speeding, unsafe or improper lane change, following too closely, failing to yield right of way, improper passing, and failure to obey traffic control devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia</strong></td>
<td>Operation of a motor vehicle with the intent to annoy, harass, molest, intimidate, injure, or obstruct another person while violating motor vehicle code sections including overtaking and passing another vehicle; traffic lane violations; following too closely; turn signal; lane change; slowing or stopping violations; impeding traffic flows; or reckless driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland</strong></td>
<td>At least three of the following: failure to obey traffic control device, overtaking and passing, passing on right, improper driving on laned roadways, following too closely, failure to yield right of way or exceeding maximum speed limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nevada</strong></td>
<td>Within 1 mile, speeds create a hazard for other drivers and at least two of the following: fails to obey traffic control device, passing on the right off of paved roadway, following too closely, failure to yield right of way, lane violation, and failure to yield right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong></td>
<td>Speeding and driving carelessly and heedlessly in willful or wanton disregard of the rights or safety of others (defined as reckless driving and includes at least two of the following: running a red light, running a stop sign, illegal passing, failing to yield right of way, and following too close.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhode Island</strong></td>
<td>At least two of the following: failure to obey traffic control device, passing on the right, driving outside the lanes of traffic, following too closely, failure to yield right of way, failure to use turn signals, and use of emergency lane for travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utah</strong></td>
<td>Amended reckless driving law to include aggressive driver actions: willful and wanton disregard and 3 or more moving violations in one episode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong></td>
<td>Is a hazard to others with the intent to harass, intimidate, injure or obstruct another person and commits at least one of the following: failure to drive on the right side of highway, failure to drive in lanes marked for traffic, following too closely, failure to yield right of way, failure to obey traffic control device, passing on right, speeding and stopping on a highway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speeding-related data; aggressive driving data

Being able to isolate and capture specific speeding-related deaths and injuries is an integral part of comparing the incidence of speeding-related deaths and injuries to all deaths and injuries within a state. Such identification allows jurisdictions to subsequently target funds to address the specific problem. While all jurisdictions have developed and use a state-specific standardized crash report form, forms vary from state to state, making regional comparisons difficult. Some states are able to isolate speeding-related fatal and injury crashes while others are not.

Of the 50 jurisdictions responding to the survey, almost all (48) collect speeding-related crash data, primarily from crash reports that are maintained in a state database. Some states also collect specific speed data, not related to speeding citations. By law, Colorado collects 85th percentile speed data (measuring driving speeds on sections of roadway to calculate the prevailing driving speeds of 85 percent of drivers) from engineering studies in order to change speed limits. Idaho collects speed data from temporary and permanent speed counters located throughout the state. Massachusetts defines speeding-related crashes by considering speeding-related violations issued as the result of a crash, and has identified nine violations that are considered specifically speeding-related. Oklahoma also collects 85th percentile speeds at various points along the highway system. Pennsylvania collects spot speed data manually through radar at specific locations and also uses automatic traffic data collection devices embedded in the roadway surface to collect speed data on major thoroughfares.

By comparison, speeding-related citation data is not as frequently collected or maintained in a statewide database. In response to the question of maintaining speeding-related citation data, 51 jurisdictions (AL, AK, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, Guam, HI, IL, IA, KY, LA, MD, MA, MS, NC, NV, NH, NJ, OK, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY) responded in the affirmative. Many of the affirmative responses stated that citation database information is only maintained on citations issued by the state police and does not include speeding citations issued by local enforcement agencies.

Some states, while not counting the number of speeding citations, reported they are nonetheless able to extrapolate the effects of speeding by counting the number of speeding violations posted to driving records or through analyzing conviction data. Maintaining both citation and conviction data for comparison purposes is one means of identifying problem areas relating to adjudication.

In responding to a question about collecting aggressive driving data, it is interesting to note that 21 states (CA, CO, DE, D.C., FL, ID, IL, IN, MD, MA, MS, MO, NH, NC, PA, SC, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA) report collecting aggressive driving data, but only 10 states (AZ, DE, FL, GA, MD, NC, NV, RI, UT, VA) report having enacted legislation to legally define “aggressive” driving. Most states reported that aggressive driving is not a category of offense recognized by state statute, but is rather a generally recognized set of behaviors that have been used by law enforcement and the courts to define aggressive driving in crash and citation reports. Some states report using reckless driving statutes to determine aggressive driving offenses. Several jurisdictions reported that state police mirror the National Highway Traffic Safety’s (NHTSA) definition of aggressive driving in determining citable driver actions. NHTSA defines aggressive driving as “the operation of a motor vehicle in a manner which endangers or is likely to endanger persons or property.”

Proportion fatal and injury speeding-related data, speed citation data and specific group data

One method of identifying and subsequently addressing speeding as an issue is to look at the proportion of fatal and injury crashes attributed to speeding compared with all fatal and injury crashes. Proportional data is useful in determining the overall scope of any particular highway safety problem area. Proportional data is often coupled with citation (or conviction) data to add yet another dimension to the data analysis. A more comprehensive problem identification process is to compare relational data, citation (or conviction) data and geographic, race, gender, age and other grouping data. For example, if all three data sets are available, a highway safety jurisdiction would be
able to isolate speeding as a percentage of crashes, to understand how the problem of speeding is being addressed through adjudication, and to identify significant geographic or population groupings most often associated with the problem of speeding. The appropriate mix of countermeasures could then be applied to address the problem.

Nearly all respondents provided proportional fatal and injury crash data, charts of which are provided in Appendix A, as reported by each respondent. Appendix A also contains information related to speeding citation (or conviction) data where available, as well as data covering over- or under-representation by a given geographic or other group.

Description of efforts to address speeding
When asked to describe efforts to reduce excessive speeding, jurisdictions were asked to provide information specifically targeting speeding. Nearly all respondents reported on programs that address multiple unsafe driving behaviors, among which was speeding. For example, most states reported utilizing the Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) or similar program to address speeding, with speeding being one of several components of a STEP. States also combined impaired driving and seat belt use programs with speeding enforcement and education efforts. Specific responses from each jurisdiction are contained in Appendix A.

Program funding committed to speeding
Jurisdictions were asked to provide information about the amount or percentage of federal highway safety dollars committed to reducing speeding in each of three fiscal years. Responses were a mix of dollars, percentages and aggregates of all funding (rather than just funding related to speeding.) Similarly, the majority of respondents reported funds committed to STEP or similar programs that addressed a variety of unsafe driving behaviors, among which was speeding. It was not possible to isolate federal dollars committed specifically to speeding in most instances. Each jurisdiction’s specific response is contained in Appendix A. Of those that did provide percentages of federal highway safety dollars that addressed speeding, at least to some degree, the average range was 15 percent to 20 percent. Four states (AZ, IA, TX, WY) reported a range of 34 percent to 37 percent, and one state (OH) estimated 40 percent.

Colorado was the only state to report using state funds (beyond those committed to state patrol for enforcement activities or used for highway safety personnel expenses.) However, not all states responded to this question, thus more state funds may actually be committed to addressing speeding than what was reported.

Impact of speeding or aggressive driving program in the last two years
Some jurisdictions did not have data available for the report period. Of the 50 respondents, 21 jurisdictions (AZ, AR, CA, CO, FL, GA, ID, IL, IA, KS, KY, MD, NJ, OH, PA, SC, SD, UT, VA, WA) reported reductions in speeding, in speeding-related crashes, in numbers of high accident locations or in the death rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled. Two states (MA, NH) reported increases in the numbers of speeding-related citations. One state (MD) implemented a program targeting speeding and aggressive driving, and reported an increase in public awareness by measuring pre- and post-program awareness levels. One state (VT) observed a relationship between an increase in fatalities and a decrease in funding for enforcement.
Compliance with posted limits
The three generally recognized elements of traffic safety are the roadway, the vehicle and the driver. Engineers design roadways, auto manufacturers install safety devices in vehicles and employ the latest safety technology, legislatures enact laws... but in the end, traffic safety programs are largely measured by how well the driver chooses to interact with the roadway, use safety equipment and comply with laws.

One factor that influences driver behavior is known as “perception of risk.” This refers to the tendency to obey certain laws based on whether the driver believes s/he will be cited. Anecdotally, the act of speeding has a low perception of risk in the eyes of the motoring public. This may be in part due to either a decrease in the number of law enforcement officers dedicated to enforcing posted speed limits or in part due to a general decrease in the overall numbers of law enforcement officers nationally. Federal funding to support state and local law enforcement efforts has been reduced substantially over the last several years. In a January 2005 New York Times interview, Barbara Harsha, GHSA’s Executive Director said, “States are cutting back on law enforcement right now, they’re diverting law enforcement to homeland security, and law enforcement officers are retiring. Resources are stretched thin.”

States use a variety of approaches to augment enforcement efforts aimed at reducing speeding. These include:

- **Stationary Patrol Vehicles** (some with manikins) Average traffic speeds tend to be closer to the posted limit in the immediate vicinity of the patrol vehicle. A Federal Highway Administration synopsis on speeding-related research noted that average speeds increased to the pre-enforcement level within three days after a single episode of stationary enforcement, whereas exposure to a stationary patrol vehicle over a five-day period had the greatest effect in suppressing speeds after enforcement ended.

- **Aerial Enforcement** (marking pavement at intervals so that surveillance aircraft can calculate vehicle speeds) Research has demonstrated that aerial speed enforcement programs have a generally positive effect in reducing highway speeds. One Australian study (Kearns and Webster, 1998) found that eleven months of aerial speed enforcement resulted in a 22 percent decrease in crashes.

- **Radar and Laser Speed Monitoring Equipment.** A Federal Highway Administration research synopsis found that laser speed guns were significantly more effective in identifying speeding motorists than radar (41 speeding citations per 1,000 vehicles, compared to 33 speeding citations per 1,000 vehicles for radar)

- **Automated Enforcement.** These systems combine radar or laser-measuring technology and video or photographic identification to automatically detect and record speed limit violations. Generally, radar or infrared laser instruments detect a speeding vehicle, and trigger a pre-positioned camera to photograph the vehicle’s license plate and driver. The time of the violation and recorded vehicle speed are superimposed on the photograph. If the license plate number and driver can be clearly identified in the photograph, a speeding citation is issued and mailed to the registered owner. According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, speed cameras are in use in six states plus D.C. as of March 2005. These are Arizona (Mesa, Paradise Valley, Phoenix, Scottsdale, Tempe); California (San Jose); Colorado (Boulder, Denver, Fort Collins); North Carolina (Charlotte-Mecklenburg); Ohio (Toledo); Oregon (Beaver, Medford, Portland); and Washington D.C.

In this survey, highway safety jurisdictions were asked, “In your opinion, is the motoring public perception that police give them a cushion above the speed limit? If yes, how much.” Of the 50 jurisdictions responding, 42 stated there does exist a cushion, not only in the minds of the public, but also in enforcement practice. One state (PA) reported that state law provides for a cushion when enforcement officials use radar or other speed timing devices. Respondents gave a general range of 5-10 mph over the posted limit before the public believed officers would issue a citation. With respect to enforcement actions toward speeders, perhaps Iowa stated it best: “…it is realistically impossible, both physically and from a public policy standpoint, to have a zero tolerance toward operator speed.”
Alabama

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Alabama noted these limits do not apply to all roadways within the state. In 2004, on unpaved county roads the maximum speed limit was placed at 35 mph. For paved county roads, the maximum speed limit is 45 mph. Additionally, on two federal and state highways, the maximum speed limit is 55 mph, and on four-lane highways, the maximum speed limit is 65 mph.

**Speeding-related Data**

Alabama collects speeding-related crash data from information provided on the state’s motor vehicle crash report forms. Data elements include: over speed limit, under minimum speed and improper driving environment. Alabama also collects speeding-related citation data. State statutes do not define aggressive driving.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proportion Speeding-related Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Data Not Provided</td>
<td>100,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>105,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>95,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>105,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>116,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>Data Not Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The state analyzed over representation of speeding in crash reports from cities and counties and identified the problem as being in rural areas near the large cities. Alabama provided an analysis of speeding-related crashes for all attributes on the crash form. The following table presents some of the more interesting over representations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Degree*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Vehicle</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Roadway</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Roads</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Country</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curves</td>
<td>3.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Lanes</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkness</td>
<td>2.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segments</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 PM-6 AM</td>
<td>2.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Involvement</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 16-21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Driver</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Degree refers to the number of times over the expected, when compared with non-speed caused injury crashes.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**
Alabama includes speeding as an element of their Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) efforts. Although the state highway safety office did not fund a STEP in fiscal year (FY) 2004, law enforcement agencies did fund the program, using different sources of funding including Section 163 federal impaired driving incentive funds. The Interstate 20 project used state funding to support enforcement efforts on speeding, following too close and other crash causing violations. Additionally, the state includes a speeding component in school presentations on safe driving.

Since speeding is only one of several components of STEP, it was not possible for the state highway safety office to identify a percentage or amount of federal highway safety dollars committed to reducing speed.

**Public Perception**
Alabama’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Alaska

### Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

These limits apply to all roadways within the state.

**Speeding-related Data**

Alaska reported speeding-related crash data is not collected, although the state does identify human factors on the motor vehicle crash report form. The state also collects speeding-related citation data. Alaska did not report whether the state statutes define aggressive driving.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

Alaska currently has no active program that specifically addresses speeding. Future activities include implementing a Red Light Running media campaign.

**Public Perception**

Alaska’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
The speed data shown applies to all roadways in the state.

### Speeding-related Data

Arizona collects speeding-related crash data from Violation/Behavior information retrieved from collision report forms. Data elements include speed too fast for conditions and exceeded speed limit. The state statute defines aggressive driving as speeding and least two of the following: failure to obey a traffic control device, passing on the right out of regular lanes of traffic, unsafe lane change, following too closely, or failure to yield right of way; and the person’s driving is an immediate hazard to another person or vehicle. Arizona provided information on the proportion of fatal and injury crashes where speed was cited as a factor in crashes, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent of Total Drivers</th>
<th>Percent of Fatal Drivers</th>
<th>Percent of Injury Drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 Exceeded Lawful Speed</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Exceeded Lawful Speed</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Exceeded Lawful Speed</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Too Fast for Conditions</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Too Fast for Conditions</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>19.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual citations issued by the state patrol or other law enforcement agencies are not available in a statewide database.

### Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

Arizona implemented a special speeding program, Operation Safe Commute 2002 in two phases. The first phase targeted commuter traffic on Interstate 17 from May 20-May 31. The second phase targeted commuter traffic on Interstate 10 from June 3-June 14. The program was overwhelmingly successful, resulting in a combined collision reduction of 32 percent during the enforcement detail. Desiring to replicate the success of the initial program, Operation Safe Commute 2003 was also implemented in two phases. The first phase targeted commuter traffic on Interstate 17 and State Route 101 from May 19-May 30. The second phase targeted commuter traffic on Interstate 10 both in the east and central valley from June 2-June 13. Combined traffic collisions decreased by 37 percent.

Arizona reported committing 34 percent of federal highway safety dollars to reducing speeding in 2003. In 2004, 29 percent was expended and in 2005, the state estimated expending 33 percent. No state funds are specifically dedicated to addressing speeding. Arizona reported the impact of speed/aggressive driving programs has been a decrease in the number of speeding-related crashes.

### Public Perception

Arizona’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
These limits do not apply to all roadways within the state. State highways are set at 55 mph, unless otherwise posted. On limited access Rural Interstates the truck speed limit is 65 mph. Arkansas also reported the following specified speed limits:

- Rural Freeways - 70 mph for cars and 65 mph for trucks
- Suburban Freeways - 60 mph for all vehicles
- Urban Freeways - 60 mph for all vehicles
- Rural Expressways with High-Type Partial Control of Access - 60 mph for all vehicles

### Speeding-related Data
Arkansas collects crash data related to speeding, using the driving too fast for conditions data element. The state does not maintain a speeding-related citation database. State statutes do not define aggressive driving and no data specific to aggressive driving is collected or maintained.

#### Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding Related</th>
<th>Number of Crashes</th>
<th>Percent Speed Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>11,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5069</td>
<td>68,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>11,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td>70,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>11,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4392</td>
<td>70,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state police issued 80,333 citations for speeding in 2002 and 73,703 citations in 2003. Data was not available for 2001.
Data specific to geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, or age was not readily available in the highway patrol records. Arkansas has some total speeding-related citation data, with higher numbers reported in the most urban area within the state.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
A state highway police speeding-related enforcement project to improve compliance with speed limits among commercial vehicles on the interstate system was implemented in fiscal year (FY) 1999 and funded with Section 402 funding through FY 2000. Although Section 402 funding ended, the project was continued during FY 2001 – FY 2004 using other funds. An added emphasis area of this project was the enforcement of traffic laws in construction work zones. Other funds will be used for FY 2005 enforcement. Speeding-related enforcement will continue to be a component of all selective traffic enforcement projects implemented.

