



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration**



DOT HS 813 597

July 2024

Countermeasures That Work: An Introductory Resource For Rural Communities

This page intentionally left blank.

DISCLAIMER

This publication is distributed by the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in the interest of information exchange. If trade or manufacturers' names or products are mentioned, it is because they are considered essential to the object of the publication and should not be construed as an endorsement. The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers.

Suggested APA Format Citation:

Kostrzewski, H., Haskett, L., & Office of Behavioral Safety Research. (2024, July). *Countermeasures that work: An introductory resource for rural communities* (Report No. DOT HS 813 597). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

This page intentionally left blank.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. DOT HS 813 597		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Countermeasures That Work: An Introductory Resource for Rural Communities			5. Report Date July 2024		
			6. Performing Organization Code		
7. Authors Holly Kostrzewski, Lori Haskett, both in NHTSA's Impaired Driving Division, and the Office of Behavioral Safety Research			8. Performing Organization Report No.		
9. Performing Organization Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, DC 20590			10. Work Unit No. (TRAVIS)		
			11. Contract or Grant No.		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, DC 20590			13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report		
			14. Sponsoring Agency Code		
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract Rural America makes up 97% of the Nation's land mass and as of 2020 was home to more than 66 million people, or 20% of the population. USDOT typically defines a rural area based on the community's location in relation to a U.S. Census-designated urban area of certain populations. Regardless of definition, rural communities vary by geography and population among other things but have a few things in common—Rural roads are disproportionately affected by the ongoing traffic problems on our Nation's roadways. While only 20% live in rural areas, the fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 2021 was 1.5 times higher in rural areas than in urban areas. Speeding, higher maximum speed limits, infrastructure and poor roadway conditions, and longer EMS response times may all affect rural communities more adversely than urban communities. NHTSA's <i>Countermeasures That Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices</i> , 11th edition, describes major strategies and countermeasures; summarizes their use, effectiveness, costs, and implementation time; and provides references to research summaries and studies. This report presents some of those many countermeasures specifically for use in rural communities.					
17. Key Words urban/rural, rural communities, countermeasures, countermeasures that work			18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the public from the DOT, BTS, National Transportation Library, Repository & Open Science Access Portal, https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov .		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 33	22. Price

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Reproduction of completed page authorized

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

Why Rural?	1
What is a Countermeasure?	3
About This Guide	5
How Can I Get Started?	7
Speed	9
Countermeasures to Consider in Beginning Speed Programs in Your Community	9
Alcohol-Impaired Driving	11
Countermeasures to Consider in Beginning Alcohol-Impaired Driving Programs in Your Community	11
Seat Belts and Child Restraints	17
Countermeasures to Consider in Beginning Seat Belt and Child Restraint Programs in Your Community	17
References	21

This page intentionally left blank.

Why Rural?

Rural America makes up 97% of the Nation’s land mass and—at the time of the 2020 U.S. Census—was home to more than 66 million people or 20% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2023). While the U.S. Census Bureau defines rural as “all population, housing, and territory not included within an urban area,” rural definitions vary across the Federal Government and even within the U.S. Department of Transportation. The USDOT typically defines a rural area based on the community’s location in relation to a U.S. Census-designated urban area of certain populations (e.g., the community is located outside of a U.S. Census-designated urban area with a population of 50,000 or more).¹ Regardless of the definition used, the communities that comprise rural America are distinctive and may vary by geography and population. The distinct characteristics of Tribal Nations in rural areas must be noted as well. Still, rural communities have a few things in common—they are critical to our nation’s economic competitiveness and well-being, and they face challenges that impede their safety.

Rural roads are disproportionately affected by the ongoing crisis on our Nation’s roadways. While only 20% of the U.S. population live in rural areas, the fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in 2021 was 1.5 times higher in rural areas than in urban areas (NCSA, 2023). Behavioral (e.g., speeding and higher speed limits), infrastructural (e.g., poor roadway conditions), and other factors (e.g., longer emergency response times) affect rural communities more adversely than urban communities, causing this gap to persist over time.

One reason for the higher fatality rates in rural areas concerns EMS. Emergency response times can be much greater in rural America due in part to the limited number of EMS personnel, large coverage areas, and long distances to trauma centers. In 2021 some 69% of drivers killed in rural areas died at the scenes of the crashes, compared to 52% of drivers killed in urban areas. Of all drivers who were transported to hospitals and died en route, 56% were in rural areas compared to 44% in urban areas (NCSA, 2023). The availability of emergency responders and access to trauma centers are essential to survival in rural crashes.

