

**Matching Countermeasures to Driver Types and Speeding Behavior
Supporting Statement for Information Collection Request**

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Part A.

JUSTIFICATION

Table of Contents

A. Justification – Brief Description of Study.....1

A.1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.....2

 A1.1 Circumstances making the collection necessary.....2

 A1.2 Statute authorizing the collection of information.....3

A.2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used.....3

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.....4

A.4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.....5

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

A.6. Describe the consequences to Federal Program or policy activities if the collection is not collected or collected less frequently.....5

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.....6

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.....6

A.9. Explain any decisions to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.....7

A.10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents.....7

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..8

A.12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information on the respondents. 8

A.13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost to the respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information.....9

A.14. Provide estimates of the annualized cost to the Federal Government.....9

A.15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-I.....9

A.16. For collection of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication.....10

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.....10

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.....10

References.....11

Approval is requested to conduct the study entitled: Matching Countermeasures to Driver Types and Speeding Behaviors.

A. JUSTIFICATION - BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

In this study, NHTSA will be conducting a survey of a random sample of licensed drivers in the State of Idaho, stratified by age, gender and number of speeding convictions, in order to further explore typologies of driver speeding types developed in our recent *Motivations for Speeding* project and our *2011 National Survey of Speeding Attitudes and Behavior* with a focus on finding appropriate countermeasures for various speeder types. This project will collect information on the attitudes and experiences of the drivers surveyed with regard to speeding countermeasures as well as actual driving records and match countermeasures with driver types.

One objective of this project is to further examine the driver speeding typologies from the two previous studies. Each of the typologies provides a different way of defining speeder types. The four speeder types from the *Motivations for Speeding* project are based on the actual driving behaviors of a small sample of volunteer drivers. The three speeder types from the 2011 national phone survey are based on self-reports from a nationally representative sample of drivers. This project will compare these two ways of defining types of drivers with regard to their speeding behavior using driver records and the results of a mail survey of a representative sample of fully-licensed drivers and examine the utility of each way of defining types of speeders.

A second objective of this project is the exploration of appropriate speeding countermeasures for various driver speeding types and roadways. This includes examining various countermeasures applied to speeding, such as traditional law enforcement, in-vehicle technologies, and driver education. This project will collect information on the attitudes and experiences of the drivers surveyed with regard to speeding countermeasures and match countermeasures with driver types from the two speeding typologies. Based on the analysis of this matching, recommendations for the most appropriate speeding countermeasures for various driver types will be produced.

The third objective of this project is to match actual driver records with individual survey responses in order to compare patterns of actual driving violations with speeding types and other responses, and to validate self-report information found in the survey. The driver records data will also be used to conduct a non-response bias analysis for the survey.

Specific questions that will be addressed in this research study include:

1. How do the speeding types that emerge from national surveys vs. actual driving behaviors compare to one another in terms of predicting speeding?
2. What speeding countermeasures are most appropriate for the various driver types and roadway situations?
3. How strong is the relationship between driver records and self-report survey reports, and can the relationship be used to design targeted countermeasure approaches for future evaluation?

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.

A1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES MAKING THE COLLECTION NECESSARY

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 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.

Speeding is one of the most significant contributors to traffic fatalities. For over a decade, there has been little change in the proportion of speed-related fatal crashes. Speeding is also common behavior and most drivers exceed the speed limit at some point. In the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) *2011 National Survey of Speeding Attitudes and Behaviors* (NSSAB , 2013, report forthcoming), when asked how often they drove 10 or 15 miles per hour over the posted speed limit, over half of the respondents (52%) reported having driven 15 mph over the speed limit on multi-lane divided highways, over one-third (36%) reported having driven 15 mph over the posted speed limit on two-lane roads, and 36% also reported having driven 10 mph over the posted limit on neighborhood or residential streets. Nine percent of those surveyed reported having been stopped by the police for speeding in the previous year, and eight percent reported receiving a speeding ticket through the mail for a violation recorded by a speed camera (NSSAB). Given the widespread occurrence of speeding and the high toll in injuries and lives lost in speeding-related crashes (9,944 fatalities in 2011), as well as the high economic costs of speed-related crashes—estimated at \$40.4 billion per year (National Center for Statistics and Analysis, 2011)—this is a safety issue that demands a great deal of attention.

