

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Circumstances making collection of information necessary

Every year, several thousand motorcyclists are involved in fatal highway crashes, and many more sustain nonfatal injuries. While the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) focuses on preventing motorcycle crashes, decreasing motorcycle crash injuries and fatalities, increasing the proportion of properly licensed motorcyclists, and promoting motorcycle safety education, the escalating fatality and injury trends signal that more needs to be done. States are given considerable latitude in implementing motorcycle safety measures which leads to considerable differences across States. NHTSA has selected AIR to conduct a study aimed at gathering comprehensive data on what each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia are doing to promote and ensure safe riding behavior. This study will equip NHTSA with previously unknown information about the State-by-State differences/similarities in carrying out motorcycle safety provisions.

Motorcycle safety does not lie only with NHTSA – it is the responsibility of State and local policymakers, law enforcement officials, and motorists across the United States. Ultimately, this study will provide information to States and to the general public (both motorcycle riders and non-riders alike) in order to increase awareness of the issue of motorcycle safety and equip them with the knowledge and tools necessary to address this growing problem.

2. Purposes and uses of the data

The increase in motorcycle-related deaths and injuries calls for new strategies as well as to expand existing programs. There have been periods of major improvement in motorcycle safety, especially since the implementation of Federal laws and programs that were first established over 35 years ago. But escalating fatality and injury trends signal that more needs to be done and areas of focus must be expanded. NHTSA has not determined all of the causes of these increases in fatalities.

The information gained through this study will allow NHTSA to determine which strategies and programs are effective in reducing motorcycle-related deaths and injuries, which strategies and programs need to be expanded, and which strategies and programs need to be re-evaluated. This provides NHTSA with the data to support States in their efforts to improve their motorcycle safety efforts. Moreover, States can draw on the study results to inform policy decisions aimed at increasing motorcycle rider safety.

3. Use of technology to reduce burden

The survey to be administered in this study will be in paper-and-pencil format, as developing web-based methods would not be cost-effective given the small number of respondents in the study. In some circumstances, technology will be used to reduce burden such as using the telephone and/or email to distribute and/or remind respondents to complete the surveys, giving respondents the option of faxing or emailing the completed survey back to project

team members instead of mailing, and offering to complete the survey over the phone to make it easier for them.

4. Efforts to identify duplication

The Evaluation of State Motorcycle Safety Programs represents NHTSA's only study currently underway that is aimed at compiling inclusive data on each States' programs to promote motorcycle safety. NHTSA conducts other research initiatives on motorcycle safety, though most focus on a specific aspect, such as alcohol impairment, crash causes/outcomes, operator behavior, safety education materials, helmet legislation, or conspicuity. While NHTSA will provide AIR with a few pieces of previously-collected data on aspects of State programs in order to further reduce duplication, there is no other comprehensive source of data available on State strategies and programs to improve motorcycle safety. Thus the data must be collected as part of the study.

5. Methods to minimize burden on small entities

No small businesses or entities will be involved as respondents. Data will be collected only from State Motorcycle Safety Administrators and State Highway Safety Offices.

6. Consequences of not collecting the data

The Evaluation of State Motorcycle Safety Programs represents one of the primary efforts by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to decrease motorcycle-related injuries and fatalities. Without this study, there would be no systematic, rigorous data on State strategies and programs to enforce and promote motorcycle safety. Therefore, NHTSA would have no data from which to determine the effectiveness of current initiatives and no way to conclude what changes should or should not be made to reduce crashes and improve safety for motorcyclists and motorists alike.

7. Special circumstances

No special circumstances apply to this study.

8. Adherence to 5CFR 1320.8 guidelines and consultation outside the agency

This study was not listed in the Federal Register.

To assist with the development of the Evaluation of State Motorcycle Safety Programs study, project staff have drawn on the experience and expertise of several outside experts. The consultants and their affiliations are as follows:

Ronald Shepard — State Director, Idaho STAR Motorcycle Safety Program

Steven Garets — State Director, TEAM OREGON Motorcycle Safety Program

Project staff will use outside experts for consultation on an as-needed basis.