When a serious injury or fatal crash occurs, it can affect the entire community and have a devastating ripple effect on the community’s social and economic fabric. The impact can be even more apparent in the smallest and most remote communities. Therefore, it is important that people living in and serving rural communities are knowledgeable about traffic safety countermeasures that can save lives.

¹ See the Bureau of Transportation Statistics Rural Funding Eligibility Tool for additional information on USDOT’s rural definitions, www.transportation.gov/rural/eligibility.

This page intentionally left blank.

What is a Countermeasure?

The countermeasures presented here provide an overview for traffic safety stakeholders to familiarize themselves with behavioral strategies and identify opportunities to implement programs in their communities.

Countermeasures are the basis for effective programs that save lives, prevent crashes, and make our roads safer for everyone.

The effectiveness of any countermeasure varies immensely across States and communities. What is done is often less important than how it is done. The best countermeasure may have little effect if it is not implemented vigorously, publicized extensively, and funded appropriately. The countermeasure effectiveness data presented in this guide shows the maximum effect that has been realized with high-quality implementation. Many countermeasures have not been evaluated well, or at all, as noted in the effectiveness data. As more research becomes available, some countermeasures found to be effective many years ago may not be as effective today.

Effectiveness ratings are based primarily on demonstrated reductions in crashes; however, changes in behavior and knowledge are factored into the ratings when crash information is not available. Countermeasure effectiveness is shown using a 5-star rating system:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 5 Stars | Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results. |
| 4 Stars | Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations in certain situations. |
| 3 Stars | Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations. |
| 2 Stars | Limited evaluation evidence but adheres to principles of human behavior and may be effective if implemented well. |
| 1 Star | No evaluation evidence but adheres to principles of human behavior and may be effective if implemented well. |

This page intentionally left blank.

About This Guide

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has identified behavioral countermeasures that have been determined to be effective in [*Countermeasures That Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices, 11th edition*](#) (Kirley et al., 2023), commonly abbreviated as CMTW. The guide is designed to be a basic reference to assist traffic safety stakeholders seeking effective countermeasures. The guide describes major strategies and countermeasures; summarizes their use, effectiveness, costs, and implementation time; and provides references to research summaries and studies. CMTW is designed as a tool and is not intended to be a comprehensive list of countermeasures available for State use or a list of expectations for State Highway Safety Office (SHSO) implementation.

While many of the safety countermeasures included in this resource are proven to be effective regardless of geography or rural/urban designation, this supplement seeks to highlight select behavioral roadway safety countermeasures of relevance to rural communities related to speed, alcohol-impaired driving, seat belts, and child restraints. CMTW is a non-exhaustive compilation of safety countermeasures that create starting places for those looking to address challenges in rural traffic safety.

Unless otherwise specified, all content contained in this rural supplement is derived from the 11th edition of the *Countermeasures That Work* (Kirley et al., 2023). For more information on safety countermeasures not included in this resource, including behavioral topics relating to distracted driving, drowsy driving, motorcyclists, young drivers, older drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists, please see the full CMTW.

This page intentionally left blank.

How Can I Get Started?

Community engagement across interdisciplinary partners is key to successfully implementing traffic safety countermeasures and is a common theme in CMTW. A traffic safety coalition, community action group, or task force is a great place to begin exploring ways to implement safety countermeasures for rural areas. Initial steps to support meaningful public involvement² and traffic safety improvements in rural communities might include:

- Convening health educators, child passenger safety technicians, county/city engineers, law enforcement (e.g., highway patrol, county sheriff, and city officers), emergency medical services (e.g., local volunteers and paramedics), and trauma hospital specialists (e.g., managers and emergency room doctors), as well as people working in the judicial system (e.g., lawyers and advocates) to discuss common and unique traffic safety challenges.
- Requesting local crash, injury, fatality, observation, and self-report survey data from your highway safety office or local law enforcement.
- Reviewing the data and working together as a team to see what your communities' trends are and how to address them.
- Meeting your local traffic safety stakeholders to determine community goals and next steps.

Resources exist to support practitioners and researchers interested in evaluating or establishing traffic safety programs. For example, NHTSA developed [A Primer for Evaluating Underage Drinking and Driving Programs](#) as a practical guide that explains program evaluation and provides information that is specific to underage drinking and driving (Ankem et al., 2021).

While this resource does not address funding, the USDOT has other resources on grant opportunities. For information on USDOT-wide grant opportunities, the [DOT Navigator](#) website can help you apply for grants, identify existing resources, and answer questions on how to connect with funding opportunities. For information on NHTSA's State Highway Safety Grants Program, please visit [Highway Safety Grants Programs](#) or [NHTSA Resources Guide](#) pages.

