National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center

A Program of the National Institute of Justice

BULLETIN

October 2000

Michigan State Police Tests 2001 Patrol Vehicles

Patrol vehicles are one of the most critical purchases that a law enforcement agency makes. For both large and small agencies, patrol vehicle purchases frequently represent the second largest expenditure, after personnel, in their annual operating budgets. Selecting a vehicle that balances both budgetary and performance requirements has become an increasingly challenging task for police fleet administrators. Many agencies are painfully aware of the consequences that result from being "penny-wise and pound-foolish," where vehicles with inadequate performance, such as regular production passenger vehicles not specifically designed for police service, are selected because they cost less than "police-package" vehicles. While some agencies have had limited success with nontraditional police vehicles, most agencies find that the increased maintenance costs resulting from such vehicles breaking down under the stress of police service quickly offset any initial "savings."

For more than 20 years, the Michigan State Police (MSP) has conducted extensive evaluations of the performance capabilities of each new model year's police vehicles as part of its annual vehicle procurement process. Since 1981, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), through its National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center (NLECTC), has sponsored these tests through a partnership with MSP. By disseminating these results to State and local law enforcement agencies, NIJ helps these agencies select vehicles that maximize their budgets and ensures that evaluated vehicles provide reliable and safe performance under the increased demands of police service.

The 2001 model year patrol vehicles were evaluated from September 16 through 18, 2000. For the purposes of the MSP evaluation, police-package vehicles are those that are designed and manufactured for use in the full spectrum of law enforcement patrol service, including pursuits. A "special-service" vehicle is a vehicle that may be used by law enforcement agencies for specialized use (e.g., off-road, inclement weather, K–9, or commercial vehicle enforcement), but is not designed or manufactured to be used in pursuit situations. By creating this distinction, it is hoped that it will be easier for agencies to realistically assess the capabilities of each vehicle.

Each vehicle is subjected to six major tests and evaluations. The results are weighted to reflect the relative importance of each attribute as related to MSP operational requirements. Table 1 lists the tests and point scores. MSP scores each vehicle's overall performance, reviews the manufacturer's bid price, and calculates a final score for each vehicle using a sophisticated formula that combines the overall performance score and the manufacturer's price.

Eight police-package vehicles and five special-service vehicles were submitted for evaluation. Table 2 provides a complete listing and description of each vehicle. This NLECTC bulletin contains a

Table 1 **Tests and scoring**

Test	Points
Vehicle dynamics	30
Acceleration	20
Top speed	15
Braking	20
Ergonomics and communications	10
Fuel economy	5
Total	**100**

synopsis of the test results; a detailed report also is available. Page 7 of this bulletin contains information on how to obtain the report.

It should be noted that the MSP vehicle specifications, test categories, and scoring reflect MSP needs. If your department employs this or a similar method, consider your own needs carefully and alter the weighting factors accordingly.

What's new for 2001

AM General: This year AM General is offering the Hummer Tactical Vehicle as a pursuit-rated vehicle. The Hummer has an independent 4-wheel-drive (4WD) suspension system with heavy-duty coil springs and hydraulic shock absorbers that reduce stress on steering components, body, chassis, equipment, and crews, according to AM General engineers. Brakes are inboard-mounted power disc brakes. The vehicle's body is heat-treated aluminum alloy, bonded and secured with more than 2,800 rivets, with a 16-inch ground clearance, a 72-inch track width, and a low center of gravity for stability.

The Hummer is powered by General Motors' 6.5L, 195-horsepower turbo-diesel engine. Special options include the Central Tire Inflation System, which enables the driver to inflate or deflate the tires from inside the vehicle for better traction.

