

## **Overview of OHSP competitive grant award process**

In order to make the best use of scarce dollars and direct life-saving efforts for Michigan citizens, the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) may employ a competitive grant award process to award grants. A competitive grant award process may be employed when there is no clear single best source for a service that OHSP requires, or on occasions in which there are a variety of equally worthy approaches that a grantee might take to fulfill OHSP's needs. OHSP will award the grant to the candidate whose proposal represents the best value to the State of Michigan, combining a promising strategy with effective implementation at a reasonable cost.

The Office of Highway Safety Planning is Michigan's primary traffic safety agency. OHSP's mission is "to save lives and reduce injuries on Michigan roads through leadership, innovation, facilitation, and program support in partnership with other public and private organizations."

### **Project descriptions**

When seeking candidates for a prospective grant, OHSP will provide a description of the conditions under which proposals are being solicited. Such descriptions will include the background and purpose of the grant, necessary deliverables, any additional specifications, due date for proposals, and contact information for any inquiries.

### **Proposal guidelines**

Proposals should be concise, straightforward, and prepared simply and economically. Elaborate presentation and promotional materials are neither necessary nor desired. Proposals need not adhere to a specific format, although each should include:

- Contact information for the organization.
- An overview that demonstrates an understanding of the problem to be addressed.
- A narrative of planned activities to achieve the project objectives, including a detailed timeline of major tasks. This can include any special methods or details that the agency feels are relevant to the proposal. The timeline should include dates for any project deliverables.
- The capabilities, qualifications, and experience of the organization, including a listing of key personnel as relevant.
- A detailed budget for the proposal.

Any organization receiving a grant must agree to abide by the OHSP "Grant Management Requirements." A copy of the "Grant Management Requirements" is available by contacting our office or on the OHSP web site. Following the selection of a successful proposal, the grantee must complete the formal grant application and review process through Michigan's web-based grant application to finalize grant details. All OHSP grants are administered on a reimbursement basis. All grant-related costs incurred are first paid by the grantee, the grantee submits reimbursement claims to OHSP, and then OHSP reimburses the grantee.

Proposals may be submitted electronically in Adobe Acrobat or Microsoft Office format. If submitting paper copies, the candidate must submit five (5) copies. All proposals are due by the date listed in the project description.

### **Selection Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated based upon the demonstrated understanding of the problem, the merit of the proposed approach to addressing it, the quality of the team to participate, the capacity of the organization to support the work proposed, and the costs involved.

OHSP encourages proposals to explain the value of a particular approach or expertise, especially if it goes beyond what is required to fulfill the project description. If the project's purpose would be better served by changing or expanding the scope of the deliverables, a proposal can make that case; such a recommendation can come in addition to or instead of a response specific to the request for proposals, but no more than one alternative should be proposed. If an agency wishes to list its highest ranked team member in an advisory role, with another member as project director, a case can be made that the team has sufficient expertise and authority to carry out the project.

One grant award is expected for each grant opportunity. Please note that OHSP is not required to award this grant to the lowest price offer, but rather to the proposal meeting specifications that provides the best value to the State of Michigan. Given budget restraints, cost differences remain important in deciding between similar proposals.

OHSP will work closely with the grant recipient to ensure a successful project that will help improve traffic safety and save lives on Michigan roadways, responsive to evolving conditions at the local, state, and federal levels.

## **FY2007 Grant Opportunities**

- Corporate Outreach Evaluation
- Direct Observation Surveys of Safety Belt Use
- Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan Training Evaluation - UPDATED

Proposals for these grant opportunities are due by June 26, 2006. The 2007 grant year begins October 1, 2006 and ends September 30, 2007.

## **Project description – Corporate Outreach Evaluation**

Please reference “Overview of OHSP competitive grant award process” on the Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) web site (<http://www.michigan.gov/ohsp>) for an explanation of the process.

### **Background**

Michigan’s traffic safety community has actively coordinated efforts with corporate partners since the 1990s, most visibly as a part of the Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS). Michigan has had a greater commitment to corporate partnerships than most other states, with a full-time corporate outreach coordinator at OHSP. These outreach programs have brought traffic safety information and programs to companies with the intent of improving workplace safety and making employees safer drivers on and off the job. Corporate partners have also assisted in publicizing other traffic safety campaigns.

