

Information Collection Request Supporting Statements: Part A
Strategies to Improve DRE Officers' Performance and Law Enforcement Agencies' DRE Programs
OMB Control No. 2127-New

Abstract:¹

This information collection request (ICR) is to seek approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for a new voluntary information collection that would be part of an agency demonstration project intended to study best practices for implementing strategies to improve Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) programs. DREs are law enforcement officers trained and certified through the International Drug Evaluation and Classification (DEC) program to recognize impairment in drivers under the influence of drugs other than, or in addition to, alcohol. The demonstration project will involve selecting state law enforcement agencies (LEAs) based on an application process and providing resources that will allow the LEAs to implement different strategies for improving their DRE programs. Agencies selected to participate will be provided tools and technologies for collecting data, implementing a call-out system, implementing an electronic warrant system, and/or implementing law enforcement phlebotomy to help support carrying out Drug Influence Evaluations on drivers suspected of drug-impaired driving. NHTSA will then collect information on a monthly and quarterly basis regarding the agencies' implementation of the strategies. The information collected from the agency application, monthly reporting, and quarterly reporting will inform the development of follow-up evaluation. The follow-up evaluation will include the collection of process measures used during the implementation phase as well as a questionnaire or discussion group that will be covered by a subsequent ICR. After the demonstration project is completed, NHTSA intends to publish a report on best practices for implementing the different strategies for improving DRE programs. The report will be developed using information collected from the agency application, monthly reporting, and quarterly reporting, as well as from the planned evaluation questions. Publication of the report will support NHTSA's mission to reduce deaths and injuries resulting from traffic crashes by allowing NHTSA to provide State and local law enforcement agencies with information to help improve programs intended to address the issue of drug impaired driving.

Information will be voluntarily collected by NHTSA's support contractor, Toxcel, from agencies selected to participate. Selected agencies will be asked to submit, via email, monthly reports documenting activities conducted in the reporting month and planned for the next month. Quarterly conversations will be conducted to open clear lines of communication to assure participating agencies are successfully implementing the components of the project, utilizing the resources (tools & technologies) provided, to offer technical assistance, and/or to answer questions. The application to participate has total estimated burden of 15 hours. The monthly email reports are expected to have a burden of 1 hour

¹ The Abstract must include the following information: (1) whether responding to the collection is mandatory, voluntary, or required to obtain or retain a benefit; (2) a description of the entities who must respond; (3) whether the collection is reporting (indicate if a survey), recordkeeping, and/or disclosure; (4) the frequency of the collection (e.g., bi-annual, annual, monthly, weekly, as needed); (5) a description of the information that would be reported, maintained in records, or disclosed; (6) a description of who would receive the information; (7) if the information collection involves approval by an institutional review board, include a statement to that effect; (8) the purpose of the collection; and (9) if a revision, a description of the revision and the change in burden.

monthly and the quarterly conversations have an estimated burden of 1 hour each quarter. The total expected burden for this collection is 1,320 hours.

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.**

NHTSA was established by the Highway Safety Act of 1970 (Pub. L. No. 91-605, §202(a), 84 Stat. 1713, 1739-40). Its mission is to reduce the number of deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes on our nation's highways. To further this mission, NHTSA conducts research on driver behavior and traffic safety to develop efficient and effective means of bringing about safety improvements.

Safety improvements in the impaired driving arena could not only lead to a reduction in impaired driving traffic injuries and fatalities but can provide our nation's law enforcement officers, prosecutors, toxicologists, highway safety offices, and others with improved skill and ability in uniformly testing and identifying impaired drivers on our roadways. A comprehensive list of research related to impaired driving and DRE programs is included in Appendix B. As the number of States legalizing marijuana continues to increase, the need for effective strategies to address the growing concerns about drug impaired driving is imperative. Although there is a standardized process for the Drug Influence Evaluation (DIE) performed by DREs, implementation of DRE programs can vary significantly. These differences are due to a variety of reasons, including funding, the number of trained DREs, individual laws, and other factors.

Some States have strengthened their programs with the utilization of tools and technologies, such as tablets and software that aid in the accurate and efficient collection of data. There has, however, been no research to document best practice strategies that other agencies could use with fidelity to replicate what some have done to improve their DRE officers' performance and law enforcement agencies' DRE programs. This project is a one-time demonstration project to study strategies to improve the ability of DRE officers and effectiveness of DRE programs to address drug-impaired driving. The demonstration will look specifically at the implementation of the following four strategies for improving DRE programs.

- a. Resources, technology, and tools (both hardware and software) to enhance efficiency, completeness, and consistency in data collection.
- b. Protocols, policies, and procedures to enhance or improve how DREs are used (i.e., call-out procedures, sharing DREs across jurisdictions).
- c. Procedures to facilitate the DRE evaluation process (i.e., law enforcement phlebotomy, expedited warrants).
- d. A continuing education program to enhance consistency in training among all DREs and provide easy access to continuing education opportunities.