² See USDOT's *Promising Practices for Meaningful Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making* (2023) for additional guidance: https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2023-11/Promising%20Practices%20for%20Meaningful%20Public%20Involvement_2023Update_FINAL.pdf

This page intentionally left blank.

Speed

In 2021 there were 12,330 fatalities in speeding-related traffic crashes throughout the United States (NCSA, 2023). Thirty-nine percent of these speeding-related fatalities (4,833) occurred in rural areas. This represents 28% of the total 17,103 rural traffic fatalities that occurred in 2021.

Countermeasures to Consider in Beginning Speed Programs in Your Community

<p>Title: Lower Speed Limits</p> <p>Chapter: Speeding and Speed Management</p> <p>Effectiveness: 5 Star</p>	<p>A speed limit is in effect on all road segments in all States. Speed limits are set both by legislation and by administrative action. Default speed limits apply to all roads in a class such as rural interstates or local streets. Default limits are set by State, municipal, or, at times, Federal law. An important safety strategy involves setting appropriate speed limits using practices that take into consideration the road segment’s design, vulnerable users, traffic operations, land use, and environmental conditions (NHTSA, FHWA, & FMCSA, 2014).</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A study found that each 5-mph increase of State maximum speed limits was associated with an 8% increase in fatality rates on interstates and freeways and a 4% increase on other roads (Farmer, 2017). • A systematic evaluation of speed limit changes found consistent increases in travel speeds on rural roads where limits were raised and decreases where limits were lowered (Vadeby & Forsman, 2018).
<p>Title: Dynamic Speed Display/Feedback Signs</p> <p>Chapter: Speeding and Speed Management</p> <p>Effectiveness: 5 Star</p>	<p>Unstaffed speed display devices, also known as speed feedback signs, which can be portable (on trailers) or permanently installed, can show drivers that they are speeding and may encourage some drivers to slow down. These feedback signs (with radar to detect speeds) may also suggest to drivers that speeds are being monitored or enforcement is nearby.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signs that provided either an implication that speeds were being monitored or a social norms message (“Average Speed” at the site; “Your Speed”) were effective at reducing speeds in a 50 km/h (31 mph) zone (Wrapson et al., 2006). • Several U.S. studies have found promising reductions of speeds in school zones in response to permanent installations of speed display or changeable message signs (Lee et al., 2006; O’Brien & Simpson, 2012; Rose & Ullman, 2003). • Permanently installed dynamic speed display signs decreased speeds and crashes at rural, two-lane curves (speed limits 50 to 60 mph). A high-quality evaluation of dynamic speed display or

	curve warning signs installed at 22 rural, two-lane sites in 7 States estimated that crashes were decreased by 5 to 7% (Hallmark et al., 2015).
--	---

Alcohol-Impaired Driving

Of the 13,384 alcohol-impaired-driving fatalities in 2021, there were 5,190 (39%) that occurred in rural areas, 8,122 (61%) occurred in urban areas, and 72 (1%) occurred in areas that were not reported as rural or urban (NCSA, 2023).

Countermeasures to Consider in Beginning Alcohol-Impaired Driving Programs in Your Community

<p>Title: Alcohol Ignition Interlocks</p> <p>Chapter: Alcohol-Impaired Driving</p> <p>Effectiveness: 5 Star</p>	<p>An alcohol ignition interlock prevents a vehicle from starting or being operated unless the driver provides a breath sample with a BrAC lower than a pre-set level, usually .02. Interlocks typically are used as a condition of probation for DWI offenders, to prevent them from driving while impaired by alcohol after their driver’s licenses have been reinstated.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A review of 15 studies of interlock effectiveness found that offenders who had interlocks installed in their vehicles had arrest recidivism rates that were 75% lower than drivers who did not have interlocks installed (Elder et al., 2011; see also Government Accountability Office [GAO], 2014).• Studies have also demonstrated that interlocks reduce alcohol-related crashes and fatalities while they are installed in vehicles (Elder et al., 2011; Kaufman & Wiebe, 2016; McGinty et al., 2017; Teoh et al., 2021; Vanlaar et al., 2017). For example, Teoh et al. (2021) found that States that require interlocks for all DWI offenders had 26% fewer alcohol-involved fatal crashes than States with no interlock laws.
--	--

