

Table of Contents

- A) Justification.....3
- A.1) Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any Legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.....3
 - A.1.a) Circumstances making the collection necessary.....3
 - A.1.b) Statute authorizing the collection of information.....6
- A.2) Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.....7
- A.3) Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical or other technological collection techniques or other information technology. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.....8
- A.4) Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information, already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.....9
- A.5) If the collection of information involves small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.....9
- A.6) Describe the consequences to Federal Program or policy activities if the collection is not collected or collected less frequently.....9
- A.7) Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines set forth in 5 CFR 1320.6.....10
- A.8) Provide a copy of the Federal Register document soliciting comments on the collection of information, a summary of all public comments responding to the notice, and a description of the agency’s actions in response to the comments. Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views.....10
 - A.8.a) Federal Register Notice.....10
 - A.8.b) Expert Consultation.....11
- A.9) Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.....11
- A.10) Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents.....11
- A.11) Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior or attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.....12
- A.12) Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information on the respondents.....12
- A.13) Provide an estimate of the total annual cost to the respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information.....13
- A.14) Provide estimates of the annualized cost to the Federal Government.....13
- A.15) Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-I.....13
- A.16) For collection of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication.....14

- A.17) If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.....14
- A.18) Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, “Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions” of the OMB Form 83-I.....15

Appendices

- Appendix A: Title 49, Chapter 301, Section 30168 of the United States Code
- Appendix B-1: 60 Day Federal Register Notice (74 FR 39991-39992)
- Appendix B-2: 30 Day Federal Register Notice (74 FR 62379-62380)
- Appendix C: National Survey of Distracted Driving Attitudes and Behavior (NSDDAB)
- Appendix D: [REMOVED FROM PACKAGE]
- Appendix E: Distracted Driver Intercept Survey (DDIS)
- Appendix F-1: Question-by-Question Justification for Telephone Survey Items
- Appendix F-2: Question-by-Question Justification for Intercept Survey Items
- Appendix G: Detailed Demographic Description of the Experimental and Control Sites

SECTION A

A) Justification

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) was established by the Highway Safety Act of 1970 (23 U.S.C. 101) to carry out a Congressional mandate to reduce the mounting number of deaths, injuries and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes on our Nation's highways. In support of this mission, NHTSA proposes to conduct information collections to (1) assess attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors related to distracted and unsafe driving practices, and (2) evaluate the effectiveness of a high-visibility enforcement (HVE) demonstration program in deterring those practices.

NHTSA must account for whether its initiatives were effective. An essential part of this evaluation effort will be comparing a baseline survey of public's awareness and attitudes towards NHTSA's initiatives to reduce distracted driving immediately prior to the initiation of a mobilization with a post-mobilization survey conducted immediately following the campaign. A national survey provides an additional baseline for comparison, and annual administrations of the same survey will help NHTSA monitor trends in distracted driving and develop more effective interventions.

The first wave of the HVE demonstration programs are expected to occur in the Spring of 2010. NHTSA is requesting approval to conduct intercept surveys at driver licensing offices in two States before, during, and after a Distracted Driving Demonstration programs for the purpose of evaluating the demonstration program. The DMV intercept surveys will begin in March 2010 and conclude in the summer of 2011. NHTSA will administer the Distracted Driving Intercept Survey (DDIS), a one-page survey that drivers can complete while waiting at selected driver's licensing (DMV) offices.

In addition, in order to track national trends in public awareness and perceptions of distracted driving NHTSA is requesting approval to conduct two national telephone surveys over three years. There is a lot of attention being paid to this issue, including increased media coverage, increased enforcement activity, and new laws under consideration by the States. We would like to administer the same survey in the same way approximately one and a half years apart. The first survey will be administered in the fall of 2010, at the conclusion of the Census Moratorium, and the second will be administered in 2012.

The following sections describe the justification for these proposed studies in more detail, along with the estimates of cost and burden.

A.1) Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any Legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information

A.1.a) Circumstances making the collection necessary

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) was established to reduce the mounting number of deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes on the Nation's highways. As part of this statutory mandate, NHTSA is authorized to conduct research as a foundation for the development of motor vehicle standards and traffic safety programs.