Arkansas reported no funds are committed solely and/or specifically to reducing speed. Speeding-related enforcement is included as an element of each Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) contract.

Although speed and/or aggressive driving programs and data are not specifically tracked, Arkansas reported measured decreases in speeding-related fatalities and injuries.

Public Perception
Arkansas’ state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
California

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The above speeds apply to all roadways. In California, the speed limit for trucks in all categories is 55 mph.

**Speeding-related Data**

California collects speeding-related crash data from information provided on the motor vehicle crash report form. The state also collects speeding-related citation data. Specific aggressive driving statistics are not collected or maintained in a database, although the state does collect aggressive driving citation data with the following components: reckless driving, unsafe lane change and following too close.

- California defines an aggressive driver as one who exhibits the following driving behaviors:
  - Driving with excessive speed
  - Tailgating (the 3-second space cushion is recommended when possible)
  - Frequent unnecessary lane changes
  - Improper merging techniques (having enough room to enter safely)

**Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Crashes</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>State Highway Patrol Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>28,205 (36.7%)</td>
<td>76,813</td>
<td>993,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26,964 (36.1%)</td>
<td>74,655</td>
<td>954,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27,750 (37.7%)</td>
<td>73,528</td>
<td>925,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state highway safety office reported speed data does not show over-representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

California reported funding a number of speeding-related activities:

- Sideshow and Street Racing project, in cooperation with allied agencies, to establish a hazard-assessment for sideshow/street racing activities statewide. The project uses a task force approach to evaluate the results of street racing collisions due to speed.

- Corridor Safety Program strategically focuses enforcement efforts on corridors where unusual spikes in the number of impaired driving, speeding and other primary collision-related factors signal a need for enhanced enforcement and increased public awareness.

- Highway patrol radar (installed in 100 percent of enforcement vehicles) and aerial speed enforcement are used. One educational tool is the SPECial Traffic Education Radar (SPECTER) Trailer. These radar-equipped display trailers are deployed around school zones, parks, special events and other areas experiencing a high incidence of speed-related conditions. The purpose of the trailers is to give the motoring public a visual evidence of their speed, remind them of the posted speed limit in the area and encourage them to reduce their speed accordingly. Many highway patrol jurisdictions have special teams of officers (Specialized Enforcement Units-SEU) that focus on specific violations for enforcement. Often these teams concentrate efforts on speed laws.

- Statewide Traffic Collision Reduction on County Roads Project is a statewide exclusive focus on county roads to reduce traffic collisions caused by the top primary collision factors, including speeding.

- Operation Road Share days were conducted four times each month throughout California. Operation Road Share days were pre-planned events where every available officer conducted rules of the road enforcement for commercial motor vehicle and passenger vehicle drivers. During an Operation Road Share mobilization, speeding was the most common violation cited.

- Funding to cities and counties for the purchase of visible display radar trailers, radar and laser speed detection units, solar powered vehicle speed feedback signs (devices are attached to poles) and flashing beacons.

- Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities that include a focus on speed enforcement and education. All STEP programs target enforcement of the top primary collision factors – speeding, improper turning, auto right-of-way, stop signs and so forth.

California reported that in 2003, 2004 and 2005 an average of 15 percent of all federal highway safety dollars were committed to reducing speeding (approximately 12 percent in 2003, approximately 14 percent in 2004 and approximately 18 percent in 2005). The estimated percentage of STEP funds used for speed-related activities is 30 percent. California uses state funds for highway patrol speeding enforcement but not for other grant-related activities.

California reported positive results from speed and/or aggressive driving programs in the last two years. In 2003, the provisional Mileage Death Rate (MDR) was 1.25, which is down from 1.28 in 2002. The MDR measures the number of traffic fatalities per 100 million miles of travel. During the same time period, speeding-related fatal and injury collisions also decreased, from 36 percent to 35.9 percent.

Public Perception

California’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5-10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Colorado

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speed limits shown above apply to all roadways, subject to a traffic engineering study. Speed Zoning Traffic Engineering Studies by law must contain 85th percentile analysis. This type of analysis measures driving speeds on sections of roadway to calculate speeds of 85 percent of drivers (commonly referred to as the “prevailing speed”). This type of analysis is often used to either increase or decrease a posted limit.

Speeding-related Data
Colorado collects crash data, using driving too fast for conditions and exceeding posted limits data elements. Speeding-related citation data is also collected, as is aggressive driving data. Colorado state patrol produces a report on aggressive driving, which is defined as the operation of a motor vehicle in a manner that endangers or is likely to endanger persons or property.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>75,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51,706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colorado analyzed data to determine if a specific group or groups are over represented in the crash data. The speed data shows that Adams, Jefferson, and Denver counties had slightly higher accident areas than any other county. Caucasians, male and the 16-18 years age group had the highest number of crashes.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Colorado implemented a Click-it-or-Ticket Campaign that primarily addresses seat belt use, although the majority of violations are for speeding. (In Colorado, in order to cite a driver for not wearing a seat belt, another traffic violation must occur. This is known as a secondary seat belt law.) Colorado has no specific programs that deal only with excessive speeding.
The state highway safety office reported the following aggressive driving programs, in which speeding is an enforcement factor:

- 2003 Aggressive Driving Enforcement in Construction Zones  
  $50,000 (State funds)

- 2003 Aggressive Driving Enforcement /Colorado State Patrol  
  $200,000 (State funds, $154,000 agency match)

- 2003 Weld County Sheriff's Office Traffic Unit  
  $104,000 (State funds, $312,000 agency match)

- 2003 El Paso County Sheriff's Office Aggressive Driving  
  $26,000 (State funds, $58,000 agency match)

- 2003 Colorado State Patrol Motorcycle Team Enforcement  
  $250,000 (State funds, $288,000 agency match)

- 2004 Aggressive Driver Enforcement, Colorado State Patrol  
  $250,000 (State funds, $378,670 agency match)

- 2004 Construction Zone Enforcement  
  $125,000

- 2005 Aggressive Driver Enforcement/Colorado State Patrol  
  $250,000 (State funds, $378,670 agency match)

- 2005 High Hazard Enforcement Golden  
  $107,000 (State funds, $62,000 agency match)

- 2005 Construction Zone Enforcement  
  $125,000 (State funds)

Colorado state highway safety office is committed to reducing crashes and improving transportation efficiency through reducing or managing the gap in driving speeds among drivers on a roadway, known as speed ‘differential.’ When the speed differential is too great, there is a greater likelihood of crashes occurring. Colorado manages speed differentials by establishing a speed limit as closely as possible to the 85th percentile (the speed at which 85 percent of drivers are driving).

Colorado’s Construction Zone Enforcement Program, funded at $125,000 in 2004, utilizes the state patrol and concentrates on speeding enforcement. The state routinely uses state dollars to perform speed-zoning activities that establish speed limits on curves and on tangent sections of highway.

Colorado reported a positive impact of speeding-related programs in the last two years. The state compares pre- and post-program crash and violation data at locations where speeding and aggressive driving-related programs were implemented. If the number of violations for speeding, red light running, careless driving, failure to yield, failure to stop and other aggressive driving violations has decreased, the program is considered successful. A decrease in numbers of crashes is also used as an indicator of success.

The state focuses on eliminating inappropriately low speed limits and adjusting speed limits to agree with prevailing traffic speeds. By doing so, Colorado has reduced the number of dangerous locations with high-speed differentials, thereby reducing traffic turbulence and aggressive driving incidences.

**Public Perception**  
Colorado’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police generally give a 7-10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Connecticut

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connecticut has a maximum 55 mph speed limit on all secondary roads within the state.

Speeding-related Data
Connecticut collects speeding-related data through enforcement actions, written warnings and speeding-related crash data. The most common data element used to collect the information is speed too fast for conditions. The state also collects speeding-related citation data.

State statutes do not define aggressive driving, although speeding, unsafe lane changes, following too close and reckless driving are all considered to be acts of aggressive driving.

Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding as a Factor in Crashes</th>
<th>State Police Speeding Tickets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>92,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>93,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>102,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connecticut speed data shows over-representation in fatal crashes among drivers ages 16-20 and 21-34, where speed was in excess of 75 mph.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Connecticut state police utilize marked and unmarked patrol vehicles to identify aggressive (speeding) drivers. Aircraft is utilized in tandem with ground units. Periodic public information campaigns are coordinated with special enforcement efforts. Approximately 20 percent of the annual funding is provided to the state police for speeding-related efforts.

Public Perception
Connecticut’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
The 2004 increased speed limits shown above apply to State Route 1 and Interstate 495 only. Trucks do not have a separate speed limit.

**Speeding-related Data**

Delaware collects and identifies speeding-related crash data where the primary contributing circumstance for the crash is speeding too fast for conditions. The state also collects speeding-related citation data as well as aggressive driving data. Data collected and maintained for aggressive driving includes: primary contributing circumstance in crashes; aggressive driving violations; crash location; predominant times/days of the week/month; and gender.

Delaware has encoded aggressive driving in the state statutes as: Anyone who commits three targeted traffic offenses in a single incident (Delaware Code says “in continuous conduct”). The targeted offenses include speeding, running red lights or stop signs, failure to yield right-of-way, making unsafe lane changes, passing on the shoulder, following too closely and passing stopped school buses.

**Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speeding Tickets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td>399 (7%)</td>
<td>44,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20 (17%)</td>
<td>407 (7%)</td>
<td>47,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td>399 (7%)</td>
<td>44,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delaware analyzed speed data for over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. Males were over-represented in aggressive driving related crashes in 2003. Males caused sixty-five percent of the aggressive driving crashes. Additionally, 16-24 year old drivers caused fifty-one percent of the aggressive driving crashes. Data related to race is not collected on the state’s motor vehicle crash report, although the state will begin collecting the information in 2005 with the statewide implementation of the state’s automated crash report form.
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

In 2004 the state highway safety office coordinated a six-week enforcement and education mobilization titled *Operation Slow It Down* specifically aimed at reducing speeding-related crashes. The initiative was in response to the escalating number of speeding-related fatal crashes the state was experiencing. In order to increase the impact of the campaign, the state’s highway safety office partnered with the state’s department of transportation, emergency medical services, law enforcement agencies and the Dover Air Force Base. The campaign included the following components:

- 13 police agencies were identified to participate based on locations of speeding-related crashes. Each agency was provided overtime funds for speeding enforcement activities in their respective jurisdiction.
- A kick-off press event, featuring speakers from each of the partnering disciplines.
- Recorded radio spots by EMS, law enforcement and highway safety personnel for airing throughout the state.
- Stepped-up speeding-related enforcement activities conducted on Dover Air Force Base, using speed trailers and displayed campaign messages on variable message boards.

Delaware's highway safety office reported no funds are directed specifically toward reducing incidences of speeding other than for the special enforcement campaign. However, the state does track the percentage of aggressive driving fund levels, including speeding. The state reported 8 percent of highway safety state funds were allocated to aggressive driving enforcement in 2003. In 2004, 17 percent of funds were allocated and in 2005, 19 percent of funds have been allocated for aggressive driving.

However, funding and programs have had minimal impact. In 2000, speeding attributed to 9 percent of the fatal crashes. The percentage has increased since 2000 to 16 percent in 2004, despite slight reductions between 2001 and 2003. The percentage of personal injury crashes that were attributed to speeding has remained fairly constant since 2000 at 6 percent.

Public Perception

Delaware’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Speed limits identified apply to all roadways within the District. D.C. has no separate speed limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Data
The District of Columbia collects speeding-related crash data via the police report using the exceeding posted limits data element. D.C. also collects speeding-related citation data as well as aggressive driving data. The District defines aggressive driving as red light running, stop sign violation, speeding, unsafe lane changes and tailgating.

Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Speeding-related Fatalities</th>
<th>Percent Speeding-related Injuries</th>
<th>Police Department Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>423,910 photo radar 10,391 hand written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>327,746 photo radar 9,189 hand written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District does not collect crash data related to geographic area, race, ethnic, gender or age groups.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
The District of Columbia reported the following programs and activities as primary efforts:

- Photo radar speeding-related enforcement operated by the Metropolitan Police Department
- District department of transportation efforts to install traffic calming devices in residential areas and school zones
- Testing of certain speed management signal timing strategies

The District reported that its programs and efforts are successful, with the Photo Radar Speeding Reduction Program continuing to show impressive results in reducing the number of aggressive speeders. The program was initiated in the summer of 2001 and is now in its fourth year. Aggressive speeding and average speeds both show declines. Since August 2001, about 1.2 million Notices of Infraction have been mailed and approximately 873,000 paid. This level of consistent enforcement has been achieved without taking officers from other community policing assignments or otherwise diminishing public safety services in D.C.’s neighborhoods.

From a funding perspective, the District reports the following federal highway safety Section 402 levels of funding for the periods requested in the questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 obligations</td>
<td>$174,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 expenditures</td>
<td>$ 37,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 expenditures</td>
<td>$259,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Perception
D.C.’s highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Speed limit changes do not apply to all roadways. The changes applied only to the interstate highway system and other limited access roadways outside of urban areas with a population of less than 5,000 with at least four lanes and a median strip. The maximum speed in any residential or business district is 30 mph. In both years, the maximum speed limit in these areas may have been reduced to 25 miles per hour (1994) and 20 or 25 miles per hour (2004) if after an investigation it was deemed reasonable. In all other areas the maximum speed limit was 55 miles per hour for both years. The state has no specialized speed limits for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**
Florida collects speeding-related crash data using the exceeded safe speed limit and exceeded posted limit data elements. Florida has an aggressive driving statute, but currently does not formally collect aggressive driving data other than a check box on the citation form indicating the officer deemed the infraction an act of aggressive driving as defined in Florida law. Florida statute defines “aggressive careless driving” as committing two or more of the following defined acts simultaneously or in succession: exceeding the posted speed limit; unsafely or improperly changing lanes; following another vehicle too closely; failing to yield right of way; improperly passing; violating traffic control and signal devices.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatalities (Percent Total)</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injuries (Percent Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>464 (14.89%)</td>
<td>5001 (3.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>498 (15.84%)</td>
<td>5002 (4.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>446 (14.80%)</td>
<td>5132 (3.53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florida reported the following speeding citation information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Patrol</td>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>Highway Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded 55</td>
<td>78,437</td>
<td>50,019</td>
<td>37,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded 65</td>
<td>40,640</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>18,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded Posted Speed</td>
<td>205,342</td>
<td>666,411</td>
<td>330,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Unsafe for Conditions</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>16,124</td>
<td>2,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>326,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>739,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>388,762</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Florida analyzed speed data for over representation to create a Highway Safety Matrix each year to rank cities and counties in all traffic safety areas, including speeding. The matrix is based on fatalities and severe injury crashes. While the matrix does provide geographical information on where the most speeding-related crashes occur relative to population, it does not provide for gender, race, ethnic group or other grouping.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**
Florida targets specific activities and programs toward reducing excessive speed. In the area of training, during fiscal year 2004, the following classes were provided:

- Three Police Traffic Radar Instructor classes – 23 total students
- Three Police Traffic Laser Instructor classes – 20 total students

Because Florida requires that a radar or laser operator be certified through Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the instructor training classes enable officers to become radar and laser instructors, and thus able to certify personnel to conduct radar and laser speeding-related enforcement within their communities.

During fiscal year 2004, Florida also awarded fifty-one grants to state and local agencies for radar and laser speed measuring units, speed-monitoring trailers, message boards and public awareness items. In addition, funding was provided to traffic unit personnel to specifically target the speeder and the aggressive driver. Grant funded agencies are required to collect local data to identify areas with a high incidence of speed violators, as well as other aggressive driving behaviors. Specialized random enforcement operations are conducted in the previously identified areas. All grant-funded officers are provided with radar, laser and video cameras to assist in the prosecution of offenders.

Speeding-related projects constituted approximately 14 percent of the total safety grant funds in 2003, and approximately 16 percent in 2004. The percentage is expected to be about the same in 2005. There are no state funds being used for speeding-related activities.

Florida reported a significant decline in the number of speeding and aggressive driving related fatalities and injuries in the past two years. This is especially true in locations where aggressive enforcement is conducted on a regular basis.

**Public Perception**
Florida's state highway safety office felt most Florida residents believe police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit and issue a ticket at 15 mph over the limit. The exceptions are school and work zones. Additionally, school buses are not permitted to exceed 55 miles per hour at any time.
Georgia

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speed limits indicated above do not apply to all roadways within the state. Speed limits on state highways range from 45 mph to 65 mph, depending on the area. Most city streets are 30 mph to 45 mph. There are no separate speed limits for trucks.

