

**Evaluation of Impaired Riding Interventions  
Supporting Statement for Information Collection Request**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

**A. JUSTIFICATION**

1.	Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.....	1
2.	Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used .....	3
3.	Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.....	5
4.	Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used.....	5
5.	If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe methods used to minimize burden.....	5
6.	Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.....	6
7.	Explain any special circumstances that would cause the information collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines set forth in 5 CFR 1320.6.....	6
8.	Provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency’s notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8 (d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views.....	6
9.	Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.....	7
10.	Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents.....	8
11.	Provide additional justification for questions of a sensitive nature.....	8
12.	Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information on the	

respondents.....	8
13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information.....	9
14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.....	10
15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB Form 83-1.....	10
16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation, and publication.....	10
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.....	11
18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions,” of OMB Form 83-1.....	11

## **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 an information collection to evaluate the effectiveness of high-visibility enforcement (HVE) demonstration programs in deterring alcohol-impaired motorcycle riding.

NHTSA must account for whether its initiatives were effective. An essential part of this evaluation effort is to examine measures of attitudes, intervention awareness, and (relevant) self-reported behavior to determine if the interventions were associated with changes on those indices.

The HVE demonstration programs will occur during the summer of 2012 in conjunction with motorcycle events that draw a large number of motorcycle riders to an area and that typically feature drinking by attendees. During the campaigns, law enforcement officers will conduct heightened enforcement of impaired driving in the form of saturation patrols, roving patrols, and sobriety checkpoints on roads leading to the motorcycle events. Media will publicize the increased enforcement of impaired motorcycle riding. This media will include radio advertisements with the tagline "Ride Sober or Get Pulled Over" and advertisements on the internet via sites such as Facebook and Google aimed at motorcycle riders living near the intervention sites, and may also include advertisements on the websites for the events and on local motorcycling websites, print media displayed in publications read by and at locations frequented by event attendees, news stories, and variable message boards on the roads with increased enforcement activity.

NHTSA is requesting approval to conduct intercept surveys at the motorcycle events at which HVE efforts are directed (e.g., motorcycle rallies, and bars and restaurants that conduct weekly bike nights), in a total of four planned intervention sites (two sites in Indiana and two sites in Pennsylvania) and three planned comparison sites before, during, and after impaired riding demonstration programs, for the purpose of evaluating the demonstration programs. NHTSA will administer short in-person interviews to motorcycle riders at these events in the intervention and comparison locations.

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. 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.

Motorcycle crashes and fatalities have become a rapidly escalating traffic safety problem on our Nation's roads. Motorcycle fatalities in the US decreased in 2009 for the first time after steadily increasing for 11 years; however, even with this decline, the number of motorcycle fatalities in 2009 was nearly double that from a decade earlier (NHTSA, 2009, 2010). Alcohol impairment is a factor that contributes to a substantial proportion of fatal motorcycle crashes. In 2009, 30% of fatally injured motorcycle riders had a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) at or above .08 g/dL, which is *per se* evidence of impaired riding in all States. Forty-two percent of riders who died in single-vehicle crashes in 2009, and 63% of riders who died in single-vehicle crashes on weekend nights, had a BAC of .08 g/dL or higher (NHTSA, 2012). NHTSA's National Roadside Survey found in 2007 that 5.6% of motorcycle riders on weekend nights had a BAC of .08 g/dL or above, as compared to 2.3% of passenger vehicle drivers (Lacey et al., 2009).

High visibility enforcement (HVE), in which media is paired with increased enforcement efforts in order to heighten the public's awareness that traffic laws are being enforced, has been used successfully as a means to deter impaired driving. Past impaired driving HVE campaigns, such as those in Clearwater and Largo, FL in the 1980's (Lacey, Marchetti, Stewart, Murphy, & Jones, 1990) and in Tennessee in the 1990's (Lacey, Jones, & Smith, 1999), have been effective in decreasing alcohol-related crashes. Although HVE of impaired driving would ideally be sustained year-round, in practice law enforcement agencies may deploy impaired driving HVE in a small number of waves that occur each year. This approach is used in NHTSA's impaired driving crackdowns, which consist of two-week waves of impaired driving HVE that occur near Labor Day and Christmas/New Years.

Media spots directed towards motorcycle riders are included in NHTSA's summer National Impaired Driving Crackdown and in some States' impaired driving media materials. However, there has been little documented effort to combine impaired riding media campaigns with dedicated enforcement of impaired riding, by law enforcement trained to recognize impaired riding cues, in locations that are frequented by motorcycle riders. To address the issue of alcohol-impaired riding, NHTSA is sponsoring an impaired riding crackdown demonstration project in which the HVE model will be applied to alcohol-impaired motorcycle riding. Media messages will be developed for an audience of motorcycle riders with the tagline "Ride Sober or Get Pulled Over." These messages will be deployed in areas in which motorcycle events such as bike nights and rallies bring high motorcycle ridership, and will be coupled with increased enforcement of impaired driving laws for all vehicles in the intervention areas. The HVE demonstration programs will occur during the summer of 2012.