<p>Title: Publicized Sobriety Checkpoints</p> <p>Chapter: Alcohol-Impaired Driving</p> <p>Effectiveness: 5 Star</p>	<p>At sobriety checkpoints, law enforcement officers stop vehicles at predetermined locations to investigate whether drivers are impaired. Although sobriety checkpoints remove impaired drivers from the road, the primary purpose of checkpoints is to deter driving after drinking among the general population by increasing the perceived risk of being caught and arrested. To do this, checkpoints must be highly visible, publicized extensively, and conducted regularly, as part of an ongoing sobriety checkpoint program.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirty-eight States and the District of Columbia permit sobriety checkpoints as part of their impaired-driving enforcement, but they vary how regularly they are conducted (Foundation for Advancing Alcohol Responsibility, 2022). • The public generally supports sobriety checkpoints. In a representative survey of 2,000 U.S. drivers, two-thirds (65%) were in favor of conducting sobriety checkpoints at least monthly (Fell, 2019). • Checkpoints reduce alcohol-related fatal crashes by 9% (Bergen et al., 2014). Publicized sobriety checkpoint programs were proven effective in reducing alcohol-related crashes among high-risk populations including males and drivers 21 to 34 years old.
<p>Title: DWI Courts</p> <p>Chapter: Alcohol-Impaired Driving</p> <p>Effectiveness: 4 Star</p>	<p>Driving While Intoxicated or Impaired (DWI) courts are specialized courts dedicated to changing the behavior of DWI offenders through intensive supervision and treatment. DWI courts have greater success in changing driver behaviors compared to traditional court processes and sanctions and can be a particularly useful countermeasure for high-risk offenders. The cost of DWI courts is also lower than standard probation (Mitchell et al., 2012).</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A study in Michigan found that DWI court participants were 19 times less likely to be rearrested for DWI within 2 years than a comparison group of offenders who were on traditional probation (Michigan Supreme Court & NPC Research, 2008). • A study of three DWI courts in Georgia found that offenders who graduated from the court program had a 9% recidivism rate within the next 4 years, compared to a 24% recidivism rate for a comparison group of offenders processed in traditional courts (Fell, Tippetts & Langston, 2011).

<p>Title: DWI Offender Monitoring</p> <p>Chapter: Alcohol-Impaired Driving</p> <p>Effectiveness: 4 Star</p>	<p>The most successful methods for managing convicted DWI offenders and reducing recidivism have the common feature that they monitor offenders closely. Note that while these methods monitor sobriety, they do not actually prevent someone from drinking or driving the vehicle. Close monitoring can be accomplished in many ways including formal intensive supervision programs, home confinement with electronic monitoring, and dedicated detention facilities. However, all close monitoring programs are more expensive than the standard high-caseload and low-contact probation, but less expensive than jail. New Mexico estimated that intensive supervision costs \$2,500 per offender per year compared to \$27,500 per offender per year for jail (Century Councils, 2008).</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Dakota’s 24/7 Sobriety Project is one example of an intensive supervision program. Participants are prohibited from using alcohol or drugs as a condition of remaining in the community and avoiding incarceration. The program includes twice daily alcohol breath testing, transdermal devices that monitor for alcohol consumption, and random drug testing. If an offender tests positive for alcohol or drugs, they are taken into custody and appear before a judge within 24 hours. Studies examining the effectiveness of the 24/7 sobriety program in North and South Dakota have found reductions in recidivism for DWI offenders enrolled in the program. South Dakota’s implementation of the 24/7 sobriety program resulted in a 12% decrease in repeat DWI arrests, and a 4% decrease in collisions by participants (Kilmer et al., 2013).
--	---

<p>Title: Alcohol Vendor Compliance Checks</p> <p>Chapter: Alcohol-Impaired Driving</p> <p>Effectiveness: 3 Star</p>	<p>To reduce the likelihood that alcohol vendors sell alcohol to underage people, law enforcement officers can conduct frequent compliance checks. In a compliance check or “sting,” law enforcement officers watch as underage people attempt to buy alcohol and cite the server or vendor for an MLDA-21 violation if a sale is made. An effective compliance check program works primarily through deterrence. The goal is to increase the perception among vendors they will be caught if they sell alcohol to underage people. Compliance checks can be implemented within 3 months if officers are trained in proper compliance check procedures; training typically takes less than a week.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several studies document that well-publicized and vigorous compliance checks reduce alcohol sales to youth. For example, a review of 8 high-quality studies found that compliance checks reduced sales to underage people by an average of 42% (Elder et al., 2007). • The effects of compliance checks decay over a few months, so an ongoing program is needed to maintain deterrence (Wagenaar et al., 2005). • Some States employ graduated penalties for vendors who fail compliance checks, where both fines and suspension periods increase with each violation (Goodwin et al., 2005).
<p>Title: Alternative Transportation</p> <p>Chapter: Alcohol-Impaired Driving</p> <p>Effectiveness: 3 Star</p>	<p>Alternative transportation describes methods people can use to get to and from places where they drink without having to drive. Alternative transportation can include for-profit rideshare services, nonprofit safe ride programs, and public transportation such as subways or buses. While year-round programs need enough steady funding to accommodate demand, short-term ride service programs can be operated largely with donated rides and can be established and operated informally in a few weeks (Neuman et al., 2003). Rural communities have partnered with bars, rideshare services, tow truck companies, and bus companies to provide sober ride services for a nominal fee.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fell et al. (2020) reviewed 125 studies of alternative transportation programs. The review found that well-implemented programs can reduce impaired driving. For example, a safe ride program called “Road Crew” that provided rides to drinkers in rural Wisconsin was successful in reducing alcohol-impaired driving, especially among young adults (Rothschild et al., 2006). The program resulted in a 17% decline in alcohol-related crashes during the first year.

