Countermeasure 5d1: Improve Robustness of Data Related to Possible Drug Impairment on Crash Reports

Objective: To identify the most effective data elements relating to drugged-driving crashes.

1. Identify vehicle indicators that can be observed during the crash investigation.
2. Identify chemical evidence that can and should be obtained in crash investigations.
3. Calculate the return on investment for each of the identified data elements.

Objective: To develop methods by which law enforcement officers can recognize and document data that can identify drugged driving on the crash report.

1. Review the application of ARIDE and DEC in the field.
2. Identify ways to improve the documentation of ARIDE and DEC by law enforcement officers.
3. Identify stakeholders and advocates to improve the use of existing techniques to identify and classify drug impairment.

Objective: To identify data gaps related to documenting drugged driving on the crash report.

1. Compare the existing crash report to the data judged as most effective, and identify the gaps.
2. Revise the crash report to reflect the data elements that best inform the likelihood of drug-impaired driving.
3. Allow stakeholders to review the revised crash report and provide feedback.
4. Make the final updates to the crash report.
5. Train law enforcement officers through roll-call deliveries on the changes to the crash report.

Objective: To improve the accuracy of data and the process for determining a drug-elevated crash county.

1. Develop a baseline using current data collection methods.
2. Determine the threshold for classifying counties according to drugged-driving crashes.
3. Track the overall number of crashes with drugged-driving crashes including the crash data elements previously identified.

Countermeasure 5d2: Use Supplemental Crash Reports to Add Missing Drug-Impairment Data to Crash Reports

Objective: To provide valuable details that enhance information about drugged-driving contributing factors.

1. Identify data elements that can be gathered after an initial report is filed that will enhance the classification of crashes relative to drug impairment.
2. Compare the existing supplemental report to the data judged as most effective, and identify the gaps.
3. Revise the supplemental report to reflect the data elements that best inform the likelihood of drug-impaired driving.
4. Add formatting to ease report completion for all potential users.
5. Allow stakeholders to review the revised crash report and provide feedback.
6. Make final updates to the supplemental crash report.

Objective: To train law enforcement, emergency medical services, and/or medical examiners on how to add missing drug-impairment data to crash reports.

1. Train all potential users on the changes to the supplemental report.
2. Develop field tools to serve as reminders for users.

Countermeasure 5d3: Analyze Policies and Possible Legislation Advancing Decriminalization and Legalization of Marijuana

Objective: To analyze legislation and traffic safety impact in other states with legalized marijuana.

1. Review existing legislation in states where marijuana has been legalized.
2. Identify differences in legislation based on type: recreational, medical, and drug form.
3. Quantify the impact on traffic safety crashes.
4. Summarize the findings in a matrix format.
5. Submit the matrix to selected stakeholders to gage the ease of understanding of the analysis results.
6. Revise the matrix based on stakeholder feedback.

Objective: To educate legislators about the potential impact of legalizing marijuana on highway safety.

1. Based on the analysis, develop an outline for the legislative educational materials.
2. Develop educational materials for distribution to legislators and their staff.
3. Develop presentation materials for use in communications with legislators and their staff.
4. Distribute materials to legislators, staff, and other stakeholders who will further distribute materials to target audiences.

Objective: To educate the traffic safety stakeholders and general public about the potential consequences of legalizing marijuana on highway safety.

1. Based on the analysis, develop an outline for traffic safety stakeholder educational materials.
2. Develop educational materials for distribution to traffic safety stakeholders.
3. Develop presentation materials for use in communications with traffic safety stakeholders.
4. Based on the analysis, develop an outline for the educational materials targeting the general public.
5. Develop educational materials for distribution to the general public.
6. Develop presentation materials for use in communications with the general public.
7. Distribute materials to stakeholders who will further distribute materials to target audiences.

Countermeasure 5d4: Optimize Resources Available in the Gathering and Processing of Evidence Related to Drug-Impaired Driving

Objective: To review available resources in gathering and testing blood evidence in drugged-driving cases.

