

Report to Congress
on
Guidance and Oversight of State Highway
Safety Grant Programs

Prepared by:
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
U. S. Department of Transportation
April 2004

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past several years, about 42,000 people were killed and about 2.9 million others were injured annually in motor vehicle crashes. The deaths, injuries and property damage caused by these crashes cost America more than \$230.6 billion annually. Congress has charged the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) with the lead responsibility for reducing deaths, injuries and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes nationwide; NHTSA works in partnership with the States and private sector stakeholders to achieve these results.

Beginning in 1966, Congress established highway safety grants to States to support programs to improve highway safety. Prior to Fiscal Year (FY) 1998, NHTSA regulations required each State to prepare a Highway Safety Plan (HSP), which detailed, at the project level, the activities the State proposed to implement with Federal grant funding. Beginning in FY 1998, after two years of pilot testing and positive results from a program evaluation, NHTSA instituted a new performance-based process for State grant management. The new approach eliminated the requirement for NHTSA to approve individual highway safety projects of the States. In lieu of project approval, States are required to submit a Performance Plan and HSP, which establish baseline performance levels using highway safety data, and measure each year the safety progress achieved by their programs based on their data.

In April 2003, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report to Congress that raised concerns regarding NHTSA's "performance-based" approach to oversight of State highway safety programs. The report noted inconsistencies among the NHTSA Regional Offices in the level of guidance to States on how to expend their grant funds.

In November 2003, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations conferees, in their FY 2004 Conference report (Report # 108-401), directed NHTSA to:

1. Examine the Agency's policies with regard to the State grant programs, and submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, which should include: (a) current Agency policies for providing guidance to States on how best to craft respective highway safety plans and (b) an analysis of oversight review responsibilities NHTSA currently has with regard to these plans, as proposed by the House. The conferees requested that this report include: the steps that NHTSA would undertake if, in reviewing a State's plan, the Agency had a conflict with the way in which States planned to obligate Federal grant funds and a detailed spectrum

of annual examples, since FY 2000, for which States used Section 402 funds, including items that NHTSA considers exemplary and items NHTSA may consider frivolous.

2. Develop a clear policy on management review of State highway safety plans, including when a State improvement plan should be required, as proposed by the Senate.

The following information provides the report and policy requested by the Conference Committee in the FY 2004 report.

Current Guidance Provided to States on How Best to Craft Highway Safety Programs

The statutory scheme established by the Congress in the Highway Safety Act of 1966 provides the basis for the guidance provided to the States on how best to craft its highway safety program. The Section 403 Research and Demonstration Program provides research on potential countermeasure solutions to State highway safety problems. The Section 403 program also provides for data analysis of State and national highway safety results contained in crash data files, driver licensing files, traffic records, injury and other data to identify and assess highway safety trends and countermeasures. The Section 403 program also is used to provide evaluations of new and/or innovative programs developed by States or other partners and share the results broadly among the States and highway safety community for potential adoption in other jurisdictions. NHTSA staff review the plans and reports developed by all the States using Section 402 State and Community Grant funds and provide advice, guidance and technical assistance to their own assigned State based on these on-going or completed projects.

The guidance provided to States on program activities is continuous, based on a variety of factors. NHTSA staff share the results of national studies, evaluations, data analyses; and also provide guidance based on project reviews of State grant funded projects, management reviews and observations of State program management practices.

New practices are being initiated, including issuing an agency program priority memorandum at the beginning of each year; providing each State with annual data assessing the State's safety performance in relation to the Nation; providing States with information on program development and management "best practices" to use in their jurisdiction; developing data analysis and program evaluation training for State and Federal safety program managers; and preparing "Highway Safety Management Process Guidelines" to assist the States in improving their management practices. NHTSA is expanding its Regional Strategic Action Plan process to include management performance action plans, in addition to program performance plans.

Current Oversight Review Responsibilities

NHTSA has and continues to provide oversight and supervision of the State grant programs by conducting management and program reviews; program assessments; fiscal reviews; and reviews of State monitoring practices.