So far, attempts to address this problem through a variety of approaches have not led to a significant reduction in speed-related fatalities (NHTSA, 2005). In 2011, nearly one-third (30%) of all fatal crashes had speeding as a contributing factor (NHTSA, 2013) the same percentage as in 1996 (NHTSA, 2005). Speeding countermeasures have been associated with uncertain or limited success. NHTSA's (Goodwin, et al., 2013) report, *Countermeasures That Work*, provides a list of speeding countermeasures that have been demonstrated to be effective; however, most of these are one-dimensional in the sense that they focus on enforcement/punishment to reduce speeding. A significant limitation with these types of countermeasures is that they do not seem to be as effective with some driver groups, such as risk-taking young males, because these drivers rarely consider the potential consequences of their behaviors (e.g., McKenna & Horswill, 2006). Similarly, National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500 provides several engineering-based countermeasures to address speeding (NCHRP, 2005). While these countermeasures can be effective in reducing speeding at specific locations, the problem is that they can be expensive and only cover small parts of the transportation network. They are also inefficient because other non-speeding drivers are impacted by the countermeasures as well.

NHTSA's *Motivations for Speeding* project (Richard et al., 2012) collected actual driving speeds by road type and posted speed limit for a sample of volunteer drivers (n=164) tracked over several weeks. Some of these drivers also participated in focus groups after the on-road data collection. The analyses of the driving data identified four basic speeding types (incidental speeding, regular speeding but in small amounts per trip, occasional speeding but in large amounts for these trips, and habitual speeding). The project also found that speeding patterns varied across different roadway types and, in some speed limit ranges, were significantly associated with certain factors, such as their interpretation of the meaning of speed limits, which were revealed during the focus groups.

NHTSA's 2011 NSSAB collected a wide range of speeding related information, including self-report driving behavior and attitudes on public acceptability of various countermeasures. This recent national telephone survey provides additional insights into patterns of speeding behavior. Cluster analyses of the national survey data indicated that 86% of all respondents in the survey fell into one of three distinct types of driving behavior based on six core questions on their driving tendencies per passing other vehicles and matching the flow of traffic, their average speeds on different types of roads, and how often they had been stopped for speeding. Of those respondents classified in the cluster analyses, 30% of the drivers reported they rarely speed, 40% of the drivers reported they sometimes speed, and 30% of the drivers reported they regularly speed. For these survey respondents, concerns over the danger of speeding and attitudes towards various countermeasures clearly varied by speeder type.

Speeding related crashes continue to be a serious problem. For over a decade, there has been little change in the proportion of speed-related fatal crashes. Recent NHTSA sponsored research, cited above, is providing important new insights into speeding behavior as it reveals some of the complexity of this pervasive and multi-faceted traffic safety problem. Given this complexity, it is evident that different countermeasures may be better suited to address different speeding types/patterns. The data collected in this study will help us better understand the types of speeding that occur and assist in the development of more targeted countermeasures that address the various types of speeding.

A1.2 STATUTE AUTHORIZING THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION

NHTSA has statutory authority to conduct crash injury research and collect relevant data in the interest of public health. Specifically, NHTSA is authorized to conduct research on all phases of highway safety and traffic conditions; conduct ongoing research into driver behavior and its effect on traffic safety; and conduct research, training, and programs relating to traffic safety (See 23 U.S.C. 403(a)(1), 23 U.S.C. 403 (a)(2), 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 data from this study will provide NHTSA with information that will guide the development of new behavioral and vehicle-based countermeasures targeted to specific speeder types in order

to reduce speeding-related crashes and improve overall traffic safety. Data collected from questionnaires will be used primarily to (1) compare the two driver speeding typologies developed in the two previous research projects and examine their utility in identifying speeders and (2) identify the most appropriate speeding countermeasures for the various speeder types. For example, if a certain speeder type indicates being more receptive to a specific type of countermeasure, the countermeasure could be tailored to better target that speeder type's typical speeding behavior, or if a specific speeder type is over-represented in a specific demographic, targeted messaging campaigns could then be developed to address that audience demographic.

NHTSA will disseminate the information collected to State and local highway safety authorities, who will use it to develop, improve and target their own speed management safety countermeasures. NHTSA will also disseminate the information to other organizations and partners concerned with speed management and 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.

Resulting publications will include a caveat that data were collected from a random sample within the State of Idaho, and that the results cannot be generalized to the population of American drivers. We will not attempt to characterize American drivers with the results. We will instead use the findings as a foundation from which to generate ideas for the development of new behavioral- and vehicle-based countermeasures for traffic safety related to speed management.

