

1946

The Uniform Enforcement Policy: A System for Providing Uniform Enforcement of Traffic Regulations

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

The Uniform Enforcement Policy: A System for Providing Uniform Enforcement of Traffic Regulations, 37 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 157 (1946-1947)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

AMERICAN JOURNAL of POLICE SCIENCE

A UNIFORM ENFORCEMENT POLICY

(A System for Providing Uniform Enforcement of
Traffic Regulations)

DEVELOPED BY

*The Safety and Traffic Committee of the Michigan Association
of Chiefs of Police:*

Committee Members

Capt. Caesar J. Scavarda, State Police	Chief Roy Butcher, Ferndale
E. Lansing, <i>Chairman</i>	Chief H. R. Thompson, Hastings
Insp. R. C. Demaroff, Flint	Deputy Supt. Christian Nelson,
Chief Fred Roper, South Haven	Detroit
Chief Ray Hebner, Manistee	Maxwell Halsey, <i>Executive Sec'y.,</i>
Chief E. D. Drumm, Three Rivers	Mich. State Safety Comm., <i>Secretary</i>

Advisory Committee Members

Capt. George Cheek, Battle Creek	Lt. Sidney Peters, Highland Park
Lt. William S. Rosebush, Bay City	Capt. William Thompson, Jackson
Insp. C. R. Whitson, Dearborn	Lt. Melvin Beardsley, Kalamazoo
Director James Lupton, Detroit	Lt. George Warner, Lansing
Capt. Herman Crites, Flint	Lt. B. C. Kline, Muskegon
Capt. C. H. McConnell, Grand Rapids	Lt. Edward H. Shigley, Pontiac
Sgt. William Nowicki, Hamtramck	Capt. Fred Bossman, Saginaw

UNIFORM ENFORCEMENT POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE

Battle Creek	Chief Harold E. Haun	Capt. George Cheek
Bay City	Chief Frank W. Anderson	Lt. William S. Rosebush
Jackson	Chief Harry H. Bailes	Capt. William Thompson
Kalamazoo	Chief Howard W. Hoyt	Lt. Melvin Beardsley
Saginaw	Chief Geo. H. McNicoll	Capt. Fred Bossman

REPORTED BY

MAXWELL HALSEY, *Executive Secretary of the
Michigan State Safety Commission*

This Police Training Manual covering the "Uniform Enforcement Policy" represents over a year's work by the Committee, its Advisory Committee, over 50 police, traffic and safety administrators, the staff of the Michigan State Safety Commission and several members of the staff of the Northwestern University Traffic Institute and the Safety Division of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

The manual is being used starting July 8, 1946, in training schools in the cities of Bay City, Saginaw, Jackson, Battle Creek and Kalamazoo which the Committee has authorized to install the system as pilot cities starting July 22, 1946.

Police administrators have for many years been in agreement that uniform enforcement of traffic laws is even more important than uniformity of traffic laws themselves, when they are not uniformly enforced. But because of the large number of laws and different situations it has previously been thought impossible to develop a single practical system. But such a system has now been developed to such a point that further refinements can only be had from practical experience. Six months' experience in the five pilot cities will permit such refinements before the final plan is submitted to the Executive Committee of the Association with the recommendation that it then be recommended to all Michigan cities.

The purpose of the uniform enforcement policy is to give to the police for the first time a basis by which the individual officer may witness a violation, determine that it falls into a particular class, and be given positive direction as to what action, if any, his department wishes him to take.

The system is for administrative use *only*, for training, for determining officer action, and court action. It is *not* proposed to go to the public with the detail of the unit values but merely with the "big six" violations and the "big six" conditions and the "written warning" system.

The system converts traffic violations to simple, illegal maneuvers which constitute violations. It lists the conditions at the scene of the violations. It then places these items in columns and gives them a hazard rating. If the rating is below a certain level the violation notice ticket which the driver receives will result in its serving as a written warning if it is his first offense in the preceding twelve months — or a trip to court if it is his second offense. If the rating is above this level the violation notice ticket will result in a trip to court.

The system, by creating a class which deserves a written warning, offers a solution to a common problem of police administrators. Administrators would like to increase the number of police-violator contacts but they know that if this resulted in each officer making 10 or 20 arrests (resulting in fines) a

day that this might produce repercussions among the public and the official family. Yet they feel that if officers were to stop more drivers, who are violating the law, even in a minor way, this would build up a state of mind in the community which would probably result in a reduction in accidents. By utilizing the written warning class of the system the contacts can be increased without the number of fines being increased. The written warning with the "second violation" threat behind it has teeth in it and thus has a stronger effect than a verbal warning which is difficult to keep track of accurately and which might be a temptation to individual officers as a substitution for a deserved arrest which would result in a fine.

The system will also solve a common dilemma of officers — namely, that many conscientious officers view numerous violations a day but realize if they made arrests in all of the cases that trouble would result. The written warning gives the officer an opportunity to take an action which is satisfying to him when he sees a violation yet will not produce more arrests than the public are prepared for during a given period of months. Since the officer would know that when he gives a "notice of violation ticket" to a driver who commits a relatively minor violation this will serve a written warning if it is a first offense but it will result in a trip to court if it is a second or third offense, it will give the officer a feeling of justice and he may thus be less reluctant to take any action at all regarding a borderline case.

To simplify the problem of developing a uniform policy this first application has been purposely restricted to the six principal violations which contribute to some 80% of the accidents and to six conditions which make these violations even more dangerous. Since the principle of selective enforcement dictates that most of the police effort be aimed at these violations a uniform policy covering them will thus include the larger portion of daily police enforcement activity. After the uniform policy has been applied successfully on these it may ultimately be possible to apply the plan to practically all other violations.

To bring about uniformity and make possible a rating system it was necessary to break down each of the six violations into three specific driving maneuvers which were clear-cut and not subject to more than one interpretation. This produced 18 maneuvers on a chart which became a check list on a traffic ticket thus not requiring the officer to memorize them. A careful study of words produced 31 specific terms upon which everyone could agree.

The maneuvers which constituted a violation were then arranged in three columns. Those in the first column repre-

CHART 1

CHART SHOWING UNIT VALUE FOR HAZARD RATING OF
VIOLATIONS UNDER IDEAL CONDITIONS
(Broad daylight, dry pavement, no other vehicles or pedestrians present)

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS	ONE UNIT ITEMS	TWO UNIT ITEMS	THREE UNIT ITEMS
(1) Speeding Over Limit	1 — 5 miles	6 — 9 miles	10 miles or over
(2) Improper Left Turn	No signal	Cut corner	From wrong lane
(3) Improper Right Turn	No signal	Into wrong lane	From wrong lane
(4) Disobeyed Traffic Signal When Light Turned Red	Past middle of Intersection	Middle of Intersection	Not reached Intersection
(5) Disobeyed Stop Sign	Wrong place	Walk speed	Higher speed
(6) Improper Passing	At Intersection	Cut in	Wrong side of pavement

sented the *least* dangerous maneuvers. Those in the second column represented *more* dangerous maneuvers. And those in the third column represented the *most* dangerous maneuvers. The six conditions were similarly arranged in three columns. The arrangement in these columns might be referred to as "hazard ratings," the values indicating the amount of hazard involved.

