

SECTION A
INFORMATION COLLECTION
SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Evaluation of Community-Oriented Enforcement Demonstrations

Within the next hour, an average of one person will die in an alcohol-impaired-driving crash and one person will die unbuckled in a crash. In 2014, 9,967 people died in alcohol-impaired-driving crashes, an average of one alcohol-impaired-driving death every 53 minutes.¹ In the same year, 9,385 people died in passenger vehicle crashes while not wearing a seat belt, an average of one person dying unbuckled every 56 minutes.² To help decrease alcohol-impaired-driving deaths and save more lives with seat belts, approval is requested to conduct a public information collection to help evaluate the effectiveness of two traffic safety programs called *Building Community Support for Impaired Driving Enforcement* and *Building Community Support for Seat Belt Enforcement*. The programs will use community-oriented enforcement programs to increase community involvement in and support for alcohol-impaired-driving and seat belt enforcement. The programs are designed to create stronger community norms surrounding the value of traffic enforcement and the importance of driving sober and being buckled. A key to determining if these programs reach their objective is to survey the public regarding exposure to the program and support for enforcement.

A) Justification

A.1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any Legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection.

a. Circumstances making the collection necessary

1. *National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) mission*

NHTSA was established by the Highway Safety Act of 1970 (23 U.S.C. 101). Its Congressional mandate is to reduce the number of deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes on our nation's highways. To accomplish this mission, NHTSA conducts research on driver behavior and traffic safety to develop efficient and effective means of bringing about safety improvements. This information collection supports NHTSA's strategic goal of safety.

2. *Severity of Alcohol-Impaired Driving and Seat Belt Problems*

¹ National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2015, December). *Alcohol-impaired driving: 2014 data*. (Traffic Safety Facts. DOT HS 812 231). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812231.pdf>

² National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2016, April). *Occupant protection: 2014 data*. (Traffic Safety Facts. DOT HS 812 262). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812262.pdf>

In 2014, 9,967 people died in crashes involving a driver with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of .08 g/dL or higher, which is 31% of total traffic deaths in 2014.³ In the same year, when looking only at cases where restraint status was known, 9,385 people died in passenger vehicle crashes while not wearing their seat belts.⁴ Based upon estimates by the National Center for Statistics and Analysis, if everyone buckled up in 2014, an additional 2,814 people could have been saved. These data point to the continued need for countermeasure development to decrease alcohol-impaired driving and increase seat belt use.

b. Legal basis for collecting data

Title 23, United States Code, Chapter 4, Section 403 gives the Secretary authorization to use funds appropriated to carry out this section to conduct research and development activities, including demonstration projects and the collection and analysis of highway and motor vehicle safety data and related information needed to carry out this section, with respect to all aspects of highway and traffic safety systems and conditions relating to - vehicle, highway, driver, passenger, motorcyclist, bicyclist, and pedestrian characteristics; accident causation and investigations; and human behavioral factors and their effect on highway and traffic safety, including impaired driving. [See 23 U.S.C. 403(b)(1)(A)(i), 23 U.S.C. 403(b)(1)(A)(ii), 23 U.S.C. 403(b)(1)(B)(ii)].

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.

NHTSA will use this new collection to evaluate the effectiveness of two new traffic safety programs called *Building Community Support for Impaired Driving Enforcement* and *Building Community Support for Seat Belt Enforcement*. The programs are designed to decrease alcohol-impaired-driving and increase seat belt use by creating stronger social norms surrounding the importance of driving sober and buckling up. The programs will attempt to create this change by increasing community engagement in and support for alcohol-impaired-driving and seat belt enforcement. Because community support is the mechanism driving change for this program, it is essential that the research team measure changes in community support to properly interpret the effect and utility of the program for future use.

More specifically, the study will address the following objectives:

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the community-oriented alcohol-impaired-driving and seat belt enforcement programs called *Building Community Support for Impaired Driving Enforcement* and *Building Community Support for Seat Belt Enforcement*.
2. Conduct a process evaluation to document the implementation of the program including the occurrence and makeup of community, enforcement, and media activities.

³ National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2015, December). *Alcohol-impaired driving: 2014 data*. (Traffic Safety Facts. DOT HS 812 231). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812231.pdf>

⁴ National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2016, April). *Occupant protection: 2014 data*. (Traffic Safety Facts. DOT HS 812 262). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812262.pdf>

3. Conduct an outcome evaluation by measuring changes in community awareness and support for law enforcement, as well as changes in observed seat belt use.
4. Conduct an impact evaluation to assess changes in alcohol-impaired driving and unrestrained crashes, injuries and deaths.

The data collected in the study will be used to assist NHTSA in its ongoing responsibilities for: (a) planning, policy-related issues, and designing program activities to decrease alcohol-impaired-driving and unrestrained deaths on our nation's roadways; (b) providing support to governmental agencies, private organizations, and safety advocate groups involved in carrying out alcohol-impaired-driving and seat belt programs; and (c) identifying countermeasure strategies that are most acceptable and effective in decreasing alcohol-impaired-driving and increasing seat belt use.

The results will assist governmental agencies, private organizations, and advocates in directing the implementation of strategies and action plans aimed to reduce the incidence of serious and fatal injuries associated with alcohol-impaired-driving and the nonuse of seat belts.

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.