Speeding-related Data

Georgia collects speeding-related crash data, primarily from information entered on the motor vehicle crash report form. The state also collects speeding citation data. Although Georgia defines aggressive driving in state statutes, no specific data is collected about aggressive driving. Georgia’s definition of aggressive driving states a person commits the offense of aggressive driving when he or she operates any motor vehicle with the intent to annoy, harass, molest, intimidate, injure, or obstruct another person, including overtaking and passing; traffic lane violations; following too closely; turn signals, changing lanes, slowing or stopping; impeding traffic flow; motorcycle violations; or reckless driving.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>204,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>189,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>173,743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information relating to geographic area, race, ethnic, gender or age groups that may be over represented in crash data is not currently available.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

Georgia implements a number of law enforcement task forces around the state with a speeding component. Two initiatives specifically target excessive speed in the state. The first is a ten-agency task force primarily in the metro Atlanta area that addresses the occurrences of speeding and aggressive driving. The acronym for the task force is HEAT or Highway Enforcement of Aggressive Traffic. The state initially funded eight local law enforcement agencies in the Metro Atlanta area and provided low profile police vehicles, all with the same markings and look with the exception of the agency’s name. These units have become extremely successful in combating speeding as well as aggressive and impaired driving in the metro area. The concept is now spreading beyond the metro Atlanta area to other jurisdictions across the state.
The second initiative was the extremely successful 100 Days of Summer HEAT sustained speeding enforcement campaign conducted during the summer of 2004. The enforcement period lasted from the May Click it or Ticket Mobilization through the Labor Day Impaired Driving Mobilization. Law enforcement agencies around the state concentrated enforcement efforts, with massive corridor speeding-related enforcement occurring at pre-scheduled times. Paid media and state department of transportation message boards reminded the motoring public about the statewide enforcement and played a key role in the campaign’s success. The campaign resulted in a 2.2 percent increase in the state’s seatbelt usage rate (84.5 percent to 86.7 percent), a reduction in speeding-related fatalities from the same period in 2003 and a 14 percent reduction in overall fatalities from the same period in 2003. A considerable reduction in holiday fatalities during the period was also noted. During the three-month period, Georgia’s law enforcement officers issued over 223,000 speeding citations and arrested almost 16,000 impaired drivers.

Georgia’s state highway safety office includes a speeding component in Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) contracts. The state reported the combined total of speeding-related activities funded in 2003 at 16.33 percent and 21.04 percent in 2004. Georgia expects to expend 29 percent of their overall federal highway safety dollars in 2005 on speeding-related activities. There are no state funds available.

Georgia efforts to address the speed issue have proven successful, as evidenced by a reduction in speeding-related fatalities.

Public Perception
Georgia’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Guam

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speed limits listed above apply to all roadways in Guam. There is a specific speed limit also for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**
Guam collects speeding-related crash data and speeding-related citation data. Statutes do not define aggressive driving and no data is collected specific to aggressive driving. Crash and citation data was not readily available for inclusion in this report. Available data does not indicate over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

**Efforts to Reduce Speed**
Guam includes speed as an element of the territory's Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) efforts. This includes stationary enforcement activities using laser or saturation patrol activities using radar. Guam also reported that speeding is a topic in presentations to schools and other organizations.

**Public Perception**
Guam’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Hawaii

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speed limits apply to most roadways. Hawaii reports that in 2004, speed limits for a limited number of rural freeways increased to 60 mph.

Speeding-related Data
Hawaii collects both speeding-related crash data and speeding-related citation data. The state's definition of aggressive driving mirrors the definition used by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. No data specific to aggressive driving is maintained.

Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding-related</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Speeding-related</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injury Crashes</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding-related</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>2,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual speeding citations issued by the four county police departments were 31,684 in 2001; 31,684 in 2002 and 39,013 in 2003. Data does not indicate over-representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

Hawaii includes speeding as an element of the state's Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) efforts in all four Hawaii counties, with funding primarily used for conducting overtime speeding-related enforcement activities. Federal highway safety funding for speeding-related activities was 6.6 percent of total funding in 2003, 8.2 percent in 2004 and 12.5 percent in 2005.

No state funds are specifically committed to speed reduction. Hawaii reported the impact of speeding and/or aggressive driving programs has remained about the same.

Public Perception
Hawaii's state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Idaho reported the 2004 speed limits apply to all the roadways within the state. The speed limit for trucks is 65 mph on both urban and rural interstates.

**Speeding-related Data**
Idaho collects speed data through approximately 120 permanent speed counters. The counters collect data by speed and vehicle type (cars or trucks) and time of day. The state also has portable counters that are set out on an annual basis and by request. In 2004, speed data was collected at 70 locations. Additionally, highway and transportation district traffic operation offices regularly perform speed studies to verify that speed limits are appropriately set. While there is no centralized tracking of the number of speed studies undertaken, the state estimated a conservative annual number of one hundred.

In addition to speed data, Idaho also collects speeding-related crash data through the state’s motor vehicle crash report form, using driving too fast for conditions and exceeding posted limits data elements.

Idaho’s highway safety office believes speeding is just one symptom of aggressive driving. From the state’s perspective, if a driver is speeding, the driver is usually also running red lights, rolling through stop signs and following too close. Idaho believes if the state can intervene to stop a driver from committing one of these aggressive driving behaviors, that driver is more likely to cease exhibiting most of the other behaviors. As a performance measure, the state calculates a statewide five-year aggressive driving fatal and serious injury crash rate per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Idaho also collects aggressive driving data. Based on crash data, the state calculates a statewide, five-year aggressive driving fatal and serious injury crash rate. Idaho statute does not define aggressive driving. However, in 1998, the state identified aggressive driving as one of the leading causes of traffic crashes. Idaho subsequently implemented an Aggressive Driving Program and has included aggressive driving as one the state’s Section 402 Focus Areas each year for the past six years. Idaho bases the definition used for aggressive driving on factors contributing to a traffic crash. These factors include failure to yield right of way; following too close; passed stop sign; disregarded signal; exceeded posted speed; and driving too fast for conditions.

Idaho makes a distinction between aggressive driving and road rage. In practice, the state defines road rage incidences as deliberate intentional acts that, if they lead to injury, are considered felonies. If an investigating officer establishes that the crash was a result of road rage, it is considered a crime not a traffic crash, and no vehicle crash report is taken.

### Idaho Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Idaho reported the 2004 speed limits apply to all the roadways within the state. The speed limit for trucks is 65 mph on both urban and rural interstates.
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

Idaho highway safety office includes speeding as a component of the Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) efforts; however, STEP teams are only funded when a local law enforcement jurisdiction has multiple crash problems. The state tracks total crashes, fatal and injury crashes and impaired driving crashes, and STEP teams are responsible for reducing those types of crashes. The state assists the STEP officers by identifying high crash corridors and high accident locations, thereby increasing the effectiveness of STEP teams.

Idaho’s highway safety office does not identify or fund speeding as a distinct category, but does incorporate speeding as a component of aggressive driving programs. In federal fiscal year (FFY) 2003, 18.8 percent of Section 402 funds were targeted for aggressive driving countermeasures; in FFY 2004, aggressive driving received 12.6 percent; and in FFY 2005, the percentage is 15.9. The state estimated over 80 percent of the STEP funds target aggressive driving behaviors.

The impact of Idaho’s aggressive driving program has been positive. Over the last 5 years the rate of fatal and serious injury crashes that involved aggressive driver behaviors has decreased from 8.31 crashes per 100 million Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (AVMT) to 6.71 crashes per 100 million AVMT. With the exception of 2002 there was a decrease in rate every year. The state acknowledged a number of other factors that also have contributed to the decline. The state reported factors such as vehicle safety features, engineering improvements, occupant restraint usage, demographic changes, traffic volume and weather all play a role in traffic crashes and may have contributed to the change in rates over the past few years in addition to Idaho’s aggressive driving program.

Public Perception

Idaho’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give at least a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit. Idaho believes a factor linked to speeding is that most drivers perceive their risk of getting caught speeding, or engaging in any other aggressive driving behavior, is very small.
Illinois

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Illinois reported there is no actual “urban/rural” limit. The speed limit is 65 mph unless it is posted lower. In major metropolitan areas the speed limit is normally 55 mph. Some rural divided limited access highways are posted at 65 mph, otherwise the limit is 55 mph. State statute limits or restricts trucks over 4 tons, house cars, campers and all vehicles towing trailers to a maximum speed of 55 mph for all highway categories.

Speeding-related Data
Illinois collects speeding-related crash data for fatal crashes, and also collects both speeding-related citation data and data about aggressive driving. The Illinois Office of the Secretary of State defines aggressive driving as: the operation of a motor vehicle in a manner that endangers or is likely to endanger persons or property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Patrol Speeding Citations Issued</th>
<th>Speeding Convictions Added to Drivers Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2003</td>
<td>173,080</td>
<td>408,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2002</td>
<td>206,762</td>
<td>468,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2001</td>
<td>25,067</td>
<td>446,459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Illinois programs federal highway safety funds for enforcement of all traffic laws, and does not specifically target speeding. The state highway safety office reported the following fiscal year (FY) expenditures:

FY 2005

- Illinois Specialized Traffic Enforcement Project (STEP) ($578,000) to conduct increased patrol and enforcement of all traffic laws with a primary emphasis on the maximum speed limit, occupant restraint and impaired driving laws.

- Speeding & Traffic Accident Reduction (STAR) project ($76,100) to conduct increased patrols and enforcement to apprehend traffic law violators committing common traffic offenses with particular emphasis on speeding, safety belts and child restraint.

- Local Project – Integrated Mini-Grant Enforcement Program (IMaGE) ($1,427,886) to conduct enforcement of all traffic laws with special emphasis on impaired driving violations.

- Local Project – Traffic Law Enforcement Project (TLEP) ($975,151) to conduct enforcement of special traffic laws at selected high crash locations and to conduct public information and education campaigns.
Illinois reported efforts that address speeding and/or aggressive driving have been successful. Illinois traffic deaths fell to a 60-year low in 2004, the result of stricter safety-belt laws, safer vehicles, enforcement of traffic laws and tougher rules on teen driving and child passenger safety. Preliminary figures show 1,341 people died in traffic crashes in 2004, the lowest number of fatalities since 1943, when 1,328 people were killed. The figures represent an 8 percent drop from the 1,454 traffic deaths recorded in 2003.

Public Perception
Illinois’ state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Indiana

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speed limits listed above apply to all roadways within the state. Indiana imposes a 60 mph restriction on Limited Access Rural Interstates for trucks.

Speeding-related Data

Indiana state police jurisdictions collect and maintain speed data and report the following major categories for citations for each calendar year (CY) noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CY 2001</th>
<th>CY 2002</th>
<th>CY 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit Unreasonable Speed</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Speed Limit Work Site</td>
<td>5,751</td>
<td>5,522</td>
<td>5,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceededing Speed Limit - Urban</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceededing Speed Limit - Maximum 55 mph</td>
<td>119,694</td>
<td>121,724</td>
<td>102,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding - Interstate 65 mph</td>
<td>54,528</td>
<td>55,376</td>
<td>46,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding 60 mph Trucks - Interstate</td>
<td>11,340</td>
<td>9,381</td>
<td>6,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding in Zone posted by CO</td>
<td>11,673</td>
<td>10,851</td>
<td>9,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Unsafe for Conditions</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indiana does not collect aggressive driving data. The state statutes define aggressive driving as reckless driving as follows: A person operating a vehicle who recklessly drives at such an unreasonably high rate of speed or at such an unreasonably low rate of speed as to endanger the safety or the property of others or block the proper flow of traffic; who passes another vehicle from the rear while on a slope or on a curve where vision is obstructed for a distance of less than five hundred (500) feet ahead; who drives in and out of a line of traffic, except as otherwise permitted; who speeds up or refuses to give one-half of the roadway to a driver overtaking and desiring to pass; or who passes a school bus stopped on a roadway when the arm signal device is extended.
**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatalities (Percent Total)</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injuries Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>217 (26.0%)</td>
<td>173,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>185 (23.3%)</td>
<td>205,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>205,663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

Indiana includes speeding as an element of Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities, and annually commits federal highway safety funds. Indiana reported expending $271,226 for STEP activities in 2003 and $233,864 in 2004 for that purpose. The state allocated $200,000 for STEP activities in 2005.

**Public Perception**

Indiana’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Indian Nation

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004
The Indian Nation funds highway safety activities in 560+ individual Tribes throughout the United States. Although it is likely that specific speed limits on individual tribal lands have been established, the data has not been collected or reported in a national database.

Speeding-related Data
The Indian Nation does not have a collective means of tabulating speeding-related crash or citation data nationwide. The Bureau of Indian Affairs Highway Safety Program tracks speeding citation information only for Tribes funded through the BIA program. The number of Tribes funded varies from year to year. It is likely individual Tribes collect speeding citation data, but no national Tribal database exists. No data is collected on aggressive driving. Where appropriate and for funded Tribes, the BIA uses the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA) definition of aggressive driving.

Without a national database to collect and tabulate information from the 560+ Tribes in the Indian State, analysis of speeding-related crash and injury data is not possible. Without data is it also not possible to identify any geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping that may be over-represented in crash statistics.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
BIA Indian Highway Safety Program provides highway safety related material though NHTSA, and also provides Tribes with the opportunity to apply for competitive traffic safety grants. The amount of funding varies from year to year, depending on the number of Tribes who apply and are selected for Police Traffic Services grants.
Iowa reported that speed limits apply to all roadways, except that limits for Rural Four-Lane Expressways were increased to 70 mph. The state has no separate speed limit for trucks.

### Speeding-related Data

Iowa collects speeding-related crash data from two elements on the state’s motor vehicle crash report form: driving too fast for conditions and exceeding posted limits. Iowa collects speeding-related citation data, but only from citations issued by the state patrol. Aggressive driving is not defined in state statutes. No data is collected about aggressive driving.

### Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Police Speeding Tickets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>102,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>113,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>95,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iowa reported the percentages of both fatal and injury crashes has remained relatively unchanged in recent years. The state is not able to breakout speed data to identify over-representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

### Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

**Educational** – Two main activities in this area include 1) public education and information programs, including speeding, serious moving violations, occupant restraint and impaired driving; and 2) fourteen safety education officers employed full time by the state patrol who conduct thousands of public education activities each year, with speeding and speeding violations being an integral and important part of this effort.

**Engineering** – Iowa fully considers operator speed in the design of new roads, establishing speed limits on existing roads and in road resurfacing and restoration (3R) projects. All 3R projects now involve safety audits prior to renovation, including evaluation of speed-related signing and other issues.
Enforcement – Speeding-related enforcement is a universal part of all enforcement contracts, including those where impaired driving or occupant protection compliance are a primary focus. Speeding citations and warnings are the most prevalent violations cited by enforcement officers in each major enforcement program. In addition to overtime enforcement support, the state highway safety office provided speeding-related enforcement equipment, including radars and laser speed detectors to over 100 law enforcement agencies statewide in recent years. In federal fiscal year (FFY) 2004 alone, over 77,000 speed citations and warnings resulted from highway safety funded initiatives, as shown below:

![Speeding Citations & Warnings](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Speeding Citations &amp; Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402-Alcohol</td>
<td>4,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-Occupant Protection</td>
<td>12,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-Police Traffic Services</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-Alcohol Incentive</td>
<td>14,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157-STEP</td>
<td>29,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,349</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speeding-related enforcement actions were more than twice as numerous as the next leading category of violations (77,349 speeding-related enforcement actions versus 37,918 occupant protection enforcement actions.)

Funding levels specifically related to speeding-related programs must be estimated. The estimated percentage of Iowa’s federal highway safety dollars committed to speeding is 27 percent. This figure has remained consistent for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2003, 2004 and 2005. State funding levels are relatively small and are used to support personnel expenses. For STEP, Iowa estimated that 35 percent of the federal and state funds are used for speeding-related activities. This level has been consistent for FFY 2003, 2004 and 2005.

Iowa reported a substantial safety benefit from speeding enforcement programs, complemented by strong public information and education efforts. In 2002, Iowa reached a 57-year low in the number of traffic deaths of 405 persons. While fatalities rebounded in 2003 to the 2000-2001 levels of 443 deaths, 2004 saw another record low with 387 deaths. This is the first time traffic fatalities were below 400 since 1945. A preliminary estimate of 1.19 fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for 2004 represents an all-time low for the state and a figure well below the 2003 national rate of 1.48 per 100 million VMT.

**Public Perception**

Iowa’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police generally give a cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit because it is realistically impossible, both physically and from a public policy standpoint, to have a zero tolerance policy towards operators’ speed. The state reported that many, but certainly not all, motorists assume a tolerance of 5 mph under most driving circumstances.
Kansas reported that limits set in 2004 vary, depending on the roadway. Speed limits are generally set after speed studies are completed. Trucks do not have a separate speed limit.

**Speeding-related Data**
Kansas collects speeding-related crash data, primarily through driving too fast for conditions and exceeding posted limits data elements. The state does not collect speeding citation data or data about aggressive driving. Kansas state statutes do not specifically define aggressive driving.