Process for Questioning Planned State Expenditures of Federal Grant Funds and Examples of State Use of Section 402 Funds

The Highway Safety Program planning process is continuous and evolutionary, with frequent opportunity for program discussions between and among Federal and State highway safety staff. The process generally is initiated in early spring by the State as it begins to assemble its program plans for the coming Federal fiscal year grant period. It is at this point that NHTSA will provide its program priority memorandum for the coming fiscal year to the States. At the staff and management levels, Federal and State personnel will discuss any results of last year's program, the data available from State and Federal data systems, and potential programmatic initiatives of the State. During these discussions and exchanges of information, NHTSA personnel offer their thoughts, suggestions and guidance on potential and proposed State programs and/or projects. Frequently, plans are revised, modified or eliminated as a result of these conversations.

During the development of the Performance Plan and the HSP, if the regional office staff had questions concerning planned expenditures, they would typically provide them orally through discussions at regional meetings or trips to States; at the same time, they would provide the State with highway safety data, regulatory language, or research results to support the regional position that an alternative use of the funding would be more effective.

In certain regions, the practice has been in place of documenting the NHTSA analysis of States' highway safety plans in formal review letters. Beginning with the FY 2005 Highway Safety Plans, in September 2004, this practice will be expanded to all regions, for all States. Making this a uniform practice will improve the overall quality of the program and technical assistance to the States and also serve to address the issue of consistency in NHTSA program management and oversight practices.

As requested by the conferees, a detailed spectrum of examples, since FY 2000, for which States used Section 402 funds, including items that NHTSA considers exemplary and items NHTSA has questioned, are provided in attachments to this report. Attachment A shows annual expenditures in the 402 program, by program area and State, since 2000. Attachment B contains examples of NHTSA review comments on items included in HSPs that NHTSA considered exemplary. Attachment C contains examples of NHTSA review comments on items included in HSPs that NHTSA has questioned.

Policy on Management Review of State Highway Safety Plans

In response to the GAO Highway Safety Report titled "*Better Guidance Could Improve Oversight of State Highway Safety Programs*," a new set of program management and oversight guidelines has been developed in conjunction with representatives of the State Highway Safety Offices (SHSOs) and the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA). Additionally, detailed instructions are being developed for regional staff that will implement the new processes. This will assure that these processes are conducted in a consistent manner in every NHTSA region, as recommended in the findings of the GAO report.

NHTSA and our State partners are working to implement the guidance of Congress and GAO to improve oversight of the State highway safety programs. Revised management procedures will result in more cost-effective expenditures of highway safety grant funds, based on available data and proven program research and development.

REPORT TO CONGRESS ON GUIDANCE AND OVERSIGHT OF STATE HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

Background

Over the past several years, about 42,000 people were killed and about 2.9 million others were injured annually in motor vehicle crashes. The deaths, injuries and property damage caused by these crashes cost America more than \$230.6 billion annually. Society, as a whole, shares in the billions of dollars traffic crashes cost each year in lost productivity, property damage, increased costs for medical and car insurance, and municipal expenses such as police, fire and emergency medical services. Congress has charged the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) with the lead responsibility for reducing deaths, injuries and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes nationwide; NHTSA works in partnership with the States and private sector stakeholders to achieve these results.

This collaborative effort has achieved considerable success. As a result of highway safety programs and improvements in vehicle safety, the highway fatality rate has decreased dramatically, from 3.3 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in 1980 to the 2002 rate of 1.51, a historic low.

Beginning in 1966, Congress established highway safety grants for States to support programs to improve highway safety. Most recently, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) authorized approximately \$2.3 billion for fiscal years 1998-2003 in grants to States, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Indian Nations for highway safety activities. At the Federal level, NHTSA administers this program through a coordinated system of national research and demonstration projects; data collection and analysis; program evaluation; technical assistance, and program implementation activities provided through its 10 regional offices. In each State, the Governor designates a representative to serve as the Governor's Representative for Highway Safety (GR) and establishes a State Highway Safety Office (SHSO) for the administration of the grant funds and coordination of the State's highway safety programs.

Prior to Fiscal Year (FY) 1998, NHTSA regulations required each State to prepare a Highway Safety Plan (HSP), which detailed, at the project level, the activities the State proposed to implement with Federal grant funding. Projects were based on identified national priority programs: occupant protection, alcohol and other drug countermeasures, police traffic services, emergency medical services, traffic records, motorcycle safety, pedestrian and bicycle safety, speed control and roadway safety. The NHTSA Regional Administrators reviewed and approved or disapproved these plans.