Chevrolet: For 2001, Chevrolet has enhanced its 9C1 Impala Police Package with the addition of new special equipment options that include a 10mm ground stud, located at the right side of the trunk; an assist handle, located above the right-front passenger door, to aid in getting out of the vehicle and in pursuit situations; and an exterior head and tail lamp emergency flashing system. Chevrolet continues to offer optional special equipment that includes wiring for auxiliary speakers, coaxial radio antenna cable, horn/siren circuit, and grille lamps. The 9C1 comes with heavy-duty front bucket seats with no console between the seats. Instead, a security panel or reinforcement in the seat back protects the driver from kicks or blows to the back of the seat from an unruly rear passenger.

Chevrolet also is introducing a new version of the Impala for 2001—the 9C3 Unmarked Police Package. Although the 9C3's standard features are almost identical to the 9C1, it is intended for covert (i.e., administrative and investigative) use and is not designed to be used

Table 2 **Vehicles tested**

Category	Vehicle	Engine
Police	AM General Hummer HMCS	6.5L (396 cid) Turbo-Diesel
Police	Chevrolet Camaro (Automatic)	5.7L (350 cid) SFI
Police	Chevrolet Camaro (6-speed manual)	5.7L (350 cid) SFI
Police	Chevrolet Impala	3.8L (231 cid) SFI
Special Service	Chevrolet Tahoe (2-wheel drive)	4.8L (292 cid) SFI
Special Service	Chevrolet Tahoe (4-wheel drive)	4.8L (292 cid) SFI
Police	DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (2-wheel drive)	4.0L (242 cid) PFI
Police	DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (4-wheel drive)	4.0L (242 cid) PFI
Police	Ford Police Interceptor	4.6L (281 cid) SFI
Police	Ford Police Interceptor (CNG)	4.6L (281 cid) SFI (CNG)
Special Service	Ford Excursion (4-wheel drive)	6.8L (415 cid) SFI
Special Service	Ford Expedition (4-wheel drive)	5.4L (329 cid) SFI
Special Service	Ford Explorer (4-wheel drive)	4.0L (245 cid) PFI

cid = Cubic inch displacement
PFI = Multiport fuel injection
Turbo = Turbocharged
SFI = Sequential port fuel injection
L = Liter
CNG = Compressed natural gas

Chevrolet Motor Division of General Motors Corporation submitted three models for testing: the Tahoe 4WD and 2WD (first and fifth from the left), the Camaro (tested in two versions—a six-speed manual transmission and an automatic transmission, second and fourth from the left), and the Impala (third from the left). Shown at the far right is the AM General Hummer.

Photo courtesy of Michigan State Police.

Ford Motor Company submitted four different models for testing (pictured from left to right): the Excursion (4WD), the Police Interceptor (tested in two versions—gasoline and CNG, second and fourth from the left), the Expedition (4WD), and the Explorer (4WD).

Photo courtesy of Michigan State Police.

as a marked patrol car. Instead of the 9C1's bucket seats, the 9C3 has a 60/40 front split bench seat. This design reconfiguration, which allows the 9C3 to accommodate three front seat passengers, also changes the vehicle's cargo weight, prompting Chevrolet's recommendation that the 9C3 not be used for marked patrol use.

The 2001 Camaro is a carryover from the 2000 model year with no significant changes. The B4C Camaro Special Service Police Package offers a vehicle that is pursuit capable, but special equipment options like spotlamps and wiring are not available from the manufacturer.

As expected, Chevrolet is reintroducing the Tahoe for special-service vehicle use, such as SWAT or K–9 operations, but only 500 units will be available. This vehicle is not designed or intended for pursuit use. The Tahoe, available in 2-wheel drive (2WD) and 4WD, features 4-wheel antilock front and rear disc brakes, a 4800 Vortec V8 engine, and 4-speed automatic transmission with overdrive and towhaul mode.

DaimlerChrysler: The DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee will be offered again in 2001 in 2WD and 4WD models with no major performance or mechanical changes from the year 2000 models.

With an eye toward the future, DaimlerChrysler is exploring the possibility of offering the Dodge Intrepid as a police-package vehicle and the Dodge Durango (in both 2WD and 4WD) as a special-service vehicle for the 2002 model year. DaimlerChrysler currently is performing evaluations for both vehicles, and no final decisions have been made.