Kansas reported the following percentage of fatal and injury crashes in which speeding was cited as a factor for the past three years as follows: 11 percent in 2001; 12 percent in 2002 and 12 percent in 2003. The state highway safety office did not have information available about the number of annual speeding citations or the number of speeding-related citations added to driver records. In reviewing data, however, the state does note that persons aged 15-24 have a higher incidence of speeding-related crashes.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**
Kansas’ state highway safety office uses the educational medium of pamphlets as part of their public information and education efforts to address speeding. Engineering activities include marking pavement at intervals so that surveillance aircraft can calculate vehicle speeds and narrowing traffic lanes to reduce speed. Kansas highway safety office includes speeding as an aspect of Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) efforts. There is no program or activity that specifically addresses speeding.

Although STEP funds primarily target occupant protection and impaired driving, the estimated number of speeding citations issued in STEP activities is 70 percent. The success of efforts is reflected in an overall decrease in speeding-related crashes.

**Public Perception**
Kansas’ state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Kentucky reported that the speed limits shown above only apply to interstates and state parkways. All other roads have a maximum speed limit of 55 mph. Trucks do not have a separate speed limit.

**Speeding-related Data**

Kentucky collects speeding-related crash data through exceeded stated speed limit, not under proper control and driving too fast for conditions data elements. Aggressive driving data is not collected and aggressive driving is not defined in state statute. However, reckless driving is defined by statute and relates to the safe operation of a vehicle: the operator of any vehicle upon a highway shall operate the vehicle in a careful manner, with regard for the safety and convenience of pedestrians and other vehicles upon the highway.

Data are not available on the proportion of fatal and injury crashes where speeding was a factor, as Kentucky law does not allow issuing a citation for a moving hazardous violation that does not occur in the officer’s presence (with the exception of impaired driving laws).

Speeding-related citation data, however, is available from state police records. Kentucky reported 130,919 speeding citations were issued in 2001. The number was 129,124 in 2002, and 96,787 in 2003. Data was not available to identify or support conclusions of over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

Although Kentucky’s state highway safety office places a priority on reducing speeding and speeding-related crashes, and includes speeding as an element in police traffic services grants, the grants address numerous unsafe driving behaviors, only one of which is speeding. Grant applications are scrutinized to ensure they are utilizing crash data to locate speeding-related high-crash locations. The Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) with the state police is also designed to curb unsafe driving behaviors, one of which is speeding. STEP utilizes unmarked vehicles to support the program.

Kentucky does not utilize state dollars for specific speeding-related activities. State funds are used for general enforcement activities, including speeding-related enforcement. The state highway safety office estimated 11.5 percent of funds were committed to reducing speed in 2003. That estimated percentage increased in 2004 to 15.4 percent. The estimate for 2005 expenditures was 14.9 percent.

Speed and/or aggressive driving efforts in Kentucky have been successful. For the five-year period (1999-2003), speeding-related crashes represented 7.0 percent of all crashes, 10.5 percent of injury crashes, and 22.0 percent of fatal crashes. The number of speeding-related fatal crashes decreased by 5.2 percent in 2003 compared to the previous four-year average.

**Public Perception**

Kentucky’s state highway safety office felt a common perception is that motorists can travel under 10 miles over the posted limit and not receive a citation.
Louisiana reported the speed limits indicated above apply to all roadways. Generally speaking, the state has no separate limit for trucks, with the exception of one 18-mile stretch of elevated interstate, which has a speed limit of 55 mph for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**
Louisiana collects speeding-related crash data on the state’s motor vehicle crash report form through exceeding safe speed limit and exceeding state speed limit data elements. However, many officers do not check the speeding element on the vehicle crash report form because officers feel it is too difficult to defend. Unless there is overwhelming evidence, some other causation factor is used.

The state collects speeding-related citation data, although no data relating to aggressive driving is collected. Louisiana does not define aggressive driving in state statutes.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>155,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>156,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>179,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speed data does not indicate any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping is over represented.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**
Louisiana’s state highway safety office includes speeding-related enforcement as a part of any public presentation. The state police use highway signage denoting “speed limit strictly enforced” to advise the motoring public.

Louisiana has no state funds committed to speed reduction. Although Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) funds address speeding as one of several components, the state highway safety office estimated 38 percent of STEP funds are used for speeding-related activities. Louisiana felt the impact of speeding-related enforcement programs has been minimal.

Louisiana’s state highway safety office reported that federal highway safety funds committed to speeding as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$233,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$215,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$217,239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Perception**
Louisiana’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Maryland

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speed limits apply only to full freeways only. In Maryland, trucks are limited to 60 mph on Interstate 68 in the western mountainous regions of the state.

Speeding-related Data

Maryland collects speeding-related crash data and speeding-related citation data. Speeding-related crashes are defined as any reportable crash in which speeding was listed as a contributing factor, whether or not the driver was noted as going over the posted speed limit. Contributing factors include exceeding speed limits and too fast for conditions. The state also collects crash and citation data about aggressive driving. Maryland statute defines aggressive driving as committing three or more of the following offenses at the same time or during a single and continuous period of driving: violation of traffic lights with steady indication; overtaking and passing vehicles; passing on right; driving on laned roadways; following too closely; failure to yield right of way or exceeding a maximum speed limit.

Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Citations All Agencies (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>349,921 (34.5% all citations issued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>368,305 (32.8% all citations issued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>357,962 (32.8% all citations issued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maryland analyzed speed data for over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. The state reported the highest number of speeding-related crashes and fatal speeding-related crashes have historically occurred during the daylight hours. Other conclusions are:

■ Among all drivers involved in speeding-related crashes, the driver age group of 16-20 and 20-24 years was the most involved in total crashes and fatal crashes. The driver age group of 16-20 years had the highest percentage of drivers involved in speeding crashes (25.5 percent) and the highest driver fatalities involved in speeding crashes (18.3 percent). As driver age increases, the fraction of speeding drivers involved in speeding-related crashes decreases.

■ The proportion of male drivers involved in fatal speeding crashes was significantly higher than that of male drivers in all crashes (63.0 versus 52.0 percent).

■ Total and fatal speeding-related crashes were highest in Prince George’s County.
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Maryland produces and distributes a brochure describing speed limits, the law surrounding them and the manner by which they are set. Speed display trailers are frequently purchased and utilized by local jurisdictions to monitor and enforce speed limits. Engineering efforts include a pilot project in 2005 involving the use of variable speed limits in construction zones. Other construction zone efforts include studies analyzing the effectiveness of speed control strategies involving temporary rumble strips, truck-mounted Portable Changeable Message Sign (PCMS) technology w/radar, an advisory ‘Speed Ahead’ signs using radar and wider lane lines to reduce speed. State, county and municipal law enforcement agencies continue to enforce speed limit violations.

The state highway safety office distributes funds to Community Traffic Safety Programs (CTSP) in each county jurisdiction. The CTSPs award funds for a variety of activities, including local speeding-related and aggressive driving enforcement efforts. Additionally the state police agency receives grant funds for aggressive driving enforcement. Grant monies are then allocated for both speeding and aggressive driving related enforcement activities according to the specific needs of a regional command. Given this formula, 2.1 percent of federal highway safety dollars were spent for speeding-related enforcement projects in 2003. In 2004, 3.3 percent of funds were spent and in 2005, 1.5 percent of federal highway safety dollars are committed for speeding-related enforcement projects. Other than funds used as match, Maryland has no state dollars for speeding-related activities.

Maryland reports success in efforts to address speeding. For the past eight years the state has been an active participant in the regional Smooth Operator program. Smooth Operator is a unique partnership involving Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia, and combines enforcement, education and engineering approaches to address the problem of aggressive driving. As a result of the public education campaign, public awareness of aggressive driving issues has been measured at 67 percent and 78 percent in the Baltimore and Washington, D.C. metro areas, respectively in 2005. The percentages were about 11 lower during the 2004 campaign. In 2003, the percentages were 46 percent and 78 percent respectively. Additionally, over the past several years, law enforcement involvement in the Smooth Operator program has grown to include sixty-eight municipal agencies across the state (at least one agency in every county), as well as all 24 barracks of the state police. During four summer week-long enforcement waves in 2003 and 2004, Maryland police officers issued 103,000 and 140,000 citations for aggressive driving behaviors, of which speeding-related enforcement remains a cornerstone.

Public Perception
Maryland’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5-10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Massachusetts reported that speed limits apply to all roadways within the state. Trucks do not have a different designated speed limit.

**Speeding-related Data**
Massachusetts collects speeding-related crash and citation data. Regarding crash data, the contributing circumstance element on the state crash report form includes an option for speed. However, this field is often marked as unknown or empty by the investigating officer. Because of the data quality concerns, these data are not used to examine speeding-related crashes.

Speeding-related violation data, including speeding-related violations for crashes and speeding-related violations in general, are collected in the citation database. Speeding-related crashes are defined in the violation data by considering speeding-related violations issued as the result of a crash. Based on the violation data, the following types of violations are considered speeding-related: speeding on specific roadways, turnpikes, tunnels and bridges; speeding in general; speeding with metallic tires; speeding by overweight vehicles and drag racing.

Massachusetts also collects data about aggressive driving, although the term is not defined by statute. The state uses violation data to examine aggressive driving both for crashes and in general. If more than one violation is issued in the same citation for behaviors identified with aggressive driving, the violation is classified as being related to aggressive driving. Currently Massachusetts is in the process of developing a comprehensive list of behaviors and violations associated with aggressive driving. The process will review some of the standards associated with aggressive driving, after which the state may decide to enact a specific aggressive driving statute.

**Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatalities</th>
<th>Speeding Crash Violations</th>
<th>All Speeding Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>337,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>354,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>399,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Massachusetts analyzed speeding-related data for over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. Data analysis indicated males ages 16-34 were over represented when comparing speeding-related crash violations and licensed driver population. In 2002, the year for which the most recent data is available, males ages 18-20 had the most notable spike in speeding-related crashes.
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

In federal fiscal year (FFY) 2004 Massachusetts re-launched its aggressive driving and speeding campaign called *Road Respect*. This campaign originally ran from 1998 to 2000. The new version of the campaign followed the latest Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) model: high-visibility enforcement coordinated with paid and earned media. In FFY 2004 the state conducted two two-week *Road Respect* mobilizations. Each mobilization involved $80,000 of high-visibility state police enforcement as well as $75,000 of radio advertising and earned media. As part of this campaign, the state purchased $100,000 of new speed-related traffic enforcement equipment for the state police.

In FFY 2005, Massachusetts is conducting one two-week *Road Respect* mobilization. This will involve $495,000 of high-visibility state and local police enforcement coordinated with $155,000 of radio advertising, earned media and community education. The state is also conducting two *Click It or Ticket* mobilizations and three *You Drink & Drive, You Lose* mobilizations during FFY 2005. The *Click It or Ticket* mobilizations involve extensive speeding-related enforcement to offset the limitation of a secondary safety belt law. Also, many communities participating in the May *Click It or Ticket* mobilization will receive speeding-related traffic enforcement equipment for three approved community safety belt educational initiatives. The state police reduce excessive speeding through routine traffic patrols as well as on-going traffic safety education efforts. The state also has a number of engineering efforts to reduce excessive speeding.

In FFY 2005, the state will expend approximately $650,000 on its *Road Respect* Campaign or about 15 percent of all its STEP funds.

Massachusetts reported a positive impact of its speeding and/or aggressive driving-related programs during the most recent two years for which data is available. Between 2001 and 2002, there was a slight increase (2 percent) in the number of speeding-related crash violations issued in the state. Between 2002 and 2003, there was a significant decrease in speeding-related fatalities as a percentage of all motor vehicle-related fatalities, from 38.3 percent to 33.8 percent.
Michigan

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

With the exception of a limited number of urban freeway miles, state law sets maximum speed limits on U.S., interstate and state highway routes at 70 mph. In densely populated (urban) areas where there are many exit and entrance ramps constructed close together, the speed limit is held to 55 mph. The speed limit for commercial trucks on all highways is never higher than 55 mph. Vehicles of 10,000 pounds or more, a truck tractor with a trailer or a combination of these vehicles is limited to 55 mph on all roads, including freeways, and limited to 35 mph when reduced loading is enforced during the spring (when daily temperature fluctuations cause buckling of roadway beds - often referred to as Frost Laws.)

Speeding-related Data
Michigan collects speeding-related crash data. Police officers code hazardous actions on the motor vehicle crash report form, including excessive speed, through the speed too fast data element. The form does not distinguish whether speed was in excess of the posted limit, violation of basic speed rule, too fast for conditions and so forth. Michigan does not collect speeding-related citation data. The state police only collect data on hazardous or non-hazardous action citations. It is not clear whether the state has citation data beyond what individual courts have for their jurisdictions, as there is no central depository for court citation data.

Michigan does not define aggressive driving except for the hazardous action code on crash reports. Some hazardous actions could be interpreted as such, or in combination with other factors, but a specific aggressive driving state statute is still in the discussion stage.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes
The following chart depicts the number and percentage of drivers involved in each category of crash, not the number of crashes. Hazardous action is coded by driver, not by crash. Specific state police citation data is not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Drivers in Fatal Crashes “Speed too Fast” (percent)</th>
<th>Drivers in Injury Crashes “Speed too Fast” (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>248 (13.1%)</td>
<td>10,505 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>242 (12.7%)</td>
<td>9,882 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>262 (13.2%)</td>
<td>9,551 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efforts to Reduce Speed
Michigan includes speeding as a component in other programs and activities, but has not had programs devoted specifically to reducing excessive speed in fiscal years (FY) 2003, 2004, or 2005. Programs often address a wide variety of unsafe driving behavior, including speeding.

The state highway safety office reported that it has not committed funds specifically to reducing speeding, and no Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) funds are used specifically for speeding-related enforcement. Speeding-related enforcement is a requirement of all grant-funded enforcement activities.

Michigan reported the following impact of speed and/or aggressive driving programs, representing the number of crashes with “excessive speed.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minnesota reported that for Limited Access Urban Interstates in 2004, half had speed limits of 55 mph and the remainder had speed limits posted at 60, 65 or 70 mph. There is no separate speed limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Data
Minnesota reported speeding-related crash data specifically relating to the speed limit change is available on the website: [http://www.dot.mn.speed/index.html](http://www.dot.mn.speed/index.html). Reported speed limit and the estimated speed provided by the officer on the crash report form are the primary elements used to record the data. Speeding-related citation data is collected by the state patrol but other agency speeding citation data is not available on a statewide database. Some speeding-related citation/violation data is available from the driver record database. For example, in the 2004 calendar year, 175,155 speeding violations were posted to the driving records.

Minnesota statutes do not define aggressive driving, nor does the state have a citation category called “aggressive driving.” However, the crash report form introduced in 2003 has a field called “apparent physical condition” which the officer completes for drivers in crashes. One of the categories in that field is “aggressive.” The state noted that officers completing crash report forms need to be given guidelines on what types of behaviors would be defined to include an “apparent physical condition” of “aggressive.” Currently that decision is left to the judgment of the officer who completes the report. Among the 233,257 motor vehicle drivers on whom a crash report has been written, the field “aggressive” was reported 112 times (one-twentieth of one percent). There is some consensus that “aggressive driving” might be operationally defined as driving characterized by two or more driving violations that might include speeding and following too closely, or speeding and unsafe lane use.
No study has been performed to determine if there is over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. Minnesota noted, however, that operating speeds increase as vehicles approach the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

Minnesota’s state patrol and other law enforcement agencies enforce traffic laws, including those related to speeding. The more urban areas of the state utilize traffic calming strategies. Some jurisdictions slow traffic down by using speed display signs, roundabouts, reducing the number of through streets in residential areas and so forth. Annually since the fall of 1994, Minnesota has supported Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities. Called Safe & Sober, the programs are conducted on and around holiday periods and focus on one of the three areas for each of the periods.

Minnesota reported that federal highway dollars committed to speed are those that fund the Safe & Sober programs, involving state patrol troopers, county deputies and municipal officers. In 2002, approximately $200,000 was expended on activities that addressed speeding. In 2003, approximately $297,000 was expended on efforts that addressed speeding, and in 2004, approximately $330,000 was expended on speeding.

Minnesota reported little impact of speeding-related programs. While no formal evaluation of the specific speeding components of Safe & Sober programs has been carried out, there has been no apparent impact on speeding. Statewide data is indicating 85th percentile speeds (the prevailing speed of 85 percent of drivers on a particular stretch of roadway over a specified period of time) have continued to increase (from 1997 when speed limits increased through 2002) on rural freeways, rural divided highways and urban freeways. On rural two lane/two way roadways, 85th percentile speeds have remained about the same. Although speeds on urban divided highways have decreased, that decrease likely relates as much to increased congestion as to driver speed selection.

**Public Perception**

Minnesota state highway safety office noted state law provides that citations are not recorded on the driver record for less than 10 miles per hour over the posted limit in 55 mph zones, resulting in some abuse of the posted limit. While the law applies to 55 zones specifically, the attitude does seem to spill over into other zones.
Mississippi noted speed limits on Limited Access Urban Interstates varies from 50 to 70 mph, depending on the locality. Additionally, all two lane/two-way speed limits remain at a maximum speed limit of 55 mph. Speed limits apply equally to truck traffic.