NHTSA seeks approval to administer intercept surveys using in-person interviews to help evaluate the mobilizations within the locations participating in the NHTSA-sponsored impaired riding crackdown demonstration project. The interview questions will be designed to determine if the interventions are penetrating the awareness of the target audience, if they are influencing

motorcycle riders' attitudes and perceptions, and if they are associated with changes in relevant (self-reported) behavior. Combined with other measures (e.g., crashes, alcohol-impaired riding arrests), they will enable NHTSA to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions.

***b. Statute authorizing the collection of information***

Title 23, United States Code, Chapter 4, Section 403 (attached as Attachment A) gives the Secretary authorization to use funds appropriated to carry out this section to conduct research on all phases of highway safety and traffic conditions; conduct ongoing research into driver behavior and its effect on traffic safety; conduct research on, and evaluate the effectiveness of, traffic safety countermeasures, including seat belts and impaired driving initiatives; and conduct research, training, and programs relating to motorcycle safety, including impaired driving (See 23 U.S.C. 403(a)(1), 23 U.S.C. 403 (a)(2), 23 U.S.C. 403 (a)(5), and 23 U.S.C. 403 (a)(9)).

**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.**

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

Data from the intercept surveys will be used to evaluate motorcycle riders' awareness of, attitudes towards, and self-reported behaviors in response to NHTSA-sponsored enforcement and media campaigns directed at reducing alcohol-impaired motorcycle riding and to assess the overall effectiveness of these programs.

NHTSA and evaluation contractor Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) plan to evaluate the campaign efforts in four sites: two sites in Indiana, and two sites in Pennsylvania. We plan to evaluate efforts in one site in each State that will conduct its campaign in conjunction with local bike nights, which are gatherings of motorcycle riders that occur weekly throughout the motorcycle riding season at bars and restaurants. We additionally plan to evaluate efforts at a second site in each State that will conduct its campaign in conjunction with a one-time motorcycle rally, which is a large multi-day gathering of motorcycle enthusiasts. Sites with bike nights will conduct one wave of campaign activity during the summer of 2012. Sites with motorcycle rallies will conduct one wave of activity during the event, also during the summer of 2012. Each wave of enforcement activity for bike nights will occur over a one-week period (i.e., during several consecutive evenings on which there are bike nights during one week), and enforcement activity for motorcycle rallies will occur on days riders are traveling to the event and during the event itself. Media publicizing the enforcement will occur one to two weeks before the events and during the events.

We plan to conduct intercept surveys at bike nights before and after the two waves of activity, for a total of two surveys per site (Pre and Post). Intercept surveys are planned at rallies during the events themselves, and thus one survey will be conducted at each rally. Intercept surveys will additionally be collected at appropriate comparison bike nights and rallies that will not receive an intervention. For bike night sites, pretest measures will be compared to posttest measures to examine if attitudes, awareness, and self-reported behaviors of motorcycle riders that attend bike nights change from before the campaign to after the campaign.

For rally sites, attitudes, awareness, and self-reported behaviors of motorcycle riders attending the rallies will be compared to those attending a comparison rally that did not receive an intervention. In these cases, we will not be measuring the change in behavior, awareness, and perception before and after the event, but rather will be comparing a snapshot of riders at a site that did experience an intervention to a snapshot of riders at a site that did not. The table below illustrates the planned schedule of data collection at bike night sites, rally sites, and their corresponding comparison sites.

<b>Planned Schedule of Data Collection</b>		
<i>Bike Nights</i>		
	<b>Wave</b>	
IN Bike Nights (Intervention)	Pre	Post
PA Bike Nights (Intervention)	Pre	Post
Bike Nights Comparison	Pre	Post
<i>Rallies</i>		
	<b>Wave</b>	
IN Motorcycle Rally (Intervention)		During Event
Motorcycle Rally Comparison #1		During Event
PA Motorcycle Rally (Intervention)		During Event
Motorcycle Rally Comparison #2		During Event

The results of the analyses described above will be used by NHTSA to assess the effectiveness of the mobilizations 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.

The findings from this proposed collection of information will assist NHTSA in addressing the problem of alcohol-impaired motorcycle riding 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 alcohol-impaired motorcycle riding, and to provide informational support to States, localities, and law enforcement agencies that will aid them in their efforts to reduce alcohol-impaired riding crashes.

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 alcohol-impaired riding 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.

NHTSA reports are available to the general public on our web site. Many of NHTSA's reports are accompanied by a press release. In these cases, the press reports our results to the general public.