<p>Title: Alcohol-Impaired Driving Mass Media Campaigns</p> <p>Chapter: Alcohol-Impaired Driving</p> <p>Effectiveness: 2 Star</p>	<p>Mass media campaigns are a standard part of every State’s effort to reduce alcohol-impaired driving. A mass media campaign consists of intensive communication and outreach activities regarding alcohol-impaired driving that use radio, television, print, social, and other mass media, both paid and earned. Effective campaigns identify a specific target audience and communications goal and develop messages and delivery methods that are appropriate to—and effective for—the audience and goal (Williams, 2007). Social networking sites can be used to reach the public with messages concerning alcohol-impaired driving.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elder et al. (2004) studied the few available high-quality evaluations of mass media campaigns. The campaigns being evaluated were carefully planned, well- funded, well-executed, achieved high levels of audience exposure (usually by using paid advertising), had high-quality messages that were pre-tested for effectiveness, and were conducted in conjunction with other impaired-driving activities (usually enforcement). These mass media campaigns were associated with a 13% reduction in alcohol-related crashes. In general, mass media outreach works best when it is one part of a multifaceted campaign that includes HVE.
--	---

This page intentionally left blank.

Seat Belts and Child Restraints

In 2021 there were more unrestrained passenger vehicle occupants killed in rural areas than urban areas. Based on known restraint use, 51% of rural passenger vehicle occupant fatalities were unrestrained, compared to 49% of urban fatalities. Sixty-one percent of pickup truck occupants killed in rural areas in 2021 were unrestrained – the highest percentage of any passenger vehicle occupants killed among both rural and urban areas.

Countermeasures to Consider in Beginning Seat Belt and Child Restraint Programs in Your Community

<p>Title: Short-Term, High-Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement</p> <p>Chapter: Seat Belts and Child Restraints</p> <p>Effectiveness: 5 stars</p>	<p>The most common high-visibility seat belt law enforcement method consists of short (typically lasting 2 weeks), intense, highly publicized periods of increased belt law enforcement, frequently using checkpoints (in States where checkpoints are permitted), saturation patrols, or enforcement zones.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is well established that short-term, HVE programs are effective at increasing seat belt use. CDC’s systematic review of 15 high-quality studies (Dinh-Zarr et al., 2001; Shults et al., 2004) found that short-term, HVE programs increased belt use by about 16 percentage points, with greater gains when pre-program belt use was lower. Following the enforcement program, belt use often dropped by about 6 percentage points, demonstrating the ratchet effect typical of these programs. (Belt use increases during the program but decreases somewhat afterwards, though belt use remains at a level higher than prior to the program.)
<p>Title: Nighttime, High-Visibility Seat Belt Law Enforcement</p> <p>Chapter: Seat Belts and Child Restraints</p> <p>Effectiveness: 5 Star</p>	<p>Resources focused on nighttime seat belt enforcement may provide additional gains in seat belt use and injury reduction. In particular, belt law checkpoints, saturation patrols, or enforcement zone operations could be conducted at night, when belt use is lower, DWI is higher, and crash risk is greater than during the day. Enforcement activities should be conducted in locations with adequate lighting or by using light enhancing technologies.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 3-year high-visibility nighttime seat belt enforcement program conducted in Maryland successfully raised nighttime seat belt use (Retting et al., 2018). This program included five waves of HVE coupled with extensive paid and earned media. The primary message of the ad campaign was: “Cops are cracking down on seat belt violations, especially at night.” Driver awareness of the seat belt enforcement increased significantly during the HVE period. Furthermore, even though seat belt use rates were already high in this region (90-95%), there was a small but significant

	increase in observed nighttime seat belt use in three of the five waves when compared to a pre-HVE period.
--	--