Ford: Ford has made several changes to its 2001 Police Interceptor and is adding a Police Prep Package that includes manufacturer installation of the auxiliary items Ford says are most often requested to fully equip vehicles for police use. The package has several options that will make installing radio and lighting equipment easier. One offers a new wiring harness with leads and connectors for wiring accessories that will make it unnecessary for a department to remove the interior of the vehicle to install equipment. Another option—the visibility package—includes a strobe power supply, control panel, two rear-deck strobe lights, and an alternating headlight flasher.

Ford beefed up the Police Interceptor with a new 235-horsepower 4.6L V8 engine and reconfigured last year's rear axle ratio of 3.55:1 to 3.27:1 for improved fuel economy. Ergonomic and safety improvements include improved seats with power lumbar adjustment offered on the driver's side, a weapons cut-out feature added to both front seats, and optional adjustable-position accelerator and brake pedals. For personal safety, Ford engineers have designed an advanced restraint system that works via a combination of seat belt pretensioners, dual-stage air bags, and seat position sensors that adjust air bag deployment speeds. The sensors monitor both the seat position and the passenger weight of the seat occupant.

The all-new Explorer, available in the first quarter of 2001 as a 2002 model, includes a number of enhancements. Major changes include a body that is 2.5 inches wider and a wheelbase that is 2 inches longer. New features include standard independent rear suspension for improved handling, a standard 210 HP 4.0L Single

Overhead Cam (SOHC) V6, and 16-inch wheels and tires. The Police Special Service Package will be available in the fall of 2001.

The 2001 Expedition and Excursion are essentially carryovers from the 2000 model year, with no major mechanical or body style changes.

Vehicle dynamics testing

Objective: To determine high-speed pursuit handling characteristics. The 2-mile road racing course contains hills, curves, and corners; except for the absence of traffic, it simulates actual pursuit conditions. The evaluation measures each vehicle's blending of suspension components, acceleration capabilities, and braking characteristics.

Methodology: Each vehicle is driven 16 timed laps by four drivers. The final score is the average of the 12 fastest laps.

Table 3 shows the average results of the vehicle dynamics test.

Acceleration and top-speed testing

Acceleration

Qualification test objective: To determine the ability of each vehicle to accelerate from a standing start to 60 mph within 10 seconds, 80 mph within 17.2 seconds, and 100 mph within 28.2 seconds.

Competitive test objective: To determine acceleration time to 100 mph.

Methodology: Using a Datron noncontact optical sensor in conjunction with a personal computer, each vehicle is driven through four acceleration sequences—two northbound and two southbound—to allow for wind direction. The average of the four is the score on the competitive test.

Table 3 **Results of vehicle dynamics testing**

Make/Model	Average*
AM General Hummer HMCS 6.5L Turbo-Diesel	02:00.97
Chevrolet Camaro (Automatic) 5.7L SFI	01:36.76
Chevrolet Camaro (6-speed manual) 5.7L SFI	01:37.01
Chevrolet Impala 3.8L SFI	01:43.59
Chevrolet Tahoe (2-wheel drive) 4.8L SFI	**
Chevrolet Tahoe (4-wheel drive) 4.8L SFI	**
DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (2-wheel drive) 4.0L PFI	01:45.02
DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (4-wheel drive) 4.0L PFI	01:46.16
Ford Police Interceptor 4.6L SFI	01:42.58
Ford Police Interceptor (CNG) 4.6L SFI (CNG)	01:49.18
Ford Excursion (4-wheel drive) 6.8L SFI	**
Ford Expedition (4-wheel drive) 5.4L SFI	**
Ford Explorer (4-wheel drive) 4.0L PFI	**

NOTE: Times are in minutes, seconds, and hundredths of a second; i.e., 1:29.74 = 1 minute, 29 seconds, and 74/100 of a second.
* Average of the 12 fastest laps.
** The vehicle manufacturer has indicated that these vehicles are neither designed for nor intended to be used as pursuit vehicles. Therefore, these vehicles were not subjected to vehicle dynamics testing.

