

**Traffic Safety Culture Transportation Pooled-Fund (TSC-TPF) Program
Notes
5/18/2016**

11 am- 1 pm PST, noon- 2 pm MST, 1 pm- 3 pm CST, 2 pm- 4 pm EST

Attendees:

Marcee Allen/ FHWA-MT Division	Jim Hollis/TX DOT
Audrey Allums/MT DOT	Carla Little/WTI
Lindsay Arnold/AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety	Annmarie McMahon/CHSC – WTI
Erica Burrell/CHSC-WTI	Jay Otto/CHSC-WTI
Dortha Cummins/LA Center for Transportation Safety	Joe Ouellette/CT DOT
Kari Finley/CHSC-WTI	Ned Parrish/ITD
Carole Guzzetta/NHSTA	Joshua Ross/IN Criminal Justice Institute
Tim Harmon/NH DOT - Retired	Sue Sillick/MT DOT
	John Tomlinson/ITD
	Nic Ward/CHSC-WTI

Project Website: <http://mdt.mt.gov/research/projects/trafficsafety.shtml>

Pooled Fund Website: <http://pooledfund.org/Details/Study/558>

1. Housekeeping

- Welcome and Introductions: Sue Sillick welcomed attendees.
- Additions/Changes to the Agenda: Nic asked if Sue had received the request for an extension for the citizenship project. Sue said yes, and that it could be discussed during project updates. There were no other changes to the agenda.
- Management Plan: Sue announced that the Management Plan for the project has been approved, and was posted to the MDT website. It is available here: http://mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/research/docs/research_proj/tsc/TSC_TPF_MGMT_PLAN_FINAL.pdf
- Approval of February Meeting Notes: Sue reported that she had sent out the notes for the meeting on February 17, 2016, and asked if there were any corrections. There were no proposed changes from the group.

2. TPF and Fiscal Update – Financial Sheet Attached

Sue reviewed the fiscal status of the Transportation Pooled Fund (TPF commitments/obligations, HSIP funds, expenditures) and the corresponding Excel spreadsheet.

For Federal Fiscal Year 2016, the TPF has \$205,000 in committed funding and of that has received \$130,000. The transfer from **Connecticut** is in progress, and **Texas** is checking on the status of its transfer. **Sue** has not received an update from **New Hampshire** on its transfer, but said **she will follow-up with Michelle**.

Reviewing the tally of funds received relative to contracted obligations, the pooled fund currently is in the black, with about \$5,000 above what is currently contracted. Sue said that will change after receiving remaining commitments. She asked if there were any questions about the fiscal report, and there were none.

Sue then stated that she had not yet received an update from Utah about whether they are allowed to contribute Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds to the pooled fund under the FAST Act. The last Sue heard from NH is that they were able to transfer HSIP funds. Audrey stated it was her understanding that HSIP funds could be used for research; Sue corroborated Audrey's statement. Sue emphasized that with both NH and UT contributing HSIP funds, this issue could affect \$60,000/year in TPF funding, so it is an important issue that needs to be resolved.

3. Related Efforts - Relevant Information and Events

a. National Center for Rural Road Safety

Nic Ward provided an update on the National Center for Rural Road Safety, which is an FHWA Center of Excellence managed by the Western Transportation Institute (WTI) in partnership with other universities. He said the Center is looking at workforce development and training for improving both urban and rural road safety, but focused more specifically on rural. The Center provides tools and resources to practitioners that will help them with data driven decision making on safety mitigation.

The Center is leading a research project on culture, but it is focused on organizational culture, and how the culture of state, local, and tribal transportation agencies contributes to organizational safety, as well as their use (or disuse) of workforce development tools and resources. Regarding the status of the project, the research team sent online surveys to state DOTs, asking respondents about the safety culture in their agencies, and also about which tools and resources they use for workforce development initiatives. The project is currently in the data collection phase. Nic said that the project is related to the pooled fund project, but more focused on organizational culture than the culture of road users.

Joe Ouellette asked how state DOTs were selected for the survey. Nic responded that the research team looked at the safety performance indicators of state DOTs and changes in those indicators over time, and tried to sample from those agencies whose safety performance was improving over time.

b. NCHRP 17-69 - *A Strategic Approach to Transforming Traffic Safety Culture to Reduce Deaths and Injuries*

Nic Ward described this project, which aims to define traffic safety culture, look at a process for transforming culture, and identify strategies and best practices. The research team will also be developing short videos that will be available online.