<p>Title: Communication Strategies for Low-Belt-Use Groups as Part of HVE</p> <p>Chapter: Seat Belts and Child Restraints</p> <p>Effectiveness: 4 Star</p>	<p>Seat belt use rates have increased substantially over the years. However, research shows that seat belt use is not universally high. The 2021 NOPUS found lower seat belt use rates among males and occupants 16 to 24, groups that have consistently been identified as having lower restraint use (Boyle, 2022). NHTSA’s 2016 National Motor Vehicle Occupant Safety Survey found similar patterns with young drivers, rural drivers, and pickup truck drivers, all reporting lower seat belt use (Spado et al., 2019). Communications and outreach campaigns directed at low-belt-use groups can support higher seat belt use rates.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Trauma Nurses Talk Tough,” originally developed in Oregon in 1988, is a seat belt diversion program implemented by trauma nurses in a hospital setting that targets drivers who have been ticketed for not wearing a seat belt. The program was implemented in Robeson County, North Carolina, a diverse county whose seat belt rates were consistently lower than the rest of the State. Those who went through the program were more likely to have a positive outlook on the use of seat belts. Following the program, observed seat belt use increased significantly in the county at eight survey locations (from 81% to 86%) and two additional sites (from 69% to 78%) (Thomas et al., 2014). • An evaluation of Rural Initiatives conducted in Missouri and Kansas showed increased seatbelt use (Thomas & Blomberg, 2016). These States ran multi-wave HVE campaigns focused on rural counties from Spring 2009 to Spring 2010. The evaluations indicated that seat belt use in the rural Missouri counties increased from 66.4% to 69.2%, while seat belt use in the rural Kansas counties increased from 61% to 70%.
---	--

<p>Title: Programs for Increasing Child Restraint and Booster Seat Use</p> <p>Chapter: Seat Belts and Child Restraints</p> <p>Effectiveness: 2 Star</p>	<p>Abundant research has shown that correctly using an appropriate child restraint or seat belt is the single most effective way to save lives and reduce injuries in crashes. However, unrestrained children continue to be overrepresented in child motor vehicle fatalities, which indicates that additional lives can be saved by further increasing restraint use among children (Sauber-Schatz et al., 2014). Programs and campaigns aimed at increasing child restraint and booster seat use have the potential to increase vehicle safety for children.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will et al. (2009) used a message aimed at increasing caregivers’ perception of risk and combating barriers to correct restraint use to increase booster seat use among attendees of two large daycare/after-school programs in Eastern Virginia. The intervention included a video made with images to invoke emotions, crash test footage, well-respected experts, and personal stories to convey a message of high-threat consequences without using graphic, gory images. The study found significant increases in overall observed restraint use and booster seat use following exposure to the intervention and concluded that applying messages that increase perception of vulnerability using high-threat consequences (without gore) is a promising approach to increase booster seat use. • The “Strike Out Child Passenger Injury” program used community sports programs to promote booster seat use among 4- to 7-year-olds in 20 rural communities across Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, and Indiana (Aitken et al., 2013). In the intervention communities, information about proper restraint use was shared in conjunction with T-ball season. In addition to information, parents were given the opportunity to meet with a CPS technician during a T-ball event to get a personal assessment and recommendation for proper restraint use. Child restraints and booster seats were provided to families in need and baseball-themed prizes were provided to participants.
---	---

This page intentionally left blank.