We will not attempt to characterize the larger population of American motorcycle riders from these results. Resulting publications will include a caveat that data were collected from a convenience sample of volunteers, at specific events in specific locations, and that the results cannot be generalized to the population of American motorcycle riders. We plan instead to use the findings to describe a snapshot of attitudes, awareness, and self-reported behaviors from the sample of motorcycle riders who attend the specific events at which the high visibility enforcement campaigns will be directed.

**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 considerations of using information technology to reduce burden.**

This collection of information does not involve the use of technological collection techniques. NHTSA believes that simple pen and paper forms for data collectors are cost effective (because of not having to purchase the equipment to collect the data electronically), and provide a less formal and more comfortable environment for the interviewed motorcycle riders. While the data collectors will not use electronic devices such as Personal Data Assistants, the collected data will be entered into an electronic database and NHTSA will receive 100 percent of the results of the data collection in electronic files.

**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 is requesting approval to conduct surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of a specific demonstration project designed to reduce alcohol-impaired motorcycle riding. Because no data on this program exists until it is collected, no other data source can be substituted. 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 individuals (motorcycle riders), not small businesses. Potential survey sites (e.g., bars, restaurants, motorcycle rallies) will be contacted in advance to

see if they would be willing to voluntarily grant permission to conduct the survey at their establishment. Businesses will be fully informed as to the nature of the survey operations, as well as the amount of time required for the data collection activities. However, business is not the target of the survey.

**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 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.

For interventions that will take place in conjunction with regularly-occurring bike nights the collection of information will occur at two points: one administration before implementation of the HVE campaign, and a second administration at the conclusion of the campaign. Researchers conduct the collections as an independent cross-section of motorcycle riders in the target locations. Each respondent participates in one administration. The baseline and post-campaign surveys are necessary to determine whether observed changes in rider attitudes and behaviors can be attributed to the program activities (as opposed to extraneous events or random chance).

**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.**

There are no special circumstances that would cause this collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

**A.8. Provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8 (d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views.**

***a. Federal Register Notice***

NHTSA published a notice in the *Federal Register* with a 60-day public comment period to announce this proposed information collection on April 15, 2011, Volume 76, Number 73, pages 21422-21423.

NHTSA published a notice in the *Federal Register* with a 30-day public comment period to announce forwarding of the information collection request to OMB for approval on September 9, 2011, Volume 76, Number 175, page 56003.

***b. Responses to the Federal Register Notice***



No comments were submitted to Docket Number NHTSA-2011-0046 in response to the 60 Day Federal Register Notice.

***c. Consultation with experts***

National experts at NHTSA, PIRE, and Dunlap and Associates collaborated on and agreed to the survey instrument content and interview procedures. PIRE, the contractor hired by NHTSA to conduct the intercept interviews, and Dunlap and Associates, PIRE's subcontractor, are national leaders in the field of impaired driving with more than 30 years of experience in impaired driving research. Both of these firms have extensive experience with evaluating HVE interventions.

The mobilization survey instruments were designed based on the key characteristics of the "Click It or Ticket" and the National alcohol crackdown mobilization surveys. Prior to the survey development work, NHTSA's program and research offices provided significant input on the topics and questions to be included.

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

Respondents will be provided with a small incentive for their participation worth approximately \$10. When possible, the incentive will be a gift card or gift certificate to the bar where the survey will occur, or to a vendor at the motorcycle rally where the survey will occur. We will ensure that we will only distribute gift certificates that cannot be used to purchase alcohol (e.g., gift certificate good for food only if for a restaurant).

The purposes of the incentive are twofold. The first purpose of the incentive is to increase the response rate by giving potential respondents an enticement to leave the social activity in which they are participating to take part in the survey. Because we are conducting surveys at locations where motorcycle riders congregate to enjoy themselves, such as bars and motorcycle rallies, we believe that potential respondents may need a greater incentive to draw themselves away from social activities and participate than they might if the surveys were conducted in a different, less social environment. The value of the incentive we propose is analogous to those used to bolster response rates in other similar intercept interview surveys conducted at social venues. For example, previous surveys lasting 5-15 minutes that interviewed individuals who were attending or traveling to events such as bars, dance clubs, and festivals have offered incentives worth \$5-\$25 for participation (Gripenberg-Abdon et al., 2012; Johnson & Clapp, 2011; Kelley-Baker, Mumford, Vishnuvajjala, Voas, & Romano, 2008; Ramchand, Becker, Ruder, & Fisher, 2011; Voas et al., 2006).

The second purpose of the incentive is to persuade businesses to allow us to conduct surveys within their establishments by purchasing and distributing gift certificates to their establishments. Other studies that have sought to gain access to bars to conduct research have paid the bars up to \$500 for permission to work inside their premises (Clapp et al., 2007). By using gift certificates from the establishments as incentives to participate, we can fulfill dual purposes recruiting establishments at which to survey and recruiting individual respondents, without an additional cost.