In order to provide a simple basis of evaluation, the first column was given a unit value of one, the second column two and the third column three. Then it became possible to evaluate a violation or a violation under certain conditions ranging from one to 11 units thus providing an intelligent range of the degree of hazard produced by the maneuver, either by itself or in terms of practical driving conditions which made it still more dangerous.

The classes of maneuvers were purposely arranged in such a fashion that the least dangerous would not warrant any police action (without aggravating conditions), the most dangerous would warrant a trip to court (regardless of conditions) and the middle group would warrant a written warning (without aggravating conditions). But in most cases the rating of a maneuver would be raised because one or more of the aggravating conditions would most likely be present at the time of the violation and thus add from one to eight unit values.

Having established values for the illegal maneuvers and the aggravating conditions the next step was to establish the administrative scale which would determine the number of units which would warrant no official action, a written warning, or a trip to court. After careful study it was decided that one unit should require no official action, two would require a written warning (for a first offense) and three a trip to court.

On this basis a one-unit maneuver item by itself requires no official action, a one-unit maneuver item with a one-unit condition added to it would require a written warning, and a one-

CHART 2

CHART SHOWING UNIT VALUE FOR HAZARD RATING OF
AGGRAVATING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS*(which increase the opportunities of a violation to cause an accident)*

CONDITIONS	ONE UNIT ITEMS	TWO UNIT ITEMS	THREE UNIT ITEMS
Condition (A)	Slippery pavement		
Condition (B)	Darkness		
Condition (C)	Heavy traffic		
Condition (D)		Caused person to dodge	
Condition (E)		Just missed accident	
Condition (F)			Actually hit object

unit maneuver item with two one-unit condition items or one two-unit condition item added to it would require a trip to court. A two-unit maneuver item by itself would require a written warning but with a one-unit condition added to it would require a trip to court. And any three-unit maneuver would require a trip to court without the addition of any unit for conditions.

To apply the uniform enforcement policy, a new "traffic violation notice" ticket was developed. In the center of this ticket the six violations and the six conditions are listed with boxes for checking. The officer observes a violation, which will usually be one of the six listed and checks the maneuver. He also checks the conditions. His check marks provide all the essential information from which his departmental policy will determine the policy of warning or going to court. They also make possible the selection of an adequate fine from the fine schedule of the traffic violations bureau, and provide information which the judge in court will use to determine whether the case deserves a minimum, medium or maximum fine within the normal bracket or range which all judges generally establish through custom for the violation of a particular law.

Violations other than the six principal violations printed on the form are to be written in by the officer and a separate ticket will be used by "downtown officers" checking parking meters, overtime parking and other parking violations.

The ticket is printed in red and green to obtain safety educational value by making the 12 items stand out, to encourage the officer to watch carefully for them and to make checking and writing in black pencil easier to read.

The entire system is based on a policy of having the traffic violation notice ticket serve as a written warning on a two-unit rating — after the violator has gone to the violations bureau and his file shows that it is his first offense in twelve months. Any second offense results in an appearance in court.

Whatever merit the system has lies in its being specific, its orderly arrangement, and the clear-cut procedures which it makes possible. Future adjustments of maneuvers, conditions, and hazard rating would in no way alter the advantages of the system.

History of Traffic Measurement: The development of a unit value system to assist the officer in uniformly applying an enforcement policy has precedent in many past scientific police and traffic developments.

The acknowledged techniques of selective enforcement and the enforcement index have advanced police science away from past unmeasured operations which were less accurate. Fingerprints, analysis of blood stains, chemical tests for intoxication and ballistics are other examples in the police field.

Over two decades ago a system composed of warrants, elements and points was developed to set standards for the installation of traffic signals. Prior to that time traffic signals were installed on the same basis as officers now handle violations — namely — “use your head” — “use your judgment.” It is generally accepted that these standards for traffic signals have been of enormous value in installing the right kind of signals under the right kind of conditions so that they would decrease accidents instead of increase them.

Engineers have for centuries used formulas for measuring stresses and strains. Chemists have always found it essential to use formulas. There is not a single known science or profession that does not have measurements. The police profession can be no exception but must follow the example of other fields that have been successful.

No profession can successfully make advancements if it does not develop standards. Therefore enforcement must have the benefit of requirements, justifications, warrants, elements, and units to place it upon a professional basis. To this end a hazard rating unit value system has been developed.

The Public and the Uniform Enforcement Policy: The simple fact that political boundary lines mean nothing to vehicles whose drivers normally cross cities, counties and states makes it essential that the control of traffic be consistent and uniform. Traffic authorities have since the early 1920's been deeply concerned about the importance of Uniform Traffic Laws in reducing accidents. Thousands of conferences and hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent to achieve them.

No one can question the value of uniform laws. But it is quite proper for traffic authorities to question whether or not there might be some other administrative improvement which might have an even greater effect on reducing accidents than making the laws uniform to the point of being identical.

It is believed that the uniform enforcement of traffic laws will eliminate more accidents than the making of laws uniform without enforcing them uniformly.

The motorist is concerned much more about what action the traffic officer is going to take when he meets him on the streets and highways than he is about the technicalities of the law itself. To the motorist the officer is the law, or at least the arm of the law. The motorist would favor uniform law but he would favor even more strongly a uniform consistent action by the police. It will be a great relief to the citizen to know that the police of Michigan have a well thought out system and are using it uniformly. Therefore it is imperative that the police apply the uniform enforcement policy which has been approved by the Committee as well as by the Police Departments, the Judges, the City Attorneys and the Mayors and City Managers of the five pilot cities.

In a practical sense the law is what the Chief of Police instructs the men to do. It is what the men themselves do. A "policy" is merely what is agreed upon in advance as to what is to be done.

The public will like the Uniform Enforcement Policy for the following reasons:

(1) From the public's point of view it appears to take the guesswork out of policing.

(2) It takes the police officer "out from behind the billboard" in the sense that the motorist will now know what the officer and the court are going to do.

(3) It gives the good citizen who is normally a good driver with a good record fair treatment on a first offense of a minor nature.

(4) It will serve to penalize the "repeater."