Driving while distracted increases the likelihood of a crash, and recent well publicized events have brought this unsafe driving behavior to the forefront of the public eye. Cell phone subscriptions have grown exponentially from 1988 through 2005. About 70 percent, or 250 million, of all Americans have a cell phone, according to CTIA-The Wireless Association^{®1}. For many, it is the only kind of telephone they possess. Cellular phone use is ubiquitous, and in a recent survey most individuals (77%) reported that they talk on the phone while driving at least some of the time (NHTSA, 2008)². The popularity of text messaging is increasing, and videotaped footage of crashes in which drivers were texting immediately prior to the crash have circulated widely on television. The emergence of other portable technologies such as MP3 players and GPS systems introduce more opportunity for drivers to attend to something other than the roadway environment.

Quantifying the effects of distracted driving on traffic crashes is problematic. Many police accident reports do not have a section for the responding officer to document whether or not distraction was a crash factor. Drivers who used a mobile device just before a crash may be reluctant to admit to device use for fear of penalties. Finally, the reports are post-hoc because officers arrive at the crash scene after the crash has occurred. These conditions lead to underreporting of distracted driving crashes.

Despite the difficulties of measuring the absolute effect of distraction on traffic crashes, there is much research about the nature of distracted driving. One research approach uses test tracks or simulators to compare driving while engaged in various distracting tasks to driving without a secondary task. These controlled studies frequently used cellular phone conversations as the distracting task. Horrey and Wickens (2006)³ completed a meta-analysis of studies that measured the effects of cell phone use on driving performance. Twenty three experiments were included in the analysis, and the authors found that, across all studies, reactions times were consistently slower when using a cell phone relative to normal driving. The authors report that hands-free phones did not reduce this decrement. This finding underscores the risks associated from cognitive distraction.

¹ CTIA 2009 Report. Retrieved on 8/25/09 from <http://www.ctia.org/media/index.cfm/AID/10323>

² NHTSA (2008). 2007 Motor Vehicle Occupant Safety Survey Volume 4: Crash Injury and Emergency Medical Services Report. DOT HS 810 977.

³ Horrey, W. & Wickens, C. (2006). Horrey, W. J., & Wickens, C. D. (2006). Examining the impact of cell phone conversations on driving using meta-analytic techniques. *Human Factors*, 48, 196-205.

A second approach to studying distracted driving uses sophisticated instrumentation to observe everyday driving in naturalistic settings. The 100 car study recorded data for a 1 year period during which drivers of the vehicles had a number of crashes and near-crashes. Klauer et al. (2006)⁴ computed the odds-ratio for various types of driver distraction and reported that moderately complex secondary tasks, defined as requiring at most two glances away from the road or two button presses, and complex secondary tasks, defined as requiring three or more glances or button presses, significantly increased the probability of being involved in a crash or near crash. These results indicate that activities with relatively high visual/manual attentional demands increase risk. Taken together, the controlled laboratory and naturalistic driving studies indicate that cognitive and visual/manual distraction lead to degraded driving performance and increase crash or near crash risk.

Traffic safety stakeholders have pushed for laws to prevent distracted driving crashes. In response, States have enacted legislation with various laws that ban drivers from using cellular phones while driving. Most existing laws that apply to drivers of all ages ban the use of handheld cellular phones but allow hands-free cellular phones. The effect of the laws is mixed. In New York, the first state to enact a law banning cellular phone use, observed use of handheld cellular phones was 2.3% pre-legislation, dropping to 1.1 percent immediately after legislation took effect, and rising to 2.1% one year after legislation (McCartt & Geary, 2004)⁵. The difference from pre-legislation to one year post legislation was not statistically significant. McCartt et al. reported that in New York there was no targeted enforcement and little public information and education (PI&E) after the law took effect. This gradual extinction of the effect is not surprising; the high visibility enforcement (HVE) Click It or Ticket model to change attitudes about and to increase use of seatbelts finds repeated success when paid media stressing active enforcement is coupled with targeted enforcement.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is planning to conduct pilot demonstration programs to build public awareness of the hazards of inattentive driving by applying NHTSA's proven Click It or Ticket HVE model, paid media messaging and evaluation to distracted driving. The CIOT model includes 1) data collection before, during, and after media and enforcement phases; 2) earned and paid publicity announcing vigorous enforcement; 3) highly visible enforcement each day of a two-week enforcement period; and 4) a media event announcing program results and giving credit to all of the participants in the community program at the end of each wave. NHTSA currently plans to implement this program in up to three mid-sized cities located in States that have a law banning drivers from using hand held cell phones.

