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Questions

• Why do legislators and policy leaders support or oppose evidenced-based safety countermeasures? Is it that they are not convinced of the evidence or concerned about constituent response?

• How do public opinion surveys on these countermeasures affect their decisions in support or opposition.

• How do key influencers such as law enforcement or lobbying groups affect the decisions of legislators or policy leaders on these countermeasures?

• How have state safety programs affected the adoptions of evidence-based policy countermeasures? What are the best practices among states in this regard?
Research Project

- Assess and compare current highway safety policies among six Midwest UTC states
- Using policies from national Toward Zero Deaths program, scoring criteria established to measure absolute and relative strength of state roadway safety policy
- Study also examines underlying issues contributing to adoption of TZD policies
  - Interviews with state legislators, legislative staff, traffic safety officials provide basis additional analysis and scoring
  - Better understanding of underlying issues contribution to -- or hindering -- state policy adoption
Public Support for Evidence-Based Safety Policy Countermeasures*

- Primary seat belt laws – 72%
- Sobriety checkpoints – 82%
- Motorcycle helmet mandate – 84%
- Graduated driver’s licenses – 88%
- Automated speed enforcement – 64%
- Breathalyzer-based ignition locks – 88%

* Randomized national probability sample of 1,205 registered voters who drive weekly. 20-minute phone interviews, March 23, 2010 to May 6, 2010. Margin of error is +/-2.8% for entire sample. Conducted by Critical Insights of Portland, Maine, for Humphrey School of Public Affairs.

Source: Knapp (2011); Munnich & Loveland (2011), TRR No. 2213
# Roadway Safety Policy & Leadership Study

## Implementation of Road Safety Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Primary Seat Belt Law</th>
<th>Universal Motorcycle Helmet Use</th>
<th>Sobriety Checkpoints</th>
<th>GDL Upgrade</th>
<th>Mandatory Ignition Interlocks</th>
<th>ASE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Toward Zero Deaths States

Source: AASHTO (2012)
Successful TZD Programs

1. An ambitious goal of eliminating traffic fatalities and serious injuries;
2. High levels of inter-agency cooperation in pursuit of the TZD goal among state departments of transportation, public safety, health, and other relevant agencies;
3. A comprehensive strategy addressing all 4 E’s – engineering, enforcement, education, and EMS elements of traffic safety;
4. A performance-based, data-driven system of targeting resources and strategies where they will have the greatest impact in reducing traffic fatalities; and
5. Policy leadership from relevant entities, including the Governor, the state legislature, and the heads of state agencies.

Source: Munnich, Douma, Qin, Thorpe, and Wang (2013), TRB paper
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### Strength of TZD State Roadway Safety Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ambitious Goal</th>
<th>Inter-agency Cooperation</th>
<th>Comprehensive Strategy (4E’s)</th>
<th>Performance-based, Data-driven</th>
<th>Policy Leadership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credible Messengers on Safety*

* Randomized national probability sample of 1,205 registered voters who drive weekly. 20-minute phone interviews, March 23, 2010 to May 6, 2010. Margin of error is ±2.8% for entire sample. Conducted by Critical Insights of Portland, Maine, for Humphrey School of Public Affairs.
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