Nic stated that the project is past the midway point. The interim report has been approved, and the project has been extended through the end of the year. For the remainder of the project, the team will be completing the final report, looking at how culture strategies can be extended into existing processes and funding programs, developing approximately nine short videos, and integrating all the findings into a guidebook for practitioners.

The research represents foundational work focused on defining culture, as compared with the Pooled Fund project, which is more applied research.

c. NCHRP 20-68 (Scan 14-03) - *Successful Approaches for the Development of an Organization-Wide Safety Culture on Transportation Agencies*

NCHRP 14-03 is the domestic scan project led by Nevada Department of Transportation, with participation by numerous other state DOT representatives. Nic Ward served as a subject matter expert. The goal of the project is to examine six organizations, including both state DOTs and two commercial/non-governmental organizations, which exhibit strong safety culture. The scan seeks to identify the conditions that are in place at these organizations that allowed change (prioritizing safety) to take place, as well as the processes used to transform culture.

Nic said that the project is near completion, but there has been a protracted process to get the final report approved. He hopes that NCHRP will release the final report by the end of the year. The National Center for Rural Road Safety hosted a webinar in March 2016 during which scan members presented some of the principal findings. For those interested in this project, the webinar is available at: <http://ruralsafetycenter.org/resources/list/an-overview-of-the-factors-and-processes-to-increase-organization-safety-culture/>

d. Rural Road Safety Summit

The National Center for Rural Road Safety and the Western Transportation Institute are hosting the Rural Road Safety Summit in Denver, CO from September 7-9, 2016. The goal is to bring together a broad range of stakeholders with an interest in rural traffic safety. The participants will be encouraged to approach safety issues across their “silos” of primary interest. During the summit, there will be one or two sessions on culture, although the sessions will probably be more focused on organizational culture.

Nic believes it will be a good venue to discuss the findings of the NCHRP Domestic Scan project, as well as the findings from the culture research project sponsored by the National Center for Rural Road Safety. He reported that the workshop schedule is still being finalized. Carole Guzzetta asked if the agenda would include the names of all presenters and invited organizations. Nic said he believed so, and would provide the group with the agenda information when available.

Currently, general information and registration information is available at <http://ruralsafetycenter.org/news-events/moving-rural-america-summit/>.

e. University Transportation Center Proposal

Nic Ward reported that the Western Transportation Institute and the Center for Health and Safety Culture submitted a proposal on May 13, 2016 for the University Transportation Center grant program competition, which is funded by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the U.S. Department of Transportation. The program provides 5 years of funding to establish and operate three types of University Transportation Centers: national, regional, and “Tier 1” (centers focused on one research theme).

WTI/CHSC (with other partner universities) submitted a proposal for a Tier 1 Center (\$1.5 million/year in funding for 5 years) which will conduct research, education, workforce development, and technology transfer around the topic of Traffic Safety Culture. The UTC will follow a multi-disciplinary approach that combines engineering with public health and social behavioral sciences. Center activities will focus on developing strategies based on four “levers” that help to move culture forward:

- Community/citizen engagement
- Organization culture
- Stakeholder policy and its relationship to culture
- Individual behavior that encourages behavior of others (“Safety Citizenship”)

In addition to research, the center will conduct activities to translate the research into educational initiatives and workforce development/technology transfer efforts that make the research useful for practitioners. The partners for the proposal are the University of Iowa (Policy Center and College of Public Health), Morgan State University (research experience with high risk behaviors and community engagement) and two campuses of Pennsylvania State University (policy expertise and a Rail Safety Center). Nic believes that the strengths of the proposal are its multidisciplinary and multimodal approaches.

Nic asked for input from the group if anyone has “ears to the ground” intelligence about when or how Centers will be selected. He also is interested in suggestions for people to serve on the Center’s Collaboration Advisory Panel, which will identify potential research partners, synergistic activities, and opportunities to expand dissemination of research results.

Sue Sillick stated that she heard the UTCs will be selected before the November election. She also said that if this proposal is selected for a grant, the new center will have great synergy with the Transportation Pooled Fund group. Nic and Sue stated that the two projects can “team up” and there may even be opportunities to leverage matching funds.

f. NHTSA/NCREP – Audrey Allums

Audrey is working with NCREP, the National Cooperative Research and Evaluation Program (a joint effort by NHTSA and the Governor’s Highway Safety Association), which has \$1.2 million/year to fund traffic safety projects. NCREP just finished its Call for Projects. Audrey reported that 15 project proposals were submitted, and they represent an interesting range of topics, including Law Enforcement participation in safety, teen driver safety, marijuana use, and impaired driving. (One participant on the conference call asked if there were any topics related to drowsy driving, and Audrey said no.) Project selection is expected to be completed by the end of the August.