Photo courtesy of Michigan State Police.

The Jeep Division of the DaimlerChrysler Corporation submitted the Cherokee (pictured at left) in both a 2WD and a 4WD version.

Top speed

Qualification test objective: To determine the vehicle's ability to reach 110 mph within 1 mile and 120 mph within 2 miles.

Competitive test objective: To determine the actual top speed (up to 150 mph) attained within 14 miles from a standing start.

Methodology: Following the fourth acceleration run, the vehicle continues to accelerate to the top speed attainable within 14 miles from the start of the run. The highest speed attained within the 14 miles is the vehicle's score on the competitive test. Table 4 summarizes the acceleration and top-speed test results.

Braking testing

Brake test objective: To determine the deceleration rate attained by each test vehicle on 12, 60-to-0 mph impending skid (threshold) stops, with the Antilock Braking System (ABS) in operation if the vehicle is so equipped. Each vehicle will be scored on the average deceleration rate it attains.

Brake test methodology: Each vehicle will make two decelerations at specific, predetermined points on the test road from 90-to-0 mph at 22 ft/sec^2, with the driver using a decelerometer to maintain the deceleration rate. Immediately after these "heat-up" stops are completed, the vehicle will be turned around and will make six measured 60-to-0 mph impending skid (threshold) stops with ABS in operation, if the vehicle is so equipped, at specific, predetermined points. Following a 4-minute heat soak, the entire sequence will be repeated. The exact initial velocity at the beginning of each of the 60-to-0 mph decelerations and the exact distance required to make each stop will be recorded by means of a fifth wheel in conjunction with electronic speed and distance meters. The data resulting from the 12 stops will be used to calculate the average deceleration rate, which is the vehicle's score for this test. Table 5 shows the results of the braking test.

Ergonomics and communications

Objectives: To rate the vehicle's ability to provide a suitable environment for patrol officers to perform their job, to accommodate the required communications and emergency warning equipment, and to assess the relative difficulty of installing the equipment.

Methodology: A minimum of four officers independently and individually score each vehicle on

Table 4 **Results of acceleration* and top-speed** testing**

Speed (mph)	AM General Hummer HMCS	Chevrolet Camaro (Automatic)	Chevrolet Camaro (6-speed manual)	Chevrolet Impala	Chevrolet Tahoe (2WD)	Chevrolet Tahoe (4WD)	DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (2WD)	DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (4WD)	Ford Police Interceptor	Ford Police Interceptor (CNG)	Ford Excursion (4WD)	Ford Expedition (4WD)	Ford Explorer (4WD)
0–20	2.51	1.61	1.72	2.02	2.10	2.28	1.88	1.94	1.88	2.47	2.24	1.89	2.05
0–30	4.87	2.47	2.56	3.28	3.54	3.73	3.18	3.29	3.20	4.31	3.87	3.46	3.42
0–40	8.10	3.36	3.36	4.70	4.96	5.18	4.63	4.80	4.64	6.18	5.66	5.12	5.13
0–50	12.63	4.45	4.58	6.67	7.18	7.45	6.82	7.16	6.39	8.64	8.27	7.16	7.36
0–60	18.55	5.87	5.77	9.20	9.77	10.12	9.18	9.71	8.70	12.14	11.27	10.04	10.48
0–70	27.92	7.31	7.23	11.91	12.48	12.93	12.25	13.04	11.22	15.86	14.62	13.19	14.07
0–80	49.27	9.06	9.03	15.23	17.17	18.20	16.99	18.24	14.35	20.38	19.59	17.24	18.60
0–90	N/A	11.33	10.90	19.90	23.86	25.44	22.80	24.71	18.97	26.67	26.34	24.63	25.36
0–100	N/A	13.93	13.35	25.40	N/A	N/A	30.93	34.53	24.61	37.02	N/A	34.32	36.22
Top Speed in mph	**88**	**159**	**159**	**124**	**98**	**98**	**111**	**111**	**129**	**123**	**94**	**106**	**106**

* Figures represent the average of four runs.
** All vehicles are equipped with electronic speed limiters.
N/A = Vehicle did not achieve or exceed speeds of 100 mph.