### **Purpose**

This evaluation will seek to measure the effectiveness of corporate outreach efforts in reaching employers and employees with traffic safety programs and information, as well as those programs’ effectiveness in reducing crashes, injuries, and fatalities. OHSP is also interested in the value of these programs in establishing partnerships that facilitate communication with the general public and improve traffic safety.

### **Deliverables**

The grantee shall provide OHSP with a draft report by August 15, 2007. Following OHSP review, the final report shall be due by September 15, 2007 (75 print copies and an electronic copy).

The report may include a research review or comparison to other states with comparable programs, if the grantee believes this to be of value. The report must address:

- a review of program activities, with an emphasis on Michigan NETS activities for fiscal years 2000 through 2005;
- evaluation of the Michigan NETS membership base, specifically whether there are significant gaps in employers the corporate outreach program is reaching and the degree to which members are active participants;
- identification of public sector organizations that would benefit or benefit from cooperation with corporate outreach programs, such as state agencies and non-governmental organizations;
- evaluation of whether employers are making use of information provided through corporate outreach programs, including whether the information provided is of use to employers and if there are informational needs that OHSP is failing to meet;
- evaluation of employers’ effectiveness in reaching employees with traffic safety information;
- evaluation of changes in employees’ traffic safety and behavior as a result of these programs and information provided;
- estimates of reductions in crashes, injuries, and fatalities that result;
- estimates of savings to employers that result and whether these benefits accrue to NETS members in particular or employers generally;
- estimates of any further economic benefits identifiable;
- evaluation of additional benefits of corporate partnerships not arising from communications to employees, such as business participation in statewide traffic safety program;
- recommendations arising from these findings, such as ways to improve recruiting, information provision, or the information provided.

If not all of these factors are amenable to evaluation, that fact will be useful to OHSP as well. OHSP is open to suggestions for relevant or better evaluation questions for determining program effectiveness.

The grantee shall also provide OHSP with an informal summary of findings to date on March 30, 2007, for use in fiscal year 2008 planning. For this reason, OHSP would prefer to see some early activity planned, although it is understood that activities and analysis will not be complete as of that date.

## **Additional specifications**

The organization awarded the grant must agree to abide by the OHSP "Grant Management Requirements," as posted on the OHSP web site. Following the selection of a successful proposal, the grantee must complete the formal grant application and review process through Michigan's web-based grant application to finalize grant details. All OHSP grants are administered on a reimbursement basis. All grant-related costs incurred are first paid by the grantee, the grantee bills OHSP, and then OHSP reimburses the grantee. Quarterly progress and financial reports are required, even for quarters with no activity.

Funding for this project is contingent upon the availability of U.S. Department of Transportation Highway Safety Funds for fiscal year 2007. Changes in federal plans may lead to changes in OHSP programs requiring reasonable accommodations from grantees to keep existing projects consistent with organizational goals. OHSP appreciates the difficulty of adjusting plans and appreciates grantees' flexibility in adapting projects to evolving conditions.

All relevant materials that exist will be made available to the successful grantee, including the NETS membership database, reports and publications, OHSP in-house grant information, occasional surveys of NETS members, and materials from biweekly employer updates, Drive Safely Work Week campaigns, annual conferences, and NETS national. Information on the Michigan NETS and NETS national websites may be of use in formulating proposals:

- <http://www.trafficsafety.org/index2.asp>
- <http://www.michigan.gov/michnets/>

Unlike several recent OHSP evaluation grants, the methodology for this project is relatively open-ended. Candidates should explain their methods and may wish to include reasons why such methods were selected or are superior to alternatives. The quality of the approach will be a significant factor in determining which proposal to accept.

## **Due date**

All proposals for this project must be received at OHSP by June 26, 2006. Proposals may be submitted electronically in Adobe Acrobat or Microsoft Office format. If submitting paper copies, the candidate must submit five (5) copies.

## **Contact information**

Please direct proposals and any questions about this grant opportunity to:  
Piétro Semifero  
Office of Highway Safety Planning  
4000 Collins Road, P.O. Box 30633  
Lansing, MI 48910-8133  
(517) 333-5320  
semiferp@michigan.gov

## **Project description –Direct Observation Surveys of Safety Belt Use**

Please reference “Overview of OHSP competitive grant award process” on the Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) web site (<http://www.michigan.gov/ohsp>) for an explanation of the process.

### **Background**

Traffic crashes remain the number one cause of death before age thirty-five and a leading cause of death at all ages. The use of safety belts is a simple and effective method of reducing injuries and deaths in motor vehicle crashes. To increase safety belt use and decrease fatalities and injuries, Michigan has required the use of safety belts by front seat occupants of motor vehicles since 1985 and has allowed primary (standard) enforcement of this law since 2000.

The Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) has commissioned an annual survey to determine the statewide safety belt use rate every year since 1983. This survey became more formal and consistent with the implementation of federal guidelines for safety belt surveys in the early 1990s. The current survey methodology has remained nearly unchanged since 1993, with an annual safety belt survey around Labor Day each year. Since 2002, Michigan has participated in the national *Click It or Ticket* mobilizations around Memorial Day, with corresponding before and after surveys.

### **Purpose**

Statewide safety belt surveys provide a consistent basis of comparison for passenger safety and the success of traffic safety programs. The grantee shall carry out three waves of statewide safety belt surveys and report the results. The expected steps in this process are: verify that the current survey methodology remains suitable for the annual evaluation, retain and train observers for the survey, observe and record safety belt use along with selected demographic characteristics, analyze the resulting data, prepare reports on the findings, and respond to any questions from OHSP, NHTSA, or the media concerning the observations and report.

### **Deliverables**

The grantee shall provide OHSP with the preliminary safety belt use rate, as determined by the observations, within two weeks of the end of each of three waves of observations. The grantee shall provide OHSP with a draft of the full report on the first two survey waves by August 3, 2007 and a draft of the full report on the annual Labor Day survey by October 15, 2007. Final reports are due one month after each draft, barring unusual delays in OHSP review (75 print copies and an electronic copy).

Observations and the report must comply with all federal guidelines for observational surveys of safety belt use, notably to be found in the Federal Register at 63 FR 46389-46394 and 65 FR 13679-13683. These guidelines require a full explanation of the methodology employed, as well as the safety belt use for each category of vehicle.

Each report must include a detailed explanation of methodology used, including observation site selection, collection of observation data, and calculation of results. Reports must show overall safety belt use, safety belt use by stratum or region, by vehicle type, time of day, day of week, vehicle occupant sex, estimated age, and seating position. Reports should cross-tabulate results for each stratum/region against vehicle type, for sex against age, and for vehicle type against all other demographics. Other vehicle characteristics and driver demographics, such as ethnicity, are welcomed. Reports must make relevant comparisons to previous years' results, including notes of statistically significant changes. OHSP welcomes innovations in reporting and analysis.

## **Additional specifications**

For purposes of consistency and longitudinal comparison, the grantee shall be expected to use the existing methodology, as approved by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Intended deviations from the existing methodology for selecting sites, conducting observations, or calculating results must be outlined in the proposal, consistent with program objectives, and approved by OHSP and NHTSA. It shall be the responsibility of the grantee to secure such approvals before training observers and conducting observations, with sufficient lead time before activity begins.

Observations must take place in the following time frame:

- *Click It or Ticket* pre-surveys: must begin after April 1 and end by May 13, 2007. Later in the time frame is preferred.
- *Click It or Ticket* post-surveys: must begin immediately after June 3, 2007, with initial surveys to be completed within two weeks. Make-up sites due to unexpected problems can extend past June 18, but the estimates of statewide safety belt use for both the pre- and post-surveys are due by July 4, 2007.
- Annual Labor Day survey: must begin after August 10 and end by September 16, 2007. Surveys at the end of August are preferred, but not strongly.

Specific observation dates are at the grantee's discretion, though federal guidelines require that observations take place on every day of the week and during all daylight hours.

The existing methodology allows for either paper or electronic collection of observation data, and the grantee can choose either so long as deadlines are met. Specific survey sites may be redrawn in accordance with the existing methodology, if necessary or desired. All intersections with traffic controls in observed counties must be included in the site selection pool.

The organization awarded the grant must agree to abide by the OHSP "Grant Management Requirements," as posted on the OHSP web site. Following the selection of a successful proposal, the grantee must complete the formal grant application and review process through Michigan's web-based grant application to finalize grant details. All OHSP grants are administered on a reimbursement basis. All grant-related costs incurred are first paid by the grantee, the grantee bills OHSP, and then OHSP reimburses the grantee. Quarterly progress and financial reports are required, even for quarters with no activity.