1. Identify the number of samples collected.
2. Analyze the available resources and time requirements to fully test for drug impairment in all samples.
3. Identify needed lab equipment and personnel to fully and promptly process all blood submissions for known substances.
4. Identify and report needed increases.
5. Estimate the return on investment for the proposed changes.
6. Gather input on potential stakeholders.
7. Communicate needed resources to all affected stakeholders.
8. Analyze the impact by collecting data over a designated period.

Objective: To investigate potential efficiencies in employing a law enforcement phlebotomist program.

1. Obtain best practice procedures and processes associated with a law enforcement phlebotomist program based on existing programs modified with Texas legal requirements.
2. Estimate the return on investment for a law enforcement phlebotomist program.
3. Gather stakeholder input related to the draft procedures and processes.
4. Summarize the proposed procedures/process, return on investment, and stakeholder input.
5. Submit the final summary to an advisory group (senior law enforcement, prosecutors, attorneys general, and/or judges) for review and recommended actions.

Objective: To investigate efficiencies in using a jailor phlebotomist program.

1. Obtain best practice procedures and processes associated with a jailor phlebotomist program based on existing programs and Texas legal requirements.
2. Estimate the return on investment for a jailor phlebotomist program.
3. Gather stakeholder input related to the draft procedures and processes.
4. Summarize the proposed procedures/process, return on investment, and stakeholder input.
5. Submit the final summary to an advisory group (senior jail administrators, enforcement, prosecutors, attorneys general, and/or judges) for review and recommended actions.

Countermeasure 5d5: Assess Law Enforcement Resources (Number of DREs, ARIDE Officers, etc.) and Resources for Prosecutors in Drug-Elevated Crash Counties

Objective: To identify and prioritize where ARIDE- and DRE-trained officers are required.

1. Develop a statewide database of individual training to conduct ARIDE and DRE evaluations.
2. Map the trained officers and associated agencies to the counties.
3. Identify gaps in resources based on the county comparison, with special emphasis on those counties designated as elevated in relation to drugged-driving crashes.
4. Compare the location of training opportunities to the gaps in resources.
5. Develop a plan to deliver ARIDE and/or DRE training to individuals and agencies that have a demonstrated need.
6. Track training in order to plan for and deliver refresher training in ARIDE and DRE.

Objective: To access if prosecutors have received adequate resources relating to drug-impaired driving.

1. Coordinate with the Texas District and County Attorneys Association's DWI Prosecutor Task Force to identify existing and needed resources.
2. Determine barriers to prosecutors auditing ARIDE and DRE training.
3. Identify gaps in resources based on the county comparison, with special emphasis on those counties designated as elevated in relation to drugged-driving crashes.
4. Compare the location of training opportunities to the gaps in resources.
5. Use the Texas District and County Attorneys Association's DWI Prosecutor Task Force to get DRE and ARIDE resources into existing and new training, publications, and online resources.

Countermeasure 5d6: Use the SFST, ARIDE, and DRE Tracking System to Identify Common Factors Associated with Impaired Driving

1. Review similar tracking systems in other states.
2. Compare the characteristics of other systems to the policies and procedures that impact resources at Texas law enforcement agencies (time, equipment, training, interest, etc.).
3. Conduct a survey of current SFST, ARIDE, and DRE officers to identify strengths and challenges on employing a tracking system.
4. Determine the inputs, outputs, constraints, limitations, and participation requirements of a proposed system.
5. Assess the financial resources required to develop and deploy a tracking system.
6. Based on this analysis, determine the return on investment of a tracking system for Texas.

Countermeasure 5d7: Determine Whether the Drug Testing Equipment Is Accessible and Robust Enough to Quantify Blood Drug Results

1. Identify the minimum equipment required to support testing related to ARIDE and DRE evaluations.
2. Determine the return on investment based on arrests, crashes, and prosecuting processes.
3. Determine the existing equipment resources.
4. Compare the equipment resources to the drugged-driving crashes and trained personnel to perform evaluations.
5. Identify gaps and establish a plan to address the deficiencies.