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

In the survey's introduction, respondents will be informed that participation is voluntary and that their answers are anonymous. These surveys do not collect identifying information such as names, addresses, telephone numbers, or social security numbers. Upon completion of these surveys, it would be impossible for anyone to be identified based on his or her responses to our 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.**

We acknowledge that collecting information on drinking alcohol and riding is a sensitive issue. However, this information is important to collect in order for NHTSA to determine the success of our programs. In addition, riding motorcycles on roads and drinking in bars and restaurants are often seen as public activities. The questions are not probing. Instead, they request basic information on behavior and are geared more towards attitudes, perceptions and awareness of our mobilizations. Given the perceived sensitive nature of this information, our questions are phrased in a neutral/ nonjudgmental fashion.

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

The intercept survey will require up to 500 participants per administration. NHTSA and PIRE plan to conduct two survey administrations at one intervention site in each State where HVE activities will occur in conjunction with recurring bike nights, and in one additional comparison sites that also has recurring bike nights but that will not experience interventions. In these three planned sites (IN bike night intervention site, PA bike night intervention site, one comparison bike night site), we plan to conduct intercept surveys before the intervention and after the second wave of HVE activity (Pre, Post 1).

NHTSA and PIRE additionally plan to conduct one survey administration during a one-time motorcycle rally in each State, and in two additional comparison sites that also have one-time motorcycle rallies but that will not experience interventions.

Each interview will take approximately 5-10 minutes to administer. We estimate 8 minutes as the average burden per survey. The following tables report the burden hours that would be required for the anticipated number of survey administrations.

<b>Sample Size, Broken Down By Planned Site</b>			
<i>Pilot Testing</i>			
			40
<i>Bike Nights</i>			
	<b>Wave</b>		
	Pre	Post 1	<b>Total</b>
IN Bike Nights (Intervention)	500	500	1,000
PA Bike Nights (Intervention)	500	500	1,000
Bike Nights Comparison	500	500	1,000
<i>Rallies</i>			
		<b>During Event</b>	
IN Motorcycle Rally (Intervention)		500	500
Motorcycle Rally Comparison #1		500	500
PA Motorcycle Rally (Intervention)		500	500
Motorcycle Rally Comparison #2		500	500
<b>Total</b>			<b>5,040</b>

<b>Total Burden</b>			
	<b>Annual Sample</b>	<b>Minutes</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>
Total	5,040	x 8	672

In sum, NHTSA proposes to interview up to 5,040 participants in one year and estimates an annual burden of 672 hours.

Based on median per capita income, the maximum total input cost, if all respondents were interviewed on the job, is estimated as follows:

$$\$21.35 \text{ per hour}^1 \quad \times \quad 672 \text{ interviewing hours} \quad = \quad \$14,347.20$$

**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. 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

<sup>1</sup> US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (2011). May 2010 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates. [http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes\\_nat.htm](http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm)

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**

The cost to the Federal Government for the contract to conduct the evaluation will be \$946,541 over 30 months. Approximately 70% of the contract cost will be allocated to the survey for planning, data collection, data tabulation, data analysis, and report preparation.

Thus, the estimated total cost of the survey is \$662,579 (70% of \$946,541) over 30 months, or \$265,032 annually.

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

This is a new collection to evaluate a new impaired motorcycle riding demonstration project that NHTSA has not previously conducted, which results in a program change of an increase to NHTSA's overall burden hour by 672 hours. The impaired motorcycle riding demonstration project is being conducted in response to the large increase in motorcycle rider fatalities that has occurred in the United States over the past 15 years. Alcohol impairment is a factor that contributes to a substantial number of fatal motorcycle crashes.

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

The final report for this evaluation project will contain a detailed summary of findings, a description of the data analysis, and a complete set of data presentations. Frequencies will be computed for each of the questions in the surveys. Pre-intervention and post-intervention measures taken at sites with recurring bike nights, as well as measures taken at one-time rallies in intervention sites and measures taken at one-time rallies in comparison sites, will be compared to ascertain differences. The results of these analyses will be included in the final report.

The final report will be distributed to traffic safety officials at the national, State and local levels, as well as other interested persons. In addition, findings will be disseminated through briefings and presentations to traffic safety officials and other interested parties.

We will not attempt to characterize the larger population of American motorcycle riders from these results. Resulting publications will include a caveat that data were collected from a convenience sample of volunteers, at specific events in specific locations, and that the results cannot be generalized to the population of American motorcycle riders. We plan instead to use the findings to describe a snapshot of attitudes, awareness, and self-reported behaviors from the sample of motorcycle riders who attend the specific events at which the high visibility enforcement campaigns will be directed.

**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.**

NHTSA will 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 statement are made.