Agencies interested in participating in the demonstration project and receiving support will voluntarily fill out an application.

Agencies selected to participate will be provided tools and technologies by the NHTSA support contractor, Toxcel, for collecting data, implementing a call-out system, implementing an electronic warrant system, and/or implementing law enforcement phlebotomy to help support carrying out Drug Influence Evaluations on drivers suspected of drug-impaired driving. Provided tools and technologies will include tablets, laptops, cell phones, software, applications, and phlebotomy supplies (see Appendix A: Tools, Technologies and Supplies). Provided tools, technologies and supplies are to be requested by participating agencies using Equipment, Technology, and Supplies order form 1680. Participating agencies will be required to submit, via email, monthly reports documenting activities conducted in the reporting month and planned for the next month.

The goal is to understand which tools, technologies, and strategies support the development of best or promising practices for replication by other agencies. Resultant findings will provide guidance on how to consistently collect complete evidence efficiently and effectively for the successful prosecution of drug impaired drivers, leading to a wider adoption of identified strategies by DRE programs across the United States, and ultimately removing drug impaired drivers from America's roadways. DRE programs can play a critical role in a State's efforts to reduce impaired driving. Program findings will be shared with States with the intention of assisting law enforcement agencies in improving their DRE officers' performance and enforcement programs overall. This collection of information is necessary to allow interested enforcement agencies with DRE programs to submit an application that shares information about their current DRE program. This is a demonstration project. Application data will include questions relevant to each agency, collected as baseline data that will be compiled and used to better understand process outcomes that other law enforcement agencies could use to replicate and improve their programs.

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.

Interested law enforcement agencies with DRE programs from across the United States will submit information about their current DRE program using a fillable form (see Form 1663: Application Questions) that will be emailed to Toxcel, the contracting agency. The information received by Toxcel will be used to identify agencies to engage in the demonstration work.

This opportunity is open to all State and local agencies that maintain DRE programs. This includes State and local law enforcement agencies, State Highway Safety Offices, Offices of the Attorney General/District Attorney, and State and local departments of transportation. Agencies interested in participating will voluntarily fill out an application and submit it via email to NHTSA's support contractor (i.e., Toxcel). The application process will remain open as long as funding is available and there is time to collect sufficient data for use by a separate evaluation agency contracted by NHTSA. After year 3, there will likely be no continued applications being accepted even if funding remains, due to time constraints.

The application will include fields for the agency name, address, point of contact name, email address, and phone number. It will request information about existing DRE processes and procedures, tools and strategies used, and how the agency plans to implement new or enhance existing processes and procedures. In addition, an Equipment, Technology, and Supplies Order Form (Form 1680) is to be completed and returned to indicate participating agency's needs. NHTSA's support contractors involved with this effort (Toxcel), NHTSA staff, and the contracted evaluator (Not secured as part of this demonstration project. Will be a separate evaluation contractor.) are the only entities that will have

access to the information collected in each application. Application information will be stored in a Microsoft Access database. The selected agencies will be required to submit, via email, monthly reports (form 1662) documenting the status of activities conducted in the reporting month and planned for the next month. The monthly reports will also include information on equipment/technology received as of the date of the report. Information collected in monthly reports are meant to verify that the project overall is on task and time with recruitment, distribution of resources, and in meeting the needs of all participating agencies. Additionally, monthly reports will be stored in the Microsoft Access database.

Quarterly reports will be required and will be collected through telephone conversations between the selected agencies and the support contractor, Toxcel. These calls will serve to discuss what has occurred within the past quarter in relation to the project, such as how the tools and technologies have been implemented, any challenges faced and how they were or will be addressed, any successes to date, and lessons learned. They will also include a conversation about planned activities and concerns for the upcoming quarter. Information from these calls will be documented in the Microsoft Access database.

NHTSA's support contractor, Toxcel, will collect all information from the selected agencies throughout the life of the project. This information will be used by a separate evaluation contractor, not secured as part of this demonstration project. There will be a separate evaluation contractor with a separate project agreement who will conduct the evaluation. Other information may include but may not be limited to the following: before and after data for number of DRE call-outs; number of DRE responses to assist with other agencies or jurisdictions; time elapsed between requesting a search warrant to obtain chemical evidence to obtaining the warrant; time elapsed to draw blood for chemical testing; time elapsed from conducting the DRE evaluation to entering any information gathered into the data portal; comparison of details and evaluation of findings from before and after new evaluation equipment was provided and used; the number of new DREs in State-based project implementation efforts (e.g. training that occurred, time period elapsed (e.g., one year) after the implementation of the selected strategies, or other). The Microsoft Access database that includes each agency's application will be made available to NHTSA and NHTSA's evaluation contractor.