⁴ Klauer, S.G., Dingus, T. A., Neale, V. L., Sudweeks, J.D., and Ramsey, D.J. (2006). The Impact of Driver Inattention on Near-Crash/Crash Risk: An Analysis Using the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study Data. DOT HS 810 594.

⁵ McCartt, A.T. & Geary, L.L. (2004). Longer term effects of New York State's law on drivers' handheld cell phone use. *Injury Prevention*, 10, 11-15.

To date, NHTSA has awarded cooperative agreements to Connecticut and New York's State Highway Safety Offices to implement community-level high visibility enforcement programs. NHTSA will provide paid media advertisements and an independent evaluation to measure the effectiveness of the program. The State Highway Safety Offices will coordinate the enforcement aspect of the program. The program will be conducted over the course of one year in quarterly mobilizations. Some of the distracted driving waves may occur immediately before or after other traffic safety enforcement mobilizations such as Click It or Ticket or impaired driving crackdowns.

We are proposing two types of distracted driving surveys to be administered to drivers ages 16 years and older (pending IRB approval⁶). These surveys will be administered nationally and within communities in States participating in distracted driving enforcement demonstration project. NHTSA seeks approval to administer a national telephone (cell phone and landline) to establish a baseline and trend regarding knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors concerning distracted driving. Within States participating in NHTSA-sponsored distracted driving demonstration project, NHTSA seeks approval to administer an intercept survey to measure awareness of distracted driving campaigns.

The proposed studies will employ statistical sampling methods to collect information from the target populations and draw inferences from the sample to the target populations. The following sections describe the justification for administering a National Survey of Distracted Driving Attitudes and Behavior (NSDDAB) and a Distracted Driver Intercept Survey (DDIS).

A.1.b) Statute authorizing the collection of information

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, Title 15 United States Code 1395, Section 106 (b), gives the Secretary authorization to conduct research, testing, development, and training as authorized to be carried out by subsections of this title. The Vehicle Safety Act was subsequently re-codified under Title 49 of the U.S. Code in Chapter 301, Motor Vehicle Safety. Section 30168 of Title 49, Chapter 301, gives the Secretary authorization to conduct research, testing, development, and training to carry out this chapter (see Appendix A for full text).

A.2) Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.

⁶ NHTSA is awaiting approval for this information collection from OMB before asking our contractor, Preusser Research Group (PRG), to apply for IRB approval for the specific survey instruments. PRG will be requesting IRB approval from: New England Institutional Review Board (NEIRB), 40 Washington Street, Suite 130, Wellesley, MA 02481, Phone: 781-431-7577, Fax: 781-237-0330

The purpose of these surveys is to provide critical information needed by NHTSA to develop and demonstrate effective countermeasures that meet the Agency's mandate to improve highway traffic safety. The data collected in these surveys will be used to assist NHTSA in its ongoing responsibilities for: (a) developing an accurate assessment of the problem on a national scale; (b) reporting the effectiveness of program activities; (c) providing information to NHTSA's partners involved in improving public safety; and (d) providing sound scientific reports on NHTSA's activities to other public safety researchers.

NHTSA will grant an award to a survey firm with extensive expertise in conducting telephone and intercept surveys. Data from the national survey (NSDDAB) will establish baselines, track trends, and identify key factors associated with the prevalence of distracted driving. Data from the community-level intercept (DDIS) surveys will be used to evaluate the public's awareness and attitudes of NHTSA-sponsored enforcement and media campaigns directed at reducing distracted driving and to assess the overall effectiveness of these programs.

The findings from this proposed collection of information will assist NHTSA in addressing the problem of distracted driving and in formulating programs and recommendations. NHTSA will use the findings to help focus current programs and activities to achieve the greatest benefit, to develop new programs to decrease the likelihood of distracted driving, and to provide informational support to States, localities, and law enforcement agencies that will aid them in their efforts to reduce distracted driving crashes.