(5) It advertises the more dangerous maneuvers and aggravating conditions.

The Officer and the Uniform Enforcement Policy: On the surface, careless thinking might lead to the conclusion that the system would tend to reduce officer judgment and thus reduce his importance. On the contrary it is a device that permits him to use his judgment better.

Without a written uniform enforcement policy the individual officer is operating under an extremely broad instruction such as "enforce the law," "use your head," "arrest all violators," "get those speeders," etc. This forces each officer to make his own personal interpretation. This emphasizes the individual characteristics of each officer. It is therefore difficult if not impossible for any two officers to enforce the law in the same manner. Furthermore it places the officer in such a position

that he may quite unintentionally enforce the law in a manner in which his superiors do not desire. All these individual differences are of course transmitted to younger officers who ride with different older officers during their training period.

Under the Uniform Enforcement Policy the officer is given explicit positive direction and instruction as to which exact cases require what specific action on his part. He will have assurances that what he is doing is in keeping with a specific plan in which his department and the court have agreed upon.

At the present time every officer who witnesses a violation is confronted with making his own personal decision as to which of three things to do:

(1) He determines that the improper driving act and aggravating conditions are *not* sufficiently important or serious enough to require any official action—and thus he does not stop the violator at all, or

(2) He determines that the improper driving act and aggravating conditions are relatively serious enough to require a warning—so he takes whatever warning action his department prescribes, or

(3) He determines the improper driving act and aggravating conditions as being serious enough to take an action which will require the violator to go to court where he will be required to pay a fine.

Thus as a practical matter the action of every officer today is based upon his own personal interpretation of the degree of the improper driving act combined with the presence of aggravating conditions which make that driving act even more dangerous. But at the present time the officer is doing this subconsciously on a basis of his own personal reasoning without the benefit of positive direction from his own department.

Therefore each officer is now confronted with an extremely tough decision—which he must make. He says to himself, "There are only three things I can do. Which one shall I do?" This business of individual officer decision is the basis of the greatest confusion in the field of traffic law enforcement. It is the basic justification for developing a uniform enforcement policy to aid the officer in making this decision.

In the interest of justice, uniformity and fairness to the officer it was necessary to devise a system for measuring the *degree* of the improper driving act and for measuring the *degree* of the additional threat against safety produced by the aggravating conditions present at the time and place of the violation.

It became inevitable that some measuring device be developed. Only by such a system could it ever be hoped that confusion could be eliminated.

Under this system unit values representing a hazard rating are assigned to the improper driving acts and to the maneuvers.

They range from one unit to three units each. By totalling up these unit values a figure is obtained which indicates far more accurately the amount of threat to public safety than could ever be made by personal judgment without the aid of a measuring device.

The officer witnesses the violation and the conditions and circumstances. He evaluates them on the basis of the unit values. If the total is one unit he takes no action. If the total is two units he stops the violator and fills out the violation notice ticket which he knows will result in a written warning instead of a fine if it is a first offense. If the total is three units he stops the violator and fills out the violation ticket which he knows will result in a fine. If the total is as high as six units he gives consideration to charging the violator with "reckless driving."

Thus for a strictly borderline type of improper driving act with no accident producing conditions present no action is taken. But this same improper driving act with an aggravating condition such as slippery pavement or darkness would call for an action which would produce a written warning. Likewise the same improper driving act with several aggravating conditions such as heavy traffic, darkness and slippery pavement would call for an action resulting in a fine.

It is most important to realize that this Uniform Enforcement Policy System is simply taking what officers are doing today and merely giving them a guide to assist them in doing it more accurately and making it possible for them all to do it the same.

The following are the reasons why officers have indicated that they like the system:

- (1) It tells them exactly what the policy of their department and the court is.
- (2) It provides them with positive direction which avoids misunderstandings.
- (3) It removes reluctance on their part to take action on lesser degrees of violation.
- (4) It gives the public advance warning of what they are going to do.
- (5) It takes the "heat" off the individual officer because it is not his personal idea but a system devised and approved by an official committee of the Chiefs' Association and is being used by many cities.

The Police Department and the Uniform Enforcement Policy: The administrators of a police department have many policy problems. The Chief knows that the only way to keep accidents from increasing and to reduce them to a practical minimum is to apprehend more violators. This will reduce the number of violations and hence the number of accidents.

But, the Chief has been reluctant to increase the number of apprehensions beyond a certain point because the increase in the number of persons fined would not be pleasing to the public. This would reduce the public support for the department.

Under the Uniform Enforcement Policy System the Chief is able to issue instructions which will result in more violators being apprehended but which will not necessarily increase the number of persons being fined. Thus the deterrent effect of more drivers being stopped and more drivers seeing other drivers being stopped can be achieved without a bad public reaction.

In the past, the Chief has also been reluctant to launch a more vigorous enforcement program until a system could be devised that would provide uniformity. To launch an increased attack using past methods would be apt to magnify the difference in personal interpretation by officers the differences of which would be apt to confuse the public. The new system gets around that difficulty.

The number of violators that will be stopped by officers during a month's period will be determined by the "definition" given by a chief to his men. If the chief draws a line high up on the scale which only includes very serious cases then his men can only find a relatively small number of them. If he draws a line far down on the scale which includes very minor cases then his men can easily find a large number of cases. But since the extremely bad cases produce little argument in court over a fine and since relatively minor cases produce much argument in court the chief has usually been reluctant to draw the line low enough to include minor degrees of violation. But under the written warning system which is a part of the Uniform Enforcement Policy the minor degrees of violation can be treated without fear of a poor public reaction. Thus the chief will now issue instructions that the minor degrees of violation are to be included. This will greatly enlarge the opportunity of the police officer to increase the number of motorists he stops per month. Most of these increased stops will result in written warnings rather than fines.

It is believed that by including the relatively minor degrees of violation on the Traffic Violation Notice Ticket that an average city would increase its total officer-violator contacts several fold. The number of cases resulting in fines would remain about the same (or a little higher) but on top of the number of fine cases there would be several times that number of warning cases.

The administrators of police departments are in favor of the Uniform Enforcement Policy System for the following reasons:

- (1) It produces detailed agreement between the police department and the court.

- (2) It reduces confusion by being specific and orderly.
- (3) It establishes a written warning system which permits more officer-violator contacts without necessarily increasing the number of fines.
- (4) It makes it easier to do a good job of training.
- (5) It makes it possible to tell the public what the department's policy is.

The Court and the Uniform Enforcement Policy: The Uniform Enforcement Policy System has been approved by the judges and city attorneys of each of the five pilot cities through conferences with the chief of police. Thus police officers have complete assurance that the "court" is not only completely sympathetic but enthusiastic about the system. This means that the individual officer now knows that he and the judge are operating on the same identical plan or system and that cases which the officer brings in that are in accordance with the system will be treated by the judge in accordance with the system.