The information gathered during the implementation phase of the project will be used to develop a final report documenting the application, selection, and funding process; the evaluation process; overall lessons learned, challenges and mitigation strategies; and individual sections for each participant documenting DRE background, the strategies, and tools that were implemented and how they were implemented; as well as overall challenges, lessons learned, the data collected, and evaluation findings. The report will be delivered to NHTSA.

- 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.**

Selected agencies will be asked to submit, via email, monthly reports documenting activities conducted in the reporting month and planned for the next month. The information will be submitted on a digital fillable form and submitted to Toxcel using a corporate email box established specifically for this project.

Consideration was given to collecting information using automated or electronic collection methods; however, after a cost benefit analysis was conducted, the fillable form and email submission was determined to bring the greatest benefit and least burden to States and law enforcement agencies.

Quarterly reports will be collected through telephone conversations between the selected agencies and the NHTSA's contractor. Quarterly conversations will be conducted to open clear lines of communication, to assure information is accurately and efficiently documented, to assure participating agencies are successfully implementing the components of the project, utilizing the resources (tools & technologies), to offer technical assistance, and/or to answer questions.

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.

Information collected for this one-time demonstration project to study strategies to improve DRE programs could not be obtained through any existing means. NHTSA was unable to locate any source of information that contains all of the aspects of DRE strategy implementation that this demonstration project is designed to study.

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

This demonstration project will be open to all law enforcement agencies no matter the size of the agency who voluntarily step up. Additionally, because NHTSA is interested in studying implementation of the strategies by different size law enforcement, NHTSA expects that some respondents will be small entities. However, since participation in the demonstration project is voluntary, NHTSA believes that small entities will only participate if they believe the experience will be beneficial to them.

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.

Collecting the information identified as being part of this demonstration project will help NHTSA understand what law enforcement has done in the past, is doing currently, and how, by working together, processes for collecting data could be improved. The consequences for not collecting this information would be that NHTSA is prohibited from learning more about the processes and from creating a means for assisting law enforcement to improve how they implement their DRE programs in the future and ultimately to remove drug impaired drivers from America's roadways.

Collecting monthly and quarterly reports is to assure the project overall is on task and time with recruitment, distribution of resources, and in meeting the needs of all participating agencies. Collecting information less frequently could lead to improper program implementation ultimately leading to poor, skewed, or far worse, a total disregard for data collection.

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.

This information collection does require monthly reports to verify that the project overall is on task and time with recruitment, distribution of resources, and in meeting the needs of all participating agencies. Monthly reporting is to be used as a tool to check-in with participating agencies to assure they can successfully implement program efforts. Monthly reporting allows for the participating agencies to share their accomplishments but also to give forward thought to problems/delays and suggested solutions to remedy such risks, and to ask for assistance, when and where needed.

- 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 on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format, and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.**

A 60-day Notice and comment period soliciting comments on the following information collection was published on August 31, 2022, Docket No. NHTSSA-2022-0032. Four general comments were received (Yolanda Robinson, anonymous, and NAMIC which submitted two letters).

Yolanda Robinson provided remarks in support of "any opportunities for law enforcement to receive additional training outside of firearm skill training". Ms. Robinson went on to share data and her analysis of data she accessed from Wisconsin and Colorado. She references other articles and information on how the fatality rates in those States have been impacted as a result of the legalization of marijuana. She goes further to state that "additional training to assist officers in detecting impaired drivers and interacting with them, will be a lifesaving investment". Training is being afforded as a component of this project; therefore, Ms. Robinson's comments show support to the project but do not affect what has been planned for the Information Collection Request.

The anonymous letter provided remarks regarding the lack of standardized processes for the DRE program. The author expands and describes that it may be challenging to standardize DRE evaluation processes because of variability in laws state-to-state. The author goes on to express that the ability for the DRE protocol to capture evidentiary data is limited and that current processes hold the potential for human error, biases or other inaccuracies and that the learning from this project is a great opportunity to improve the DRE program at the national level through automated, standardized, and objective practices to eliminate human error and improve data capture. The author goes further to recommend using video recordings, forced auto populated forms, and a device known as GAIZE or other comparable devices to capture/record eye movements. They share that improving the processes with additional objectivity and accuracy could not only improve the DRE evaluation processes but contribute to a meaningful body of evidence. Many different tools will be made available to DRE's as a component of this project; therefore, the anonymous contributor's comments show support to the project but do not affect or alter what has been planned for the Information Collection Request.

Two letters in support of the DRE project were submitted by the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC). Both comments included very similar language. In NAMIC's letters addressed to NHTSA Administrator Ann Carlson, "NAMIC supports NHTSA's proposed new information collection.

NAMIC acknowledges that while there are standardized practices, there are "differences in how each State and local DRE program collects evidence, records data, and determines who will respond when a DRE is needed". And, that these differences are a result of different funding, numbers of trained DRE's, laws and other factors unique to each jurisdiction.