**Speeding-related Data**
Mississippi collects speeding-related crash data, such as driving too fast for conditions and exceeding posted limits. The state also collects speeding-related citation data as well as data associated with aggressive driving. Mississippi has no formal definition of aggressive driving, but does collect certain data elements the state ascribes to be aggressive driving, such as driving under the influence, reckless driving and so forth.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes (All Crashes)</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes (All Crashes)</th>
<th>State Highway Patrol Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>95 (786)</td>
<td>2,098 (24,228)</td>
<td>197,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>79 (769)</td>
<td>2,264 (25,100)</td>
<td>258,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>72 (704)</td>
<td>2,219 (24,529)</td>
<td>283,706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing speed data for over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping, the state noted young drivers ages 16 to 20 comprise 7.2 percent of licensed drivers, yet receive 16.6 percent of speeding citations.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**
Mississippi has various construction/reconstruction projects throughout the state that include speeding-related enforcement, particularly in work zones. Specific construction funds are used to support work zone speeding-related enforcement. Section 154 transfer funds have been used to develop a Drive Smart Mississippi public information and education campaign focusing on speeding, safety belts and work-zone safety. In 2004, Mississippi enacted a law that doubled fines for speeding in work zones.

Approximately $200,000 annually has been allocated to the state police for overtime funding and special details to combat speeding. This amount is approximately 20 percent of the federal highway safety funding available to the state. There is no recent impact study to evaluate the success of Mississippi’s programs.

**Public Perception**
Mississippi’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5-9 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Missouri noted they do not currently have a differential speed limit for trucks, however, from 1988 to 1996, trucks over 12 tons were restricted to 60 mph. The state also has a Rural Expressway designation, on which speed limits in 1994 were 55 mph. Speed limits were generally increased to 65 mph in 2004 and may be raised up to 70 mph depending on the results of an engineering study.

Speeding-related Data
Missouri collects speeding-related crash data through the state’s motor vehicle crash report form, using exceeding speed limit and/or too fast for conditions data elements. Speeding-related citation data is available only from the state patrol database and not from other enforcement agencies. However, conviction data is available from the statewide driver license database. The state collects aggressive driving data, using the data elements of following too close, too fast for conditions and speed exceeded limit.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury &amp; Property Damage Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speed Tickets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>125,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>132,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>131,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missouri analyzed speed data for over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. The state reported 15-25 year olds were involved in approximately 45 percent of the speeding-related fatal crashes in 2003. Speeding-related fatal crashes are also over represented in rural areas of the state.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Missouri conducted a speed study on State Highway 13, including a seven-day speed survey to determine baseline data on 85th percentile of speeds (the prevailing speed of 85 percent of drivers.) This was followed by 14 days of aggressive enforcement and public information/education efforts that included radio public service announcements, changeable message boards and print media. At the conclusion of the speeding-related enforcement and education campaign, the speed study continued for an additional seven days to determine post-enforcement driver habits. The results indicated the public was generally traveling 10 plus mph over the posted speed limit prior to enforcement effort, with some drivers 15 to 20 plus mph over the posted speed limit. Once the enforcement effort began the motorists that were traveling at the greatest speeds over the posted limits (those 15 to 20 plus mph) came into closer compliance with the posted speed limits. The overall 85th percentile speeds were reduced to nearer the posted speed limits. After the 14 days of enforcement ended, speeds in general increased to pre-enforcement numbers. Although the study showed no lasting driver behavior change in speed, a side benefit of the study was an increase in safety belt usage. The project increased use by over 10 percent, a rate that was maintained two months after the program ended.
Missouri reported the following percentages of federal highway safety dollars expended on speed reduction efforts:

- 2003 – 12 percent
- 2004 – 18 percent
- 2005 – 19 percent

Additionally, approximately 1 percent of Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) funding is annually committed to speed reduction efforts. State funds are used by the state patrol for enforcement efforts.

The impact of speed reduction program efforts has not been statistically measured statewide. However, it is assumed that when enforcement is present, speeds are brought more into compliance with the posted limits. When the threat of enforcement is not present, motorists tend to push driving speed well beyond the posted speed limits.

**Public Perception**

Missouri’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5-7 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Montana noted that on non-interstate roads, the speed limit in 1994 was 55 mph and in 2004 the speed limit changed to 70 mph. The state has a specific speed limit for trucks: on interstate roads, the speed limit is 65 mph; on non-interstate roads the day speed limit is 65 mph and the nighttime limit is 60 mph.

**Speeding-related Data**
Montana collects speeding-related crash data, through too fast for conditions and exceeded speed limit data elements. The state does not collect citation data. No aggressive driving data is collected and the state has no formal definition of aggressive driving in state statutes.

### Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Too Fast for Conditions Crashes (# Fatal Conditions)</th>
<th>Exceeded Speed Limit Crashes (# Fatal Conditions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4,663 (58)</td>
<td>414 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4,518 (58)</td>
<td>420 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,426 (59)</td>
<td>322 (24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state noted both too fast for conditions and exceeded speed limit could be coded for the same crash.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**
Montana’s state highway safety office assists local law enforcement agencies in purchasing radar units. The state also includes speeding as an element in their Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) efforts. In order to make stops for these secondary offenses, such as safety belt use, speed infraction stops are made. No STEP funds are used specifically for speeding-related enforcement efforts but the state estimates a high number of speeding citations and warnings result from alcohol and seat belt STEP law enforcement activities.

Montana has not been targeting speeding to any serious degree because the majority of federal highway safety dollars are earmarked and targeted for alcohol and seat belts. Since Montana has the highest alcohol related fatality rate in the nation, much of the emphasis is directed toward these problem areas rather than speeding.

Montana’s speed monitoring sites are showing a small increase in speed over the last year. This change is not yet statistically significant, but is being watched closely to determine if this upward trend will continue.

**Public Perception**
Montana’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5-8 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit. State law provides for small fines for speeds up to 10 miles per hour over the speed limit, after which a much higher structured fine is imposed. Thus the state statute tends to support the idea of a cushion.
Nebraska

**Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1994 65</td>
<td>2004 75</td>
<td>1994 55</td>
<td>2004 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State officials can increase speed limits on two lane state highways from 60 mph to 65 mph upon request from the local county officials and after a satisfactory evaluation of that section of roadway. There is no separate speed limit for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**

Nebraska collects speeding-related crash data from motor vehicle crash reports. Generally the speed and speed too fast for conditions data elements are used. The state also utilizes a number of monitoring stations to collect speed data. Nebraska does not collect speeding-related citation data or aggressive driving data. State statute does not define aggressive driving.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding Convictions Added to Driver Records File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>81,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>80,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>72,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nebraska analyzed crash data to determine whether the speed data show over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. For 2001, 2002 and 2003, females made up 49.6 percent of the licensed population while accounting for approximately one-third of the speeding convictions. Males comprised 50.4 percent of the licensed population but represented nearly two-thirds of the speeding convictions. Drivers, ages 34 and younger made up 53.8 percent of the licensed population yet accounted for 56.6 percent of the speeding convictions.
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
For the past several years, Nebraska identified “speeding” as one of four major emphasis areas. As a result, the state implemented several countermeasure strategies to aid in reducing speeding-related crashes.

- Continued support for the latest speed detection equipment and training for state and local law enforcement agencies. It has been Nebraska’s long experience that new equipment generates significant increases in enforcement activity.

- Financial support for mini-grant (short-term) Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities to address speeding-related crashes. Agencies are required to identify high crash locations, utilizing specific time of day and day of week analyses.

- Requiring an accompanying media announcement by each funded agency, announcing the grant award and reason for the enforcement.

- Support for purchasing mobile speed monitoring trailers to aid in reducing speeding problems. Evaluations of the use of this equipment, combined with enforcement, have demonstrated reduced speeds in locations where they are used. Additionally, the state added permanent electronic speed monitoring signs at identified hazardous locations and made significant public information and education efforts promoting the doubling of the speeding fines in work zone locations.

Nebraska committed 13.6 percent of federal highway safety funds received in 2003 for speeding-related activities, 7 percent in 2004, and 9 percent in 2005. Although specific dollar amounts were not available, some state funding is also utilized for speeding-related activities by the state patrol and the state roads department. Additionally, Nebraska receives donations from Nebraska AAA to help purchase speed monitoring trailers. Nearly 75 percent of the federal highway safety funded dollars committed to speeding are for STEP activities.

Nebraska reported success in programs/activities that address speeding. Crash data reflects a decrease in fatal and serious injury crashes where speeding was indicated as a major contributing circumstance.

Public Perception
Nebraska’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5-7 mph cushion for highways in enforcing the posted speed limit. On urban/local roads the general belief is that up to 5 mph over the posted limit is safe.
Nevada

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1994  75</td>
<td>1994  65</td>
<td>1994  55</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004  70</td>
<td>2004  65</td>
<td>2004  70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevada has no separate speed limit for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**

Nevada collects speeding-related crash data, using failure to reduce speed, speed too fast for conditions and excessive speed data elements. The state also collects speeding-related citation data, but only for citations issued by the state patrol. Nevada does not collect data about aggressive driving, although aggressive driving is defined in code. Nevada’s aggressive driving statute is as follows:

A driver commits an offense of aggressive driving if, during any single, continuous period of driving within the course of 1 mile, the driver does all the following, in any sequence:

(a) Commits one or more acts of speeding
(b) Commits two or more of the following acts, in any combination, or commits any of the following acts more than once:
   (1) Failing to obey an official traffic-control device
   (2) Overtaking and passing another vehicle upon the right by driving off the paved portion of the highway
   (3) Improper or unsafe driving upon a highway that has marked lanes for traffic
   (4) Following another vehicle too closely
   (5) Failing to yield the right-of-way
(c) Creates an immediate hazard, regardless of its duration, to another vehicle or to another person, whether or not the other person is riding in or upon the vehicle of the driver or any other vehicle.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Speeding-related Fatal &amp; Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>78,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>80,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27.30%</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>29.25%</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Nevada includes speeding as an element of the Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities. As a secondary seat belt law state, Nevada uses STEP and Saturation patrols as a tool to enforce seat belt laws. No STEP enforcement activities are specific to speeding enforcement (with the exception of school zone enforcement). Based on crash data, Nevada’s priority is in addressing violations of traffic control devices, such as red light running.

Nevada reported approximately 4 percent of federal highway safety funds were primarily expended for speeding-related activities in 2003. In 2004, approximately 2.5 percent of federal funding was for speeding-related activities, with approximately 3.0 percent of funding committed to speeding-related activities in 2005.

Nevada has not determined the impact of speed and/or aggressive driving programs.

Public Perception
Nevada’s state highway safety office felt that the motoring public believes there to be a cushion of 10 mph over the posted limit before a citation is issued, and also noted state statute provides that 10 mph over the posted speed limit is not a moving violation and is not posted to the driving record.
New Hampshire

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Hampshire’s motor vehicle crash report collects illegal/unsafe speed, improper passing/overtaking, improper/unsafe lane use, skidding, failure to yield right of way and disregarding traffic control devices. All of these data elements are used to identify speeding-related crashes. The state also collects speeding-related citation data.

New Hampshire does not collect aggressive driving data and state statutes do not specifically define aggressive driving. However, the State Police Aggressive Driver Unit recognizes the aggressive driver as that “individual who has a blatant disregard for motor vehicle laws, while displaying a flagrant disrespect for the safety of the motoring public.” The unit targets the driver that commits two or more violations in one incident, where the safety of other motorists is at risk. Aggressive driving includes speeding, passing, right of way violations, following too close, hazardous moving violations, turning movements, and similar behaviors.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-Related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Total Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Number of Speeding-related</th>
<th>Percent Speeding-related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NH State Police Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speed Summonsces</th>
<th>Speed Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>44,448</td>
<td>64,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>40,372</td>
<td>65,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34,216</td>
<td>53,982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

In fiscal year 2005 the state highway safety agency will implement saturation patrols dedicated to aggressively enforcing posted speed limits. Patrols covering 13 geographic regions are proposed for the summer months (July and August 2005) in areas identified as having high traffic/crash volumes. In calendar year 2004 the State Police Aggressive Driver Unit patrolled the more congested highways in the state using two, low-profile cars and one unmarked cruiser. The effort targeted rush hour traffic during the morning and evening commute hours. The activity resulted in 2,323 court convictions and 2,856 warnings for various violations.

New Hampshire reported expending 19.4 percent of federal highway safety dollars on speeding-related programs and activities in 2003, including the purchase of radar equipment. In 2004, the state reported expending 19.8 percent, and 23.5 percent in 2005.

Public Perception

The state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit on the interstate system and 5 mph on other roadways.
### Speeding-related Data

New Jersey collects speeding-related crash data as well as speeding-related citation data. The state does not collect data about aggressive driving. Aggressive driving is not defined in state statute. New Jersey noted three state statutes address speeding offenses: reckless driving, careless driving and driving or operating a motor vehicle in an unsafe manner.

#### Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Annual Speeding Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>59,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>72,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

Educational efforts have included an ongoing *Drive Friendly* public information campaign. Enforcement efforts have included speeding-related and aggressive driving grants to state, county and municipal police agencies, as well as joint task force operations by local law enforcement agencies along major corridor roadways.

New Jersey reported that speeding-related programs and activities have been successful. The programs contributed to an overall 6 percent decline in motor vehicle fatalities in 2003, as well as a 32 percent decline in motorcycle fatalities in 2003.
New Mexico

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1994 65</td>
<td>1994 55</td>
<td>1994 55</td>
<td>2004 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 75</td>
<td>2004 65</td>
<td>2004 70</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Mexico reported the above speed limits are maximums and that many access segments have lower speed limits, depending on engineering design. All but a few sections of rural interstates are signed for 75 mph. Following the repeal of the NMSL, speed limits for rural highways were set on the basis of criteria that included lane and shoulder width, horizontal and vertical alignment and pavement condition. When NMSL was repealed in 1995, speed limits did not change until April 1996 in order to provide time for that analysis. Some segment speeds have been raised or lowered since. The state does not have a different speed limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Data
New Mexico collects speeding-related crash data from the state’s motor vehicle crash report form, using excessive speed and/or too fast for conditions data elements. The state does not collect speeding-related citation data, although speeding conviction data is collected. New Mexico does not collect aggressive driving data. Currently there is no clear definition of aggressive driving. Generally police officers code a citation as “careless or reckless” driving but coding is not uniform across the state.

Proportion of Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Speeding-related Fatal &amp; Injury Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding Convictions Added to Driver Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>117,303 (data incomplete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>122,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>129,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Mexico analyzed speed data for over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. The state found urban counties (particularly Bernalillo) are under represented. Rural counties with interstate highways and other major highways are somewhat over represented. San Juan County seems particularly high. The data shows 63 percent of convictions are male, 67 percent are under the age of 40, and 46 percent are under the age of 30.
**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

New Mexico includes speeding as an element of the Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities, and implements STEP programs in locations with high crash statistics, but not necessarily where a majority of the speeding may be occurring. There are very few STEP efforts targeted specifically at speeding. The state identified and implemented six “Safety Corridors.” These safety corridors are segments of highway that have high crash rates. Fines are doubled for these segments and the segments are identified by special signage. The state provides law enforcement funding to patrol these specific segments and is looking at six additional locations. The state does have specific speeding components of projects, but generally the projects encompass all “aggressive driving” behavior.

New Mexico commits approximately 10 percent of the total federal highway dollars received toward speeding-related activities. The state designates state funding for law enforcement activities, a portion of which is committed to speeding-related enforcement. Funding levels vary, but are estimated to be approximately $100,000 annually. New Mexico estimated approximately $500,000-$1 million per year for STEP or other related general traffic enforcement activities.

New Mexico believes there exists a direct relationship between funds spent on enforcement and a reduction in numbers of crashes.

**Public Perception**

New Mexico’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit on interstates with a 75 mph speed limit, and 10 mph on other roadways. The state also noted there are some exceptions in some counties where the public knows law enforcement officers give no cushion (Los Alamos, Sandoval.)
North Carolina

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65/70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55/65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speed limits listed above apply to all roadways within the state. North Carolina does not have a separate speed limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Data
North Carolina collects speeding-related crash data from three data elements: exceeding safe speed for conditions, exceeding authorized speed limits and failure to reduce speed. The state also collects speeding-related citation data and data about aggressive driving. North Carolina defines aggressive driving as three combined violations such as speeding, following too closely and unsafe movement.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Speeding-related Fatal &amp; Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Highway Patrol Speed Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>360,000 est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>360,000 est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>360,000 est.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
North Carolina will implement a new speed initiative in 2005 named No Need 2 Speed.

North Carolina estimated 14.5 percent of Section 402 federal highway safety dollars were expended for patrol activities, including speeding-related enforcement in 2003. In 2004, 12.8 percent of Section 402 funds were expended for patrol activities. State funds are used for personnel costs.