It should be emphasized that the principles of establishing degrees of violation adjusted by circumstances and conditions has always been used by judges in deciding the seriousness of any particular violation and hence the fine which would be equitable. Thus the Uniform Enforcement Policy merely takes what judges have been doing and provides a guide and a system whereby the court may do the same thing better and more uniformly.

All of the violations and their three illegal maneuvers printed on the Violation Notice Ticket are now handled through the Traffic Violations Bureau in all five pilot cities and the judges of all cities have instructed the Bureau to install the written warning system.

The judges and city attorneys have indicated that they like the Uniform Enforcement Policy System for the following reasons:

- (1) Because it is specific and clear cut.
- (2) Because it produces complete agreement between the court and the police department on "policy."
- (3) Because it provides the essential information necessary to provide justice.
- (4) Because it creates greater public understanding.

What the Uniform Enforcement Policy Includes: For the first application of the Uniform Enforcement Policy the items included have been *purposely* restricted to a relatively small number of items which are of the greatest importance and should thus be given priority in any enforcement program. After the public and the enforcement agencies have become accustomed to the system the same principle may be applied to other items which are also important.

Thus the system is being launched on a basis of the following six violations and six conditions:

6 VIOLATIONS

- (1) Speeding (over limit)
- (2) Improper Left Turn
- (3) Improper Right Turn
- (4) Disobeyed Traffic Signal
(When light turned red)
- (5) Disobeyed Stop Sign
- (6) Improper passing

6 CONDITIONS

- (1) Slippery pavement
- (2) Darkness
- (3) Heavy Traffic
- (4) Caused person to dodge
- (5) Just missed accident
- (6) Actually hit object

These six violations represent the biggest part of the apprehension for moving violations and thus the advantages of the system will apply to some 80% of the department's activity.

There are two fields of items which could be considered. The first is the action itself which was a violation of the law. The second are the types of things which caused the action or influenced it. For this reason the system has restricted itself to the illegal acts themselves and not the causes or contributing items.

The following items have not been included in the hazard rating system:

- (1) Driving under the influence.
- (2) Condition of the vehicle.
- (3) Condition of the roadway.

The Need for Specific Terms: Since the traffic laws are written in broad general terms or combinations of terms and at present most traffic officers are working under rather general instructions this has worked against uniform enforcement. Thus to achieve a uniform enforcement policy it becomes necessary to be specific and accurate. The first step in this direction is the use of a unit value system which adds the factor of mathematical exactness. The second step in this direction is to restrict the terms used in the unit value system to terms which are specific and not subject to a general or broad interpretation. Therefore *NO* use has been made of such terms, as generally accepted in the past, as "having due regard for," "reasonable and proper," "safe manner," "reckless," "willful disregard for," etc.

The specific terms used all define a very specific driving act, maneuver or condition, as follows:

- (1) Speed (in miles per hour)
- (2) Skid (any wheel slides)
- (3) Drift (fails to stop as soon as desired)
- (4) Dodge (turned right or left to avoid hitting car or person)
- (5) Yields (gives right of way)
- (6) Slows (brakes or takes foot off of accelerator)
- (7) Speeds up (steps on accelerator)
- (8) No signal (no hand or mechanical signal)
- (9) Cut corner (short of center lines and crosswalk)

- (10) Wide turn (crossed center or lane line of street into which he turned)
- (11) Wrong lane (turned from)
- (12) Pulled back into lane (after starting to pass)
- (13) Cut in (turned in front of a vehicle going in same direction)
- (14) Hill (which restricts sight distance)
- (15) Curve (which restricts sight distance)
- (16) Intersection (one or more streets)
- (17) Centerline (of street or highway)
- (18) Crosswalk (for pedestrian)
- (19) Wheels (two left or two right)
- (20) Darkness (night, snow, rain or fog)
- (21) Other traffic present (close enough to be significant)
- (22) Slippery pavement (rain, snow, ice, leaves, mud, sand on pavement)
- (23) Near accident (missed car or person by one to two feet)
- (24) Interfered with traffic (caused other car or pedestrian to slow, stop, turn or speed up)
- (25) Accident (touched car or person)
- (26) No action (officer does not stop car)
- (27) Violation notice (a written form given violator which will later result in a warning or an arrest)
- (28) Arrest (summons to court)
- (29) Point (unit of measurement of degree of violation and conditions)
- (30) Walk (speed up to 3 miles per hour)
- (31) Stopped wrong place (beyond crosswalk line or stop line)

Adjustments Within the Uniform Enforcement Policy: The system is more important as a *system* than is the unit value given to each item. Over a period of years the various items might have their unit value changed but the system would be retained.

The unit value system amounts simply to a ruler or yardstick which assists the officer to fit what he sees on the street into whatever action his department wishes. Under present general instructions given to officers such as "use your head" or "arrest the violators" the officer is being given a three-foot yardstick with no markings on it. All the unit value system does is to give him a three-foot yardstick marked off in inches. This simple device provides him with a more accurate measure of what the department wants him to do.

It should be pointed out, however, that no measuring system can cover all conditions. There will always be some exceptions—such as, for example, the condition of the driver, the condition of the vehicle, or the condition of the street or highway, any one of which might be sufficient for the officer to up-grade the

violation into a more severe class than the unit evaluation would call for.

But if the system can be refined to a point where it can fit 90% of the cases the officer will see that it will serve as a foundation upon which can be built a Uniform Enforcement Program.

The "No Action" Classification: At first glance it may seem poor public safety policy to admit that there is any degree of traffic law violation which is so low that the police should ignore it. But like all things including the splitting of the atom there are exceedingly small units. The significant point is that the size or degree of something is only important in terms of the effect it will have.

Common sense and fair play dictate that so-called "rigid" "technical" enforcement is not sound and that the principle of tolerance is essential if public support is to be maintained. If there should develop a public reaction hostile to the department this would reduce the accident prevention value of everything the department does.

It should be quite obvious to any practical law enforcement officer that one tenth of a mile per hour over the speed limit is obviously a violation of the law but that by itself it does not mean anything.

Furthermore, the "no action" classification is only a base to which are added other unit values for traffic conditions. Thus as a practical matter it will be found that there will be less than 5% of the no action cases that will not be raised to the warning class or the fine class by the unit values added for conditions.

It must always be kept in mind that "enforcement" is not merely composed of fines. The officer must be given positive direction as to what not to do as well as what to do. Furthermore, the person who commits a very minor degree of violation sufficient to warrant some action but not sufficient to warrant a fine should be given notice that he has violated the law and that any "second case" will mean a fine. There should be enough fines to make the written warning influence driver behavior. Only in this manner can a balanced enforcement program be created.

A policy of making only arrests which result in fines will not produce as much public support for the department as a policy of producing written warnings in addition to fines.

Furthermore, as the number of fines is increased there will ultimately come a time when they can't be increased any more because of an unfavorable public reaction. When that point is reached then all that can be done is to increase the warnings to further advertise the fines and hence secure more accident prevention value from each arrest made which resulted in a fine.

There is always a ceiling to the amount of pressure that can be exerted on the public to control driving behavior beyond which the people will not tolerate such action. The amount of pressure that can be applied depends upon the apparent fairness of what the department is doing. The "no action" classification adds to this fairness.

The written warning for "in-between" cases will build good will because the violator will more clearly see that the department has been fair. He will still appreciate the fact that the department is still being firm because of the follow-up on second records which automatically result in fines.

Chart 3 Described

(1) *Degree of Violation of Speed Over Fixed Limit:* The "no action class" is where the speed of the motorist is from one to five miles over the limit. This is given the value of one unit. If all conditions are favorable; that is, daylight, dry pavement, and no other traffic present, then the officer takes no action.

It is reasoned that it is hard to clock cars accurately within units of less than five miles per hour and that the perfect driving conditions and absence of traffic would make even a written warning look most unreasonable to the driver and that available officer time could be spent more effectively on more significant violations. It is *not* proposed to advertise this fact to the motorist.

It should also be pointed out that if there are present any conditions such as darkness, slippery pavement or heavy traffic, that this would add another unit and thus move the violation into the warning class.

If traffic was interfered with or there was a near accident this would add two units and move the violation into the "fine" class.

The "Warning Class" has been set at 6 to 9 miles over the limit. Even though all conditions are perfect this is given two units and deemed to be a sufficient violation to deserve a written warning. However, if there is a single unfavorable traffic condition present such as darkness, slippery pavement or heavy traffic, this would add another unit and move this violation into the "fine" class.

The "Fine Class" has been set at 10 miles or more over the limit and given three units. It is believed that even under perfect driving, weather, and roadway conditions, this is a sufficient degree of violation to warrant a fine. It is sufficiently over the limit so that neither the violator, the judge nor the public will think it unreasonable.

There will of course be exceptional conditions where this unit system cannot apply such as unusually heavy traffic due

CHART 3

CHART SHOWING RATING SYSTEM FOR A UNIFORM
ENFORCEMENT POLICY

(Covering Six Principal Violations and Six Aggravating Conditions)

THE STEP TO BE TAKEN BY THE OFFICER AND THE COURT WILL BE
DETERMINED BY THE RATING ASSIGNED FOR VIOLATION
ITEMS PLUS CONDITION ITEMS

RATING REQUIRED TO DETERMINE OFFICER ACTION	ONE unit requires NO ACTION (Unless aggravat- ing conditions)	TWO units require VIOLATION NOTICE resulting in warn- ing (Unless aggra- vating conditions)	THREE units re- quire VIOLATION NOTICE resulting in fine (Regardless of aggravating conditions)
--	--	--	---

UNIT VALUE FOR HAZARD RATING OF VIOLATIONS UNDER
IDEAL CONDITIONS

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS	ONE UNIT ITEMS	TWO UNIT ITEMS	THREE UNIT ITEMS
(1) Speeding Over Limit	1 — 5 miles	6 — 9 miles	10 miles or over
(2) Improper Left Turn	No signal	Cut corner	From wrong lane
(3) Improper Right Turn	No signal	Into wrong lane	From wrong lane
(4) Disobeyed Traffic Signal when light turned red	Past middle of Intersection	Middle of Intersection	Not reached Intersection
(5) Disobeyed Stop Sign	Wrong place	Walk speed	Higher speed
(6) Improper passing	At Intersection	Cut in	Wrong side of pavement

UNIT VALUE FOR HAZARD RATING OF AGGRAVATING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

CONDITIONS	ONE UNIT ITEMS	TWO UNIT ITEMS	THREE UNIT ITEMS
Condition (A)	Slippery pavement		
Condition (B)	Darkness		
Condition (C)	Heavy traffic		
Condition (D)		Caused person to dodge	
Condition (E)		Just missed accident	
Condition (F)			Actually hit object

CHART 4
(1) SPEEDING (Over Limit) CASES

VIOLATION AND CONDITIONS OBSERVED BY OFFICER			
ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY OFFICER	1 — 5 Miles per Hour Over Fixed Limit (1 Unit)	6 — 9 Miles Per Hour Over Fixed Limit (2 Units)	10 Miles Per Hour or More Over Fixed Limit (3 Units)
NO OFFICIAL ACTION	No contributing conditions present		
OFFICER GIVES VIOLATOR A VIOLATION NOTICE TICKET (which will result in a warn- ing on a first offense)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit)	No contributing conditions present	
OFFICER GIVES A VIOLATION NOTICE (which requires him to go to court)	If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit) or If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	Regardless of conditions present 3 — 11 points total
	1 — 9 points total	2 — 10 points total	

CHART 5
(2) IMPROPER LEFT TURN CASES

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY OFFICER	VIOLATION AND CONDITIONS OBSERVED BY OFFICER			
	No Signal (1 Unit)	Cut Corner (2 Units)	From Wrong Lane (3 Units)	
NO OFFICIAL ACTION	No contributing conditions present			
OFFICER GIVES VIOLATOR A VIOLATION NOTICE TICKET (which will result in a warn- ing on a first offense)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit)	No contributing conditions present		
OFFICER GIVES A VIOLATION NOTICE (which requires him to go to court)	If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit) or If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	Regardless of conditions present	3 — 11 points total
	1 — 9 points total	2 — 10 points total		

CHART 6

(3) IMPROPER RIGHT TURN CASES

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY OFFICER	VIOLATION AND CONDITIONS OBSERVED BY OFFICER		
	No Signal (1 Unit)	Cut Corner (2 Units)	From Wrong Lane (3 Units)
NO OFFICIAL ACTION	No contributing conditions present		
OFFICER GIVES VIOLATOR A VIOLATION NOTICE TICKET (which will result in a warn- ing on a first offense)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit)	No contributing conditions present	
OFFICER GIVES A VIOLATION NOTICE (which requires him to go to court)	If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit) or If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	Regardless of conditions present
	1 — 9 points total	2 — 10 points total	3 — 11 points total