Data from the DDIS surveys will be collected immediately prior to the demonstration mobilization waves and compared to data following the mobilization waves, both in the communities where the demonstration project is taking place (Syracuse, NY and Hartford, CT) and in appropriate control communities. This will permit NHTSA to assess whether the mobilizations penetrated public awareness and correspond with any changes in perception of enforcement activity and attitudes regarding distracted driving. In the future, the results from these surveys can be compared to survey findings on demonstration projects in States using alternative enforcement models and media messages (where applicable).

The results of the analyses described above will be used by NHTSA to assess the effectiveness of the mobilizations (or other campaigns) and determine where refinements or resource adjustments are needed. Demographic data collected by the survey will pinpoint group differences in response to these and other survey questions. Results of the analyses will be applied to development of strategic initiatives and future programs aimed at reducing traffic injuries and fatalities.

Besides developing its own program and technical assistance activities, NHTSA will:

- Disseminate the information to State and local highway safety authorities, who will use it to develop, improve and target their own distracted driving enforcement programs and activities.

- Disseminate the information to citizen action groups and other organizations concerned with traffic safety issues, who will use it to develop, improve and target their own programs and activities.

In sum, the proposed surveys will provide a status report on public attitudes, knowledge, and behavior related to distracted driving issues. The data will be studied to determine appropriate emphases for future countermeasure activity. The results will also be disseminated to others for use in their research and program development activities. If these surveys were not conducted, NHTSA program efforts would lack direction due to inadequate information upon which to base program decisions; severely limiting the Agency's effectiveness in reducing injuries and fatalities.

A.3) Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical or other technological collection techniques or other information technology. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.

The national telephone survey data collection will be accomplished through the use of Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). The CATI system allows a computer to perform a number of functions prone to error when done manually by interviewers, including:

- Providing correct question sequence;
- Automatically executing skip patterns based on prior answers to questions (which decreases overall interview time and, consequently, the burden on respondents);
- Recalling answers to prior questions and displaying the information in the text of later questions;
- Providing random rotation of specified questions or response categories (to avoid bias);
- Ensuring that questions cannot be skipped; and
- Rejecting invalid responses or data entries.

The CATI system lists questions and corresponding response categories automatically on the screen, eliminating the need for interviewers to track skip patterns and flip pages. Moreover, the interviewers enter responses directly from their keyboards, and the information is automatically recorded in the computer's memory.

CATI systems typically include safeguards to reduce interviewer error in direct key entry of survey responses. CATI also allows the computer to perform a number of critical assurance routines that are monitored by survey supervisors, including tracking average interview length, refusal rate, and termination rate by interviewer; and performing consistency checks for inappropriate combination of answers.

The CATI telephone interviews reduce respondent burden by shortening the average interview length and virtually eliminating many reporting and recording errors that would

require callback. Several other forms of technology for data collection (e.g., most web surveys) suffer from inadequate population coverage and non-probability sampling procedures or low response rates with no appreciable reduction in respondent burden.

A.4) Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information, already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.

NHTSA researchers have reviewed all recent studies on distracted and unsafe driving. While a few surveys have been conducted measuring some aspects of cell phone use, none provide a comprehensive data set covering such a broad range of attitude, perception, and behavioral indices from a nationally representative sample. Without administering the NSDDAB on a periodic basis NHTSA will not be able to accurately monitor trends in the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors related to distracted driving. Moreover, upon approval of this information collection, NHTSA will coordinate with both the States and NHTSA's safety coalition partners to assure that the proposed information collection does not duplicate data collection planned by others.

With regards to the DDIS, NHTSA is requesting approval to conduct the surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of a community-level demonstration project designed to reduce distracted driving. Thus there is no possibility of duplicating information that is currently available.

A.5) If the collection of information involves small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.

The collection of information involves randomly selected individuals in their residences, on their cellular phones, or in DMV offices, not small businesses.

A.6) Describe the consequences to Federal Program or policy activities if the collection is not collected or collected less frequently.

As the national leader in traffic safety research, Congress has tasked NHTSA with providing evidence-based guidance to the States and stakeholders. Without timely information on attitudes, knowledge and behavior of the general public, particularly before and after mobilization efforts, it will be impossible to develop effective intervention strategies and adequately interpret the value of these programmatic efforts.