NAMIC goes on to share their concern for the legalization of cannabis and its widespread medical and recreational use by millions of Americans and the many resulting challenges that will arise and could impact traffic crashes and fatalities. NAMIC indicates that the insurance industry will play an important and leading role in policy conversations related to cannabis, "its effects on drivers, and automobile safety as part of an ongoing effort to keep everyone on the road as safe as possible". NAMIC acknowledges that every kind of potential impairment is a problem and the lack of standardized testing of cannabis impairment makes it difficult for the problems to be addressed. They go further to reference that new technology could be key in systematizing and determining cannabis impairment however the distribution, real-time, deployment, and implementation will face challenges.

NAMIC recognizes the importance of the information collection citing recent statistics from NHTSA and the Governors Highway Safety Association, National Academy of Sciences, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's National Survey on Drug Use and Health, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the National Conference of State Legislatures as they all share their data and concerns for the rising number of road user deaths.

NAMIC's letter shows their support of the proposed collection of information as necessary and appropriate, believes that the information will have significant practical utility", that the "work is critical for the proper performance of the functions of NHTSA", and that this information collection is "another step in the possible range of safety data collection and reporting". NAMIC's comments on the proposed information collection are appreciated, showing support for Information Collection but do not affect the projected plans.

Thank you to all contributing commentors for providing thoughtful commentary as to the importance of conducting the Strategies to Improve Drug Recognition Expert Officers' Performance and Law Enforcement Agencies' DRE Programs.

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

Respondents (e.g. participating agencies) will not be provided any payment or gifts for their participation in this demonstration project. Participation is voluntary. Resources distributed as a result of this project are meant to allow participating agencies to implement different strategies for improving their DRE programs. Resources issued to participating agencies are necessary for each agency to properly participate in the demonstration project. Issued resources, cannot be recouped due to the individualized nature of the software set up, multi-factor authentication safety and security measures, and specified nature or use of the tools required by each individual participating agency. Participating agencies therefore may benefit from the resources provided (e.g. training, tools and technologies for collecting data, implementing a call-out system, implementing an electronic warrant system, and/or implementing law enforcement phlebotomy), helping to support their efforts in carrying out Drug Influence Evaluations on drivers suspected of drug-impaired driving.

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 systems of records notice (SORN) or privacy impact assessment (PIA), those should be cited and described here.

A Privacy Threshold Assessment was conducted simultaneously with this request. Informed consent is not required to collect information from participating agencies. Participating agencies are public servants, will be sharing information only about their organizations, and each State has its own public access laws, making information that may be collected from this project open and available to the public if requested. PII is not being collected or published as a result of this ICR. Information collected will be at the agency level, will be shared internally, and when shared, will be done so in the aggregate to preserve individual agency anonymity. No assurances of confidentiality are needed. The Privacy Threshold Assessment was fully adjudicated 08/01/2022.

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. 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.

No questions of a sensitive nature will be asked. The goal is to understand which tools, technologies, and strategies support best or promising practices.

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.

Estimated Burden Hours for Participating Agencies

Data collection will require the following activities for participating agencies: completing an application, reviewing and signing a memorandum of understanding, participating in a kickoff call, preparing and

submitting monthly reports and participating in quarterly phone calls. Agencies that are not selected for participation will spend time only on completing the application.

The total estimated burden hours for each participating agency is 88 hours. Assuming 15 agencies respond and are selected, the total estimated burden hours for all agencies is 1,320.00. The estimated total burden hours for any agency that submits an application but is not selected is 1 hour. This is a 36-month effort, assuming agencies are selected by March 2023 and provide monthly reports through March 2026. The average annual burden for all agencies is 440 hours or 29.33 hour per respondent. Table 1 provides more details about the total estimated burden hours.

Table 1. Estimated Total and Annual Burden Hours for Participating Agencies

Activity	No. of Respondents	No. of Times Completed	Est. Burden Hours Per Activity	Total Est. Burden Hours
Complete Application (Form 1663 & 1680)	15	1	1	15
Review and Sign Paperwork	15	1	1	15
Participate in Kickoff Call	15	1	1	15
Complete and Submit Monthly Reports (Form 1662) and Invoices	15	36	2	1,080
Participate in Quarterly Phone Calls	15	12	1	180
Total Burden Hours				1,320 hours
Total Annual Burden Hours				440 hours/year
Total Burden Hours Per Respondent				88 hours
Average Annual Burden Hours Per Respondent				29.33 hours/year

Estimated Annualized Labor Costs for Selected Agencies

The burden hour labor cost associated with this collection of information for selected agencies is derived by multiplying the appropriate mean wage published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (weighted for total compensation) by the estimated burden hours for selected agencies. The mean wage is estimated to be \$34.02 per hour for “Police and Sheriff’s Patrol Officers.”² This is estimated to be 62% of total compensation costs.³ Therefore, NHTSA estimates the hourly labor costs to be \$54.87. The estimated total labor cost for selected agencies to participate in the project is \$1,609.55 per selected agency and \$24,143.23 for all selected agencies.