CHART 9
(6) IMPROPER PASSING CASES

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY OFFICER	VIOLATION AND CONDITIONS OBSERVED BY OFFICER		
	At Intersection (1 Unit)	Cut In (2 Units)	Wrong Side of Pavement (3 Units)
NO OFFICIAL ACTION	No contributing conditions present		
OFFICER GIVES VIOLATOR A VIOLATION NOTICE TICKET (which will result in a warn- ing on a first offense)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit)	No contributing conditions present	
OFFICER GIVES A VIOLATION NOTICE (which requires him to go to court)	If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit) or If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	Regardless of conditions present
	1 — 9 points total	2 — 10 points total	3 — 11 points total

CHART 8

(5) DISOBEYED STOP SIGN CASES

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY OFFICER	VIOLATION AND CONDITIONS OBSERVED BY OFFICER		
	Wrong Place (1 Unit)	Walk Speed (2 Units)	Higher Speed (3 Units)
NO OFFICIAL ACTION	No contributing conditions present		
OFFICER GIVES VIOLATOR A VIOLATION NOTICE TICKET (which will result in a warn- ing on a first offense)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit)	No contributing conditions present	
OFFICER GIVES A VIOLATION NOTICE (which requires him to go to court)	If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit) or If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	Regardless of conditions present
	1 — 9 points total	2 — 10 points total	3 — 11 points total

CHART 7
(4) *DISOBEYED TRAFFIC SIGNAL CASES*
(When Light Turned Red)

ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY OFFICER	VIOLATION AND CONDITIONS OBSERVED BY OFFICER		
	Past Middle of Intersection (1 Unit)	Middle of Intersection (2 Units)	Not Reached Intersection (3 Units)
NO OFFICIAL ACTION	No contributing conditions present		
OFFICER GIVES VIOLATOR A VIOLATION NOTICE TICKET (which will result in a warn- ing on a first offense)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit)	No contributing conditions present	
OFFICER GIVES A VIOLATION NOTICE (which requires him to go to court)	If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	If other traffic present (1 unit) or If darkness (1 unit) or If pavement slippery (1 unit) or If interfered with traffic (2 units) or If had near accident (2 units) or If had accident (3 units)	Regardless of conditions present 3 — 11 points total
	1 — 9 points total	2 — 10 points total	

officer can write on the back of it.

(BACK OF ORIGINAL)

OFFICER COMMENTS

VEHICLE DEFECTS

Service Brake

Parking Brake

Headlights

Tail Lights

Stop Lights

Windshield Wiper

Horn

Tires

Other

IDENTIFICATION

Height

Weight

Hair color

Eyes color

Sex

Race

ACTION ON CASE

Receipt No.

Complaint

Filed

warrant

19

Served

warrant

19

First offense

warning

Traffic Violations Bureau Action

Court Action

(BINDING MARGIN)

TRAFFIC VIOLATION NOTICE

Your City Police Department

No. 12345

Date

Time

Oper. Lic. No.

Name

Address

City

Employment

Date of birth

Car Lic.

Make

Owner

Occurred at

Officer

Signature

Badge No.

SIX PRINCIPAL VIOLATIONS CAUSING MOST ACCIDENTS

SPEEDING (over limit) ☐ 5 miles ☐ 6-9 miles ☐ 10 miles or overImproper LEFT TURN ☐ No signal ☐ Cut corner ☐ From wrong laneImproper RIGHT TURN ☐ No signal ☐ Into wrong lane ☐ From wrong laneDisobeyed TRAFFIC SIGNAL (When light turned red) ☐ Past middle of intersection ☐ Middle of intersection ☐ Not reached intersectionDisobeyed STOP SIGN ☐ Wrong place ☐ Walk speed ☐ Higher speedImproper PASSING ☐ At intersection ☐ Cut in ☐ Wrong side of pavement

Other violations

CONDITIONS THAT INCREASED SERIOUSNESS OF VIOLATION

(a) SLIPPERY PAVEMENT ☐ Rain ☐ Snow ☐ Ice(d) CAUSED PERSON TO DODGE ☐ Ped. ☐ Driver(e) JUST MISSED ACCIDENT ☐ one foot ☐ one foot(f) ACTUALLY HIT OBJECT ☐ Ped. ☐ Vehicle ☐ School ☐ ResidentialDISTRICT: ☐ Business ☐ Industrial ☐ School ☐ Residential

INSTRUCTIONS TO VIOLATOR: TO THE ABOVE NAMED YOU have violated the traffic law thus committing a driving act of a kind that causes accidents. YOU ARE THEREFORE DIRECTED to report to Traffic Violations Bureau between 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. (Saturday afternoons, Sundays and legal holidays excepted) in answer to this notice within 48 hours. FAILURE TO REPORT as directed will result in a WARRANT being issued for your ARREST and in certain cases application being made to the Secretary of State to REVOKE YOUR LICENSE under Section 30 of the Michigan Motor Vehicle Law.

THIS NOTICE BECOMES A PERMANENT PART OF YOUR DRIVER LICENSE FILE

to a football game or a factory letting out where officers are encouraging traffic to drive faster to relieve congestion.

Chart 5 Described

(2) *Degrees of Improper Left Turn Violations:* The "no action" class has been set at the minimum or least dangerous condition; namely, a failure to give a hand or mechanical turn signal. Thus this is given one unit. If there are complicating conditions such as slippery pavement, darkness or heavy traffic present this would add another unit and move this violation into the warning class. If a more serious complication were present such as interfering with traffic or a near accident this would add two units and move it into the "fine" class.

The "Warning Class," two units, has been set at the improper traffic maneuver of "cutting the corner" which is obviously more dangerous than failure to signal because if the driver slowed down and pulled into the left lane this would signal following traffic. If other traffic is present, the pavement is slippery, or it is dark, this would add one unit and move it into the "fine" class.

The "Fine Class," three units, has been set at "turned from wrong lane" since this is the most dangerous because it cuts across the path of following vehicles after misleading them into believing that the motorist was not going to turn left.

Chart 6 Described

(3) *Degrees of Improper Right Turn Violations:* The "no action" class, one unit, has been set at the point where the motorist fails to give a hand or mechanical turn signal. Other complicating conditions could add one or two units and would thus move this into the "warning" or "fine" class.

The "Warning Class," two units, has been set at the condition where the driver makes a "wide right turn," and swings way out into the street into which he is turning. On a two-lane street this would put him over the centerline. On a four-lane street or highway this would put him over into the second lane from the parking lane. A single complicating condition would add one unit and move this into the "fine" class.

The "Fine Class," three units, has been set at the condition where the driver starts his turn from the wrong lane thus cutting across the path of following traffic after misleading them into believing that he was not going to turn right.

Chart 7 Described

(4) *Degree of Violation of Disobeyed Traffic Signal (When light turned red):* The "no action" class, one unit, has been set at the point where the motorist is already past the middle of the intersection at the time the signal turns from yellow to red.