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.

The survey of drivers is using an address-based sampling procedure based on driver records from the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). Therefore, survey contacts will have to be made through the mail from the DMV. The study will be conducted using a mixed-mode survey with respondents having the option of taking the survey as a paper-and-pencil survey to be mailed back in or of taking the survey electronically through an on-line Web-based survey instrument. Driver records collected for the study will be done electronically working with personnel at the ITD.

Note – the ITD will be the only entity with any Personally Identifiable Information (PII) throughout this study. Completed questionnaires will be returned to the research team. The research team will use a study specific unique case number to match de-identified driver records to anonymous survey responses. All reporting of findings will be done in the aggregate.

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.

Our two previous speeding studies, described in sections A and A1, provided two different ways to classify speeder types. It is important that we explore these driver typologies further in order to compare the utility of each typology in identifying speeders and matching appropriate countermeasures to various driver speeding types. Each of the previous studies had certain limitations. The *Motivations for Speeding* study provided unique information based on naturalistic driving data and focus groups; however, this was a relatively small sample (n=164) of volunteer drivers. The 2011 NSSAB phone survey was a representative national sample of drivers that provided important information on driver speeding and countermeasures; however, this was a self-report survey with the usual limitations that may occur in any self-report survey. The information collected in this study will be unique in that (1) it will collect data on both speeder typologies in a manner that allows the typologies to be compared and a more comprehensive speeder typology developed, (2) the newly refined speeder typology will match appropriate countermeasures to various speeder types, and (3) we will collect actual driver records data that will allow us to link additional driver history information to the survey data and examine the validity of specific survey responses with regard to self-report driving history and actual driving history. To date, we do not have data that allows us to do this. We believe this information collection will help us make a major step forward in our research on speeding and our efforts to improve speed management efforts and reduce speeding-related crashes.

A.5. IF THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION INVOLVES SMALL BUSINESSES OR OTHER SMALL ENTITIES, DESCRIBE THE METHODS USED TO MINIMIZE BURDEN.

Survey information for this study will only be collected from individuals. There is no burden on small businesses for this information. Driver records data will be collected from the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD), a State government agency, and they will be compensated for their time and efforts.

A.6. DESCRIBE THE CONSEQUENCES TO FEDERAL PROGRAM OR POLICY ACTIVITIES IF THE COLLECTION IS NOT COLLECTED OR COLLECTED LESS FREQUENTLY.

Speeding-related crashes have been a particularly difficult traffic safety problem to address. While significant strides have been made over the last decade or so in reducing alcohol-related crashes and increasing the use of seat belts, little progress has been made in reducing speeding and speeding-related crashes. To help address this problem, NHTSA is about to publish its new *Speed Management Strategic Initiative*, a five-year strategic plan aimed at reducing speeding and speeding-related crashes. A major part of this new strategic initiative is a research agenda that includes this study and the further development of driver speeder typologies and matching appropriate countermeasures to these speeder types.

Research shows that most people speed at least some of the time while driving. We are only just beginning to understand the complexity of the speeding issue; it is now evident that there are many types of speeders that speed for different reasons and in different situations. NHTSA considers this study to be an important next step in increasing our knowledge on speeding, a step that will provide crucial information that will help us better apply our recent knowledge gains to practical countermeasures to reduce the various types of speeding that occur, thus reducing speeding-related crashes and improving overall traffic safety.

The survey information collection that will accompany the data collected from the IDT driver records will inform NHTSA as to how demographic characteristics, driving beliefs and attitudes, and other factors correlate with actual driving histories. NHTSA needs this information to design behavior-based countermeasures that are effective at reducing speeding-related crashes, which can be tailored towards individual differences that may be correlated with various types of speeding and other unsafe behaviors. The number of injuries and fatalities due to speeding-related crashes will continue if more effective countermeasures cannot be identified.

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 May 8, 2013 Volume 78, Number 89, pages 26848-26849.

NHTSA published a notice in the *Federal Register* on September 5, 2013 (Volume 78, Number 172, pages 54724-54725) with a 30-day public comment period to announce forwarding of the information collection request to OMB for approval.

b. *Responses to the Federal Register Notice*

There were no comments submitted to Docket Number NHTSA-2013-0051 in response to the 60 Day Federal Register Notice; however, there was a question with follow-up from the public sent

via email directly to the NHTSA COTR for this project. This email exchange is attached to this package as NHTSA-2013-0051-1. Below is a summary of the email exchange and NHTSA's response.