North Carolina reported mixed success of speeding-related programs. The state noted that courts routinely reduce the charges for speeding violations to improper equipment or a similar infraction.

Public Perception
North Carolina’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
North Dakota

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1994 65</td>
<td>2004 75</td>
<td>1994 None</td>
<td>2004 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speeding-related Data**

North Dakota collects speeding-related crash data, but does not collect speeding-related citation data. The state defines aggressive driving as speeding, lane weaving, red light running and driving too closely but does not collect aggressive driving data. The state has not defined aggressive driving in state statute.

North Dakota reported the state patrol issued 44,250 speeding citations in 2001. In 2002 the number was 44,890; and 45,510 citations were issued in 2003.

No data is collected regarding geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

North Dakota reported that no highway safety programs are aimed specifically at speed reduction. The state expends federal highway safety dollars on impaired driving crackdowns and safety belt enforcement, and includes speeding-related enforcement as a component of these efforts.

**Public Perception**

North Dakota’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit on the interstate system.
Ohio

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speed limits noted above apply to all roadways within the state. Ohio has separate speed limits for vehicles in excess of 8,000 pounds gross vehicle weight that remained in effect after the NMSL was repealed. For all roadways, the speed limit for vehicles in excess of 8,000 pounds gross vehicle weight was 55 mph in 1994 and remained the same a decade later.

Speeding-related Data
Ohio collects speeding-related crash data from information provided on the state's motor vehicle crash report form. The state does not collect speeding-related citation data and does not collect data about aggressive driving. There is no statute defining aggressive driving.

Ohio reported the state patrol issued 473,773 speeding citations in 2001. The number for 2002 was 466,594, and in 2003 the number was 431,036. No breakout is available by geographic group, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Activities primarily include speeding-related overtime enforcement efforts that target specific locations. Speeding-related citations in 2003 by the state patrol numbered 8,971. During the same period, local law enforcement officers issued 30,635 citations.

Ohio reported expending the following percentages of federal highway safety dollars for speeding-related activities through state patrol and local law enforcement grants:

- FY 2003 $1,900.00 17 percent
- FY 2004 $1,900.00 17 percent
- FY 2005 $1,900.00 17 percent (Estimated)

Ohio reported there has not been an evaluation of the overall impact of these speeding-related enforcement activities in the past two years. However, many agencies have noted a reduction in speeds on specific roadways where enforcement efforts were concentrated.

Public Perception
Ohio's state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit, although the amount varies with type of roadway and agency. The state highway safety office felt the general belief is that there is at least a 5 mph cushion above the posted speed limit.
The speed limits indicated above do not apply to all roadways within the state. In Oklahoma, turnpikes are 75 mph and other speed limits are based on 85th percentile speeds (the speed of 85 percent of drivers on a given segment.) There is no separate speed limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Data
Oklahoma collects 85th percentile speed data at various points along the highway system. The state also collects speeding-related crash data. The cause of a crash can be “Unsafe Speed” which includes: driver’s ability-age; inexperienced driver-young; exceeding legal limit for traffic conditions, for type of roadway, for ice or snow on roadway, wind, other weather condition(s), vehicle condition, view obstruction, on curve/turn, impeding traffic, and similar data elements. The state also collects citation data, but does not collect aggressive driving data. There is no formal definition of aggressive driving in state statutes.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Unsafe Speed Causal Factor in Crashes</th>
<th>Highway Patrol Excessive Speed Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>90,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>97,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Excessive speed is addressed through law enforcement programs, community/school safety presentations and improvement to engineering analyses programs. In October of 1997, the U.S. Department of Justice awarded the Oklahoma City a Local Law Enforcement Block Grant to start an aggressive driving program. Known as R.A.A.I.D. (Reduction of Accidents and Aggressive and Inconsiderate Drivers) the program became operational in September 1998. The goal of R.A.A.I.D. is to reduce crashes, particularly fatal crashes. Generally, Oklahoma does not isolate efforts that address only speeding.

Oklahoma estimates that in 2005, 40 percent of federal highway safety dollars were committed to reducing speed. State funds are used in part to fund state patrol, whose emphasis is on speed reduction and seat belt use. Additionally, the Oklahoma City police department has an aggressive driving/speed program.

Public Perception
Oklahoma’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Speed limit increases in 2004 do not apply to all roadways. Generally speaking, all state highways (non-interstate) are 55 mph outside the city limits of an incorporated city. County roads follow the same basic trend. The speed reductions are posted as the respective roadways approach city limits or major signalized 4-way intersections. Other speed zone reductions occur where there is a permanent or temporary speed reduction order based on roadwork or some other situation like a high crash location identified by the state transportation department. Rural interstate highways in Oregon have a maximum limit of 65 mph. Urban interstate highways generally have a 55 mph speed limit with a few exceptions (East Portland (Interstate 84), Salem (Interstate 5) and Eugene (Interstate 5).) These three locations are specifically identified as having a 60 mph limit. Two other areas are lower than the 55 mph limit (Terwilliger Curves and Myrtle Creek Curves, both signed at 50 mph.) These areas have permanent speed reduction orders due to crash histories on the curves.

In Oregon truck/bus speeds are set at a maximum speed limit of 55 mph on all state and interstate highways, unless a lower speed is posted for all vehicles or a different speed is posted specifically for trucks.

Speeding-related Data
Oregon collects speeding-related crash data from police and citizen-based crash reports, primarily using the speed too fast for conditions and exceeding posted speed data elements. The state does not collect speeding citation data, but does collect speeding conviction data. There is no centralized tracking system for citations issued. Data about aggressive driving would be shown through individual violations, but not as aggressive driving. Oregon does not define aggressive driving in current law, although one city does have a specific law.
Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatalities (Percent of Crashes)</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injuries (Percent of Crashes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>273 (53.3%)</td>
<td>9,131 (32.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>225 (51.6%)</td>
<td>8,724 (31.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>211 (43.2%)</td>
<td>7,505 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the years indicated in the chart, Oregon estimates 200,000 as the annual average number of speeding convictions posted to driver records. This number represents state and local agencies.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
In the past several years, Oregon has increased the amount of effort in speeding-related enforcement, equipment and public information and education. The engineering efforts include an element of safety and address speed modification in the design phase. Although speeding is a component of various programs, the state also funds specific activities that address only speeding. These include annual funding to the state police for speeding-related enforcement and annual funding to city and county police agencies to address speed equipment needs as well as provide for overtime speeding-related enforcement. In 2005, Oregon is analyzing the top 10 counties in terms of speed and total fatalities to develop specific Multi-Agency Traffic Team Partnerships that will provide a significant visible presence and deterrent to bad driving behaviors that cause traffic crashes. The intent is to reduce the number of deaths in each specific county.

Oregon reported in fiscal year (FY) 2002, $250,000 in federal funding was committed to speed reduction measures. The amount in 2003 was $431,000, and $475,000 in 2004. In 2005, Oregon anticipates expending $750,000. The state has no funds specific to speed reduction. Oregon will implement a Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) in FY 2005. The state estimated 50 percent of the enforcement activities in the STEP projects involve speeding-related enforcement. Oregon has provided assistance for speed patrol activities under Safe Community grants, safety belt grants and driving impaired grants for over a decade.

Because a focus on the issue of speeding is relatively new both nationally and in Oregon, it is not possible to determine the overall impacts of speeding-related activities in the state. Specific financial resources would be needed to direct activities and efforts specifically to speed.

Public Perception
Oregon’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10-15 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit before being stopped.
Pennsylvania

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speed limits do not apply to all roadways within the state. In each instance of a posted 65 mph limit, an engineering and traffic study is performed to document that the speed limit is appropriate. Pennsylvania does not have a separate speed limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Data

Pennsylvania department of transportation conducts spot speed studies, usually performed manually with a radar gun and tally sheet at specific locations on roadways exhibiting some sort of safety concern. Studies are also conducted for particular projects resulting from requests from municipalities. Speed data is also collected automatically on interstate highways, expressways and other major thoroughfares through automatic traffic data collection devices embedded in the roadway surface. Additionally, the state crash report form contains space to indicate “contributing driver actions” as a crash factor. One of these contributing driver actions is “speeding”. Pennsylvania does not collect speeding citation data, but does collect speeding-related conviction data.

Pennsylvania also collects data about aggressive driving. Aggressive driving is defined by policy as “the combination of actions and behaviors by an individual who operates a motor vehicle with disregard for public safety.” The state also identifies aggressive driving statistically through “contributing driver actions” from the police crash report form:

- Driver fleeing police (police chase)
- Improper/careless turning
- Turning from wrong lane
- Proceeding without clearance after stop
- Making improper entrance to highway
- Running red light
- Failure to respond to other traffic control device
- Making improper exit from highway
- Careless passing or lane change
- Passing in no passing zone
- Running stop sign
- Tailgating
- Making illegal u-turn
- Sudden slowing or stopping
- Speeding
- Driving too fast for conditions
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

Pennsylvania is piloting a new “safety corridor” project where fines for moving violations such as speeding are doubled in certain corridors selected by an engineering study. The pilot program will study the effects of the signs and active, visible enforcement on vehicle speeds and following distances. Pennsylvania also uses speed display boards on roadways with a history of speeding vehicles, as studies have shown that vehicle speeds are reduced in the short term in the vicinity of the speed display board during its deployment.

Pennsylvania includes speeding as a component of Selective Traffic Enforcement Programs (STEP), designed to increase traffic safety and reduce the number of crashes through innovative traffic enforcement operations. STEP targets specific areas with a high incidence of crashes and traffic violations. Enforcement locations and times are selected based upon analysis of traffic volume, crash data, frequency of traffic violations and traffic conditions, as well as geographic and temporal factors. A review of patrol and traffic related data captured from computer-based “Prophecy Program” and the “Automated Incident Memo System” (AIMS) is utilized to target enforcement locations. The objective is to direct appropriate enforcement efforts toward violations that are likely to cause crashes. Speeding-related enforcement programs, such as radar and Operation State Police Aerial Reconnaissance Enforcement and targeted enforcement (including aggressive driving) is identified through analysis. The state has adopted several speeding-related enforcement programs designed to detect violators using non-traditional means. Examples are Operation Chameleon, a program where troopers pose as disabled motorists in cargo vans and passenger cars. Radar units are operated from within the vehicle, and information is radioed to a marked patrol unit situated within sight of the chameleon vehicle. Operation Yellow Jacket is a similar concept, using troopers posing as department of transportation workers.

Pennsylvania estimated federal highway safety funds in the amount of $450,000 was expended in 2003 and again in 2004 on speeding-related activities, with $1,100,000 anticipated in 2005. Pennsylvania reported speeding-related and aggressive driving fatalities in 2003 are down from 2002 levels.

Public Perception

Pennsylvania’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit. The state noted Pennsylvania law allows for a five mph cushion for police using radar (only the state police can use radar by law), and a 10 mph cushion for police using other speed timing devices where the legal speed limit is less than 55 mph (municipal police.)

### Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatalities (Percent Total)</th>
<th>Major Injuries (Percent Total)</th>
<th>Convictions: Speeding</th>
<th>Convictions: Failure to Head Traffic Control Device</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>204 (13%)</td>
<td>748 (14%)</td>
<td>261,019</td>
<td>200,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>194 (13%)</td>
<td>703 (14%)</td>
<td>255,955</td>
<td>212,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>256 (17%)</td>
<td>988 (20%)</td>
<td>242,234</td>
<td>230,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>483 (30%)</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>232,691</td>
<td>240,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>443 (28%)</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>196,222</td>
<td>236,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The speed limits shown above apply to all roadways within the state. South Carolina has no separate speed limit for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**

South Carolina collects speeding-related crash data from the state’s motor vehicle crash report form. The officer investigating a crash has the option of choosing speeding-related contributing factors in crashes. Data elements include driving too fast for conditions and exceeding posted speed limits, and also as a possible factor in both aggressive operation of a motor vehicle and reckless driving. South Carolina does not have a statute relating to aggressive driving. The state uses the statute for reckless driving to cover aggressive driving offenses. “Aggressive Operation of a Motor Vehicle“ is listed on the uniform crash report form as one of a number of contributing factors to crashes reported by investigating officers. Speeding citation data is also collected, but only by the state patrol. Local jurisdictions do not submit their citation data unless the local jurisdiction receives federal highway safety grant funding.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes/All (percent)</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes/All (percent)</th>
<th>State Patrol Speed Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>78/808 (9.6%)</td>
<td>334/30,057 (1.0%)</td>
<td>228,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>78/839 (9.3%)</td>
<td>343/30,109 (1.0%)</td>
<td>270,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>86/863 (10.0%)</td>
<td>383/30,299 (1.0%)</td>
<td>341,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

South Carolina includes speeding as a component of many program activities. The state implemented several speeding-related educational and enforcement mobilizations in the summer of 2004. As part of that effort, a multi-state press conference was conducted to promote efforts to reduce speeding-related problems. Highway safety leaders and other representatives from South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina and Mississippi supported the effort, which was referred to as the I-85 (Interstate 85) mobilization crackdown and was a component of the “100 Days of Summer Heat” initiative. State highway patrol and local law enforcement agencies throughout the five states mobilized for one week to conduct the I-85 effort. The Labor Day Sober or Slammer! and Memorial Day Buckle Up South Carolina, It’s the Law, and it’s Enforced, campaigns included stepped up enforcement components, including a focus on speeding. The state highway patrol received highway safety grant funding during federal fiscal year (FFY) 2005 that focused on impaired driving and speeding-related enforcement. Target Zero, the state’s most recent highway safety campaign effort, was introduced in December 2004. The mobilization, focusing on speeding, impaired driving and seat belt use continued through January 2005.

The state highway safety office awards federal highway safety grants each year to state and local law enforcement agencies. A funding stipulation for the grants requires agencies to participate in the state’s recently formed Law Enforcement Network system, and requires specific types of traffic enforcement efforts, including impaired driving and speeding-related enforcement. The state patrol deals exclusively with highway safety initiatives and is predominantly funded with state dollars.

South Carolina saw a significant reduction in highway fatalities from 2002 to 2003 (1,053 to 969, or 8 percent). Although preliminary statistics for 2004 indicate an increase in fatalities of approximately 5.7 percent, the final number will still remain significantly below the previous level. The state’s motor vehicle death rate reached a new low of 2.0 in 2003. Highway crash related injuries have steadily decreased over the past few years, from 52,350 in 2001 to 51,267 in 2003 (2.1 percent). Although these statistical changes cannot be attributed exclusively to speeding and/or aggressive driving programs, speeding-related enforcement played some part in the differences. Toward that end, South Carolina reported a positive impact of speeding-related programs in the state.

Public Perception

South Carolina's state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
South Dakota reported that state highways have a speed limit of 65 mph and county roads have a maximum speed of 55 mph. Trucks have different limits, according to size.

### Speeding-related Data
South Dakota collects speeding-related crash data and speeding-related citation data. The state noted that individual driver citation/driver record information is available but has not been compiled into a statewide statistical report format. South Dakota does not collect aggressive driving data and statutes do not define aggressive driving. The state noted, however, that reckless, careless and overdriving are all considered aggressive.

### Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal &amp; Injury Crashes (percent)</th>
<th>State Patrol Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,210 (15%)</td>
<td>27,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,107 (14%)</td>
<td>27,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,177 (14%)</td>
<td>26,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information was not available to determine if the speed data show over-representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

### Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
South Dakota provides funding local law enforcement to purchase radar equipment to enhance speeding-related enforcement efforts. Speeding is also a component of all law enforcement grants.

*Operation Safe* is a noticeably successful program that combines public education and awareness activities with saturation patrols. The program has improved the safety of the public even though *Operation Safe* has only been in place for one year.

South Dakota reported a total of $105,225 or 6 percent of the state’s federal highway safety funds were committed to speed reduction efforts in 2003. In 2004, the amount was $220,000 or 12 percent. South Dakota anticipates expending $240,000 or 14 percent of funds on speeding-related activities in 2005. The state reported that law enforcement agencies are funded both by state and by local dollars, however, the total amount of state and local funding is not available. South Dakota believes efforts to address speed have been positive.

### Public Perception
South Dakota’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit. The state noted that South Dakota, like most rural states, struggles with large geographic areas and low population densities, miles of roadway and limited number of law enforcement personnel to patrol. Thus public perception of the risk of getting caught while speeding in rural areas is low.
Tennessee noted that speed limits shown above apply to all roadways within the state. For limited access urban interstates, speed limits varied from 45 to 55 mph, depending on population. Although there is no statewide differential truck speed limit, trucks have different limits on steep grades in certain areas of the state.