Table 5 **Results of braking test**

	AM General Hummer HMCS	Chevrolet Camaro (Automatic)	Chevrolet Impala	Chevrolet Tahoe (2WD)	Chevrolet Tahoe (4WD)	DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (2WD)	DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (4WD)	Ford Police Interceptor	Ford Police Interceptor (CNG)	Ford Excursion (4WD)	Ford Expedition (4WD)	Ford Explorer (4WD)
Phase I												
Avg. initial speed (mph)*	60.3	60.7	60.5	60.6	60.1	60.3	60.3	60.4	60.3	61.0	60.6	60.5
Avg. stopping distance (ft)*	175.17	138.98	143.72	152.27	153.77	153.80	152.67	146.60	149.33	190.93	174.13	145.87
Avg. deceleration rate* (ft/sec^2)	22.32	28.51	27.41	25.98	25.30	25.47	25.60	26.80	26.17	20.99	22.73	27.03
Phase II												
Avg. initial speed (mph)*	60.5	60.3	60.3	60.8	60.3	60.2	60.5	60.4	60.7	60.6	60.4	60.4
Avg. stopping distance (ft)*	172.93	134.30	141.88	157.53	167.43	151.95	153.62	148.18	152.07	179.12	157.28	145.20
Avg. deceleration rate* (ft/sec^2)	22.80	29.11	27.59	25.25	23.39	25.64	25.60	26.47	26.07	22.03	24.97	27.04
Avg. Deceleration Rate (ft/sec^2)**	22.56	28.81	27.50	25.61	24.34	25.55	25.60	26.64	26.12	21.51	23.85	27.03
Projected stopping distance from 60 MPH based on average deceleration rate (ft)	**171.60**	**134.4**	**140.8**	**151.2**	**159.1**	**151.5**	**151.3**	**145.4**	**148.3**	**180.0**	**162.3**	**143.2**

All vehicles have antilocking braking systems.
* Figures represent the average of six measured stops.
** Calculated from the average deceleration rate (ft/sec^2) of all measured stops.

Table 6a **Summary of exterior and interior dimensions**

Make/Model	Length (inches)	Height (inches)	Wheelbase (inches)	Weight (lbs)	Head Room (front)	Head Room (rear)	Leg Room (front)	Leg Room (rear)
AM General Hummer	184.5	75.0	130.0	7540	37.5	36.7	36.0	36.0
Chevrolet Camaro	193.2	51.3	101.1	3485/3466 (a)	37.2	35.3	43.0	26.8
Chevrolet Impala	200.1	57.4	110.5	3587	39.2	36.8	42.2	38.4
Chevrolet Tahoe	198.9	74.2	116.0	5017/5300 (d)	40.7	39.4	41.3	38.6
DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee	165.3	63.2	101.4	3476/3655 (d)	37.8	38.0	41.4	35.0
Ford Police Interceptor	212.0	56.8	114.7	4020/4332 (f)	39.4	38.0	42.5	39.6
Ford Excursion (4WD)	226.7	77.2	137.1	7304	41.0	41.1 (g)	42.3	40.5 (g)
Ford Expedition (4WD)	204.6	74.3	119.1	5264	39.8	39.8	40.9	38.9
Ford Explorer (4WD)	189.5	69.2	113.8	4446	39.9	38.9	42.4	37.2