In evaluating demonstration project activities, the collection of information occurs at two points: one administration before implementation of a HVE mobilization wave and a second administration after the conclusion of the mobilization. Researchers conduct the collections as an independent cross-section of the target communities. Each respondent

participates in only one administration. The baseline and post-mobilization surveys are necessary to determine whether observed changes in driver attitudes and behaviors can be attributed to the program activities (as opposed to extraneous events or random chance). Without the administration of the pre- and post- surveys it would be impossible to provide evidence-based recommendations for future State and national interventions.

A.7) Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines set forth in 5 CFR 1320.6.

No special circumstances require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines in 5CFR 1320.6.

A.8) Provide a copy of the Federal Register document soliciting comments on the collection of information, a summary of all public comments responding to the notice, and a description of the agency's actions in response to the comments. Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views.

A.8.a) Federal Register Notice

A copy of the Federal Register Notice (Vol. 74, No. 152, pgs. 39991-39992) which announced NHTSA's intention to collect information is provided as Appendix B-1. The notice was published on August 10, 2009, providing 60 days for public comment.

The following comment was received on August 10, 2009, submitted by Jean Public of Florham Park, New Jersey:

“this spending of taxpayer dollars to inform the stupid people among us that they need to watch and drive carefully and not drive while textsing [sic] or cell phoning is a ludicrous waste of money catering to the absolutely retarded among us. it is clear that everybody knows it is dangerous. what AND THEY DO IT ANYHOW. WE NEED TO GET POLICEMAN SITTING ON THE SIDE OF THE ROAD GIVING OUT TICKETS. TJHE [sic] MONEY NEEDS TO BE SPENT LIKE THAT. ONCE THEY GET A TICKET FOR \$500 FINE THEY WILL LEARN THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE TO USE THEIR PHONE OR TEXT SO MUCH. THEY DO IT ANYHOW. THIS IS A STUPID SURVEY AND A REAL WASTE OF TAX DOLLARS, WHICH THIS AGENCY IS NOT WATHCING AND CAREFULLY SPENDING ON THINGS THAT MATTER. THIS IS A WASTEFUL ACTION BY THIS AGENCY.”

This data collection activity supports enforcement efforts to reduce distracted driving. Data from these surveys is needed to (a) identify groups of individuals who are more prone to drive distracted for targeted enforcement campaigns, (b) assess the effectiveness of these enforcement campaigns, and (c) support future enforcement mobilizations with scientific evidence of their effectiveness.

A copy of the Federal Register Notice (Vol. 74, No. 227, pgs. 62379-62380) announcing that NHTSA has forwarded an Information Collection Request to OMB is provided as Appendix B-2. The notice was published on November 27, 2009, providing 30 days for public comment.

A.8.b) Expert Consultation

NHTSA staff designed the survey instrument based on the key characteristics of the 2009 “Click It or Ticket” survey, the 2002 “National Survey of Distracted and Drowsy Driving Attitudes and Behaviors” and the 2007 Motor Vehicle Occupant Safety Survey (MVOSS). Prior to the survey development work, NHTSA’s program, research, communications, and regional offices provided significant input on the topics and questions to be included.

A.9) Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No payment or gifts will be offered to respondents contacted on a landline phone for their participation in this survey, as there is no direct out-of-pocket expense associated with receiving a call on a landline. To minimize out-of-pocket expenses to participants contacted on a cellular phone with pay-per-minute service plans, NHTSA will offer to call back on a landline phone and will provide a toll free number that participants may call from a landline phone.

A.10) Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents.

In the surveys’ introductions, the interviewer informs respondents that participation is voluntary, and their answers are anonymous and will be used only for statistical purposes. These surveys do not collect identifying information such as names, addresses, telephone numbers, or social security numbers. Furthermore, in the case of the national telephone survey, our contractor does not link the responses to these surveys with the telephone numbers called. Upon completion of the telephone survey it would be impossible for anyone to identify participants based on his or her responses to the questions.

The intercept survey does not collect any identifying information. Upon completion of the intercept survey it would be impossible for anyone to identify participants based on his or her responses to the questions.