Speeding-related Data
Tennessee collects speeding-related crash data. These are reported as driver actions, and include speed too fast for conditions and speed too slow. The state also collects speeding-related citation data, but does not collect aggressive driving data. There is no state statute defining aggressive driving.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

The Number of Speeding Citations by Tennessee Highway Patrol
Speed Limits 65 & 70 MPH (All Roads)
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
The mission of the Tennessee highway safety office is to promote safety. An integral component of this mission is to rigorously enforce speeding-related laws. All troopers are highly trained in speeding-related enforcement and continuously take enforcement actions to decrease undesirable driving behavior. Through the administration of speeding-related grant programs or while on regularly scheduled patrols, troopers devote a considerable amount of time to speeding-related enforcement. The state patrol utilizes a Safety Education Division to promote safe driving habits. This division publishes pamphlets, conducts safety fairs, addresses various audiences and provides public displays - all in an effort to educate motorists of the perils of negligent driving. Crash reports capture causative factors such as speeding. Reports are shared with the state transportation department who routinely analyze crash data to determine locations of crashes. If an abnormally high number of crashes continue to occur at the same location on the same roadway, engineers might examine the location to determine if changes in roadway design might help alleviate the problem. Speeding-related enforcement is a practice in all of law enforcement overtime programs.

Public Perception
Tennessee's state highway safety office felt the average driver believes they have a 5 mph cushion above the posted speed limit. Some drivers, however, feel they are allowed 10 mph due to the volume of traffic and difficulty of enforcing speed in certain locations.
Texas reported the limits noted above apply to all roadways, except roadways with 75 mph speeds. Those limits only apply to counties with fewer than 10 people per square mile. Texas is one of the few states with different speed limits for day and night driving. The state also has different speed limits for trucks. Daytime speeds for trucks are 70 mph and nighttime speeds are 65 mph on all roadways, except farm-to-market roads where the speed limits are 60 mph in the daytime and 55 mph at night.

Speeding-related Data
Texas collects speeding-related crash data, using speeding over limit and speed unsafe data elements. The state also collects data about aggressive driving (cell phone use and road rage.) However state statutes do not define aggressive driving.

Texas collects citation data, but only for the department of public safety and other agencies that have speeding-related law enforcement grants. The following tables represent speeding-related violations statewide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>Non-STEP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27,505</td>
<td>527,165</td>
<td>554,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>500,941</td>
<td>528,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73,509</td>
<td>505,468</td>
<td>578,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texas reported 41,924 speeding-related fatal and injury crashes in 2001. Data for 2002 and 2003 have not yet been finalized. Texas has the ability to report and analyze speeding-related violation data for over representation in geographic areas, by race and by gender, however, the state did not provide conclusions about the data presented.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Texas includes speeding as a component in Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities. The majority of STEP grants that include a speeding-related component also address other components such as impaired driving, safety belt use and intersection violations. In fiscal year (FY) 2005, ten communities will operate a STEP with a speeding-related component only. Ninety-seven communities will operate a STEP that includes speeding and at least one other component.

Texas reported the following percentages as representative of Section 402 and Section 157a federal highway safety funding expenditures: FY 2003, 36.8 percent; FY 2004, 34.2 percent; and in FY 2005, 37 percent. In addition, the state department of transportation has a state funded STEP to increase speeding, impaired driving and occupant protection enforcement. The amount received in FY 2004 was $8,667,000 with about the same amount again available in FY 2005.

Public Perception
Texas' state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police typically give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Utah

Speeding-related Data
Utah collects data on speeding-related crashes including participant fatalities or injuries and those involving only property damage. The crash report data elements that are used to collect this data are exceeding the posted speed limit and driving too fast for conditions. Data on speeding citations is also available. Utah has a state statute that defines aggressive driving and reckless driving as "willful and wanton disregard" and includes three or more moving violations in one episode. Aggressive driving data related to vehicle crashes is collected through the information on the crash report. The officer must indicate on the report that the driver acted in an aggressive manner.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatalities (Percent Total)</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Citations Added to Driver Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>21,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>28,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>37,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utah analyzed the speed-related data to determine if the data show over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. Crash data reflects that drivers ages 15-24 are over represented in speeding-related injury and fatal crashes. Gender differences do not appear to be a factor in property damage and injury crashes, while the data sample for fatal crashes is not large enough to be conclusive.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Numerous educational campaigns have targeted speeding, and speeding-related information is included in media sources such as television, radio, newspapers and school programs for all age groups. Driver Education courses taught in both public and private schools include curriculum addressing speed reduction as a way to reduce crashes and the related fatalities, injuries and property loss.

Engineering for new roads and freeways has been a priority in Utah with design features and signage that have resulted in a crash reduction. However, this does not seem to have resulted in a correlated reduction in speed. Rather it appears to have given the motoring public a false sense of security with more numerous,
wider and smoother lanes in which to travel. Vehicle design and handling improvements also seem to encourage a false sense of security felt by many drivers.

Enforcement efforts continue with statewide highway patrol efforts and complementary local programs. The most visible effort is the “UHP: Putting the Brakes on Aggressive Driving” campaign with goals of identifying “trouble” spots by responding to aggressive driving complaints and targeting holiday periods when high traffic flow is expected. In ten months, this campaign resulted in over 3700 stops, 4300 citations and 1500 warnings for all violations, and more than 300 assistance stops for motorists.

In federal fiscal year (FFY) 2003, Utah continued a three-year project by committing $100,000 to an aggressive driving enforcement campaign, with a focus on speeding. The project targeted State Route 6 (and adjoining routes). The project was terminated in FFY 2004 when the compliance rate among drivers (measured by the lower number of citations issued during overtime shifts) had increased and reauthorization funding was lower than expected. Utah continues campaigns directed toward aggressive driving enforcement with a much larger focus area than speeding alone.

Speed monitor trailers continue to be used on a regular basis statewide to make the motoring public aware of their speed and encourage them to slow down. Use of speed trailers is then followed by enforcement efforts. In FFY 2003, about 3 percent of Utah’s federal highway safety funds were used to acquire speed trailers, with about 1 percent used in FFY 2004. The percentage for FFY 2005 was unclear at the time of the report due to reauthorization uncertainties.

Utah reported a positive impact of speed reduction efforts and programs. The state measured the impact of programs by looking at the number of crashes and the number of complaints received before, during, and after blitzes and saturation patrol efforts. Utah reported a decrease in crashes during the blitzes while the number of complaints appears to remain about the same.

Public Perception
Utah’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public perceives there is a 5 mph buffer in most cases. Interestingly, highway patrol troopers state there are more than enough speeders at 10 mph or more above posted limits to keep them busy during blitzes, saturation patrols and regularly scheduled shifts.
Vermont reported that speed limits noted above apply to all roadways within the state. There is no different speed limit for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**

Vermont collects speeding-related crash data, using driving too fast for conditions and exceeding authorized speed limit data element. The state also collects crash data on aggressive driving, using the operating vehicle in erratic, reckless, negligent or aggressive manner data element. Vermont has not defined aggressive driving in state statute.

For 2001 (the most current year for which data is available), Vermont reported the following crash information in which speed was cited as a factor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Driving too fast</th>
<th>Excessive Speed</th>
<th>Operating recklessly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12 (14.5%)</td>
<td>7 (8.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196 (12%)</td>
<td>56 (3.4%)</td>
<td>30 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following speeding-related citation information was provided:


Vermont analyzed speed data for over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. The state reported ages 16-34 are over represented citation data, with the highest over representation in the 18-20 age group.
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
An engineering effort is replacing old “reduce speed ahead” signs with new “reduce speed ahead” signs.

Vermont uses fluorescent yellow warning signs (instead of regular sheeting) to reduce speeds in curves or through intersections. Fluorescent sheeting is more visible and commands more attention. Recent research (Transportation Research Record #1862) shows a reduction of mean speeds at curves of 1 mph when fluorescent yellow chevrons are used. Another study suggests a 5 percent reduction in injury crashes for every 1 mph reduction. In school zones, the state is also replacing school warning signs with new fluorescent yellow-green signs.

Vermont includes speed as an element of Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities. Highway safety projects are multi-faceted. Approximately 20 percent of funding is used for enforcement, which is a mix of speeding, aggressive driving and occupant protection. Perhaps two-thirds of those enforcement dollars are used for speeding-related activities, or about 15 percent of the total federal highway safety funding.

Vermont has not completed formal evaluations of speed reduction programs, but noted the state generally sees an increase in fatalities when there is a decrease in funding and enforcement.

Public Perception
Vermont’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit on the interstate. On Main Street in Burlington, where the speed limit is 25 mph, motorists believe there is a 15 mph cushion.
Virginia

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speed limits shown above apply to all roadways. Virginia notes the 60 mph speed on other limited access roads only applies in limited areas as defined by state code. Trucks are limited to 45 mph on secondary roads.

Speeding-related Data
Virginia collects a variety of speeding-related crash and injury data. Data elements used to collect the data are: exceeded speed limit and exceeded safe speed limit (but not posted speed limit). The state also collects speeding-related conviction data from all police agencies. Virginia collects crash and conviction data for aggressive driving, and has defined aggressive driving in state code. A person is guilty of aggressive driving if:

1. The person violates one or more of the following:
   - failure to observe lanes marked for traffic
   - passing on the right when overtaking vehicle
   - not giving way to overtaking vehicle
   - passing when overtaking a vehicle
   - not stopping or yielding right-of-way before entering certain highway
   - not heeding limitations on overtaking
   - not giving way to certain overtaking vehicles on divided highway; and
   - following too closely
   - evading traffic control devices
   - driving on right side of highways
   - speeding
   - passing/stopping on highways

2. That person is a hazard to another person or commits an offense with the intent to harass, intimidate, injure or obstruct another person.
Virginia noted that the speeding-related citation database information is maintained and available from the state police. All speeding citation data collected reflects age, gender and geographic area. This information is then used to determine crash severity scores and special needs, such as age-specific safety projects and target enforcement areas.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

Virginia uses all crash and citation data collected to determine federal highway safety grant funding. The state does not have a Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) per se, but notes many STEP activities fall under the adopted *Smart Safe and Sober, Click It or Ticket* and *Smooth Operator* programs, all of which have a speed and/or aggressive driving component.

Virginia received $6,330,773 in total grant funding in 2003. Of that amount 2.2 percent was spent specifically on speeding and aggressive driving programs. In 2004 Virginia received $29,539,300 in total grant funding, of which 3.5 percent was spent specifically on speeding and aggressive driving programs, and in 2005 Virginia received $34,950,798 in total grant funding and anticipates expending 3.3 percent specifically on speeding and aggressive driving programs.

Virginia reported their efforts to reduce excessive speeding have been successful. In 2001, Virginia had a total of 360 speeding-related fatalities. In 2002, there were 351 speeding-related fatalities. That number dropped in 2003 to 346. From 2001 to 2003, speeding-related fatalities decreased by 14, or a 3.89 percent reduction. In 2001, Virginia had a total of 16,728 speeding-related injuries, with 16,082 occurring in 2002. In 2003, there were 15,387 speed-related injuries. From 2001 to 2003 speeding-related injuries decreased by 1,337 representing an 8 percent reduction.

**Public Perception**

Virginia’s state highway safety office has not conducted any formal or informal survey on the public’s perception of a “speed limit cushion.” The court systems in Virginia by statute may impose sanctions for any violation 1 mph and over of speed limit statutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes (Percent)</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>346 (40%)</td>
<td>15,387 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>351 (42%)</td>
<td>16,082 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>360 (42%)</td>
<td>16,728 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Washington reports speed limits noted above apply to all roadways within the state, except county roads, where speed limits are 50 mph unless otherwise posted. Maximum speed for trucks on Washington roadways is 60 mph unless otherwise posted.

Speeding-related Data
Washington maintains data on average speed and high speed in specific areas as indicated by speed monitoring devices, aircraft and pacing. The state patrol maintains a database with data on number of speeders contacted and citations issued per month and year-to-date, as well as comparison by month, year-to-date and last 12 months. The state also collects speeding citation data and data about aggressive driving.

Washington uses the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s definition of aggressive driving: the commission of two or more moving violations likely to endanger other persons or property, or any single intentional violation that requires defensive reaction of another driver.

Washington has 39 unconventional vehicles assigned to a statewide Aggressive Driving Apprehension Team (ADAT), which monitors total contacts, citations issued (and type of violation) per month, comparisons and year-to-date totals. ADAT also tracks the number of media contacts and rides-a-long provided. Aggressive drivers reported to the communication centers by citizens are recorded and mapped, then provided to patrol commanders for deployment decisions. If the citizen can provide a license plate number, a formal letter is sent to the registered owner advising them that the vehicle was observed driving aggressively at a specific location. As of December 2004, citizens can also access a website to report locations or “hot spots” of observed aggressive driving. Those locations are also provided to patrol commanders for deployment decisions and enforcement strategies.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding Involved in Collision</th>
<th>State Police Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>289,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>260,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>174,949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding

In 2001, Washington began focusing on four core missions: strict enforcement and accountability through monthly monitoring of impaired driving enforcement, aggressive driving, dangerous speeding and occupant protection. The state believes this approach has the greatest impact on reducing serious injuries and fatalities. The results are increased activity and enforcement and a reduction in fatalities and injury collisions. There is a consistent effort to keep patrol activities in the media with interesting stories to help educate and increase awareness of the core mission. Field troopers also make a concentrated effort to educate through community outreach programs. In 2004 there were 612 presentations by field troopers statewide.

Washington dedicated $1.6 million in 2003 to the four core missions, including speeding. During 2004, the amount was $1.33 million, some of which was used to purchase unconventional vehicles to address the aggressive driving problems. Washington believes the major component in most aggressive driving acts is speeding. In 2005, the state anticipates expending $1.37 million toward the four core missions. Some of those funds will be used to purchase newer improved speed measuring devices as well as speed emphasis patrols.

Washington reported their programs to address speeding have been largely successful. Since 2002, injury collisions have been reduced by 15 percent statewide and aggressive driving citations have increased 54 percent during the same period. The most important outcome has been a reduction in fatalities on state routes by 14 percent and interstates by 8 percent. Speed contacts have increased by 8.55 percent. The aggressive driving program including mapping of citizen reports, Internet capability for citizen reports and deployment of unconventional vehicles have all raised awareness of the issue and received positive input from the public.

Public Perception

Washington does not mandate patrol quotas or require troopers to write tickets at a specific speed over the posted limit. Officers are trained to consider the totality of the circumstances and conditions in making a discretionary decision to issue a citation for speed. However, there are work standards and troopers are expected to take part in enforcement actions as a law enforcement agency. There appears to be a public perception that it is more likely than not a person will be cited at 10 mph over the posted limit. Very few citations are issued for 5 mph over the posted limit.
West Virginia

Speed Limits: 1994 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Limited Access Rural Interstates</th>
<th>Limited Access Urban Interstates</th>
<th>Other Limited Access Roads</th>
<th>Truck Speed (Y or N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

West Virginia reported that speed limits listed above apply to all roadways within the state. The current limits for 2004 on other limited access roads are 50 mph in urban areas and 65 in rural areas of the state. There is no separate speed limit for trucks.

**Speeding-related Data**

West Virginia collects some speeding-related crash data, from a subset of the crash report form under “Circumstances Contributing to Traffic Crashes” and “Circumstances Contributing to Fatal Crashes.” Data elements include exceeding safe speed and exceeding speed limit. The state also collects speeding-related conviction data. The state has not defined aggressive driving and no aggressive driving data is collected.

**Proportion Speeding-related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Circumstances Contributing to Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speed Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state noted that there may be more than one contributing circumstance for each crash. Data available does not provide for determining over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping.

**Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding**

West Virginia efforts are directed primarily toward seat belt and impaired driving enforcement, although speeding is included as a component of funded activities. The state estimates 5 percent of federal highway safety dollars are committed toward efforts to reduce speed. No state funds are used specifically for speed reduction.

**Public Perception**

West Virginia’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 10 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
Wisconsin noted that the 55 mph speed limit only applies to large metropolitan areas. A limit of 65 mph is used on most rural 4+-lane roadways, even some with cross traffic access. The state does not have a separate limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Data
Wisconsin collects speeding-related crash data, using the driving too fast for conditions, exceeding posted limits and imprudent speed (failure to have control) data elements. The state also collects speeding-related citation data, but does not collect aggressive driving data. Currently Wisconsin statutes do not define aggressive driving, although the state highway safety office plans to address the definition and take action to develop countermeasures in 2005.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes
Wisconsin analyzed speed data to determine over representation by any specific geographic area, race, ethnic group, gender, age or other grouping. The state noted speeding is most prevalent among males, and most significant in ages 16-34.

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Wisconsin includes speed as a component of Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) efforts. The state also initiated a program to target specific speeding-related enforcement details in high-speeding-related crash history areas. Deploying multiple agencies working coordinated efforts, the initiative encourages local earned media and utilizes radar, laser, and aircraft speed equipment to generate high volumes of enforcement activity. The primary media message reminds the public of the dangers associated with speeding and its increasing involvement in crash factors. In 2005, Wisconsin plans to produce and air spots with a speed-related message, entitled, “Busted, over the limit, under arrest!”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Patrol Speed Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>92,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>91,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>86,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wisconsin

Wisconsin estimated approximately 5 percent of annual federal highway safety funds were committed each year in fiscal year (FY) 2003, 2004 and 2005 to specific speed-reduction projects. Another 9 percent was committed to enforcement programs that focus on other issues such as belt use and impaired driving, but also impact speeding. About 20 percent all Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) funds are expended specifically on speeding-related enforcement. Wisconsin uses no state funding for speeding-related enforcement, but noted that the state patrol generates nearly 100,000 citations per year using state sources of funding for personnel.