Beginning in FY 1996, NHTSA began pilot testing a new performance-based grant management process developed in cooperation with 16 States. This new process was initiated in response to Congressional and State concerns about restrictive Federal oversight in the project-by-project approval process. The new process also reflected the growing maturity of State highway safety programs and the growing consensus in Congress that programs should be managed by focusing on performance, as established in the Government Performance and Results Act.

After two years of pilot testing and positive results from a program evaluation, NHTSA issued a new regulation, which instituted the new performance-based process for State grant management, effective for all States beginning in FY 1998. Under this new process, each year the SHSOs submit a Performance Plan and a HSP. The Performance Plan identifies major highway safety problems and establishes goals and performance measures to effect improvements in highway safety. The HSP describes activities at the broad program level to achieve these goals. The programs may be based on State priority program areas, as well as national priority areas. The NHTSA Regional Administrators determine if the State has submitted both plans in compliance with the regulation.

Guidance and Oversight for State Highway Safety Programs

Providing the best guidance to a State in how to allocate its highway safety funds has been a priority for the NHTSA since it began its program in 1967. This guidance has been and continues to be based on analysis of State highway crash data and on the results of NHTSA's research and development programs. With this information, States can be aided to develop countermeasure programs and activities that will address the State's unique highway safety problems.

In April 2003, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report to Congress (GAO-03-474) that raised concerns regarding NHTSA's "performance-based" approach to oversight of State highway safety programs. The report noted inconsistencies among the NHTSA regional offices in the level of guidance to States on how to expend their grant funds. GAO recommended that NHTSA provide more specific guidance to the regional offices on when it is appropriate to use management reviews and improvement plans to assist States with their safety programs, and that the guidance for using improvement plans should include a consistent means of measuring progress toward meeting established highway safety goals.

In November 2003, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations conferees, in their FY 2004 Conference report (House Report 108-401, P.L. 108-199), noted that the Senate reiterated the GAO recommendations in its FY 2004 Report, and the House included language in its FY 2004 report directing NHTSA to begin to approve each State's highway safety plan, as the Agency did prior to 1998. However, the conferees directed NHTSA to:

3. Examine the Agency's policies with regard to the State grant programs, and submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, which should include: (a) current Agency policies for providing guidance to States on how best to craft respective highway safety plans and (b) an analysis of oversight review responsibilities NHTSA currently has with regard to these plans, as proposed by the House. The conferees requested that this report include: the steps that NHTSA would undertake if, in reviewing a State's plan, the Agency had a conflict with the way in which States planned to obligate Federal grant funds and a detailed spectrum of annual examples, since FY 2000, for which States used Section 402 funds, including items that NHTSA considers exemplary and items NHTSA may consider frivolous.
4. Develop a clear policy on management review of State highway safety plans, including when a State improvement plan should be required, as proposed by the Senate.

The following information provides the report and policy requested by the Conference Committee in the FY 2004 report.

Current Guidance Provided to States on How Best to Craft Highway Safety Programs

The statutory scheme established by Congress in the Highway Safety Act of 1966 provides the basis for the guidance provided to the States on how best to craft their highway safety programs. The Section 403 Research and Demonstration Program provides research on potential countermeasure solutions to State highway safety problems. The Section 403 program also provides for data analysis of State and national highway safety results contained in crash data files, driver licensing files, traffic records, injury and other data to identify and assess trends and countermeasures. The Section 403 program also is used to provide evaluations of new and/or innovative programs developed by States or other partners and share the results broadly among the States and highway safety community for potential adoption in other jurisdictions. The results of the Section 403 products are then made available to the States for adoption using the Section 402 State and Community Grant Program. NHTSA staff review the plans and reports developed by the States using Section 402 grant funds and provide advice, guidance and technical assistance to their own assigned State based on these on-going or completed projects.

Current agency policies for providing guidance to States include:

- **Reviewing Performance Plans and Highway Safety Plans** – In accordance with the Uniform Procedures for State Highway Safety Programs, 23 CFR Part 1200, to be eligible for funding each year under the Section 402 grant program, a State is required to submit a Performance Plan, which includes a list of objective and measurable highway safety goals, and a Highway Safety Plan, which describes the projects and activities the State plans to implement to reach the

goals identified in the Performance Plan. Each State has its own timeline for developing its Performance Plan and HSP; the process normally begins early in the calendar year, but it is always completed by September 1 preceding the fiscal year to which the documents apply; this is the annual due date for submission of the documents to NHTSA as prescribed in the Uniform Procedures.