References

- Aitken, M. E., Miller, B. K., Anderson, B. L., Swearingner, C. J., Monroe, K. W., Daniels, D., O'Neill, J. O., Scherer, L. R., Hafner, J., & Mullins, S. H. (2013). Promoting use of booster seats in rural areas through community sports programs. *The Journal of Rural Health, 29*(Suppl 1), S70-S78.
- Ankem, G., Smith, R., Klauer, C., Henclewood, D., & Johnson, K. (2021, June). *A primer for evaluating underage drinking and driving programs* (Report No. DOT HS 812 953). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/56281>
- Bergen, G., Pitan, A., Qu, S., Shults, R. A., Chattopadhyay, S. K., Elder, R. W., Sleet, D. A., Coleman, H. L., Compton, R. P., Nichols, J. L., Clymer, J. M., Calvert, W. B., & the Community Preventive Services Task Force. (2014). Publicized sobriety checkpoint programs: A community guide systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 46*(5), 529-539.
- Boyle, L. L. (2022, August). *Occupant restraint use in 2021: Results from the NOPUS Controlled Intersection Study* (Report No. DOT HS 813 344). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813344>
- Century Council & National Association of State Judicial Educators. (2008). *Hardcore drunk driving: A sourcebook of promising strategies, laws & programs*. The National Hardcore Drunk Driver Project.
- Dinh-Zarr, T. B., Sleet, D. A., Shults, R. A., Zaza, S., Elder, R. W., Nichols, J. L., Thompson, R. S., Sosin, D. M., & the Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2001). Reviews of evidence regarding strategies to increase the use of safety belts. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 21*(4 Supp:), 48-65.
- Elder, R. W., Shults, R. A., Sleet, D. A., Nichols, J. L., Thompson, R. S., Rajab, W., & the Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2004). Effectiveness of mass media campaigns for reducing drinking and driving and alcohol-involved crashes. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 27*(1), 57-65.
- Elder, R. W., Voas, R., Beirness, D., Shults, R. A., Sleet, D. A., Nichols, J. L., & Compton, R. (2011). Effectiveness of ignition interlocks for preventing alcohol-impaired driving and alcohol-related crashes: A community guide systematic review. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 40*(3), 362-376.
- Farmer, C. M. (2017). Relationship of traffic fatality rates to maximum State speed limits. *Traffic Injury Prevention, 18*(4), 375-380.
- Fell, J. (2019). Underutilized strategies in traffic safety: Results of a nationally representative survey. *Traffic Injury Prevention, 20*(sup2), S57-S62.
- Fell, J. C., Scolese, J., Achoki, T., Burks, C., Goldberg, A., & DeJong, W. (2020). The effectiveness of alternative transportation programs in reducing impaired driving: A literature review and synthesis. *Journal of Safety Research, 75*, 128-139.

- Fell, J. C., Tippetts, A. S., & Langston, E. A. (2011). *An evaluation of the three Georgia DUI courts* (Report No. DOT HS 811 450). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/40546>
- Foundation for Advancing Alcohol Responsibility. (2022). *State law: Sobriety checkpoints*. [Web page]. <https://www.responsibility.org/alcohol-statistics/state-map/issue/sobriety-checkpoints/>
- Goodwin, A., Foss, R., Hedlund, J., Sohn, J., Pfefer, R., Neuman, T. R. Slack, K. L., & Hardy, K. K. (2005). *A guide for reducing alcohol-related collisions*. Transportation Research Board.
- Government Accountability Office. (2014). *Traffic safety: Alcohol ignition interlocks are effective while installed; Less is known about how to increase installation rates* (Report No. GAO-14-559).
- Hallmark, S. L., Hawkins, N., & Smadi, O. (2015, January). *Evaluation of dynamic speed feedback signs on curves: A national demonstration project* (Report No. FHWA-HRT-14-020). FHWA, Iowa DOT, Midwest Transportation Consortium, & Texas DOT. <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/14020/14020.pdf>
- Kaufman, E. J., & Wiebe, D. J. (2016). Impact of state ignition interlock laws on alcohol-involved crash deaths in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 106*(5), 865-871.
- Kilmer, B., Nicosia, N., Heaton, P., & Midgette, G. (2013). Efficacy of frequent monitoring with swift, certain and modest sanctions for violations: Insights from South Dakota's 24/7 Sobriety Project. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(1), e37-e43.
- Kirley, B. B., Robison, K. L., Goodwin, A. H., Harmon, K. J. O'Brien, N. P., West, A., Harrell, S. S., Thomas, L., & Brookshire, K. (2023, November). *Countermeasures that work: A highway safety countermeasure guide for State Highway Safety Offices*, 11th edition, 2023 (Report No. DOT HS 813 490). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Lee, C., Lee, S., Choi, B., & Oh, Y. (2006). Effectiveness of speed-monitoring displays in speed reduction in school zones. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 1973*(1), 27-35.
- McCartt, A. T., Leaf, W. A., & Farmer, C. M. (2018). Effects of Washington State's alcohol ignition interlock laws on DUI recidivism: An update. *Traffic Injury Prevention, 19*(7), 665-675.
- McGinty, E. E., Tung, G., Shulman-Laniel, J., Hardy, R., Rutkow, L., Frattaroli, S., & Vernick, J. S. (2017). Ignition interlock laws: Effects on fatal motor vehicle crashes, 1982–2013. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 52*(4), 417-423.
- Michigan Supreme Court & NPC Research. (2008). *Michigan DUI courts outcome evaluation: Executive summary*. Michigan Supreme Court State Court Administrative Office.
- Mitchell, O., Wilson, D. B., Eggers, A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2012). Assessing the effectiveness of drug courts on recidivism: A meta-analytic review of traditional and non-traditional drug courts. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(1), 60-71.