The estimated annual labor cost associated with the burden hours per selected agency and all agencies is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Estimated Annual Labor Cost for Selected Agencies

Annual Respondents	Mean Hourly	Employer Costs for	Average Hourly	Annual Average	Annual Labor	Total Annual	Total Annual
--------------------	-------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

² National estimates for Police and Sheriff’s Patrol Officers, available at <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes333051.htm> (accessed May 5, 2022).

³ Table 1: Employer costs for employee compensation by ownership, state and local government workers, available at <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/eccec.t01.htm> (accessed May 5, 2022).

	Wage for Police & Sheriff's Patrol Officers 33-3051	Employee Compensation for Wages & Salaries	Labor Cost	Burden Hours per Respondent	Cost Per Agency	Average Burden Hours	Labor Cost
15	\$34.02	0.62	\$54.87	29.33	\$1,609.55	440	\$24,143.23

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. Do not include the cost of any hour burden already reflected in the response provided in question 12.

There will be no additional costs to respondents or record keepers.

14. Provide estimates of annualized costs 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.

The annualized cost to the Federal Government is based on the Contracting Officer Representative (COR) and Alternate Contracting Officer Representative's (ACOR) salaries, annualized by an hourly rate the GSA salary schedule found at: <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/2022/general-schedule/>. NHTSA calculated the cost associated with the COR's time by using the hourly wage for a GS-14, beginning at Step 1, of \$45.99. Each successive year increases a step. To estimate total compensation costs, NHTSA used the Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimate that wages and salary only represent 62.0% of total employee compensation cost for State and local employees,⁴ which brings the total hourly cost for the employee's time in FY 22 to \$74.18. No other operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense will be incurred as a result of this collection of information. Items identified in Appendix A are also eligible expenses and will be made available to participating agencies. However, all items will not just be allocated to participating agencies. Individual participating agencies will need to request those items needed for their full participation.

In addition to the estimated costs for the COR and ACOR, included in the table is the annualized cost for the NHTSA Support Contractor, Toxcel as per their executed contract.

Table 4. Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

Annualized Costs to Federal Government	% of effort	% effort hrs/yr	% effort hrs/wk	FY '22 @	FY '23 @	FY '24 @	FY '25 @	FY '26 @	5-year Total
Salaries				\$74.18	\$76.41	\$78.70	\$81.06	\$83.49	
COR	0.08	167	3	\$12,385.09	\$12,756.65	\$13,139.34	\$13,533.53	\$13,939.53	\$65,754.14
ACOR	0.07	146	3	\$10,836.96	\$11,162.06	\$11,496.93	\$11,841.83	\$12,197.09	\$57,534.87

⁴ Employer Costs for Employee Compensation, p.4, https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/ecec_03182022.pdf. Accessed 03/30/22.

Contractor Costs				\$487,784.20	\$487,784.20	\$487,784.20	\$511,945.20	\$524,701.20	\$2,499,999.00
Total Annualize Cost		313		\$511,006.25	\$511,702.91	\$512,420.47	\$537,320.56	\$550,837.82	\$2,623,288.01

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 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 collection; the entire burden cost and number of burden hours will represent a program change. As such, it requires an estimated 440 annual average hours per participating agency and \$0 additional costs for the new information collection.

16. For collections 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.

The information will be published as a report that documents project findings for NHTSA and participating agencies. There will not be any complex analytical techniques used for tabulating results. This is a demonstration project. NHTSA intends to use the findings for internal purposes to substantiate what it takes to plan and implement the DRE project within selected jurisdictions.

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 1320.9.⁵

There are no exceptions to the certifications statement.

⁵ Specifically explain how the agency display the OMB control number and expiration date and will inform potential respondents of the information required under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3): the reasons the information is planned to be and/or has been collected; the way such information is planned to be and/or has been used to further the proper performance of the functions of the agency; an estimate, to the extent practicable, of the average burden of the collection (together with a request that the public direct to the agency any comments concerning the accuracy of this burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing this burden); whether responses to the collection of information are voluntary, required to obtain or retain a benefit (citing authority), or mandatory (citing authority); the nature and extent of confidentiality to be provided, if any (citing authority); and the fact that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Appendices

Appendix A: Tools, Technologies, and Supplies

Included herein is a list of all possible items that participating agencies may need to properly implement enhancements to their DRE Program. Participating agencies will select only those items that they identify are needed for their proper participation. The “average cost” price is included for informational purposes only. Agencies will not be charged for the items selected/needed. Items are not being provided as gifts but are considered as essential items for proper participation and implementation of the DRE Program.