A.11) Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior or attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

The survey does not contain any questions of a sensitive nature or related to matters that are commonly considered private.

A.12) Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information on the respondents.

The national telephone survey (NSDDAB) will take approximately 20 minutes to administer and will require 6,000 participants for each of the three annual administrations.

	<u>Interviews</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Years</u>	<u>Hours</u>
NSDDAB	6,000	x 20	x 3	= 6,000

The community-level intercept survey (DDIS) will require 800 participants per administration, with researchers sampling half of the participants from the target site and the other half from the control site. NHTSA plans to conduct pre- and post-mobilization administrations for each of its two demonstration projects and anticipates four mobilization waves per project.

	<u>Interviews</u>	<u>Pre & Post</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Waves</u>	<u>Projects</u>	<u>Hours</u>
DDIS	800	x 2	x 10	x 4	x 2	= 2,133

In sum, NHTSA proposes to interview up to 30,800 participants over three years (10,267 participants per year) and estimates a burden of 8,133 total hours over three years (2,711 hours per year).

The maximum total input cost over three years, if all respondents were interviewed on the job, is estimated as follows:

$$\$15.57 \text{ per hour}^7 \quad \times \quad 8,133 \text{ interviewing hours} \quad = \quad \$126,631$$

⁷ From Bureau of Labor and Statistics' median hourly wage (all occupations) in the May 2008 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates, Updated May 2009

A.13) Provide an estimate of the total annual cost to the respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information.

There are no record keeping or reporting costs to respondents. Respondents will be contacted randomly, and asked for their attitudes, knowledge, and behavior regarding specific occupant protection topics. All responses are provided spontaneously. Each respondent only participates once in the data collection. Thus there is no preparation of data required or expected of respondents. Respondents do not incur: (a) capital and start up costs, or (b) operation, maintenance, and purchase costs as a result of participating in the survey.

A.14) Provide estimates of the annualized cost to the Federal Government.

Based on the 2009 Click It or Ticket surveys, the estimated cost per participant, with adjustment for inflation, is:

- Landline phone survey: \$25 per participant
- Cellular phone survey: \$30 per participant
- DMV intercept survey: \$6 per participant

Details regarding the sampling requirements are outlined in section B.1. Annual costs for the national (NSDDAB) and community-level (DDIS) surveys are as follows:

NSDDAB	<u>Landline</u> 4440 (74%) @ \$25	<u>Cell Phone</u> 1560 (26%) @ \$30	<u>DMV</u> -	<u>Annual Cost</u> \$157,800
DDIS	-	-	<u>DMV</u> 6400 @ \$6	<u>Annual Cost</u> \$38,400

The total estimated annual cost to the Federal Government is **\$196,200**.

A.15) Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-I.

The reason for the program change is this is a new survey which will increase NHTSA's overall burden hour total by 8,133 hours over three years or 2,711hours annually.

A.16) For collection of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication.

NHTSA expects to receive an interim report from the evaluation contractor in December, 2010, which will cover the first two data collection periods and analyses and a final report in December 2011. The final report will cover all four data collection periods (April, July, and October 2010, and March 2011) and will be published upon receipt and completion of agency review, likely in March, 2012.

Below is a schematic for the entire data collection. The Interventions are scheduled quarterly to provide repeated and consistent exposure to high visibility enforcement. The data collection is being scheduled immediately before and after the interventions.

Draft High Visibility Enforcement Schedule

		March/April 2010							May 2010												
		S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S						
Earned Media		28	29	30	31	1	2	3							1						
Paid Media		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8						
Enforcement		11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15						
DMV Surveys and Cell Phone Observ.		18	19	20	21	22	23	24	16	17	18	19	20	21	22						
		25	26	27	28	29	30														
June 30		July 2010							August 2010												
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
		1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
27	28	29	30	31	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	29	30	31							
September 2010							October 2010							November 2010							
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
			1	2	3	4					1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
26	27	28	29	30	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	29	30	31							
February 2011							March 2011							April 2011							
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
			1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	4	5					1	2
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
27	28	27	28	29	30	31	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	

A.17) If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

Approval is not sought to not display the expiration date for OMB approval.

A.18) Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, “Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions” of the OMB Form 83-I.

No exceptions to the certification are made.

