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Assessment of the TDOT HELP Program by Police Officers in Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis and Nashville: Results of a Survey

In the spring of 2001, the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) surveyed police officers in Tennessee’s four largest cities to obtain information and opinions from the officers about the HELP program—TDOT’s “freeway service patrol.” This report describes the survey results.

HELP was developed by TDOT in response to growing traffic congestion and recognition that non-recurring incidents (e.g., crashes, disabled vehicles, debris in the roadway, special events, work zones) cause more than half of all congestion, as measured by vehicle hours of delay. Further, approximately 20% of all freeway crashes are “secondary,” attributable to an incident that has disrupted normal traffic flow. TDOT is responding to these needs in a number of ways. HELP was one of the first steps.

The HELP program is described briefly in the next section. The program mission statement, developed by the first class of HELP trainees, provides a good introduction:

The mission of HELP is to minimize traffic congestion, promote the safe movement of people and products, and improve the travel environment. We work in partnership with emergency response agencies and other TDOT units as part of a highway incident management team. We are committed to performing all our duties in a professional manner.

HELP PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

TDOT began staged implementation of the HELP program in 1999, when the patrols started service on the July 4th weekend in Knoxville and Nashville. The program was expanded to Chattanooga and Memphis in the summer of 2000. The HELP service was then expanded in 2001 to seven days a week in all four cities.

The HELP trucks, painted a distinctive lime yellow, patrol on designated routes in the central areas of the four cities. During off-peak hours the patrols usually extend outward, depending on traffic volumes and weather conditions. At any time, the patrolling HELP supervisors can approve responses to outlying locations when requested by law enforcement agencies, but the most heavily traveled roadways in the central areas always receive first priority. Incidents on these high volume roadways have the most immediate and severe impacts on the entire system, and “quick clearance” is critical.

The four-wheel drive vehicles are specially designed and equipped to accomplish quick clearance and to deal with almost any type of incident or emergency. At the time of the survey described herein, service was provided from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and during special events. At least four and as many as seven trucks patrolled in each city during
each of two shifts. (When the patrols were expanded to weekends, a third shift was added and the weekday hours of operation were lengthened to later at night.)

All of the uniformed HELP operators and shift supervisors receive nine weeks of initial training and subsequent recurrent training to deal with traffic control, medical emergencies, fires, hazardous materials, and the many types of minor incidents that have the potential to become major problems. Quick clearance and safety are central themes throughout the training. Each operator is certified as a medical First Responder. The patrolling HELP supervisors have police radios, and all of the HELP operators have two-way radio communication with a HELP dispatcher.

HELP is one of several TDOT initiatives to address incident-related traffic problems. The department recognizes that such efforts cannot be successful without effective working relationships with other agencies that have responsibilities for highway incident management, including law enforcement agencies, fire and emergency medical services, rescue squads, towing and recovery operators, emergency management agencies, hazardous material responders, and others.

With the HELP program, TDOT works most closely with the police departments in Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis, and Nashville. The designated HELP routes are within the central areas of these four cities, and the Tennessee Highway Patrol (THP) does not routinely respond to crashes or other incidents within these areas. HELP operators do assist with major incidents outside of the normal HELP service area, but on an infrequent basis. The HELP operators work with local police officers many times each day in each of the four cities. Thus, TDOT considers the local police officers as foremost among many important partners.

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

TDOT’s survey of police officers, conducted in the spring of 2001, had four interrelated purposes:

- Determine the officers’ opinions of the program while the service was still relatively new, i.e., while officers were still familiar with circumstances prior to the service being established

- Establish a baseline to measure “customer satisfaction” among officers in future years

- Compensate for the dearth of hard data relative to certain benefits of the program (e.g., improved safety at incident scenes, fewer secondary crashes, fewer crashes involving disabled vehicles, faster investigations)

- Solicit comments and suggestions from the officers to help improve the program
DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY

The survey instrument used four different formats: (1) statements to which the officers were asked to indicate the degree of their agreement or disagreement, (2) fill-in-the-blank questions, (3) questions that asked the officers to rate various aspects of the HELP program, and (4) a set of open-ended questions. The survey had 15 statements, 2 fill-in-the-blank questions, 7 rating questions, and 5 open-ended questions, for a total of 29 questions.