Naturally this assumes that he was travelling within the speed limit. If other traffic is present, vehicles or pedestrians, the pavement is slippery, or it is dark, this would add one unit and move this into the "warning" class.

The "Warning Class," two units, has been set at the point between the first crosswalk he reaches and the middle of the intersection at the time the signal changes from yellow to red. Even with completely favorable conditions this deserves a warning. But other traffic present, darkness, or slippery pavement would add a unit and move the case into the "fine" class.

The "Fine Class," has been set at the point where the signal has already changed from yellow to red before the motorist reaches the first crosswalk. Quite regardless of traffic conditions this case is such a flagrant violation that a fine is warranted.

Chart 8 Described

(5) *Degrees of Violation of Disobeyed Stop Sign:* The "no action" class, one unit, has been set at the point where the motorist "stopped at wrong place." In many instances this represents a condition where the motorist demonstrates his good intentions. He looks in both directions, shifts gears and stops. However, if a single condition such as other traffic present, slippery pavement or darkness is present this would add a unit and move this into the "warning" class. A more severe condition would add two units and move it into the "fine" class.

The "Warning Class," two units, has been set at the point where the motorist went through the stop sign at the speed of a walk. Even with no complicating conditions this warrants a written warning. With other traffic present, slippery pavement or darkness another unit will move this into the "fine" class.

The "Fine Class," three units, has been set at the point where the motorist completely disregards the stop sign and drives through it at a speed faster than a walk. This represents an extremely dangerous habit-forming action and even under ideal conditions warrants a fine.

Chart 9 Described

(6) *Degrees of Violation of Improper Passing:* The "no action" class has been set at the point where the motorist passes another car at the intersection. If this is done from a standing start at a traffic signal no great hazard is created. But heavy traffic, darkness, or slippery pavement would add a unit and move it up into the "warning" class.

The "Warning Class," two units, has been set at the violation maneuver of "cut in" since this is obviously more dangerous. Darkness, heavy traffic or slippery pavement would add a unit and move it up into the "fine" class.

The "Fine Class," three units, has been set at the violation maneuver of driving on the wrong side of the street. This maneuver has a high dangerous habit-forming factor, endangers oncoming traffic and results in rear-end collisions, side swipes, and other types of accidents.

Chart 10 Described

Condition "A" Slippery Pavement: This term is used to describe a condition where the pavement is slippery because of rain, snow, ice, frost, sand, mud or leaves. It is an important condition because it materially affects the distance in which it will take a car to stop. It is especially serious in speeding cars.

Since many drivers save themselves from having an accident (due to an improper driving act) by an emergency stop, it is obvious that when their ability to stop quickly is reduced then the seriousness of any illegal traffic maneuver is increased. Thus slippery pavement is a condition which justifies increasing the severity of the action to be taken by the police when a violation is observed.

A combination of wet pavement and darkness is particularly dangerous because wet pavement reflects the light from headlights up into the air and makes it more difficult to see as well as to stop. This condition is thus given one unit.

Condition "B" Darkness: This term is used to describe a condition where visibility has been reduced by the sun going down, rain, snow or fog.

It is obvious that at a time when neither motorists nor pedestrians can see as far or as distinctly as normally that there is more hazard present. Under such circumstances they will have to walk or drive even more safely to be as safe as they would if the visibility were perfect.

The records show that the probability of an accident at night in terms of the relative amount of traffic present is about seven times as great as during daylight.

Thus when a violation is committed at night, or in rain, snow or fog, it has more serious potentials and should thus be treated more severely. The more severe treatment can be made to appeal to the motorist because of the horse-sense logic that driving with restricted visibility is more dangerous. This condition is thus given one unit.

An exception to this might be made at locations where there are excellent street or highway lighting fixtures which are illuminated at the time. But even with the best street lighting available today on city streets experts agree that visibility is still not as good as it is during daylight and that thus the hazard of driving at night with street lights is still more dangerous than driving during daylight.

Condition "C" Heavy Traffic: This condition has both a

positive and negative value. If there is *no* moving traffic within the adjacent blocks in a city or within 1000 feet in the country of the place where a violation is being committed then there is no actual hazard present to another person even though a violation has been committed.

Under such circumstances the violation is only of importance in terms of its bad habit-forming effect on the motorist. Even then a warning or a fine will prove difficult to explain to the motorist in view of the fact that there was no one present who could be hit.

This "no traffic" condition will commonly be found during off-peak traffic hours such as 11:00 P.M. to 8:00 A.M., 10:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M., and 2:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M., as shown by traffic surveys or on outlying streets and highways where traffic volume is always relatively light.

On the other hand, if heavy traffic is in fact present then there is someone present who could be hit because of the violation which has taken place and hence the violation takes on added significance. The mere presence of other traffic makes the warning or fine appear more reasonable to the violator. This condition is thus given one unit. "Heavy traffic" is still a relative term and requires careful discretion on the part of the officer.

Condition "D" Caused Person to Dodge: This term is used to describe a condition where the violation of one motorist had the effect of causing another motorist or pedestrian to slow down, dodge, speed up or make an emergency stop.

This is significant because if the other motorist (or pedestrian) had not, or could not have changed his direction or speed there would have been an accident. The accident was avoided only by the forced action of a person other than the violator or by plain luck.

Thus when a violation interferes with traffic this indicates that it is a more serious violation than one which did not interfere with traffic and hence more severe action by the police is justified.

The violator can be made to appreciate the fact that his violation was more serious because of its effect on traffic movement.

Because this condition comes closer to actually producing an accident than darkness, slippery pavement, or heavy traffic, it is given two units.

Condition "E" Just Missed Accident: This term is used to describe a condition where in committing the violation the violator was forced to miss another car or pedestrian by a distance as close as a foot or two. Thus the violation resulted in a "near miss." (The violator almost had an accident.) (It was a narrow escape from an accident.)

It is obvious that the violation resulted in a condition where an accident almost happened and where the slightest error on the part of either of the two or more persons involved would definitely have resulted in an accident.

The violator can be made to appreciate the fact that since he almost hit someone, the violation was serious enough to justify the action taken by the officer.

The "one foot" term is merely being used as a term to describe how close the violator came to having an accident.

Since the violation almost produced an accident it is given two units.

Condition "F" Actually Hit Object: This term is used to describe a condition where the officer observes a violation the effect of which is to cause an accident—even as minor a one as touching bumpers, scraping fenders, or touching the clothing of a pedestrian.

The mere *contact* between the two cars or between the car and a pedestrian is the ultimate in proof that the violation took place and was serious.