9. Payment or gifts

No payments or gifts will be use over the course of this study.

10. Assurances of confidentiality

AIR research staff will be trained to keep all names and any other identifying information completely confidential, and to omit this information while recording information from the surveys. Caution will be exercised in limiting data access to authorized project staff and those

who have been instructed in the confidentiality requirements of the study. The data will contain no information that could be used to identify subjects other than that which is publicly available (e.g., his/her name as a contact for the state motorcycle rider education program on a publicly available website, brochure, or poster). No individual identifying information will appear in any of our reports. All materials will be stripped of all individually identifiable information other than state of origin to further protect respondent confidentiality.

11. Justification of sensitive questions

No questions of a sensitive nature will be included in this study. Respondents are reporting on state-level activities only.

12. Estimates of hour burden

The total estimated hour burden for the full Evaluation of State Motorcycle Safety Programs study is 25.5 hours. Based on average hourly wages for participants, this amounts to a monetary burden of \$510.

The annual response is calculated by multiplying the number of respondents (column 4 of Exhibit) by the time estimate (35 minutes per survey, or .58 of an hour). Estimated monetary cost of burden is calculated by multiplying the annual response by the hourly rate.

Exhibit: Time Burden for Respondents

Task	Total sample size	Estimated response rate	Number of respondents	Time estimate (in hours)	Total hours	Hourly rate*	Estimated monetary cost of burden
State Motorcycle Safety Administrator and State Highway Safety Office Survey	51	85%	44	.58	25.5	\$20	\$510

*Assumes an average yearly salary of \$40,000 and a 2080 hour work year

13. Estimate of cost burden to respondents

There are no additional respondent costs associated with this data collection other than the hour burden accounted for in Item 12.

14. Estimate of annual cost to the federal government

The estimated cost for the 18 month study, including development of data collection instruments, justification package, data collection, data analysis, and preparation of a final report, is \$158,331 per year.

15. Program changes or adjustments

The request is for a new data collection, therefore resulting in an increase of 26 hours to the agency’s overall burden hour total.

16. Plans for tabulation and publication of results

AIR will submit a final report summarizing the results of the entire study. In drafting the report, AIR will first create an outline of the contents. The contents will include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Executive summary
2. Purpose of project
3. Research methodology
 - a. Survey design
 - b. Data collection procedures
 - c. Pre-test procedures
 - d. Database design
 - e. Data analysis
4. Results from survey of Motorcycle Safety Administrator and State Highway Safety Officers
5. Implications of study and future directions

The Final Report will present the “state of the art” of motorcycle safety programs in the States, with emphasis on impaired driving, helmets, and licensing. It will support the presentation with results from the quantitative and qualitative data analyses. Technical information (e.g., research methodology) about the study will be included, but this information will be accessible to both technical and non-technical audiences.

Although the Final Report will summarize the results from several different topics, it is important that the results be integrated so that a general picture of motorcycle safety programs emerges. The report will serve as an important tool not only for Administrators but also for State and Federal policymakers considering budgets for motorcycle safety programs and for NHTSA and other traffic professionals interested in implementing motorcycle safety strategies. AIR will work with our expert consultants and NHTSA to make certain that the Final Report addresses the needs of key stakeholders, while rigorously documenting the procedures followed to conduct the study.

In addition to preparing the draft Final Report, AIR will submit to NHTSA a SAS database of all survey questionnaire responses. Following the receipt of comments from NHTSA on the draft Final Report, AIR will prepare the Final Report. To ensure the highest quality products, this report, and all other materials we produce, will be subjected to our usual high standards of quality control and internal review. AIR will also submit a two-page Summary Note, including a brief statement of the objective of the work performed, a brief description of the background, and a summary of how the work was accomplished.

17. Approval to not display OMB expiration date

All data collection instruments will include the OMB expiration date.

18. *Explanation of exceptions*

No exceptions are requested.