TDOT designed the survey, with input from local police commanders. Each police department surveyed their own officers. TDOT asked each department to first estimate the number of their officers who had “first hand knowledge of the HELP program” and to then survey the knowledgeable officers, aiming for responses from 10% of the total. For the purpose of the survey, a “knowledgeable officer” was defined as one who had “actually worked with or observed a HELP operator at an incident scene (wreck, disabled vehicle, etc.) at least three times.”

TDOT originally asked the police departments to distinguish between officers and “supervisors,” defined as sergeants and above. However, the instructions were unclear, and, to the extent that distinctions could be made among the returned surveys, the responses showed little if any variation between supervisors and non-supervisors. Therefore, all of the surveys were tallied together, and the word “officers” is used here to include all sworn police officers regardless of rank.

One of the most surprising results of this project was the percentage of officers judged by their commanders to have first hand knowledge of the program, since many sworn officers work in positions that would not routinely involve responding to traffic incidents. As shown in Table 1, more than 80% of the sworn officers in Knoxville and Nashville were judged by their commanders to have first hand knowledge of the program. The percentages for Chattanooga and Memphis were much lower, probably because at the time of the survey the HELP program had been operating for almost two years in Knoxville and Nashville but less than one year in the other two cities. Regardless, police officials in all four cities believed that a significant number of their sworn officers had first hand knowledge of the HELP program.

As shown in Table 2, TDOT received a total of 121 completed surveys, equal to about 6% of the statewide total of the officers deemed knowledgeable by their departments and about 3% of all the sworn officers in the four departments combined. Also as shown in Table 2, in terms of total sworn officers, Knoxville is over represented in the totals. In terms of total knowledgeable officers, Nashville is under represented. However, the responses from officers were consistent among all four cities, with just two exceptions that are discussed in a subsequent section.

Regardless, the survey results provide a useful picture of how police officers feel about the HELP program in their respective cities and about the relative benefits of the program. The results are described below.
### Table 1. Sworn Officers with First Hand Knowledge of the HELP Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Number of Sworn Officers in Department</th>
<th>Number with First Hand Knowledge of the HELP Program</th>
<th>Percent with First Hand Knowledge of the HELP Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3845</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis, and Metro Nashville Police Departments

### Table 2. Completed Surveys as Percent of Sworn Officers, All Officers and Those with First Hand Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Surveys Completed</th>
<th>Completed Surveys as Percent of All Sworn Officers</th>
<th>Completed Surveys as Percent of Officers with First Hand Knowledge of HELP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SURVEY RESULTS**