Under such a condition the violator is certainly in no position to debate whether or not he committed the violation or whether or not it was serious. (The degree of seriousness of the accident was largely a matter of luck.)

Thus this is given three units, or enough to convert even the most minor degree of violation to the "fine" class.

Office Use of the Traffic Violation Notice Ticket: This ticket has been prepared as an essential part of the Uniform Enforcement Policy System. Attention is directed to the fact that the six violations and their maneuvers and the conditions are the same as those on the chart. The maneuvers are in three columns as on the chart and thus the unit values of 1, 2 and 3 are easy to visualize even though they are not printed. The conditions are in the same order. Those in the left column are worth one unit each. In the next column "caused person to dodge," or "just missed accident" are worth two units each and "actually hit object" is worth three units.

If a motorist commits one of the maneuvers indicated by one of the boxes then the officer merely checks the proper box. He also puts a check mark in any of the boxes below under the conditions if any of them fit the situation at the time and place of the accident. He also checks the district in which the violation took place.

If a motorist is apprehended while committing a violation *not printed* in the six violations then he should write in this charge under "other violation."

If a motorist is apprehended while committing two or more of the 18 illegal maneuvers these should be checked and if any conditions below are checked, such as "caused person to dodge"

then he should give consideration to making the charge of "reckless driving." If he decides to make this charge then he should write in the charge "reckless driving" after the words "other violation." The boxes checked will then tell the judge what the driver did under what circumstances that justified a charge of reckless driving.

If a motorist is found to have defective equipment on his car then he should write in the charge "defective equipment" after the words "other violation" and then describe the items that were defective on the back of the original copy of the ticket in the proper places under the heading "vehicle defects."

The identification items at the top of the ticket should be filled in in the same manner as on previous tickets. If the motorist is not a resident of the city then the additional identification items on the back of the original copy of the ticket should be filled in in case the violator refuses to come to court and it becomes necessary to go out and get him.

In all speeding cases the proper box should be checked but in addition the actual speed clocked should be written in above the box.

The space for "officer comment" is made available for the officer to write in any unusual condition, such as "blind corner," "street under repair," "driver possibly ill and should be given a re-examination for his driver's license," "parade," "funeral," "football crowd," etc. It is not recommended that the officer enter comments on whether the motorist was pleasant, cross, or abusive. These are "personal" items having no bearing on the violation itself and should not be entered unless the officer expects to make a "non-traffic" charge against the driver.

All written entries on the ticket should be printed in capital letters. In the first few days this may take a little more time but with a little practice it will make a much more legible record.

The space at the bottom of the page on the back of the original copy of the ticket marked "action on case" is for office use and should *not* be used by the officer.

It should be emphasized that the officer himself does not use the unit measurement system except in the first column when there are no "conditions" present. Here he uses the minimum unit of value of one merely to determine that the violation he has witnessed is so relatively minor that his department does not wish him to take any action of any kind. The rest of the unit system is for the exclusive use of the chief and the judge in establishing the administrative policy controlling which cases should result in a written warning and which cases should result in a fine. This latter use is explained to the individual officer for the single purpose of keeping him informed so that he will have a complete understanding of the system as a whole and thus be better prepared to carry out his part of it effectively.

Use of the Unit Value System by the Court: The court is concerned with three specific following items:

(a) The case of a minor violation which is a first offense and which should result in a written warning.

(b) The case of a minor violation which is a second or third offense and which should result in a fine.

(c) A major violation which should result in a fine even if it is a first offense.

To set up this procedure the following instructions are given to the Violations Bureau:

INSTRUCTIONS TO VIOLATIONS BUREAU

Regarding the Operation of the Bureau

Under the Uniform Enforcement Policy System

In Force as of July 22, 1946

To the Head of the Violations Bureau:

Starting on the morning of July 22, 1946, you are hereby instructed to carry out your duties and to arrange to have all other employees of the Bureau carry out their duties as follows:

I. Violators who bring to the Violations Bureau a violation notice ticket—the unit value of which is three or more are to pay the fine for their violation which is specified for that violation on the “fine schedule.” If their violation is not listed on the “fine schedule” they are to be sent to appear before the judge as in the past. If the “fine schedule” states that their violation is one for which they should appear before the judge then they should be directed to appear before the judge as in the past.

A violation notice ticket can have a total unit value of three or more units in any of the following ways:

(1) A one-unit violation *plus* two or more units for “conditions.”

(2) A two-unit violation *plus* one or more units for “conditions.”

(3) A three-unit violation *regardless* of whether or not there are any additional units charged for conditions.

II. Violators who bring to the Violations Bureau a violation notice ticket the unit value of which is *two units* will be handled as follows:

STEP ONE—Ask the violator for his violation notice ticket.

STEP TWO—Take the ticket and go to the “name file” and determine whether or not the violator has received any kind of a violation notice or ticket at any time within the twelve months immediately preceding the date of the ticket which you have just received from the violator.

STEP THREE—If your search of the “name file” indicates that the violator has *not* received a violation notice or ticket within the twelve month’s period immediately preceding the

date on the present ticket then return the violation notice ticket to the violator and make the following exact statement:

"Since a search of our files shows that you have not been apprehended for a traffic violation in our city within the last twelve months and since your violation was a relatively minor one, you will not be required to pay a fine for this 'first offense.' However, this violation notice ticket serves as a 'written warning' a copy of which will be placed in our file under your name. If you are apprehended in our city for *any* traffic violation, no matter how relatively minor, within the next twelve months you will be required to pay a fine." After making this statement to the violator then hand the violator a copy of the joint attached statement from the judge and the chief of police which explains to the violator the policy of the department.

If your search of the name file indicates that the violator *has* received a violation notice or ticket within the twelve months immediately preceding the date on the present ticket then advise the violator that he or she must pay the fine listed on the "fine schedule."

A violation notice ticket can have a total unit value of two units in any of the following ways:

- (1) A one unit violation with a one unit condition added to it.
- (2) A two unit violation with *no* conditions listed.

Judge

Chief of Police

Public Support Program for the Uniform Enforcement Policy System: The system is being launched simultaneously in five cities on July 22, 1946. For a month preceding this date an active public educational program has been conducted which has included:

- (1) Newspaper stories
- (2) Radio programs
- (3) Addresses before service and other clubs
- (4) Meetings of officials
- (5) State-wide publicity

Thus every police officer has assurances that practically every violator he apprehends knows about the system that is being installed. This places the officer in a much more favorable position than if the public was not aware of this new accident prevention program. Each officer, having had this training program, knowing that the "official family" of his city is behind the plan, that four other cities are doing the same thing, knowing that the Safety and Traffic Committee of the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police are behind the plan and that the public knows about it should have *confidence* in carrying out his part of the plan.