Funding for this project is contingent upon the availability of U.S. Department of Transportation Highway Safety Funds for fiscal year 2007. Changes in federal plans may lead to changes in OHSP programs requiring reasonable accommodations from grantees to keep existing projects consistent with organizational goals. OHSP appreciates the difficulty of adjusting plans and appreciates grantees' flexibility in adapting projects to evolving conditions. While no adjustments are currently planned, previous years have had nontrivial expansions of the project after the initial grant award, in response to expansions of federal programs and evaluations. The grantee will receive immediate notice of proposed changes and has the right to refuse project expansions beyond their capabilities, in which case supplemental assistance may be sought.

This project is expected to continue throughout the normal duration of the SAFETEA-LU federal transportation legislation without fundamental changes. Given that procedures and costs are expected to remain relatively similar, OHSP may renew this grant in successive years rather than seeking new proposals for the duration of SAFETEA-LU, dependent on OHSP needs and grantee performance. Significant changes would lead to a new request for proposals, and the grant will not be renewed for more than three years at any rate.

This grant will be split-funded into FY2008 to complete the final report unless the grantee can complete all grant activities by September 30, 2007. If the grant is renewed, it is expected that some costs for completing reports on FY2007 activities would be included in the FY2008 grant.

**Due date**

All proposals for this project must be received at OHSP by June 26, 2006. Proposals may be submitted electronically in Adobe Acrobat or Microsoft Office format. If submitting paper copies, the candidate must submit five (5) copies.

**Contact information**

Please direct proposals and any questions about this grant opportunity to:

Pi tro Semifero

Office of Highway Safety Planning

4000 Collins Road, P.O. Box 30633

Lansing, MI 48910-8133

(517) 333-5320

[semiferp@michigan.gov](mailto:semiferp@michigan.gov)

## **Project description – Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan Training Evaluation**

Please reference “Overview of OHSP competitive grant award process” on the Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) web site (<http://www.michigan.gov/ohsp>) for an explanation of the process.

### **Background**

OHSP assists police agencies across the state with the enforcement of traffic laws, but that is not the end of the legal system. Citations may be disputed and more serious crimes such as impaired driving and vehicular homicide can require lengthy prosecution. There are a variety of benefits from the proper and successful prosecution of traffic offenders, including the provision of a credible deterrent, incapacitation of dangerous drivers, rehabilitation to reduce recidivism.

To further these goals, OHSP has supported the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan (PAAM) in providing training for prosecutors and adjudication partners on traffic safety issues, primarily the prosecution of impaired drivers, since 2001. The PAAM program has included training courses for prosecutors and assistant prosecutors, providing legal briefs, and serving as a legal consultant on traffic safety issues. While the program is viewed positively, there has been no formal evaluation of the training's effectiveness.

### **Purpose**

This project will evaluate the effectiveness of PAAM training in increasing resources available for the prosecution of impaired drivers and traffic safety in general. The primary question of interest is whether PAAM training has improved the prosecution and conviction rates of impaired drivers. Specific extensions include in what ways the training has been effective or ineffective, the extent to which it has been used across the state, reductions in plea bargains, increases in conviction rates, and correlations between conviction rates and impaired driving crashes and deaths.

### **Deliverables**

The grantee shall provide OHSP with a draft report by April 30, 2007. Following OHSP review, the final report shall be due by June 15, 2007 (75 print copies and an electronic copy).

The report may include a research review or comparison to other states with comparable programs, if the grantee believes this to be of value. The report must include:

- a review of program activities, specifically with respect to prosecutor training and education on impaired driving cases;
- estimates of effectiveness in improving prosecutor proficiency with handling and presenting evidence, working with law enforcement, and courtroom presentation;
- estimates of effectiveness in decreasing rates of plea-bargaining and increasing rates of successful prosecution;
- estimates of reductions in recidivism, impaired driving, and traffic fatalities resulting from impaired driving; and
- recommendations arising from these findings, including ways to better incorporate evaluation into future training activities.

OHSP is open to suggestions for relevant or better evaluation questions for determining program effectiveness.

The primary population of interest is prosecutors having undergone PAAM training, but OHSP is also interested in effects on those prosecutors' offices or counties (dissemination of training results) and statewide impacts. The audience for the report can be assumed to be familiar with traffic safety.

## **Additional specifications**

The organization awarded the grant must agree to abide by the OHSP "Grant Management Requirements," as posted on the OHSP web site. Following the selection of a successful proposal, the grantee must complete the formal grant application and review process through Michigan's web-based grant application to finalize grant details. All OHSP grants are administered on a reimbursement basis. All grant-related costs incurred are first paid by the grantee, the grantee bills OHSP, and then OHSP reimburses the grantee. Quarterly progress and financial reports are required, even for quarters with no activity.