The results of the survey are itemized in Tables 3, 4 and 5, showing the average response to each question as well as the median and mode responses. These tables support one immediate conclusion—the police officers in all four cities have a very positive opinion of virtually every aspect of the HELP program. The officers were the most positive in their responses about improved safety at incident scenes and about reductions in the time that roadways are blocked by disabled vehicles, by vehicles damaged in minor crashes, and by police investigation of crashes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When a HELP truck is at the scene, police officers can complete Interstate crash investigations in less time.</td>
<td>1.65 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The HELP program has improved safety at incident scenes for police officers and other emergency responders.</td>
<td>1.23 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The HELP program has reduced the number of crashes involving abandoned vehicles on the shoulders and ramps.</td>
<td>2.25 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interstate highways in our city are safer and less congested because of the HELP program.</td>
<td>2.19 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HELP is an unnecessary duplication of services already provided by law enforcement, fire services, and others.</td>
<td>4.53 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The HELP program has resulted in a reduction in secondary crashes (crashes caused by backups from previous crashes or rubbernecking).</td>
<td>2.10 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The HELP program has reduced Interstate traffic congestion caused by crashes and other incidents.</td>
<td>2.01 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The HELP operators have been effective in getting disabled vehicles out of the roadway.</td>
<td>1.40 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The HELP operators have been effective in getting damaged vehicles (minor crashes) out of the roadway without waiting for law enforcement or a tow truck.</td>
<td>1.77 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Our police department receives more accurate and timely information about incidents as a result of HELP.</td>
<td>1.93 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The HELP program is well coordinated with local agencies.</td>
<td>1.85 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The HELP operators work effectively with other responders at incident scenes.</td>
<td>1.49 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Most of our officers understand the purpose of the HELP program.</td>
<td>1.75 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Our police department gives lower priority to the Interstates now than before the HELP program started.</td>
<td>3.82 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. HELP has allowed our department to better utilize its resources on the Interstates for enforcement and emergency response.</td>
<td>1.71 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Survey Results: Fill in the Blank Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When a HELP truck is present, police officers can cut the time for normal crash investigations on the Interstates by an average of about ____ percent.</td>
<td>31% 25% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When a HELP truck is present, police officers are ____ percent safer when investigating incidents on the Interstate.</td>
<td>73% 80% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Survey Results: Rating Questions
1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Adequate, 4=Fair, 5=Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you rate the skills and expertise of the HELP operators?</td>
<td>1.68 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you rate the attitudes and professionalism displayed by the HELP operators?</td>
<td>1.55 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do you rate the HELP trucks and equipment?</td>
<td>1.23 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do you rate the HELP operators' concern for safety?</td>
<td>1.33 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you rate the time required for a HELP truck to arrive after being requested by an officer?</td>
<td>1.71 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How do you rate the effectiveness of the HELP Supervisors?</td>
<td>1.71 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How do you rate the overall HELP program?</td>
<td>1.35 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improved Safety

The police officers gave the most positive responses to statements and questions about safety, especially safety at incident scenes. The statement, “The HELP program has improved safety at incident scenes for police officers and other emergency responders,”
received an average response of 1.23 (1=Strongly Agree), the most positive of all the responses to all of the survey statements and questions. More than 80% of the officers selected “Strongly Agree.”

Also, when asked to rate the HELP operators’ concern for safety, the average response was 1.33 (1=Excellent). More than 70% of the officers selected “Excellent,” and none selected anything less than “Adequate.”

Further, one of the fill-in-the-blank questions asked the officers to estimate the percent improvement in safety when a HELP truck is present at an incident scene. While “percent improvement in safety” is admittedly an imprecise term, all of the respondents provided an answer, with an average response of 73%. The most frequent response was 100%. Clearly, the officers believe that the HELP program has improved safety for themselves and for other responders.

**Reduced Incident Duration**

Another statement that received an exceptionally positive response was: “The HELP operators have been effective in getting disabled vehicles out of the roadway.” The average response was 1.4, and almost 75% of the officers selected “Strongly Agree.” A companion statement related to vehicles involved in minor crashes also received a very positive response: “HELP operators have been very effective in getting damaged vehicles (minor crashes) out of the roadway without waiting for law enforcement or a tow truck.” The average response was 1.77, and slightly more than 50% selected “Strongly Agree.”

Two other questions looked at the impact of the HELP program on the time required to complete police investigations at crash scenes. In response to the statement, “When a HELP truck is at the scene, officers can complete Interstate crash investigations in less time,” more than 55% of the officers selected “Strongly Agree,” with an average of 1.65.

The officers were asked to quantify this benefit with a fill-in-the-blank question: “When a HELP truck is present, officers can cut the time for normal crash investigations on the Interstates by an average of about ____ percent.” The average response was 31% and the most frequent response was 50%. These, of course, are important numbers relative to the impact of the HELP program on incident duration and travel delays.