4. Projects Updates

a. Cannabis Project

Sue Sillick reported that the Board approved a one-month contract extension for the Cannabis project. The final report will be due at the end of July, and the project will finish up at the end of October. Nic Ward said that the extension will allow more time to obtain a larger sample size of responses from the survey, and he added that this is the same reason that he requested an extension for the Citizenship project. Sue then stated that the Board also approved the extension for the Citizenship project, so it will finish one month after the Cannabis project, at the end of November.

Jay Otto presented slides and reported on preliminary findings from the survey for the Cannabis project, which looks at behaviors, attitudes and beliefs around driving under the influence of cannabis. The survey includes three collection methods. The mailed survey was distributed in 48 states (it was not distributed in AK, OR, or Washington, D.C. because of very recent changes to state legislation on authorized recreational cannabis use, which puts these states in a unique “transitional” stage between illegal use and legalized use). The team did some intense surveying in Colorado and Washington, so they could compare those results with results from the rest of the states. An internet survey was also conducted to target 18 – 30 year olds, with intense surveying of those who had admitted using cannabis in the last 30 days.

According to Jay, the response rate to the survey was about 30% which he characterized as “not great but not terrible.” Response rates were higher among older respondents vs. younger respondents (very few respondents aged 18-21), and also higher among women than men. The results will be weighted to try to correct for response biases.

Regarding usage, cannabis use in the last month among respondents to the mailed survey was approximately 7% (unweighted) – 8% (weighted); among respondents to the internet survey, usage was approximately 16% (unweighted) – 17% (weighted). These findings are relatively consistent with the findings of the National Survey on Drug Use and Health in 2014.

The survey also asked about driving after usage. Driving Under the Influence of Cannabis (DUIC) was defined as driving within four hours of cannabis use. In the mailed survey, approximately 40% of cannabis users (aged 21+) responded affirmatively to DUIC one or more times, and among younger respondents (aged 18-30), approximately 50% of users responded affirmatively. Usage data will be used for development of a predictive behavioral model.

The survey also collected data on the values, attitudes, behavioral beliefs, and normative beliefs of respondents. In most cases, the data were categorized to compare the responses of cannabis users with non-users. Some of the findings of interest include:

- For values, cannabis users and non-users have similar values in areas such as helpfulness and achievement, but their values differ on topics such as broad-mindedness, conformity, and tradition.
- Non-users expressed a significantly lower willingness to drive under the influence of cannabis (compared with users). The willingness of users to drive under the influence varies quite a bit depending on conditions (emergency situation, access to side streets, had the driver also been drinking, etc.).
- Non-users have non-favorable attitudes toward DUIC compared with users. Among cannabis users, attitudes about DUIC differ significantly based on whether the respondent had driven under the influence or not. Attitudes measured included whether cannabis use is cool, pleasant, and safe.
- Behavioral beliefs also differ significantly among the two categories of users (those who have driven under the influence or not). For example, cannabis users who drive under the influence believe that they are calmer when they drive under the influence, so they see a benefit to their behavior.
- For normative beliefs (how they perceive the expectations of others), users responded that they believe that their friends are in agreement with their behavior, but that their families and employers are less in agreement with their behavior.

Jay stated that overall, the results are very interesting and that the research team can learn a lot from them. For example, the findings on willingness to DUIC will be used to build a model and to understand the importance of contributing conditions. Also, the findings on behavioral beliefs will help them understand the beliefs that predict attitudes toward driving choices and behaviors.

Going forward, the team will focus on answering key research questions including:

- How does the culture compare between users and non-users?

- How does culture affect the decision to drive under the influence of cannabis? The team will create models for specific states (i.e. those with legalized recreational cannabis use and those without) and study which attitudes affect willingness to DUIC.
- How does culture compare between states? Also, are there differences between states where medical marijuana is legal, and states where it is not legal? Jay has done some preliminary study of this type of data, and thinks there is enough data available to make comparisons.

b. Safety Citizenship Project

It was noted above that the one month contract extension request was approved.