Wisconsin has not completed specific impact evaluations of their speeding-related programs and so the impact is largely unknown. However, the state noted average speeds continue to climb, the percentage of speeding-related crashes increases and greater numbers of top-end speeders are being detected. While current programs have been effective in generating speeding-related enforcement, the state noted the programs are not sufficient to reverse these trends. Wisconsin believes it is not possible to accurately determine the impact of the state's speeding-related programs against current trends to determine if the rates of increase would have been greater without having any of the countermeasures in place.

Public Perception
Wisconsin's state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit. The amount varies, but has been steadily increasing. On most rural highways, the perceived tolerance has climbed to nearly 9 mph, while the rural interstates have climbed to around 14 mph over posted limits.
Speed limits listed above apply to all limited state highways. Wyoming noted limits do not apply to Bureau of Indian Affairs, Forest Service and county and city roadways within the state. The state does not currently have a separate speed limit for trucks.

Speeding-related Crash Data
Wyoming collects speeding-related crash data using estimated speed of vehicle, posted speed for roadway, unsafe speed for conditions, and exceeding speed limit or speed too fast for conditions data elements. The state collects speeding-related citation data from state patrol citations, but does not collect data about aggressive driving and no state statute defines aggressive driving.

Proportion Speeding-related Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Speeding-related Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Speeding-related Injury Crashes</th>
<th>State Highway Patrol Speed Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts to Reduce Excessive Speeding
Wyoming includes speeding as a component of Special Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) activities as well as impaired driving enforcement. Wyoming estimated 33 percent of federal highway safety funds were expended in 2002 on speeding-related activities. The amount expended in 2003 was 36 percent, with 35 percent in 2004. In 2005, Wyoming estimated 35 percent of funds would be expended on speeding-related activities and efforts.

Public Perception
Wyoming’s state highway safety office felt the motoring public believes police give a 5 mph cushion in enforcing the posted speed limit.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Alabama Department of Economic &amp; Community Affairs</td>
<td>334-242-8672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Traffic Safety Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alabama Department of Economic &amp; Community Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 5690, 401 Adams Avenue, Montgomery, AL 36103-5690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334-242-8672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Statewide Planning Division Highway Safety Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation &amp; Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3132 Channel Drive, Juneau, AK 99801-7898</td>
<td>907-465-4374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN SAMOA</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Department of Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 1086, Pago Pago, AS 96799</td>
<td>011-684-633-1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334-242-5843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Governor’s Office of Highway Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3030 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85012</td>
<td>602-255-3216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arkansas State Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas Highway Safety Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#1 State Police Plaza Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Rock, AR 72209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>501-618-8204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Arkansas Highway Safety Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#1 State Police Plaza Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Rock, AR 72209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>501-618-8356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business, Transportation &amp; Housing Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7000 Franklin Boulevard, Suite 440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95823</td>
<td>916-262-0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business, Transportation &amp; Housing Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7000 Franklin Boulevard, Suite 440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95823</td>
<td>916-262-0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1325 S. Colorado Boulevard, Suite B-700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Safety Engineering Branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1325 S. Colorado Boulevard, Suite B-700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denver, CO 80222</td>
<td>303-757-9879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Division of Highway Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2800 Berlin Turnpike, P.O. Box 317546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Department of Safety &amp; Homeland Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 818, Dover, DE 19903-0818</td>
<td>302-744-2677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Office of Highway Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 1321, Dover, DE 19903-1321</td>
<td>302-744-2745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>District Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank D. Reeves Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 14th Street, NW - 6th Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Transportation Safety Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank D. Reeves Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 14th Street, NW - 7th Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20009</td>
<td>202-671-0492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>605 S. University Street, MS 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450</td>
<td>850-414-5220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The first position listed under each state is the Governor’s Representative (GR). The second position is the Highway Safety Coordinator. Some states have a GR only and no designated Coordinator.
FLORIDA continued
Traffic Safety Administrator
Department of Transportation
Safety Office
605 Suwannee Street, MS 17
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450
850-488-5455

HAWAII continued
Highway Safety Coordinator
Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street - Room 405
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-587-6302

INDIAN NATION continued
Acting Coordinator
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Division of Safety
201 3rd Street, NW – Suite 310
Albuquerque, NM 87102-3370
505-245-2104

GEORGIA
Director
Governor's Office of Highway Safety
One Park Tower
34 Peachtree Street, Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-656-6996

IDAHO
Director
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129,
3311 West State Street
Boise, ID 83707-1129
208-334-8807

DEPUTY DIRECTOR
Intergovernmental & Public Affairs
Governor's Office of Highway Safety
One Park Tower
34 Peachtree Street, Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-656-6996

ILLINOIS
Secretary
Illinois Department of Transportation
2300 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62794-9212
217-782-5597

Acting Director
Division of Traffic Safety
Illinois Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 19245,
3215 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62794-9212
217-782-4972

KANSAS
Secretary
Department of Transportation
Eisenhower State Office Building
700 SW Harrison
Topeka, KS 66603-3754
785-296-3461

INDIANA
Executive Assistant for Public Safety
Governor’s Office
Room 206, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204 – 2038
317-232-2588

Acting Highway Safety Coordinator
Office of Highway Safety
Department of Public Works, Government of Guam
542 N. Marine Corps Drive
Tamuning, GU 96911
671-646-3229/5059

HAWAII
Director
Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street - Room 509
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-587-2150

HAWAII
Director
Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street - Room 405
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-587-6302

Acting Coordinator
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Division of Safety
201 3rd Street, NW – Suite 310
Albuquerque, NM 87102-3370
505-245-2104

IOWA
Commissioner
Department of Public Safety
Wallace State Office Building
502 East 9th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319-0040
515-281-5261

Director
Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau
Department of Public Safety
Wallace State Office Building
502 East 9th Street – 4th Floor
Des Moines, IA 50319-0040
515-281-3907

INDIAN NATION
Program Administrator
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Division of Safety
201 3rd Street, NW – Suite 310
Albuquerque, NM 87102-3370
505-245-2100

JACKSON
Executive Assistant for Public Safety
Governor’s Office
Room 206, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204 – 2038
317-232-2588

Acting Coordinator
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Division of Safety
201 3rd Street, NW – Suite 310
Albuquerque, NM 87102-3370
505-245-2104

Acting Director
Division of Traffic Safety
Illinois Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 19245,
3215 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62794-9212
217-782-4972

INDIAN NATION
Program Administrator
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Division of Safety
201 3rd Street, NW – Suite 310
Albuquerque, NM 87102-3370
505-245-2100

INSTRUCTOR
Program Director
Office of Traffic Safety
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129,
3311 West State Street
Boise, ID 83707-1129
208-334-8557

Acting Director
Division of Traffic Safety
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129,
3311 West State Street
Boise, ID 83707-1129
208-334-8557

IOWA
Commissioner
Department of Public Safety
Wallace State Office Building
502 East 9th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319-0040
515-281-5261

Director
Governor’s Traffic Safety Bureau
Department of Public Safety
Wallace State Office Building
502 East 9th Street – 4th Floor
Des Moines, IA 50319-0040
515-281-3907

KANSAS
Secretary
Department of Transportation
Eisenhower State Office Building
700 SW Harrison
Topeka, KS 66603-3754
785-296-3461

Acting Director
Division of Traffic Safety
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129,
3311 West State Street
Boise, ID 83707-1129
208-334-8557
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KANSAS continued
Chief
Bureau of Traffic Safety
Department of Transportation
Eisenhower State Office Building
700 SW Harrison
Topeka, KS  66603-3754
785-296-3756

KENTUCKY
Commissioner
Kentucky State Police
Headquarters
919 Versailles Road
Frankfort, KY  40601
502-695-6303
Acting Commander
Kentucky State Police
Headquarters
Governor’s Highway Safety Program
919 Versailles Road
Frankfort, KY  40601
502-695-6213

LOUISIANA
Executive Director
Highway Safety Commission
Department of Public Safety
7919 Independence Boulevard, 2nd Floor – Suite 2100
Baton Rouge, LA  70896
225-925-6991
Assistant Director
Highway Safety Commission
Department of Public Safety
7919 Independence Boulevard, 2nd Floor – Suite 2100
Baton Rouge, LA  70896
225-925-6976

MAINE
Commissioner
Bureau of Highway Safety
Department of Public Safety
164 State House Station
Augusta, ME  04333-0164
207-626-3813

MARYLAND
Administrator
Maryland State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, MD  21203-0717
410-545-0400
Chief
Maryland Highway Safety Office
State Highway Administration
7491 Connelley Drive
Hanover, MD  21076
410-787-5824

MASSACHUSETTS
Secretary
Executive Office of Public Safety
Governor’s Highway Safety Bureau
One Ashburton Place - Room 2133
Boston, MA  02108
617-727-7775
Deputy Director, Programs Division
Executive Office of Public Safety
Ten Park Plaza, Suite 3720
Boston, MA  02116
617-725-3331

MICHIGAN
Division Director
Office of Highway Safety Planning
4000 Collins Road, P.O. Box 30633
Lansing, MI  48909-8133
517-333-5301
Planning Coordinator
Office of Highway Safety Planning
4000 Collins Road, P.O. Box 30633
Lansing, MI  48909-8133
517-333-5316

MINNESOTA continued
Director
Office of Traffic Safety
Department of Public Safety
Town Square,
444 Cedar Street - Suite 150
St. Paul, MN  55101-2150
651-296-9507

MISSISSIPPI
Executive Director
Office of Highway Safety
Division of Public Safety Planning
3750 I-55 North Frontage Road
Jackson, MS  39047
601-987-4990
Director
Office of Highway Safety
Division of Public Safety Planning
3750 I-55 North Frontage Road
Jackson, MS  39047
601-987-3775

MISSOURI
Director
Missouri Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO  65102
573-751-4622
Director of Operations
Missouri Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO  65102
573-751-2976

MONTANA
Director
Montana Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 201001
Helena, MT  59620-1001
406-444-6201
State Highway Traffic Safety Officer
Montana Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 201001
Helena, MT  59620-1001
406-444-9409
NEBRASKA  
Director  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
P.O. Box 94789  
301 Centennial Mall South  
Lincoln, NE  68509-4789  
402-471-3900  

Administrator  
Office of Highway Safety  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
P.O. Box 94612  
301 Centennial Mall South  
Lincoln, NE  68509-4612  
402-471-2515  

NEVADA  
Director  
Governor’s Highway Safety Representative  
Department of Public Safety  
555 Wright Way  
Carson City, NV  89711-0900  
775-684-4559  

Highway Safety Coordinator  
Office of Traffic Safety  
Department of Public Safety  
555 Wright Way  
Carson City, NV  89711-0900  
775-684-7469  

NEW HAMPShIRE  
Coordinator  
Highway Safety Agency  
Pine Inn Plaza  
117 Manchester Street  
Concord, NH  03301  
603-271-2131  

NEW JERSEY  
Director  
Division of Highway Traffic Safety  
Department of Law & Public Safety  
P.O. Box 048  
Trenton, NJ  08625-0048  
609-633-9300  

NEW MEXICO  
Secretary  
Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 1149  
Santa Fe, NM  87504-1149  
505-827-5110  

NEW MEXICO continued  
Chief  
Traffic Safety Bureau  
P.O. Box 1149, 604 West San Mateo  
Santa Fe, NM  87506  
505-827-1584  

NEW YORK  
Commissioner  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
Governor’s Highway Safety Representative  
6 Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY  12228  
518-473-9324  

Executive Director  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
Governor’s Highway Safety Representative  
6 Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY  12228  
518-474-5111  

NORTH CAROLINA  
Director  
Governor’s Highway Safety Program  
215 East Lane Street  
Raleigh, NC  27601  
919-733-3083  

Manager  
Planning, Programs & Evaluation  
Governor’s Highway Safety Program  
215 East Lane Street  
Raleigh, NC  27601  
919-733-3083  

NORTH DAKOTA continued  
Director  
Drivers License & Traffic Safety Division  
North Dakota Department of Transportation  
608 E. Boulevard Avenue  
Bismarck, ND  58505-0700  
701-328-4865  

COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLAND  
Commissioner  
CNMI Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 10007  
Jose M. Sablan Memorial Building  
Civic Center Susupe  
Saipan, MP  96950  
670-664-9022  

Captain  
CNMI Department of Public Safety  
Office of Special Safety  
P.O. Box 500791  
Suite 302 Family Building  
Garapan Village  
Saipan, MP  96950  
670-664-9120  

OHIO  
Director  
Department of Public Safety  
1970 W. Broad Street,  
P.O. Box 182081  
Columbus, OH  43218-2081  
614-466-3383  

Administrator  
Governor’s Highway Safety Office  
Department of Public Safety  
1970 W. Broad Street,  
P.O. Box 182081  
Columbus, OH  43218-2081  
614-466-3250  

OKLAHOMA  
Commissioner  
Department of Public Safety  
Governor’s Highway Safety Representative  
3600 N. Martin Luther King Avenue  
Oklahoma City, OK  73136  
405-425-2424
Membership List
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OKLAHOMA continued
Director
Highway Safety Office
3223 N. Lincoln
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405-523-1580

OREGON
Administrator
Transportation Safety Division
Oregon Department of Transportation
235 Union Street, NE
Salem, OR 97301-1054
503-986-4192

PENNSYLVANIA
Deputy Secretary
Highway Administration
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street - 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0095
717-787-6875

Director
Bureau of Highway Safety
& Traffic Engineering
P.O. Box 2047
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2047
717-787-7350

PUERTO RICO
Executive Director
Puerto Rico Traffic Safety Commission
Minillas Government Center
Suite 501 S. Building
P.O. Box 41289, Minillas Station
Sanurce, PR 00940
787-723-3590

RHODE ISLAND continued
Administrator
Governor’s Office on Highway Safety
Department of Transportation
345 Harris Avenue, Room 209
Providence, RI 02909
401-222-5156

SOUTH CAROLINA
Director
Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 1993
Blythewood, SC 29016-1993
803-896-7932

Director
Office of Highway Safety
Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 1993
Blythewood, SC 29016-1993
803-896-9950

SOUTH DAKOTA
Secretary
Department of Public Safety
118 West Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
605-773-3178

Director
Office of Highway Safety
Department of Public Safety
118 West Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
605-773-4949

TEXAS
Executive Director
Department of Transportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701-2483
512-305-9501

Director
Traffic Operations Division
Department of Transportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701-2483
512-416-3167

UTAH
Commissioner
Department of Public Safety
Box 141775, 4501
South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-1775
801-965-4463

Director
Office of Highway Safety
Department of Public Safety
5263 South Commerce Drive, Suite 202
Salt Lake City, UT 84107
801-293-2481

VERMONT
Commissioner
Department of Public Safety
103 South Main Street
Waterbury, VT 05671-2101
802-241-5377

Coordinator
Governor’s Highway Safety Program
Department of Public Safety
5 Park Row
Waterbury, VT 05671-2101
802-241-5501
VIRGIN ISLANDS

Governor’s Representative
Office of Highway Safety
Lagoon St. Complex, Fredericksted
St. Croix, VI 00840
340-772-3025

VIRGINIA

Commissioner
Transportation Safety Services
Department of Motor Vehicles
P.O. Box 27412,
2300 West Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23269
804-367-6606

Assistant Commissioner
Transportation Safety Services
Department of Motor Vehicles
P.O. Box 27412,
2300 West Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23269
804-367-8140

WASHINGTON

Director
Washington Traffic
Safety Commission
P.O. Box 40944,
1000 S. Cherry Street
Olympia, WA 98504-0944
360-753-4018

Deputy Director
Washington Traffic
Safety Commission
P.O. Box 40944,
1000 S. Cherry Street
Olympia, WA 98504-0944
360-753-6538

WISCONSIN

Secretary
Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 7910
4802 Sheboygan Avenue,
Room 120B
Madison, WI 53707-7910
608-266-1113

Director
Bureau of Transportation Safety
Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 7936
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
Room 933
Madison, WI 53707-7936
608-266-0402

WYOMING

Engineer
Highway Safety Program
Wyoming Transportation Dept
P.O. Box 1708
Cheyenne, WY 82003-1708
307-777-4450

Supervisor
Highway Safety Program
Wyoming Transportation Dept
P.O. Box 1708
Cheyenne, WY 82003-1708
307-777-4257

WEST VIRGINIA

Commissioner
Division of Motor Vehicles
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East
State Capitol, Building 3
Charleston, WV 25317-0010
304-558-2723

State Coordinator
Governor’s Highway Safety Program
Division of Motor Vehicles
The Miller Building
2 Hale Street – Suite 100
Charleston, WV 25301
304-558-6080