Of note, the officers in Nashville estimated greater reductions in the time required for investigations than the officers in the other three cities. The average response for the Nashville officers was 41%. For Chattanooga, Knoxville, and Memphis the averages were 26%, 28% and 27% respectively. (As noted below, the responses from Nashville officers were generally more positive to all of the survey questions.) Regardless, even the 26% - 28% numbers are significant in terms of reduced clearance time at crash scenes.
Other Responses to Statements

The officers’ responses to all of the fifteen statements (Table 3) were favorable to the HELP program, including the responses to two questions that were phrased in a negative way. One question stated: “HELP is an unnecessary duplication of services already provided by law enforcement, fire service, and other agencies.” The other question stated that the police department was giving lower priority to the Interstate highways than before the HELP program began.

The officers disagreed with both statements, reacting most strongly to the question about duplication of services already provided by other agencies. The average response to that question was 4.53, where 5=Strongly Disagree. More than 75% of the officers selected “Strongly Disagree.”

For the question about the police department giving lower priority to the Interstates, the most frequent response was also “Strongly Disagree,” and the average was 3.82. More officers were uncertain about this question, and a few officers in each city seemed to believe that some shift in priorities might have occurred. On the other hand, the responses were very positive to a follow-up statement, “HELP has allowed the police department to better utilize its resources on the Interstates for enforcement and emergency response.” The average response to that question was 1.71, and “Strongly Agree” was the most frequent response.

The officers also indicate high satisfaction with the general assistance provided by HELP at incident scenes. The statement, “The HELP operators work effectively with other responders at incident scenes,” received an average response of 1.49. More than 65% of the officers selected “Strongly Agree.” The officers also gave a positive response, an average of 1.85, to the statement, “The HELP program is well coordinated with local agencies.”

For three of the broad statements about benefits of the HELP program, “Strongly Agree,” was the most frequent response, although the averages were slightly higher than for some of the other responses:

“The HELP program has reduced Interstate traffic congestion caused by crashes and other incidents.” (Average response = 2.01)

“The HELP program has resulted in a reduction in secondary crashes (crashes caused by backups from previous crashes or rubbernecking).” (Average response=2.10)

“Interstate highways in our city are safer and less congested because of the HELP program.” (Average response = 2.19)

For all three of these questions at least 65% of the officers selected either “Strongly Agree” or “Agree,” but about 20% selected “Neither Agree Nor Disagree.”

Of all the survey items, the officers were least convinced about the statement, “The HELP program has reduced the number of crashes involving abandoned vehicles on the shoulders
and ramps.” While the average response (2.25) was positive, the most frequent response was “Neither Agree Nor Disagree.” Several officers made notes on the survey form saying that more data was needed to help answer the question. Of course, one of the reasons that TDOT asked for the officers’ opinions is that data is not readily available. Nonetheless, the majority of the officers agreed with the statement, and the average response was positive.

Other Responses to Rating Questions

Responses to all of the rating questions (Table 5) were very positive, with “Excellent” being the most frequent response to all seven questions. The highest average ratings were for the “HELP trucks and equipment” and, as noted above, the “HELP operators’ concern for safety.” More than 80% of the officers rated these two aspects of the program as “Excellent.” Finally, the officers were asked to rate the “overall HELP program,” and the average response was 1.35, with approximately 70% selecting “Excellent.”

Responses to Open-ended Questions

The survey also included questions that invited written comments and suggestions from the police officers under five categories:

- Do you have any suggestions for better training of the HELP operators?
- Do you have any suggestions for additional or different equipment for the HELP trucks?
- Do you have any suggestions for changes in HELP operating procedures?
- Any suggestions for the HELP Operators to be safer or more effective at incident scenes?
- Do you have any other suggestions to help TDOT improve the overall program?

A total of 62 officers responded to one or more of these questions, offering a total of more than 100 comments or suggestions.

The most frequent suggestion was that the HELP program needed to be expanded, mostly in terms of hours or days of service rather than coverage area. The officers used terms such as “longer hours,” “weekends” or “24/7.” (TDOT heard that same suggestion in discussions with police supervisors and during other contacts with officers. In September 2001, the HELP program expanded to weekends and longer hours on weekdays.)