Jay Otto also provided an update on the survey for the safety citizenship project. This survey also has both internet and mailed survey instruments. Surveys were sent to all states, and younger respondents were targeted. The goal for the internet survey was 850 responses, and they have received more than 1200 responses. The response rate to the mailed survey is slower. At last count they had received 668 responses, which is about 25%. The lower response rate for the mailed survey is not unexpected, because it is a longer survey. The responses for the paper survey are being coded, and then preliminary findings will be compiled.

Sue Sillick asked for input from the group about reviewers for the safety citizenship project, as well as the cannabis project. She said that she had originally told the board that they should try to decide on reviewers by this meeting. However, she said that she had only received suggestions from Steve Gent, who suggested that Tom Welch may not be as appropriate for these projects as a reviewer. Jay Otto said that for the cannabis project, he had proposed Jason Kilmer from the University of Washington, who has a lot of research experience with substance use, cannabis, and young adults. No one on the call had additional suggestions. Sue suggested that they may have a little more time to decide on reviewers, because both projects had received one month extensions. She said that she would update the spreadsheet on reviewers, and send it to the group for feedback via email.

c. TraSaCu Project

Nic Ward reported on the TraSaCu (Traffic Safety Culture) project. He described it as a four-year project funded by the European Union that supports exchanges of young researchers so they can gain a better appreciation of safety culture. The goal is to explore and define traffic safety culture from a European perspective. Several European countries are participating in the project, including Albania, Austria, Estonia, Greece, The Netherlands, and Turkey. Two U.S. universities are participating in the project: Virginia Tech and Montana State University.

Five researchers have been selected to visit the U.S. this summer and fall. Susanne Kaiser (who came to MSU last year) will be returning (7/29/16 – 8/31/16). Gerald Furian from Austrian Research Institute KFV will be coming in July (7/1/16 – 7/30/16). Tamara Vik (from a different university in Austria) will also be coming this summer (8/1/16 – 8/31/16). Two students (Yesim Uzumcoglu and Ozlem Ersan) from a university in Turkey will be coming in the fall (9/1/16 – 11/21/16).

In April, Nic traveled to Austria where he attended a first year review of the project. Two European Union officials answered questions and gave updates on project management and technical merit. The project goals are to try to understand what traffic safety culture is and its role in enhancing safety; for example, what is the impact of TSC on crash risk. Regarding the status of the project, the first deliverable is complete and available on the TraSaCu website (<http://www.trasacu.eu/>). In the deliverable, they have tried to develop a definition and operational model for traffic safety culture. EU officials seemed pleased with the results to date.

Nic stated that the TraSaCu project has a similar mandate and research tasks as the NCHRP 17-69 project. However, TraSaCu has a more academic orientation, and the NCRHP project is oriented more towards practitioners and applied research. Therefore he predicts that the end products for the two projects will be very different.

Nic was asked to give the keynote address on the first day and the closing remarks on the last day of the meeting. His impression is that the EU perceives the Pooled Fund project as being “ahead of the curve” compared to the EU project, and that EU officials will be looking to the pooled fund project for guidance as they move forward.

The young researchers who have participated in exchanges to the Center for Health and Safety Culture (CHSC) at MSU gave very positive reports of their experiences in Montana, not only regarding their interactions with CHSC staff, but also with all the state and federal transportation officials they worked with. Overall the researchers felt they were supported and engaged during their visit, and that their trips were very worthwhile. Nic added that having the perspective of young European researchers at CHSC keeps the U.S. work fresh and energized, and engaged with international initiatives.

Sue Sillick said that she is working on schedule a time for Pooled Fund participants to meet with Gerald from KFV while he is in the U.S. She asked everyone to check their availability and respond to her scheduling inquiry as soon as possible. She will also set up meetings with the other researchers who will be visiting later in the summer.

5. New Project Ideas

Sue Sillick led a discussion on ideas for new research projects. She said that the group has talked about it several times but hasn't really moved forward with any ideas. Sue reported that she has not received any project ideas from review of state HSPs (Highway Safety Plans); she

thinks that these plans are not focused on culture issues. Audrey Allums agreed; she thinks that educational efforts might be needed to help HSP staff see the connection between culture and HSPs, and how culture issues can inform the development of HSPs.

Sue has included all previously submitted ideas in a spreadsheet. Current projects (cannabis and safety citizenship) were funded at about \$140,000 – \$150,000 each. Sue said that based on the current budget and anticipated transfers, there will only be approximately \$80,000 in funding available for a new project. Therefore, the group should consider research ideas that can be conducted as smaller effort. There is a possibility the amount could increase if, for example, new partners are recruited.