This information collection will not involve the use of technological collection techniques. The information collection will be conducted using paper and pencil surveys. This survey collection format was selected for two reasons. The first reason relates to feasibility of data collection in the survey environment. The surveys will be administered at Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) offices while people wait for service. The paper and pencil format works best in this environment because participants can take the paper survey on a clip board to their seat and fill out the survey while they wait. Alternatively, having the participants complete the survey using a technological collection format, such as a kiosk at the DMV, would limit the number of available data collection ports and possibly increase burden by requiring participants to stand in line. The paper and pencil format allows for all participants to take the survey simultaneously without waiting. The second reason relates to data collection costs. Paper surveys are the most cost effective survey format for a short-term and small survey effort. While a hand-held computer or tablet would allow for portable technological data collection, the costs associated with purchasing and developing software for these devices are not justifiable for this data collection. It would not be an effective use of the taxpayer dollar to invest in these devices for small scale and short term use.

All collected data will be reviewed for completeness prior to data entry into a password-protected file developed for the proposed study. A series of edit checks will be developed to identify outlier values or other anomalies. Data forms will be reviewed based on the edit checks to identify data entry error or any anomalies in the data collection process.

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.

There have been many studies on the effectiveness of the community-oriented enforcement model on reducing crime and fear of crime,⁵ but there have been no studies on the effectiveness of this model in changing traffic safety behaviors. This research will be the first study testing the effectiveness of the community-oriented enforcement model on decreasing alcohol-impaired-driving and on increasing seat belt use. Because no detailed data exist on this topic, no other data source can be substituted, and there is no possibility of duplicating information that is currently available.

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

There will be no impact on small businesses or other small entities.

A.6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

In order to reduce alcohol-impaired-driving deaths and save more people with seat belts, it is critical that NHTSA continue to develop and evaluate programs to help reach these goals. This data collection is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs, *Building Community Support for Impaired Driving Enforcement* and *Building Community Support for Seat Belt Enforcement*. Without this data collection, NHTSA would not know if the programs reached their intended goals.

A.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.

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

A.8. 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

⁵Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: a systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 10(4), 399-428.

response to these comments. Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views.

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, NHTSA published two notices in the *Federal Register*, as noted below.

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 December 9, 2015, Volume 80, Number 236, pages 76613-76615. No public comments were received on the 60-day notice during the public comment period.

NHTSA published a notice in the *Federal Register* on XXXX XX, 2016 (Volume 80, Number XX, pages XXXXX-XXXXX) with a 30-day public comment period to announce that NHTSA intended to forward the request for the proposed information collection to OMB.

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

Information collection participants will not be provided with payment or gifts for participation.

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

Throughout the data collection, the privacy of all participants would be protected. Names, addresses, social security numbers, phone numbers, and email addresses would not be collected. The only personal characteristics that would be collected would be sex, age, 5-digit ZIP code, race, ethnicity, and education level. Race and ethnicity would be collected according to the definitions specified by the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. Accordingly, ethnicity would be reported as Hispanic or Latino, and race would be reported as one of the following categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White. The broad classification of the personal characteristics would provide insufficient information to identify specific people in a 5-digit ZIP code area.

The 5-digit ZIP code would need to be collected to match the participant with either the program or control (comparison) location to ensure that the measured change in public awareness could be associated with the program activity. Demographic information would need to be collected to conduct post-stratification weighting of the sample to U.S Census data to reduce sample bias. All collected data would be stored in restricted folders on secure password protected servers that are only accessible to research personnel with needed access to such information. In addition, all

data collected from participants would be reported in aggregate, and individual participants would not be independently reported on in any reports resulting from this project.

All participants will be informed that participation in the study is completely voluntary and confidential. In addition, the Contractor is having all instruments and procedures reviewed by an Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure that the privacy of individuals participating in the study is safeguarded.

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

The data collection does not contain any questions related to matters that are commonly considered sensitive or private. Each participant will be given a survey to complete. The surveys do not include questions on sensitive issues such as emotional abuse, physical violence, and sexual violence.

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

NHTSA estimates that a total of 21,216 respondents will need to be surveyed for this proposed data collection, which will be a total burden of 2,168 hours (see Table 1).

Table 1. Survey Burden by Form

Form Number	Form Name	Respondents	Average Completion Time (minutes)	Burden (hours)
1321	Screener	16,416	5	1,368
1322	Impaired Driving Survey	2,400	10	400
1325	Seat Belt Survey	2,400	10	400
Total	-	21,216	-	2,168

Costs associated with the burden hours for the proposed collection by NHTSA can be calculated based on mean hourly wages provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for all occupations (see http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm). This source indicated the national mean hourly

wage equals \$23.23. The total cost to respondents would be a maximum of \$50,423 according to the calculation below:

Screener: \$1.94/respondent x 16,416 respondents = \$31,847

Impaired Driving Survey: \$3.87/respondent x 2,400 respondents = \$9,288

Seat Belt Survey: \$3.87/respondent x 2,400 respondents = \$9,288

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

There are no record-keeping costs.

A.14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.

The total cost to the Federal government for conducting this information collection is \$38,400. Because the data collection period will only run for fifteen months, the annualized costs for the fifteen month data collection period are \$30,720 for the first twelve month period and \$7,680 for the remaining three month period.

A.15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB Form 83-1.

This is a new information collection. This study will result in a program change of adding 2,168 hours of NHTSA overall burden hours.

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

NHTSA will develop a Final Report that presents the findings from the data collection effort. The Report will include an Executive Summary, Background, Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Conclusions sections. In addition, the report will include discussion of lessons learned and recommendations. It is important to note that individual data will not be identified in the report; data will be reported only in aggregate form as part of the findings.

The report will document survey responses over the three measurement periods in the program and control areas for each program. It will present trends of interest to the evaluation. For example, it will show trends in reported public support for alcohol-impaired-driving and seat belt enforcement over the program period.

We expect the data collection to begin in September of 2016 and to run through December of 2017. We expect the report to be published in 2019.

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.

No such approval is sought. The OMB survey number and expiration date will be displayed on the survey instrument.

A.18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions,” of OMB Form 83-1.

No exceptions to the certification statement are made.