The second most frequent set of comments related to radio communications. Several officers expressed frustration with radio communication, and most of the comments called for police radios in all of the HELP trucks to facilitate on-scene communication. At the time of the
survey, all of the HELP trucks had two-way radio communication with a HELP dispatcher, and the patrolling HELP supervisors had a police radio and could communicate directly with police officers and police dispatchers. However, individual police officers could not communicate directly with individual HELP operators. (TDOT and the police departments have engaged in ongoing discussions about radio communications, but, as of August, 2002, no plans had been made to add police radios to any more of the HELP trucks.)

About a dozen of the written comments could be characterized as “negative,” and those comments all related to tension, real or perceived, between the HELP operators’ emphasis on quick clearance and the police officers’ emphasis on thorough investigations and the safety of responders. These are examples of the comments from the officers:

- Don’t be overly concerned with the backup of traffic; we don’t want to compromise the safety of anyone on the scene.
- We (police) hear about secondary accidents and understand, but they don’t understand the importance of a good investigation.
- Remind the HELP operators that the safety of the investigators, the safety of the crash victims, and the investigation are more important than the rapid reopening of a lane of traffic.

However, even among the officers who offered comments with a negative slant, most gave the program an overall excellent rating. One officer wrote:

- The only complaint I would have as an investigator is HELP operators occasionally want to move cars, etc. before I’m ready. This has not caused any major problems for me personally. Overall I think you guys are great! Thanks!!!

Comparison of Responses from the Four Cities

Grouping the officers’ responses by city shows only two notable patterns of difference. The most prominent is that most of the responses from the Nashville officers were more positive than the responses from officers in the other cities. The second pattern is that Chattanooga officers tend to be less positive than officers in the other cities on questions about coordination at incident scenes and performance of the HELP personnel. Discussions with TDOT managers revealed possible explanations for both patterns.

Several factors may account for the more positive responses from Nashville officers, but the most likely is that representatives of the HELP program had spent much more time with Nashville officers explaining the program and answering questions. During the year preceding the survey TDOT was a regular participant in the in-service training for the Metropolitan Nashville Police Department. In groups of about 50, virtually every Nashville officer participated in a one-hour HELP presentation given by one or two TDOT managers.
and a HELP operator. The officers were invited to ask questions, inspect one of the HELP trucks and the on-board equipment, and talk directly with the TDOT personnel.

Only a few such presentations were made in other cities, usually as part of the kick-off activities when the program began. Many of the presentations to the Nashville in-service classes were made by TDOT central office personnel who could not travel to the other three cities for such frequent presentations. Plans are underway for more HELP involvement with in-service training in the other three cities.

The less positive answers for the Chattanooga officers on some questions are probably related to the “quick clearance” versus “thorough investigation” tension referred to above. Reportedly, some disagreements occurred at incident scenes shortly after the HELP program began in Chattanooga, between police officers and HELP operators (some of whom were retired police and fire officers). Regardless, the average response from Chattanooga officers was not negative, only less positive on certain questions than from officers in the other cities. TDOT managers have worked to overcome any lingering concerns among the Chattanooga police officers.

Table 6 shows the range of responses to the question asking the officers to rate the “overall HELP program.” In all four cities, “Excellent” was the most frequent response. Statewide, 70% of the officers rated the program as “Excellent,” 25% as “Good,” and 5% as “Adequate.”

Table 6. Survey Results: How do your rate the overall HELP program?
1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Adequate, 4=Fair, 5=Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Department</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this survey should be useful for all of the four original purposes described at the beginning of this report. The opinions of the police officers were captured at a time when those officers were still familiar with the circumstances prior to HELP. Also, a baseline of the officers’ opinions has been established for future surveys. Of special importance, information is now available to quantify some of the program’s important benefits and contributions. Further, TDOT has a better understanding of what the police officers see as the program’s strengths, areas where the officers have questions, and specific suggestions for improvement.