Audrey proposed two ideas for new projects. The first one would look at culture from the perspective of law enforcement. She has been hearing that traffic safety is not as important to law enforcement officers as it used to be, so it may be informative to study the values and beliefs about the importance of traffic safety to law enforcement today. This discussion is occurring nationwide.

Her second idea related to first time DUI offenders, potentially surveying participants in first-time offender classes (such as the Assessment, Course and Treatment [ACT] class in Montana). The project would look at the values and beliefs of this population and try to identify how they got to the place where they decided to drink and drive. Audrey added that it might also be interesting to target poly-drug users for a similar project.

Nic Ward stated that he thought both of these proposed research projects were great ideas. He suggested that given the \$80,000 budget, it would be worthwhile to try to leverage previous research. For example, he said that it may be possible to re-use the DUIC survey for a study on poly-drug use. Nic is also interested in studying response bias related to people who did not respond to previous surveys. Jay Otto expanded on this idea, and said it may be possible to intentionally pursue a random sample of people who didn't respond initially to a survey, then compare the results from the new sample with the original results.

John Tomlinson said he is very interested in Audrey's idea about law enforcement engagement research. He has been hearing that there is a lot of pushback from law enforcement officers about new rules related to enforcement and how work levels affect overtime concerns.

Joe Ouellette said that he also supported the law enforcement research idea. In addition, he wanted to know more about studying survey non-responders, and asked Jay how he would provide increased incentives to respond. Jay said there are several approaches that have been used for controlled substances surveys, including shorter surveys, targeted mail, substantial financial incentives, phone calls, and even personalized visits. He added that these intense approaches are generally only feasible for small survey samples, because of the time and money involved.

Nic asked Jay to describe some of previous research that the Center for Health and Safety Culture has conducted with law enforcement. Jay said that law enforcement is an important stakeholder, and they are a tight group with a strong organizational culture. The Center did a culture project with law enforcement officers in Utah regarding their own seatbelt use and enforcing seatbelt laws. One of the findings from Utah was that enforcement increases substantially when funding for enhanced enforcement is available, and then unbelted fatalities go down. However, enforcement decreases again as soon as these programs end, and then fatalities start to go back up. Jay concluded that law enforcement culture would be a very interesting topic for additional research.

Carole Guzzetta agreed that law enforcement research is a good idea. She believes that the nature of law enforcement is changing, and that it would be valuable to “take a picture of it” now.

Another conference call participant asked if a law enforcement research project could be conducted in a phased approach due to the limited funds that are currently available. Sue said yes, and also that there may be ways to increase the amount of funding for a new project, such as recruiting new members to the pooled fund or eliminating a face-to-face meeting of members. She also reminded everyone that available funding may be affected by the pending decision on whether states can use HSIP funds to contribute to the pooled fund.

Sue said that she will work with Nic to estimate the cost of a law enforcement research project and how it might be funded. They will circulate their ideas to the group via email. She asked if anyone had objections to this approach and there were none. Nic agreed to work with Jay and Sue to put these ideas together. Sue added that if anyone had other ideas for new research projects, they should send the ideas to her.

6. Recruiting New Partners

Sue Sillick reported that she will initiate efforts to recruit new partners for the pooled fund. She will draft a request for additional partners that will go to state highway safety contacts and state highway research staff to generate interest. The information could include updates on current pooled fund research projects.

7. Upcoming Meetings

The final discussion topic was upcoming meetings. Sue Sillick said that she will arrange meetings for pooled fund members to meet with the young researchers who will be visiting this summer: Gerald in July, Tamara in August, and the students from Turkey in October or November.

Sue then asked if there was still a desire among the group to hold an in-person quarterly meeting. Joe Ouellette asked if there would be enough content to warrant an in-person meeting, and Sue responded that it would depend on the status of the research projects at the

time of the meeting. One call participant said she would rather focus on research, and apply the funding toward that. Jim Hollis stated that he agreed that it would be better to meet electronically until there is enough content or a specific need to meet in person.

Sue said that since there seemed to be consensus among the group to eliminate the in-person meeting, she would make any necessary changes to the management contract and then provide a budget update to everyone on how much money would be saved by this decision.

She then asked if there were any other questions or discussion items, and hearing none, she adjourned the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

Next Scheduled Meeting: August 17, 2016