Comment 1: NHTSA exchanged emails with Betsy Aldridge, PACCAR Technical Library, 12479 Farm to Market Rd., Mount Vernon, WA. 98273.

On 5/8/13, Ms. Aldridge emailed asking about the drivers and types of vehicles being included in the survey, specifically, asking if the survey "included only passenger car drivers."

On 5/8/13, Dr. Atkins responded, "We will include all licensed drivers regardless of the type of vehicle they drive."

On 5/8/13, Ms. Aldridge sent a follow-up email asking, "So does that include those with CDLs, so medium and heavy truck drivers?"

On 5/13/13, Dr. Atkins responded, "We will ask respondents if they drive apart of their job, but we will only collect driving information on licensed drivers' personal driving in their own vehicles. We are not collecting information on commercial driving in this survey."

On 5/13/13, Ms. Aldridge responded, "Ok – thank you for that clarification."

NHTSA Response 1: In response to this exchange with Ms. Aldridge, NHTSA and the research team revised the questionnaire. The revision includes a question about whether or not respondents drive as a part of their job (not including commuting to and from work) and then provides directions to respondents specifically directing them that for the remainder of the questionnaire they should only give responses based on their personal driving.

A.9. EXPLAIN ANY DECISIONS TO PROVIDE ANY PAYMENT OR GIFT TO RESPONDENTS, OTHER THAN REMUNERATION OF CONTRACTORS OR GRANTEEES.

Survey response rates have been steadily decreasing across the various modes of survey administration. (Singer, 2006) Recent research (Messer & Dillman, 2011) has shown that, in addition to providing multiple options for completing a questionnaire, financial incentives can greatly improve response rates. Gifts or financial remunerations have become commonplace in survey research to ensure higher response rates. For this study, respondents will be provided with \$5 to compensate them for their time and the effort they give to the study in order to increase response rates for the study. This amount is similar to remunerations in other survey research projects.

A.10. DESCRIBE ANY ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PROVIDED TO RESPONDENTS.

An Informed Consent Document will be provided to each participant with the questionnaire. It will be on the second page of the questionnaire, immediately following the cover page to the questionnaire, and prior to any questions that are asked. The Consent Document states that:

“Battelle (NHTSA’s contractor for this project) and NHTSA will have access to the survey data, but Battelle and NHTSA will **never** have access to your name, address or any other information that personally identifies you. The State of Idaho is mailing out the survey questionnaires, but they will **never** have access to your survey data. “

“Your responses will be treated in a **secure and confidential** manner.”

A draft of the Informed Consent Document, which has already been approved by the contractor’s (Battelle) Institutional Review Board (IRB) and NHTSA’s attorneys, is provided in Appendix A. It can also be found within the questionnaire which is provided in Appendix C.

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 questionnaire asks questions about driving behavior with a focus on speeding behavior. This is a major traffic safety concern and the focus of this study. There is also one question about talking on the phone while driving and one question about driving after drinking, both of which are contributing factors in speeding-related crashes. There is also one question about the use of seat belts, which is related to speeding-related fatal crashes. The survey data collection does not contain additional questions related to matters that are commonly considered sensitive or private. The survey is anonymous, so there is no risk of repercussion for respondents who report engaging in any risky driving behaviors.

A.12. PROVIDE ESTIMATES OF THE HOUR BURDEN OF THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION ON THE RESPONDENTS.

Participants will be asked to complete a single questionnaire using either a paper-and-pencil mailed questionnaire or an on-line Web-based questionnaire, depending on the respondent’s choice of mode.

The questionnaire will take an average of 20-25 minutes to complete, resulting in a burden of 822.5 hours for the 1067 participants (1974 respondents x 25 minutes = 49,350 minutes or 822.5 hours).

Based on the above calculations, the total annual burden hours for this project will be 822.5 hours. These totals are also displayed in Table 1, below.

Table 1. Estimated Total Burden.

Task	Estimated Burden per Response	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Total Burden Hours
Questionnaire	25 minutes	1 response	1974	822.5 hours
<i>Total</i>				822.5 hours

Participation in this study is voluntary, and there are no costs to respondents beyond the time spent completing the questionnaire. However, the cost to respondents could be computed in terms of their hourly wage. Based on mean per capita wage for all occupations, the maximum total input cost, if all respondents completed questionnaires while on the job, is estimated as follows:

$$\$18.52 \text{ per hour}^1 \times 822.5 \text{ hours} = \$15,232.70$$

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. Respondents will be compensated with the \$5 payment respondents will receive for their time, as noted in A.9.