From the perspective of local police officers, the HELP program is achieving significant benefits in all four cities—especially improved safety at incident scenes and reductions in incident duration through prompt removal of damaged and disabled vehicles and less time required for crash investigations. The officers believe that safety at incident scenes has been improved by an average of more than 70% and that the time required for normal crash investigation has been reduced by an average of more than 30%.

The officers believe that the urban freeways are less congested and safer because of HELP. The officers believe that the program meets important needs, does not duplicate services provided by other agencies, and is well coordinated with other agencies. Overall, the police officers in these four cities express high regard for the HELP program and the HELP personnel.
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NOTES

1 Several national studies have concluded that traffic “incidents” account for more than half of all vehicle hours of delay. For instance, see Traffic Incident Management Handbook, Federal Highway Administration, November 2000, and 2002 Urban Mobility Report, Texas Transportation Institute, June 2002.

2 “Secondary crashes” are difficult to quantify, and limited data is available. However, 20% of total crashes is frequently cited as an approximate national average. The exact percentage in a specific community or on a specific freeway segment will vary, but 20% is believed by TDOT and the Tennessee Highway Patrol to be a conservative estimate for Tennessee.
Appendix

Responses to Each Survey Question
Statement 1: When a HELP truck is at the scene, police officers can complete Interstate crash investigations in less time.

Statement 2: The HELP program has improved safety at incident scenes for police officers and other emergency responders.
Statement 3: The HELP program has reduced the number of crashes involving abandoned vehicles on the shoulders and ramps.

Statement 4: Interstate highways in our city are safer and less congested because of the HELP program.
Statement 5: HELP is an unnecessary duplication of services already provided by law enforcement, fire services, and other agencies.

Statement 6: The HELP program has resulted in a reduction in secondary crashes (crashes caused by backups from previous crashes or rubbernecking.)
Statement 7: The HELP program has reduced Interstate traffic congestion caused by crashes and other incidents.

![Bar chart showing percent of officers selecting each response.]

Statement 8: The HELP operators have been effective in getting disabled vehicles out of the roadway.

![Bar chart showing percent of officers selecting each response.]
Statement 9: The HELP operators have been very effective in getting damaged vehicles (minor crashes) out of the roadway without waiting for law enforcement or a tow truck.

Statement 10: Our police department receives more accurate and more timely information about incidents as a result of the HELP program.
Statement 11: The HELP program is well coordinated with local agencies.

Statement 12: The HELP operators work effectively with other responders at incident scenes.
Statement 13: Most police officers understand the purpose of the HELP program.

Statement 14: Our police department gives lower priority to the Interstates now than before the HELP program started.
Statement 15: HELP has allowed our department to better utilize its resources on the Interstates for enforcement and emergency response.
Fill in the Blank 1: When a HELP truck is present, police officers are ____ percent safer when investigating incidents on the Interstate.

Fill in the Blank 2: When a HELP truck is present, police officers can cut the time for normal crash investigations on the Interstates by an average of about ____ percent.
Rating Question 1: How do you rate the skills and expertise of the HELP operators?

Rating Question 2: How do you rate the attitudes and professionalism displayed by the HELP operators?
Rating Question 3: How do you rate the HELP trucks and equipment?

Rating Question 4: How do you rate the HELP operators' concern for safety.
Rating Question 5: How do you rate the *time required for a HELP truck to arrive* after being requested by an officer?

![Bar chart showing responses to Rating Question 5]

Rating Question 6: How do you rate the effectiveness of the *HELP Supervisors*?

![Bar chart showing responses to Rating Question 6]
Rating Question 7: How do you rate the overall HELP program?
Statewide Average of Ratings by Question

![Bar chart showing statewide average of ratings by question.]

Ratings by City and Question

![Bar chart showing ratings by city for each question.]

City options: Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis, Nashville.