Strategy	Item	Average Cost
Data collection devices for DRE evidence gathering and reporting on drivers suspected of drug-impaired driving	iPad	\$ 595.67
	Android-based tablet	\$ 849.99
	Laptops that can also be used as tablet	\$ 1,137.99
	Smart phone	\$ 982.99
Data collection software and apps	ITSMR DRE Data Entry & Management System	Varies, cannot get actual costs since this is work done through an existing contract with NHTSA
	Other DRE Data Entry & Management Systems	There are no commercially available systems, this may be a matter of working with other agencies to use systems they developed
DRE call-out systems to obtain an available DRE when a drug influence evaluation is needed	Smart phones for text message or app-based systems	\$ 982.99
	Everbridge software	Varies, need to know specifics of what will be needed by each agency in order to get costs
	Notification applications such as GroupMe, Active911, IAmResponding	\$ 105.00
E-warrant	PDF Maker to create PDF forms or save	\$ 179.88

Strategy	Item	Average Cost
systems/programs for quickly obtaining chemical evidence for impaired driving cases	documents as PDFs	
	Tablets for accessing either a web-based or email-based system	\$ 595.67 (iPad), \$ 849.99 (android)
Law Enforcement Phlebotomy Equipment	Pelican Case	\$ 321.95
	Butterfly Needles	\$ 300.30
	Straight Needles	\$ 224.22
	Vacutainer	\$ 68.26
	Tourniquets	\$ 93.92
	Gauze	\$ 42.44
	Cohesive Tape	\$ 22.70
	Textbooks	\$ 147.50
	Tuition for Forensic Phlebotomy Training	\$ 780.63
	Hotels for training	\$ 1,490.00
	Meals for training	\$ 640.00
	Dynarex Blood Collection Holder	\$ 57.84
	Medline Sharps Container	\$ 77.75
	Chloride Swabs	\$ 15.99
	Self-Adherent Bandages	\$ 15.00
	Surgical Sponges	\$ 5.99
	Blood Collection Tray	\$ 66.01
	Scrubs	\$ 52.54
	Vein Finder	\$ 1,817.50
	Phlebotomy Chair	\$ 525.00
	Alcohol wipes	\$ 70.00
	Antiseptic Cleaning Wipes	\$ 50.00
	Supply cabinet with lock	\$ 150.00
	Supply tray/portable box	\$ 50.00
	Storage of samples: Fridge with keyless lock	\$ 750.00
	Practice dummies /instructor demo supplies	\$ 670.50
	Arm rest wedge	\$ 50.00
Phlebotomy arm rest	\$ 300.00	
Phlebotomy Recert every 2 years	\$ 338.00	
IFAK Trauma Kit	\$ 140.00	
Other equipment used during drug influence evaluations	Breathalyzer	\$ 410.00
	Backpack	\$ 84.65
	Briefcase	\$ 131.31
	Sphygmomanometer	\$ 29.88
	Stethoscope	\$ 63.60
	Oral thermometer	\$ 392.02
	Pupillometer	\$ 232.33
	Medical pen light	\$ 15.01
	Magnifying light	\$ 130.31
	Medical gloves	\$ 12.92
	Medical masks	\$ 21.95

Strategy	Item	Average Cost
	Camera	\$ 198.98
	Micro recorder	\$ 78.05
	Thermometer sleeves	\$ 8.35
	Anti-bacterial gel	\$ 26.46
	Thumb drive for resources/reports	\$ 15.66

Appendix B: DRE References

Active911 (n.d.). <https://www.active911.com/>

Everbridge
(n.d.). <https://www.everbridge.com/>

Engage IACP. (n.d.). *Support for local DRE programs.*

GroupMe. (n.d.). <https://groupme.com/en-US/>

International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2020). *IACP Drug Evaluation & Classification Program Annual Report*. <https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/DEC%20Annual%20Reports/2020%20Annual%20Report.pdf>

International Association of Chiefs of Police. (n.d.). *How to Become a drug recognition expert*. <https://www.theiacp.org/how-to-become-a-drug-recognition-expert>

Office of Behavioral Safety Research. (2021). *Update to special reports on traffic safety during the COVID-19 public health emergency: Fourth quarter data*. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://rosap.nhtsa.gov/view/dot/56125>

Reaves, B. (2011). *Census of state and local law enforcement agencies, 2008*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/census-state-and-local-law-enforcement-agencies-2008>

Talpins, S., Hayes, C., & Kimball, T. (2018). *Saving lives and preventing crashes: The drug evaluation and classification (DEC) program*. National Traffic Law Center

Law Enforcement Phlebotomy References

Arizona Governor's Office of Highway Safety. (2018). *Phlebotomy Program*. Retrieved from <https://www.azgohs.gov/programs/default.asp?ID=48>.

