

High Visibility Enforcement Programs

Law enforcement agencies routinely utilize general deterrence strategies. These strategies are effective because they raise the perceived risk of arrest for DUI. Research shows that in order to be effective, enforcement activities must be well planned, properly executed, visible, and sustained for substantial periods of time. These DUI enforcement strategies must be complemented by aggressive, timely, and complementary public information campaigns.

High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) campaigns typically utilize stepped up enforcement efforts that may include saturation patrols, No Refusal programs, and/or sobriety checkpoints combined with strong complementary public information campaigns. Electronic message boards, road signs, command posts, scene lighting, and Breath Alcohol Testing (BAT) vehicles enhance the highly visible law enforcement presence. Annual impaired driving, speeding, and seatbelt enforcement campaigns utilize the HVE model.

Research Highlights:

- States with highly visible, highly publicized impaired driving enforcement programs tend to have lower impaired driving rates in fatal crashes (Fell et al., 2013).
- Among repeat offenders, when police presence was certain, there was a decrease in DUI behavior (Wiliszowski et al., 1996).
- After a sustained year-long HVE program in Tennessee (*Checkpoint Tennessee*), there was a 20.4% reduction in alcohol-related crashes (Lacey et al., 1999).
- Checkpoints can also be effective in detecting offenders who continue to drive with a suspended or revoked license (Ross and Gonzales, 1988).
- An intensive checkpoint program can be expected to reduce alcohol-attributable crashes by about 15% (Miller et al., 1998).

States Utilizing High Visibility Enforcement:

Every state operates some form of HVE and states receive millions of Federal dollars for these campaigns.

Responsibility.org Position:

The Foundation for Advancing Alcohol Responsibility supports high visibility enforcement efforts (HVE) to reduce impaired driving. These comprehensive enforcement efforts should be utilized in areas with a high occurrence of impaired driving crashes or fatalities.

References:

Fell, J., McKnight, S., & Auld-Owens, A. (2013). *Increasing Impaired Driving Enforcement Visibility: Six Case Studies*. DOT HS 811 716. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation.

Lacey, J., Jones, R., & Smith, R. (1999). *Checkpoint Tennessee: Tennessee's Statewide Sobriety Checkpoint Program*. DOT HS 808 841. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation.

Miller, T., Galbraith, M., & Lawrence, B., (1998). Costs and benefits of a community sobriety checkpoint program. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 59(4), 462-468.

Ross, H., & Gonzales, P. (1988). The effect of license revocation on drunk-driving offenders. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 20(5), 379-391.

Wiliszowski, C., Murphy, P., Jones, R., & Lacey, J. (1996). *Determine Reasons for Repeat Drinking and Driving*. DOT HS 808 401. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation.