

Information Collection Request Supporting Statements: Part A
Survey on Driver Awareness of Motorcycles
OMB Control No. New

Abstract: The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation is seeking approval to conduct a one-time survey of randomly selected adults aged 18 years or older and who have driven a motor vehicle at least once in the past three months to report their knowledge, attitudes, and awareness of safe-driving behaviors towards motorcycles. One sample consists of adult drivers residing in Florida and the other sample consists of adult drivers residing in Pennsylvania. NHTSA will contact a total of 33,460 to achieve a target of at least 2,486 complete voluntary responses consisting of 1,243 completed instruments from the Florida sample and 1,243 completed instruments from the Pennsylvania sample. The large geographic and demographic sizes of Florida and Pennsylvania allow for complex driving environments in which motorcycles and passenger vehicles operate in a range of traffic conditions. Notably, neither State has a universal motorcycle helmet use law, but each has a sizable population of registered motorcycles and varied helmet use rates. For example, in 2019, 52 percent of motorcyclists killed in Florida and 51 percent of motorcyclists killed in Pennsylvania were not helmeted.¹ The estimated burden of this collection is 3,289 hours with 2,709 hours associated with survey invitations and reminders and 580 hours associated with survey completions.

NHTSA will summarize the results of the collection using aggregate statistics in a final report to be distributed to NHTSA program and regional offices, State Highway Safety Offices, and other traffic safety and motorcycle safety stakeholders. This collection supports NHTSA's mission by obtaining information needed for the development of traffic safety countermeasures, particularly in the areas of communications and outreach, for the purpose of reducing fatalities, injuries, and crashes associated with multi-vehicle motorcycle crashes.

A. Justification

- 1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal and 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*

NHTSA was established by the Highway Safety Act of 1970 and its mission is to reduce deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes on the nation's highways. To further this mission, NHTSA is authorized to conduct research for the development of traffic safety programs.

¹National Center for Statistics and Analysis (2021, April). Motorcycles: 2019 data (Traffic Safety Facts. Report No. DOT HS 813 112). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Motorcycling has become increasingly popular over the past 20 years and with this growth has also been an increase in motorcycle crashes and motorcyclist fatalities. For example, in 2019, there were 5,104 motorcyclist fatalities accounting for 14 percent of all traffic fatalities that year and occurring 29 times more frequently than passenger car occupant fatalities per vehicle miles traveled.² The high proportion of motorcyclist fatalities relative to other types of road users demonstrates the greater risk of motorcycle travel and suggests the challenges associated with improving motorcycle safety. NHTSA conducts research in behavioral traffic safety and vehicle safety to identify countermeasures for problems and areas needing improvement. NHTSA works with State highway safety offices to identify ways of lowering the risk of motorcycle crashes and improving the survivability of motorcycle crashes.

This information collection addresses interactions between motorcycles and other vehicles that can increase the risk of multi-vehicle crashes. The goal of the information collection is to advance our understanding of the behavioral factors underlying safe and unsafe (riskier) interactions between motorcyclists and other motorists. For example, multi-vehicle crashes involving a motorcycle can result when the other driver “looked but did not see” the motorcycle or misjudged the motorcycle’s distance or speed. Aside from the perceptual challenges associated with detecting motorcycles due to their smaller size relative to other motor vehicles, motorists unfamiliar with motorcycles may be less likely to practice or be aware of safe behaviors toward motorcycles.³ This information collection supports NHTSA’s mission by providing data on what motorists know about motorcycles and how that knowledge may influence their interactions with motorcycles. The collected information will enable NHTSA and stakeholders to advance our understanding of the factors involved in driver perception of motorcycles and driver behaviors toward motorcycles and help determine what is needed in terms of outreach and education to reduce unsafe interactions between these vehicle types.

b. Statute authorizing the collection of information

Title 23, United States Code, Chapter 4, Section 403 authorizes the Secretary (NHTSA by delegation) to use funds appropriated 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. [See 23 U.S.C. 403(b)(1)(A)(i)-(ii); 23 U.S.C. 403(b)(1)(B)].⁴

² National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2021, April). Motorcycles: 2019 data (Traffic Safety Facts. Report No. DOT HS 813 112). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

³ Shahar, A., Clarke, D., Crundall, D. (2011). Applying the motorcyclist's perspective to improve car drivers' attitudes towards motorcyclists. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, Vol 43, 1743-1750.

⁴ Highway safety research and development, 23 U.S.C. § 403.

www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2012-title23/pdf/USCODE-2012-title23-chap4-sec403.pdf

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.

This is a new collection. It will provide critical information needed by NHTSA to develop, implement, and maintain effective traffic safety programs (countermeasures) that meet the Agency's mission to improve traffic safety. NHTSA conducts research on motorcycle safety-related issues including training and licensing, impaired driving, and the use of personal protective gear. This information collection addresses multi-vehicle crashes between passenger vehicles and motorcycles by seeking insight into perception and awareness of other motorists towards motorcycles. The information collected will expand our understanding of the beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions underlying driving behaviors towards motorcycles and will inform the development of safety countermeasures. A significant portion of motorcycle crashes involve other vehicles in which the motorist violated the motorcyclist's right of way. In many of these cases, it appears that the motorists "looked but did not see" the motorcycle or misjudged the distance or speed of the motorcycle. Aside from the perceptual processes involved in detecting motorcycles, familiarity with motorcycles or motorcyclists may be associated with having fewer crashes with motorcycles.⁵ Therefore, awareness and knowledge of motorcycles appears to influence driver perception and decision-making regarding motorcycles. In addition, some types of motorcycle maneuvers may be subject to misinterpretation by drivers unfamiliar with motorcycling. For instance, a motorist observing a motorcycle that swerves to avoid a hazard, such as a pile of wet leaves or a pothole, could interpret the move as reckless or erratic. Similarly, a motorcycle traveling behind a car on a highway may choose to ride near the edge of the lane for the purpose of being seen in the leading vehicle's rearview mirror. A motorist who is not aware of this tactic could interpret it as menacing or aggressive. Drivers who interpret the actions of other motorists as offensive may react aggressively.⁶

It is important to understand driver attitudes and beliefs, as these factors influence safe driving behaviors and interactions with other motorists. Drivers with greater awareness of motorcycles or empathy with motorcyclists may practice safer driving behaviors around them. NHTSA will use the collected information to assess the extent to which the motoring public is aware of safe driving behaviors towards motorcycles and identify areas needing improvement in outreach and education.

The survey data will be used to assist NHTSA in its ongoing responsibilities for: (a) planning and designing research and program activities to improve motorcycle safety; (b) providing support to groups involved in developing and implementing motorcycle safety outreach programs and driver safety campaigns; and (c) identifying areas in driver awareness and

⁵ Shahar, A., Clarke, D., Crundall, D. (2011). Applying the motorcyclist's perspective to improve car drivers' attitudes towards motorcyclists. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, Vol 43, 1743-1750.

⁶ Wickens, C.M., Mann, R.E., & Wiesenthal, D.L. (2013). Addressing driver aggression: Contributions from psychological science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22(5), 386-391.

knowledge that need attention. In addition to using the collected information for its own program development and technical assistance activities, NHTSA will disseminate the information to State and local highway safety authorities who may use it to develop, improve, and target their own programs and activities; interested safety organizations so that this information can be used to develop, improve and target their own programs and activities, especially for public information and education campaigns; and academics concerned with traffic safety issues through a peer-reviewed journal article, so that it can be used as a baseline for future studies.

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 forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also, describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.

The proposed methodology is a self-administered web-based survey with paper versions available if the participant does not respond to the web survey. The design of the web survey and the paper version is based on standard practices for survey instruments. The following are features of the web survey designed to improve efficiency and reduce burden:

- A brief introduction that explains the survey's purpose and encourages participation;
- Instructions that are clear and easily understood on how to progress through the survey;
- Navigational ease from page to page, and section to section;
- User assistance tools such as help screens and/or text boxes where necessary;
- A review and edit feature that allows the participant to adjust responses prior to submitting the survey; and
- Automatically executed skip patterns based on prior question answers, which decreases survey-taking time and burden on respondents.

The web survey will be considered the default due to the efficiencies it provides. Paper surveys will be made available for potential participants who are unable or unwilling to complete the web-based survey. Paper surveys will be designed to work with optical mark recognition and image scanning to facilitate ease of use and data accuracy.

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 has not previously conducted a similar information collection and a review of previous research projects did not find a citation for a similar probability survey in the United States, which indicates that this data collection does not entail duplication. The work to identify duplication showed that this project would be unique, especially as it addresses the specific concern regarding self-reports of driving behaviors in relation to motorcycles. The lack of data

on this topic produces a knowledge gap in motorcycle safety, which limits the ability of NHTSA and stakeholders in highway traffic safety to develop and implement effective countermeasures.

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

Questionnaire information for this study will only be collected from individuals. There is no burden on small businesses for this collection of information request.

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

Understanding the factors that contribute to driver-related motorcycle accidents is essential to the sound development of programs aimed at increasing motorcycle awareness and safe driving behaviors in the presence of motorcycles. While research focused on driver attitudes toward and beliefs about motorcycles and motorcyclists has increased in recent years, much of it has relied on non-U.S. populations making it unsuitable for guiding the development of programs intended to educate drivers in the United States about safe driving practices or increase empathy and positive attitudes toward motorcycles and motorcyclists. Furthermore, research linking attitudes and beliefs to driver behavior is limited. The ability to develop approaches to driver education that increase empathy and positive attitudes toward motorcycles and motorcyclists that will promote drivers' positive behavioral change requires data that will support identifying correlations between attitudes, beliefs, and driver behavior when interacting with motorcycles on the road. In the absence of this data collection, we will be less able to thoroughly assess the extent of driver awareness and practices of safe driving behaviors towards motorcycles.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:

- a. requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;
- b. requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;
- c. requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;
- d. requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than three years;
- e. in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;
- f. requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;
- g. that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and

data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or

- h. requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

No special circumstances require this collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2).

- 8. If applicable, 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 the comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden. Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views.**

NHTSA published a 60-day Federal Register Notice, which notified the public of NHTSA's intent to conduct this collection of information and provided a 60-day comment period, on April 07, 2022 (Vol. 87, No. 67, Pages 20501-20504). NHTSA received six comments and one letter from the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies supportive of the proposed information collection. None of the comments necessitate a revision of the materials or protocol. Two individuals provided supportive comments of the information collection. A third commented that "... the most dangerous part about [riding a motorcycle] is other vehicle operators." A fourth anonymous post was that "...many riders are most concerned about the use of additional ethenol [sic] in our gasoline" but the issue of gasoline is not addressed in the proposed information collection. A fifth comment was about training of automobile drivers and motorcycle operators and a sixth comment was that "...the greatest danger to a modern motorcyclist are [sic] the other motor vehicle (cars, trucks, SUVs) drivers on their cell phones."

A copy of a second, 30-day Federal Register Notice (Vol. 87, No. 123, Pages 38452-38455), which announced that this information collection request will be forwarded to OMB, was published on June 28, 2022.

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

Because of the general decline in people's willingness to take surveys in all modes, researchers are challenged with finding ways to increase response rates.⁷ A lower response rate increases the

⁷ Dykema, J., Jaques, K., Cyffka, K., Assad, N., Hammers, R. G., Elver, K., et al. (2015). Effects of Sequential Prepaid Incentives and Envelope Messaging in Mail Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 79(4), 906-931.

risk of non-response bias, which occurs when sampled units who respond differ from those who do not respond in a way that impacts the survey's estimates.⁸ Consequently, a low response rate can lead to biased research findings despite selecting a well-representative sample. Offering a non-contingent incentive is one method that researchers have used to improve survey response rates.⁹ Ryu et al. (2006)¹⁰ found that pre-paid monetary incentives were associated with higher rates of response to mail surveys. Millar and Dillman (2011)¹¹ found that mailing a pre-paid cash incentive induced response to a web survey, and Messer and Dillman (2011)¹² saw similar findings with both mail and web responses to a mixed mode survey in which some participants were contacted in both modes and others were contacted by mail only.

The methodology includes a \$1 non-contingent incentive.¹³ Based on research of social exchange theory, non-contingent incentives have been shown to increase response rates by engendering good will.¹⁴ The norm of reciprocity anticipates that some people will feel more obligated to complete the survey—that is, to reciprocate the extra effort on the part of the researcher—than they otherwise would, leading to a higher response rate.¹⁵ Thus, a dollar bill will be included in the survey invitation letter (NHTSA Form 1578) as motivation to complete the survey. This letter will be on NHTSA letterhead and describe the purpose of the study in a clear and relatable way. Eligible respondents who complete the survey will have the option to receive a \$10 cash post-survey incentive. Our experience indicates that anything less than the proposed compensation would likely result in failure to survey enough participants to provide adequate statistical power. Recent studies by NHTSA (2127-0704, 2127-0645) have confirmed that this level of compensation is necessary to meet recruiting requirements.^{16,17}

<https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfv041>.

⁸ Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

⁹ Dirmaier, J., Harfst, T., Koch, U., & Schulz, H. (2007). Incentives increased return rates but did not influence partial nonresponse or treatment outcome in a randomized trial. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *60*(12), 1263–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.04.006>.

¹⁰ Ryu, E., Couper, M. P., & Marans, R. W. (2006). Survey incentives: Cash vs. In-Kind; Face-to-Face vs. Mail; Response Rate vs. Nonresponse Error. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *18*(1), 89–106. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edh089>.

¹¹ Millar, M. M., & Dillman, D. A. (2011). Improving Response to Web and Mixed-Mode Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *75*(2), 249–269. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfr003>.

¹² Messer, B. L., & Dillman, D. A. (2011). Surveying the General Public over the Internet Using Address-Based Sampling and Mail Contact Procedures. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *75*(3), 429–457. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfr021>.

¹³ The methodology also includes a \$10 post-survey incentive.

¹⁴ Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963947.n331>.

¹⁵ Groves, R. M., Cialdini, R. B., & Couper, M. P. (1992). Understanding the Decision to Participate in a Survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *56*(4), 475–495. DOI: 10.1086/269338.

¹⁶ Wilbur, M. (2019, October). Young driver survey (Report No. DOT HS 812 761). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

The survey literature^{18,19,20} provides further evidence that a pre-incentive along with a substantial post-incentive provides the most efficient path towards a strong response rate for both mail and web survey modes. This trend is likely to hold true in a general population study of drivers 18 years of age or older.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy. If the collection requires a system of records notice (SORN) or privacy impact assessment (PIA), those should be cited and described here.

In a letter mailed to all sampled households, we inform the respondent that the data will be kept private, are to be used only for statistical purposes, and are protected to the full extent of the law. Surveys are self-administered and all respondents can stop taking the survey at any time. The household contact materials emphasize the need for privacy and the protection of survey data. The survey front matter includes a statement affirming that no personally identifiable information (PII) will be published. PII will not be collected in the survey instrument and will not be made available to researchers. Specific information linking individuals to survey responses will not be included in any information viewed by researchers. All published results will provide only summary statistics that cannot be used to identify any individual or individual's responses. Participation in the survey is voluntary. There will not be any identifying information such as names, addresses, telephone numbers, or social security numbers in the database delivered to NHTSA.

Access to the online survey would be controlled using a unique ID-protected access. Online surveys will be self-administered and only accessible for a designated period. If the participant chooses to complete the mailed paper survey, again, the survey will be self-administered. Mailed paper surveys will be tagged with a unique ID code, known only to the researchers. The survey mailing will include a Business Reply Envelope (BRE), so that the participant can send back the survey without incurring mailing costs. The postal addresses of sample households will be kept

¹⁷ Bailly, K., Martin, K. & Block, A. (2019, December). 2016 Motor vehicle occupant safety survey: Volume 1, Methodology report (Report No. DOT HS 812 851). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

¹⁸ Coopersmith, J., Vogel, L. K., Bruursema, T., & Feeney, K. (2016). Effects of Incentive Amount and Type of Web Survey Response Rates. *Survey Practice*, 9(1), 1-10. doi:10.29115/sp-2016-0002.

¹⁹ Singer, E. & Ye, C. (2013). The use and effects of incentives in surveys. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645(1), 112–141.

²⁰ LeClere, F., Plumme, S., Vanicek, J., Amaya, A. & Carris, K. (2012). Household early bird incentives: leveraging family influence to improve household response rates. *JSM Proceedings, Survey Research Methods Section*. http://www.asasrms.org/Proceedings/y2012/Files/304811_73772.pdf

separate from the data collected and will be stored in restricted folders on secure FedRAMP²¹ compliant servers that are only accessible to study staff who need to access such information.

A SORN has not been filed for this research as PII will not be retained by the government. A unique identifier (a system generated Master ID) will be linked with household address, not individuals. The survey response data and household address are held in separate files. While the contractor will access information by unique Master ID, the access will be limited. The PII (an address file) will be accessed four times to flag households that respond to the survey to avoid sending them future reminders. The contractor will extract an electronic list of the unique ID codes from the response file and will merge the list with the address file before processing the mailing of the reminders to flag households who responded. After the merge, the electronic list of unique ID codes will be destroyed. Other than the mailings, the contractor only accesses the addresses in very limited circumstances, such as when a researcher needs to ensure the quality of the data.

This proposed collection is covered under the Privacy Impact Assessment “NHTSA Office of Behavioral Safety Research (OBSR) Research Studies,” which is available at <https://www.transportation.gov/individuals/privacy/nhtsa-office-behavioral-safety-research-obsr-research-studies>. The OBSR conducts research studies on behaviors and attitudes in highway safety, focusing on drivers, passengers, pedestrians, and motorcyclists, and uses those studies to develop and refine countermeasures to deter unsafe behaviors and promote safe alternatives. To carry out these research studies, such as the one associated with this proposed collection, OBSR contracts with universities and other research partners. This Privacy Impact Assessment was conducted because OBSR’s contractors collect, process, and maintain PII on members of the public on behalf of NHTSA as part of these studies.

An Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed all instruments, informed consent materials, and procedures to ensure that the rights of individuals participating in the survey are safeguarded and using the Department of Health and Human Services regulations found at 45 CFR 46.104(d) (2) determined that the research project is exempt from IRB oversight.

²¹ The Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP) is a government-wide program that provides a standardized approach to security assessment, authorization, and continuous monitoring for cloud products and services.” See <https://www.fedramp.gov/about/>

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. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

The survey instrument includes items about driving habits such as the type of vehicle driven and the frequency of driving and questions on knowledge, awareness, and attitudes about other motor vehicles and road users, including motorcyclists. However, this information is not commonly considered private or sensitive, but it is critical to understanding the safety problem, and it will only be used and reported in aggregate. The survey data collection does not contain additional questions related to matters that are commonly considered sensitive or private.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information on the respondents and estimates of the annualized labor cost to respondents associated with that hour burden.

NHTSA estimates the total burden of this information collection by estimating the burden to those who NHTSA contacts who respond and are eligible for participation (eligible respondents that take the survey) and those contacted that are not eligible or do not choose to take the survey (non-responders). The estimated time to contact 33,460 potential participants (participants and non-responders) for the survey is one minute per person per contact attempt. Contact attempts will be made in five waves with fewer potential participants contacted in each subsequent wave; the sixth wave is to provide the contingent incentive to participants who submitted a completed response. The contacts (mailings) for each wave is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 NHTSA Form Number, Description, and Mailing Wave.

NHTSA Form Number	Description	Mailing Wave
1577	Initial Postcard - serves as a notice of selection, explains survey rationale.	1
1578	Invitation Letter - provides instructions and hyperlink to the online survey and includes the \$1 non-contingent incentive	2
1579	Reminder Postcard #1 - the first reminder, includes instructions and hyperlink to the online survey	3
1580	Reminder Letter #1 – the second reminder with the paper survey, prepaid return envelope, PIN, and hyperlink to the	4

	online survey	
1581	Reminder Postcard #2 - last reminder, includes hyperlink to the online survey	5
1582	Questionnaire - the online version, provided on a secure website	2, 3, 4, 5
1583	Questionnaire – the paper version, for responders not using the online questionnaire	4
1588	Thank You Letter – includes the contingent incentive	6

Table 2 shows the estimated burden for each wave and by type of participation (non-respondent, eligible, and ineligible). In a mass mailing using USPS DSF, NHTSA will contact 33,460 households, resulting in an expected 3,108 willing participants out of which 2,486 are expected to be eligible. (An ineligible responder is a person who does not drive a motor vehicle, does not reside at the address, or is younger than 18 years old). The time for a non-respondent at each wave is expected to be 1 minute for a total of 2,058 hours cumulated across waves. Of 2,486 respondents expected to complete the full survey at 14 minutes in length for an estimated burden of 580 hours with an additional 1minute review of the final communication “Thank You” letter (NHTSA Form 1588). The estimated burden for the eligibility screener is 1 minute. Additional details regarding burden estimates can be found in Table 1.

Table 2. Estimated Total Burden for Main Survey Data Collection.

Mailing Wave (Form Number)	Number of Contacts	Participant Type	Estimated Burden Per Sample Unit (in minutes)	Frequency of Burden	Number of Sample Units	Burden Hours*	Total Burden Hours*
Wave 1 NHTSA Form 1577	33,460	Contacted potential participant	1	1	33,460	558	558
Wave 2 NHTSA Form 1578	33,460	Non-respondent	1	1	31,787	530	870
		Ineligible respondent	1	1	335	6	
		Eligible respondent	15	1	1,338	334	
Wave 3	31,787	Non-respondent	1	1	30,833	514	708
		Ineligible	1	1	191	3	

NHTSA Form 1579		respondent					
		Eligible respondent	15	1	763	191	
Wave 4	30,833	Non-respondent	1	1	30,524	509	572
NHTSA Form 1580		Ineligible respondent	1	1	62	1	
		Eligible respondent	15	1	247	62	
Wave 5	30,524	Non-respondent	1	1	30,351	506	541
NHTSA Form 1581		Ineligible respondent	1	1	35	1	
		Eligible respondent	15	1	138	34	
Wave 6	2,486	Completed responders	1	1	2,486	41	41
NHTSA Form 1588							
Total							3,289

* burden hour estimates are rounded to the nearest hour.

Table 3 provides total burden hours associated with each NHTSA form. For example, 2,486 anticipated responders who provide completed questionnaires (NHTSA Forms 1582 and 1583) are expected to spend 14 minutes each, resulting in an estimated burden of 580 hours.

Table 3 Estimated Total Burden by NHTSA Form for the Data Collection.

Information Collection	Number of Responses	Burden per Response	Burden per Respondent	Total Burden Hours*
Questionnaire - NHTSA Forms 1582 and 1583	2,486	14 minutes	14 minutes	580 hours
Initial Postcard – NHTSA Form 1577	33,460	1 minute	1 minute	558
Invitation Letter - NHTSA Form 1578	33,460	1 minute	1 minute	558
Postcard Reminder - NHTSA Form 1579	31,787	1 minute	1 minute	530
Reminder Letter -	30,833	1 minute	1 minute	514

NHTSA Form 1580				
Final Postcard Reminder - NHTSA Form 1581	30,524	1 minute	1 minute	508
Thank You Letter - NHTSA Form 1588	2,486	1 minute	1 minute	41
Total				3,289

*Rounded up to the nearest hour.