Berning, A., Compton, R., Vegega, M., Beirness, D., Hedlund, J., Jones, R., & Nichols, J. (2008). *Refusal of Intoxication Testing: A Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Retrieved from https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/811098_1.pdf

Berning, A., Beirness, D., Hedlund, J., & Jones, R. (2007). *Traffic Safety Facts Research Note: Breath Test Refusals*. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Retrieved from <https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/810871.pdf>

Birchfield v. North Dakota, 579 U.S. _ (2016). Retrieved from <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/579/14-1468/>.

Compton, R. (2017, July). *Marijuana-Impaired Driving: A Report to Congress*. (DOT HS 812 440). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Retrieved from <https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/documents/812440-marijuana-impaired-driving-report-to-congress.pdf>

- Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Department of Justice (US) (2017). Crime in the United States 2016: *Uniform Crime Reports*. Washington (DC). Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2016/crime-in-the-u.s.-2016/tables/table-18>
- Hedlund, J. (2017). *Drug-Impaired Driving: A Guide for States*. Governors Highway Safety Association.
- Kelley-Baker, T. (2014). *Marijuana and Driving Performance*. Retrieved from Presentation at TRB Alcohol, Other Drugs and Transportation Committee 2014 Midyear Meeting.
- Logan, B.K. (2014). *Thresholds for THC and Driving*. Presentation at TRB Alcohol, Other Drugs and Transportation Committee 2014 Midyear Meeting.
- Marose, D. (2017). *Law Enforcement Has Another Tool in the Fight Against Impaired Driving: Law Enforcement Phlebotomy in Minnesota*.
- Minnesota Traffic Law Enforcement Training Program. (2017). *Training Announcement: Law Enforcement Phlebotomist*. Retrieved from <https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/msp/about/Documents/Training%20Announcement%20August%202017.pdf>
- Missouri v. McNeely, 569 U.S. 141 (2013). Retrieved from <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/569/11-1425/>.
- Namuswe, E, Coleman, H., & Berning, A. (2014). *Breath Test Refusal Rates in the United States - 2011 Update*. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Retrieved from https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/breath_test_refusal_rates-811881.pdf
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2017). *Traffic Safety Facts 2016 Data: Alcohol-Impaired Driving*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC; Retrieved from <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812450>
- Olson, J. (2016). *Law Enforcement Phlebotomy: An introduction to the 6 Steps in creating a quality Law Enforcement Phlebotomy Program*. Handout from Idaho Prosecuting Attorneys Association Conference 2016.
- Schmerber v. California, 384 U.S. 757 (1966). Retrieved from <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/384/757/case.html>
- State of Idaho: Impaired Driving Program. (2017). *Law Enforcement Phlebotomy Training Program*. Retrieved from <https://www.post.idaho.gov/Reg2/052617PhlebotomyTrainingApplication.pdf>
- State v. May, 2 CA-CR 2004-0099 Court of Appeals, State of Arizona - Division Two. Retrieved from <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/az-court-of-appeals/1419603.html>
- Utah Department of Public Safety. (2017). *Additional Non-POST Sponsored Training: Peace Officer Standards and Training*. Retrieved from <https://post.utah.gov/in-service-investigations/additional-non-post-sponsored-training/>

Expedited Search Warrant References

- 725 Illinois Compiled Statutes. 5/108-4. Issuance of Search Warrant.
www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?ActID=1966&ChapterID=54&SeqStart=8200000&SeqEnd=14900000
- 2016 Colorado Revised Statutes - CO Rev Stat § 16-1-106 (2016).
<https://law.justia.com/codes/colorado/2016/title-16/code-of-criminal-procedure/article-1/section-16-1-106/>
- Arizona Supreme Court Administrative Order 2018-51 (2018).
www.azcourts.gov/Portals/22/admorder/Orders18/2018-51.pdf
- Benefiel, G. T. (2012). DUI search warrants: Prosecuting DUI refusals. *The Kansas Prosecutor*, 9(1). www.kcdaa.org/Resources/Documents/KSPProsecutor-Spring12.pdf
- Berning, A., Beirness, D., Hedlund, J., & Jones, R. (2007). *Breath test refusals* (Traffic Safety Facts Research Note. Report No. DOT HS 810 871. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/810871.pdf
- Berning, A., Compton, R., Vegega, M., Beirness, D., Hedlund, J., Jones, R., & Nichols, J. (2008). *Refusal of intoxication testing: A Report to Congress* (Report No. DOT HS 811 098). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/811098_1.pdf
- Birchfield v. North Dakota*, 136 S.Ct. 2160 (2016).
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/579/14-1468/>
- Borakove, E., & Banks, R. (2018). *A guide to implementing electronic warrants*. Justice Management Institute. www.responsibility.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/FAAR_3715-eWarrants-Interactive-PDF_V-4.pdf?pdf=eWarrants_Implementation_Guide
- Bureau of Justice Assistance (2014). *Warrant & Disposition Toolkit*. Alabama Warrant Management Project. www.wdmtoolkit.org/~/.media/Microsites/Files/Warrants%20and%20Dispositions/State%20Implementations/Alabama/AL%20-%20Results%20and%20Lessons%20Learned%207-8-2015.ashx
- California Code, Penal Code - PEN CA PENAL § 1526.
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=1526.&awCode=PEN
- California Courts. (n.d.). *Electronic On-Call Warrants - San Bernardino Superior Court*.
www.courts.ca.gov/27655.htm
- Chapter 107 of the 2014 Laws of Maryland – Criminal Procedure – Search Warrants –