A.14. PROVIDE ESTIMATES OF THE ANNUALIZED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

This is one-time data collection and there will be no recurrence. The total cost to the Federal Government for this study is \$662,727 over 30 months, which amounts to an annual cost of approximately \$265,091 per year for 2.5 years. In addition to administering questionnaires, this cost includes participant recruitment, participant payment, driver record data collection, data analysis, report writing, and other project planning and administrative costs.

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 information collection. NHTSA has not previously conducted this survey, which results in a program change of an increase to NHTSA's overall burden hour by 822.5 hours. This study of driver speeding types and corresponding countermeasures is being conducted in response to the large number of speeding-related crashes that continue to occur in the United

¹ Idaho Department of Labor (2012). Idaho Occupational Employment & Wages Release 2012 State of Idaho. <http://lmi.idaho.gov/Portals/13/2012%20OES/PDF/State%20of%20Idaho.pdf>

States with little or no change over the last 15 years and recent studies that point to possible new countermeasure approaches for this persistent traffic safety problem.

A.16. FOR COLLECTION OF INFORMATION WHOSE RESULTS WILL BE PUBLISHED, OUTLINE PLANS FOR TABULATION AND PUBLICATION.

Reports and summary sheets will be published at the end of the study. Reported information will be aggregated to a level at which no individual can be identified. Analyses will be conducted to examine interactions between self-reported information collected in questionnaires and driver records. Self-reported survey information may be used to split riders into groups along a variable of interest (e.g., driver speeding type), and then driver records may be compared between these groups (e.g., comparing convictions and citations for speeding and other moving violations). Drivers may also be separated into groups based on driver record information (e.g., number of convictions, age, gender) or driver type, and then self-reported driving history, and attitudes and beliefs about driving and speeding behavior (e.g., views on speeding, countermeasures, etc.) may be compared between these groups.

A technical report, printed by NHTSA, will be disseminated to State, local, and national traffic safety officials. Reports and results will also be disseminated to advocacy and other groups interested in speed management and traffic safety, as briefings and presentations at traffic safety meetings, and to the research community through presentations at research conferences and publication of journal articles.

Resulting publications will include a caveat that data were collected from a random sample of Idaho drivers, and that the results cannot be generalized to the population of American drivers. We will not attempt to characterize American drivers with the results. We will instead use the findings as a foundation from which to generate ideas for the development of new behavioral- and vehicle-based countermeasures for enhanced speed management and improved traffic safety.

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.

REFERENCES

- Goodwin, A., Kirley, B., Sandt, L., Hall, W., Thomas, L., O'Brien, N., & Summerlin, D. (2013, April). *Countermeasures that work: A highway safety countermeasures guide for State Highway Safety Offices*. 7th edition. (Report No. DOT HS 811 727). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- McKenna, F. P., and Horswill, M. S. (2006). Risk taking from the participant's perspective: The case of driving and accident risk. *Health Psychology, 25*(2), 163-170.
- Messer, B. L., and Dillman, D. A. (2011). Surveying the general public over the internet using addressed-based sampling and mail contact procedures. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 75*(3), 429-457.
- National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). (2005). *Guidance for implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Volumes 1-17 (NCHRP Report 500)*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board.
- National Highway Transportation Safety Administration's National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2013). *Traffic Safety Facts 2011 Data: Speeding*. (Report No. DOT HS 811 751). Washington, D. C. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA). (2013, forthcoming). *2011 National survey of speeding attitudes and behavior*. Washington, DC.
- National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA). (2005). *National forum on speeding. Summary report*. (Report No. DOT HS 809 963). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/enforce/NatForumSpeeding/images/SpeedingForum.pdf>
- Richard, C. M., Campbell, J. L., Lichty, M. G., Brown, J. L., Chrysler, S., Lee, J. D., Reagle, G. (2012). *Motivations for speeding. Volume I: Summary Report*. (Report No. DOT HS 811 658). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Singer, E. (2006). Introduction: Nonresponse Bias in Household Surveys, *Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 70, No. 5, Special Issue 2006*, pp. 637–645
- U. S. Department of Transportation. (2013). *Speed Management Strategic Initiative*. Forthcoming.