The opportunity cost to respondents is computed using an average hourly wage. Based on the 2020 mean hourly wage including fringe benefits for all occupations in the United States, the maximum total input cost is estimated as follows:

$\$33.84 \text{ per hour}^{22,23} \times 3,289 \text{ hours} = \$111,299.76.$

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

Participation in this study is voluntary, and there are no costs to respondents beyond the time spent completing the questionnaires.

14. Provide estimates of the annualized cost to the Federal government. Provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information.

This is one-time data collection. The Federal Government’s awarded amount of this task order is \$642,572 which includes \$58,770 for incentives (for the survey and cognitive testing of the survey instrument). Since data collection will take less than a year, the annualized cost is the same. Project management by the Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) and the supervisor includes tracking the status of data collection, examining survey data, calculating response rates, and reviewing deliverables, etc. This cost on an hourly wage basis is calculated as follows:

- 1. COR, during data collection = 8 hours x 8 weeks x \$59.72/hour = \$3,822.08
- 2. COR, after data collection = 4 hours x 16 weeks x \$59.72/hour = \$3,822.08

²² Mean per capita wage of \$27.07 as per U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor and Statistics, May 2020 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates United States:

²³ https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm#00-0000. A multiplier of 1.25 was applied to this wage to account for fringe benefits.

3. Supervisor, during data collection = 1-hour x 8 weeks x \$73.52 = \$588.16
 4. Supervisor, after data collection = 1-hour x 16 weeks x \$73.52 = \$1,176.12

The total cost for Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and the supervisor is \$9,408.44. These costs are separate from the task order award amount. Therefore, the estimated total cost to the Federal government for this information collection is \$651,980.44 (\$642,572 for the contract plus \$9,408.44 for COR/supervisor project management).

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported on the burden worksheet. If this is a new collection, the program change will be the entire burden cost and number of burden hours reported in response to questions 12 and 13. If this is a renewal or reinstatement, the change is the difference between the new burden estimates and the burden estimates from the last OMB approval.

This is a new request; therefore, the burden hours of 3,289 represent a program change. No hours were previously approved.

16. For collection of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions as applicable.

NHTSA plans to publish a technical report that includes survey results and methodology details. The results section will include summary statistics and tables, as well as the results of statistical analysis of the information, but it will not include any personal information. Figures and tables will be presented with limited accompanying text. The data presentations will be largely made up of percentage distributions and cross-tabulations. The data will be segmented by the following characteristics: age, race, gender, household income, and driver category (based on cluster analysis). The final sample size of each cell will determine the categories by which each characteristic will be analyzed. Only cells which have sufficient sample to draw reliable estimates will be used in the analysis and reported on. The methodology portion of the report will include information on the sampling frame, survey participation rate, weighting procedures, and copies of the questionnaires in both English and Spanish.

The plan is for the final technical report to be published in 2022. The technical report will provide summary statistics and tables, as well as the results of statistical analysis of the information, but it will not include any personal information or data from any one individual. All data will be in aggregate form. The plan is based upon data collection starting in Summer, 2022.

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.

18. Explain each exception to the topics of the certification statement identified in "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions." The required certifications can be found at 5 CFR 1320.9.

No exceptions to the certification statement are made.

The following statement will be provided to respondents on the survey documents:

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act, a Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a current valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Number for this information collection is 2127-xxxx. The average amount of time to complete this survey is 15 minutes. All responses to this collection of information are voluntary. If you have comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, send them to: Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave, S.E., Washington, DC, 20590 NHTSA Form 1582, NHTSA Form 158