Procedures. www.mgaleg.maryland.gov/Pubs/LegisLegal/2014rs-laws-maryland-Vol-002.pdf

Court of Appeals of Maryland Administrative Order on the Implementation of Electronic Search Warrants (2015). <https://mdcourts.gov/sites/default/files/admin-orders/20150629electronicsearchwarrants.pdf>

Gutier, A. (2016, April). "Law enforcement phlebotomy for safer roads" [online article]. The LEL. https://gohs.az.gov/sites/default/files/LEL_042016_PhlebotomyNewsArticle.pdf

Hedlund, J., & Beirness, D. (2007, October). *Use of warrants for breath test refusal: Case studies* (Report No. DOT HS 810 852). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/810852.pdf

Holmes, E. (2018, April 22-24). *Improving DUI system efficiency: Electronic warrant systems* [PowerPoint]. Lifesavers Conference 2018, San Antonio, TX. <https://lifesaversconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Holmes-ID-04-1.pdf>

Holewa, S. (2016). Final Report – Electronic Search Warrant Workgroup. North Dakota Court System.

International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2018, November). 2018 resolutions. www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/View%20the%20recently%20adopted%202018%20Resolutions.pdf?utm_source=Informz&utm_medium=e-mail&utm_campaign=Informz%20E-mail

Jacobson, M. (2013). Kentucky E-warrants Case Study. www.wdmtoolkit.org/~/.media/Microsites/Files/Warrants%20and%20Dispositions/State%20Implementations/Kentucky/Kentucky%20eWarrant%20Case%20Study.ashx

Kansas Statute 22-2502. Search warrants; issuance; proceedings authorized; availability of affidavits and testimony in support of probable cause requirement; use of electronic communications and tracking devices. <http://rvpolicy.kdor.ks.gov/Pilots/Ntrntpil/IPILv1x0.NSF/23d6cf461dc0d3f58625656e005c41cd/08121b70179ff9f286258067005c2b03?OpenDocument>

Maryland Code, Criminal Procedure 1-203. Article – Criminal Procedure. <https://law.justia.com/codes/maryland/2005/gcp/1-203.html>

Minnesota Court Rules of Criminal Procedure. www.revisor.mn.gov/court_rules/rule/cr-toh/

Minnesota v. Trahan 870 N.W.2d 396 (Minn. App. 2015). <https://cases.justia.com/minnesota/court-of-appeals/2015-a13-931.pdf?ts=1444759769>

Missouri v. McNeely, 569 U.S. 141 (2013). <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/569/11-1425/>

Mitchell v. Wisconsin, 588 U. S. _____, 139 S.Ct 2525 (2019). www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/18pdf/18-6210_2co3.pdf

Namuswe, E., Coleman, H., & Berning, A. (2014). *Breath test refusal rates in the United States – 2011 update* (Report No. DOT HS 811 881). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/breath_test_refusal_rates-811881.pdf

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2019). *Law enforcement phlebotomy toolkit: A guide to assist law enforcement agencies with planning and implementing a phlebotomy program* (Report DOT HS 812 705). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/documents/14222-phlebotomy_toolkit_final-032819-v1a_tag_0.pdf

Schmerber v. California, 384 U.S. 757 (1966).
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/384/757/case.html>

State of Utah. (2008). *E-Warrants: Cross Boundary Collaboration*. National Association of State Chief Information Officers 2008 State IT Recognition Awards. www.nascio.org/awards/

Vanlaar, W., Brown, S., Ireland, L., & Robertson, R. (2016, August). *Driving while impaired arrest process improvement: Six case studies of strategies used by law enforcement to reduce the cost and time of processing a DWI arrest* (Report No. DOT HS 812 308). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/nti/pdf/812308-DWI-Arrest-Process-Improvement.pdf

Zwicker, T. J., Hedlund, J., & Northrup, V. S. (2005, August). *Breath test refusals in DWI enforcement: An interim report* (Report No. DOT HS 809 876). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at <https://one.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/research/breathtestrefusal/images/BreathTestText.pdf>