Make/Model	Shoulder Room (front)	Shoulder Room (rear)	Hip Room (front)	Hip Room (rear)	Interior, Front (cubic feet)	Interior, Rear (cubic feet)	Interior, Combined (cubic feet)	Trunk Capacity (cubic feet)	Fuel Capacity (gallons)
AM General Hummer	78.8	78.8	50.6	50.6	61.6	61.6	123.2	57.85	42.0
Chevrolet Camaro	57.4	55.8	52.8	44.4	53.1	28.8	81.9	12.9 (b)	15.5
Chevrolet Impala	59.0	58.9	56.8	55.7	56.5	48.2	104.7	17.6 (c)	17.0
Chevrolet Tahoe	65.2	65.1	61.4	61.3	94.3	57.3	151.6	108.2	26.0
DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee	54.7	54.7	54.8	44.3	50.3	42.8	93.1	32.9 (e)	20.2
Ford Police Interceptor	60.8	60.3	57.1	59.0	58.2	51.1	109.3	20.6	19.0
Ford Excursion (4WD)	68.3	67.0 (g)	67.5	66.9 (g)	165.0	108.3	N/A	48.6	44.0
Ford Expedition (4WD)	63.9	64.4	61.5	62.3	N/A	N/A	136.2	N/A	26.0
Ford Explorer (4WD)	59.1	58.9	55.0	54.2	55.9	44.5 (h)	N/A	13.9 (i)	22.5

(a) - Automatic/6-speed manual.
(b) - Behind 2nd seat; with 2nd seat down = 32.8 cu. ft.
(c) - With compact spare tire.
(d) - 2-wheel drive/4-wheel drive.
(e) - Behind 2nd seat; with 2nd seat down = 69.0 cu. ft.
(f) = Gasoline/CNG.
(g) - Measured at 2nd seating row.
(h) - Measured with 2nd row seats upright.
(i) - Measured with 3rd row seats upright.
N/A - Information not available at press time.

Table 6b **Results of ergonomics and communications test**

Vehicle	Score*
AM General Hummer	144.43
Chevrolet Camaro	160.87
Chevrolet Impala (9C1)	213.58
Chevrolet Impala (9C3)	209.55
Chevrolet Tahoe	199.31
DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee	180.47
Ford Police Interceptor	211.28
Ford Excursion (4WD)	224.71
Ford Expedition (4WD)	213.19
Ford Explorer (4WD)	192.72

* Scores are the total points the automobile received for each of 29 attributes the MSP considers important in determining the acceptability of the vehicle as a patrol car—for example, front seat adjustability, clarity of instrumentation, and front and back visibility. The higher the number, the better the vehicle scored.

If you would like a copy of the full report, write or call the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center, P.O. Box 1160, Rockville, MD 20849–1160, 800–248–2742, or 301–519–5060; or download it from JUSTNET, www.nlectc.org.

comfort and instrumentation. Personnel from the Communications Division who are responsible for new car preparation conduct the communications portion of the evaluation, based on the relative difficulty of the necessary installations. Each factor is graded on a 1-to-10 scale, with 1 representing totally unacceptable and 10 representing superior. The scores are averaged to minimize personal prejudice. Table 6a shows a comparison of the exterior and interior dimensions of the vehicles evaluated. Table 6b shows the results of the ergonomics and communications test. (Only one of each model was tested because the interior dimensions are essentially the same.)

Fuel economy

Objective: To determine fuel economy potential. The scoring data are valid and reliable for comparison, but may not necessarily be an accurate prediction of the car's actual fuel economy.

Methodology: The vehicles' scores are based on estimates of city fuel economy to the nearest one-tenth of a mile per gallon from data supplied by the vehicle manufacturers. Table 7 shows the estimated Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) fuel economy ratings, rounded to the nearest whole number for city, highway, and combined driving conditions.