- National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2023, Aug.). *Rural/urban comparison of motor vehicle traffic fatalities: 2021 data* (Traffic Safety Facts. Report No. DOT HS 813 488). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/Publication/813488>
- National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2023, July). *Speeding: 2021 data* (Traffic Safety Facts. Report No. DOT HS 813 473). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813473.pdf>
- NHTSA, FHWA, & Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. (2014). *Speed management program plan* (Report No. DOT HS 812 028). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/speedmgt/ref_mats/docs/speedmgtprogplan812028.pdf
- Neuman, T. R., Pfefer, R., Slack, K. L., Hardy, K. K., & Waller, P. (2003). *A guide for addressing collisions involving unlicensed drivers and drivers with suspended or revoked licenses*. Transportation Research Board.
- O'Brien, S. W., & Simpson, C. L. (2012). Use of “Your Speed” changeable message signs in school zones: Experience from North Carolina Safe Routes to School program. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2318(1), 128-136.
- Retting, R., Ballou, M., Sexton, T., Miller, R., Rothenberg, H., Kerns, T., & Johnson, A. (2018, April). *Evaluation of nighttime seat belt enforcement demonstration program and identification of characteristics of unbelted high-risk drivers* (Report No. DOT HS 812 474). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://rosap.nhtsa.gov/view/dot/35962>
- Rose, E. R., & Ullman, G. L. (2003). *Evaluation of dynamic speed display signs (DSDS)* (Report No. FHWA/TX-04/0-4465-1). Texas Transportation Institute, Texas A & M University System.
- Rothschild, M. L., Mastin, B., & Miller, T. W. (2006). Reducing alcohol-impaired driving crashes through the use of social marketing. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 38(6), 1218-1230.
- Shults, R. A., Nichols, J. L., Dinh-Zarr, T. B., Sleet, D. A., & Elder, R. W. (2004). Effectiveness of primary enforcement safety belt laws and enhanced enforcement of safety belt laws: A summary of the Guide to Community Preventive Services systematic reviews. *Journal of Safety Research*, 35(2), 189-196.
- Spado, D., Schaad, A., & Block, A. (2019, December). *2016 motor vehicle occupant safety survey; Volume 2: Seat belt report* (Report No. DOT HS 812 727). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://rosap.nhtsa.gov/view/dot/43609>
- Teoh, E. R., Fell, J. C., Scherer, M., & Wolfe, D. E. (2021). State alcohol ignition interlock laws and fatal crashes. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 22(8), 589-592.
- Thomas, F. D., & Blomberg, R. D. (2016, April). *Evaluation of Kansas and Missouri rural seat belt demonstrations* (Report No. DOT HS 812 268). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. <https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/812268-evaluationkansasmissouridemo.pdf>

- Thomas, F. D., Blomberg, R. D., Fairchild, J., & Cosgrove, L. (2014, March). *Demonstration of the trauma nurses talk tough seat belt diversion program in North Carolina* (Report No. DOT HS 811 873). National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/documents/811873-trauma_nurses_talk_tough_seatbelt.pdf
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2023, Sep. 7). *2020 Census urban area facts*. Census.gov.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2023, Aug. 14). *Urban and Rural*. U.S. Department of Transportation. (2023, November update). *Promising practices for meaningful public involvement in transportation decision-making*. https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2023-11/Promising%20Practices%20for%20Meaningful%20Public%20Involvement_2023Update_FINAL.pdf
- Vadeby, A., & Forsman, Å. (2018). Traffic safety effects of new speed limits in Sweden. *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 114*, 34–39.
- Vanlaar, W. G. M., Hing, M. M., & Robertson, R. D. (2017). An evaluation of Nova Scotia's alcohol ignition interlock program. *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 100*, 44-52.
- Wagenaar, A. C., Lenk, K. M., & Toomey, T. L. (2005). Policies to reduce underage drinking: A review of the recent literature. In M. Galanter (Ed.), *Recent Developments in Alcoholism: Alcohol Problems in Adolescents and Young Adults*. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Will, K. E., Sabo, C. S., & Porter, B. E. (2009). Evaluation of the Boost 'em in the Back Seat Program: Using fear and efficacy to increase booster seat use. *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 41*(1), 57-65.
- Williams, A. F. (2007). *Public information and education in the promotion of highway safety* (Research Results Digest 322). Transportation Research Board.
- Wrapson, W., Harré, N., & Murrell, P. (2006). Reductions in driver speed using posted feedback of speeding information: Social comparison or implied surveillance? *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 38*(6), 1119-1126.

DOT HS 813 597
July 2024



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration**