Funding for this project is contingent upon the availability of U.S. Department of Transportation Highway Safety Funds for fiscal year 2007. Changes in federal plans may lead to changes in OHSP programs requiring reasonable accommodations from grantees to keep existing projects consistent with organizational goals. OHSP appreciates the difficulty of adjusting plans and appreciates grantees' flexibility in adapting projects to evolving conditions.

Less formal evaluations have been included in PAAM training, including surveys of training participants immediately after training and six months later; pre-surveys are available for more recent years as well. All relevant materials from PAAM and OHSP will be available for review, and staff will be made available to discuss the program.

Unlike several recent OHSP evaluation grants, the methodology for this project is relatively open-ended. Candidates should explain their methods and may wish to include reasons why such methods were selected or are superior to alternatives. The quality of the approach will be a significant factor in determining which proposal to accept.

## **Due date**

All proposals for this project must be received at OHSP by June 26, 2006. Proposals may be submitted electronically in Adobe Acrobat or Microsoft Office format. If submitting paper copies, the candidate must submit five (5) copies.

## **Contact information**

Please direct proposals and any questions about this grant opportunity to:  
Piétro Semifero  
Office of Highway Safety Planning  
4000 Collins Road, P.O. Box 30633  
Lansing, MI 48910-8133  
(517) 333-5320  
semiferp@michigan.gov

## Update to Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan Training Evaluation RFP

There have been concerns about the ambiguity of the term "conviction rates" as a measure of prosecutorial outcomes. It could be analogous to using "crash rates" to evaluate a program; there is a simple single measure of crash rates, but there is a richer body of data hiding beneath that term. Some comments from the PAAM project director:

Here are a couple of suggestions/ideas for the survey. First, as I mentioned, when you use the phrase "rate of conviction" you are getting into a hornet's nest of issues, everything from why was there a conviction vs. no conviction to what is an appropriate rate, (Michigan has one of the highest I believe based on the information I get.) and of course prosecutors don't have exclusive control over who is convicted.

So to look at some of the issues that prosecutors have more control over and where the program can have an impact would be more fruitful.

For example, with felony offenders (I say felony offenders since they are the ones that county prosecutors charge - not police and not municipal attorneys) what is being charged with these offenders, are they being charged appropriately, with a crime that fits the facts, and then how are they being handled, for example, when the defense files a motion, are the prosecutors caving or are they responding to the motions and getting an appropriate response. Also, along the same lines in these cases, when the defense is getting ready to file a defense expert, are the prosecutors prepared and ready to respond. It would be possible to look at the resolution of the case in these situations since then you are looking at several factors, not just the "conviction rate." So, with a conviction from either a trial or a plea, or even a dismissal, or not guilty, with an evaluation of the process would be more useful. And since felony cases are less frequent, it would be "easier" to follow and examine.

A second thing to examine would be the motion practice and the results. As you know there are numerous motions filed in these cases. You have seen from the Yahoo site the discussion on "Daubert" motions and source code motions to name a few things. How are the prosecutors responding to these motions? When it is filed, are they giving up the ghost? Do they have the information they need? What are the results of the motions? Again, this is more in the prosecutor's control - not all the time, as can be seen by the Daubert Motion in Wayne County - however, these things can at least be examined and discussed. And as is happening in Wayne County, that decision is being appealed since the prosecutor there believes that the court is absolutely wrong and it was important to take this case up on appeal. (As a side note, not every case is taken up on appeal because of time, money, and logistics.) Again, here looking at the results of a heavily contested case can provide some information and here you can examine the misdemeanor dockets where the new prosecutors are working. There may be some issues on those cases where we do not charge the case (unless it is an OWI 2nd) so that will need to be taken into account. [To explain that, some cases of OWI 1st offense, the officer writes a ticket, and it is that ticket that is then filed with the court. So the prosecutors do not have the opportunity to determine if they agree with the officer's decision or assessment of probable cause.]

Third, in cases of OWI Causing Death, looking at the charging decisions and case resolutions of these cases would be beneficial, I would think. These cases are usually very contested as you would think, and so the information here would combine the information above. Experts may be called by both sides (for sure the prosecution) and how are the experts used, and/or cross-examined would be something to consider. Also, several motions are filed in these cases. What happened in these motions? How did the prosecutor respond? All of these things can be useful information. And as a follow up to that, it seems to me that it might be possible to compare previous cases to current cases and see what has changed over time.