Table 7 **Fuel economy**

Make/Model	EPA miles per gallon		
	City	Highway	Combined
AM General Hummer HMCS 6.5L (396 cid) Turbo Diesel	10*	13*	N/A
Chevrolet Camaro (Automatic) 5.7L (350 cid) SFI	17	27	20
Chevrolet Camaro (6-speed manual) 5.7L (350 cid) SFI	18	29	22
Chevrolet Impala 3.8L (231 cid) SFI	20	29	23
Chevrolet Tahoe (2-wheel drive) 4.8L (292 cid) SFI	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chevrolet Tahoe (4-wheel drive) 4.8L (292 cid) SFI	N/A	N/A	N/A
DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (2-wheel drive) 4.0L (242 cid) PFI	17	27	21
DaimlerChrysler Jeep Cherokee (4-wheel drive) 4.0L (242 cid) PFI	17	25	20
Ford Police Interceptor 4.6L (281 cid) SFI	18	29	N/A
Ford Police Interceptor (CNG) 4.6L (281 cid) SFI (CNG)	17**	29**	N/A
Ford Excursion (4-wheel drive) 6.8L (415 cid) SFI	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ford Expedition (4-wheel drive) 5.4L (329 cid) SFI	14	21	N/A
Ford Explorer (4-wheel drive) 4.0L (245 cid) PFI	17	24	N/A

* Estimated; Class III vehicle, not tested to EPA national fuel economy standards.
** Vehicle equipped with four CNG tanks. Total fuel capacity and EPA mileage estimates are stated in gasoline equivalent.
N/A = Information not available at press time.

The National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center is supported by Cooperative Agreement #96–MU–MU–K011 awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Analyses of test results do not represent product approval or endorsement by the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice; the National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce; or Aspen Systems Corporation.

The National Institute of Justice is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime.

New Publications/Videos

The following publications/videos are available from the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center–National:

TechBeat, Fall 2000. This *TechBeat* features the latest ballistic-resistant body armor performance standard, *NIJ Standard-0101.04*; using biometric identification in corrections; and using patch systems to help alleviate interoperability in law enforcement communications.

TechBeat, Summer 2000. Articles discuss the New York Electronic Crimes Task Force, a state-of-the-art correctional facility in Kentucky's horse farm country, and through-the-wall surveillance technology.

Equipment Performance Report: Effectiveness of Tire Deflation Devices Against Self-Sealing and Run-Flat Tires. This report details the results of an evaluation of tire deflation devices, which were tested using several brands of self-sealing and run-flat tires. The devices are for use by law enforcement during pursuits. (Note: This report is available only to law enforcement agencies and must be requested via a written request on department letterhead to NLECTC, P.O. Box 1160, Rockville, MD 20849–1160.)

The following publications/videos will be available soon:

A Guide to Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Forensic Technology Resources Within the Office of Justice Programs. This first-of-its-kind resource guide delivers valuable information on law enforcement and corrections technology programs and activities of the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs, including available technologies; funding sources and demonstration programs; equipment standards, testing, and evaluation; current research and development initiatives; and training.

Selection and Application Guide to Personal Body Armor (Revised). This guide, an update of the October 1998 publication, responds to questions about the selection and use of body armor for law enforcement. It responds to commonly expressed concerns and provides information to help determine the level of protection required by officers. This guide provides information on the newly released 0101.04 ballistic-resistant standard and the new stab-resistant standard *(NIJ Standard-0115.00)*.

2000 Mock Prison Riot Video. This videotape features technologies used to quell a mock prison riot staged by the National Institute of Justice's Office of Law Enforcement Technology Commercialization. Emerging technologies were incorporated into training scenarios to demonstrate the latest crimefighting technologies.

Michigan State Police 2001 Patrol Vehicle Testing. This report provides a complete listing of the data, including summary charts, resulting from the Michigan State Police's 2001 patrol vehicle testing.

To obtain any of the above publications or videotapes, write NLECTC, P.O. Box 1160, Rockville, MD 20849–1160; telephone 800–248–2742. Publications can also be downloaded from JUSTNET at www.nlectc.org.

National Law Enforcement and
Corrections Technology Center
P.O. Box 1160
Rockville, MD 20849–1160

PRESORTED STANDARD
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
JESSUP, MD
PERMIT NO. 4030