NHTSA regional office staff typically works with the SHSO staff in the months that the plan is in development – during regional meetings, trips to individual States, and through telephone conversations – providing guidance on national priorities, on State-specific data, and on how to develop a plan that addresses the key highway safety issues in the State. By October 1, the beginning of each fiscal year, the regional offices provide letters to each State Governor and to the GR advising them that fiscal year funds can be expended for qualified Federal highway safety programs/projects. As a part of this notification process, comments are often provided to SHSOs recommending potential areas for improvement or identifying issues raised by the HSP.

- **Reviewing Annual Reports** - In December of each year, the SHSOs submit their annual report covering the previous fiscal year's program activities to the regional offices. The NHTSA regional offices assess the State's progress in achieving the goals identified in its performance plan and provide comments regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
- **Reviewing State Project Grant Agreements** – These project agreements between the State and its sub-grantees are reviewed on a continuing basis and are also reviewed during management and/or program reviews. Follow-up comments, and program or management concerns are provided to the States.
- **Grant and Program Management Training Programs** - To provide States and sub-grantees with the knowledge and skills they need to effectively manage the highway safety grant program and/or grant projects, NHTSA provides training on a regular basis that is available to all SHSO's and their grantees. Training courses include: Highway Safety Program Management, Highway Safety Project Management, and Financial Management/Grants Tracking. The Program and Project Management courses include a significant monitoring and reporting module. In addition to formal training courses, regional staffs also conduct regional meetings, periodic conference calls, and special briefings on such issues as new legislation, grant management policy and new program initiatives.

- **Additional Steps NHTSA is Initiating to Assist States in Crafting Their Highway Safety Programs**

In accordance with Congressional guidance, NHTSA has examined the Agency's policies with regard to State grant programs. As a result, in addition to current guidance provided, new practices are being initiated as follows to assist States in crafting their highway safety programs:

- A. By January 31 of each year, the NHTSA Senior Associate Administrator for Traffic Injury Control will issue a program guidance memorandum through the regional offices to the States. The purpose of this memorandum will be to highlight for States the proposed safety program priorities for the upcoming fiscal year. The memorandum will include the rationale for including each priority initiative.
- B. By March 1 of each year, NHTSA will provide to each State data and data analysis assessing State safety performance in relation to the Nation on major highway safety indicators. Some of the major indicators used will be total fatalities, and fatality rates, safety belt use, alcohol-related fatalities and rates, large truck fatalities, and intersection fatalities.
- C. NHTSA will provide States information on program development and management "best practices." This information will be provided during on-site visits and made available electronically to States.
- D. NHTSA will work with the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) and the States to develop data analysis and program evaluation training for State and Federal safety program managers. This training will contribute to building the analytic, evaluation, and program management capability of both State and Federal staff.
- E. NHTSA's Office of Traffic Injury Control is expanding its Regional Strategic Action Plan process. Presently, each regional office prepares annual strategic plans in the areas of occupant protection and impaired driving. Starting in FY 2005, each regional office will be preparing annual Regional Action Plans (RAPs). Each regional office, after consultation with their States, will define program plans and establish the objectives, activities, tasks, milestones, performance criteria and priorities by which it will monitor and evaluate State program countermeasures (impaired driving, occupant protection, data, etc.) and management/administrative performance. RAPs will be shared with Agency management and be used in resource allocation and performance assessment decisions regarding field offices.
- F. NHTSA will prepare "Highway Safety Management Process Guidelines" to assist the States in improving their management practices. These guidelines

will summarize the key parts of the highway safety management process such as: overall program and resource assessment, problem identification, establishment of initial goals and objectives, program selection and development, development of an evaluation plan and estimation of resources to accomplish planned program.

Current Oversight Review Responsibilities

NHTSA has and continues to provide oversight and supervision of the State grant program by:

- **Conducting Management Reviews:** These are a periodic review and appraisal of program and financial management practices of each SHSO in the administration of its Federal grant program. Prior to the 1998 revision of program regulations, this review (previously called the 460 Management Review) was carried out by the NHTSA regional offices at least once every three years for each State. After 1998, Management Reviews were offered as a service to States in all Regions. Some NHTSA regions, with the agreement of their States, continued to perform these reviews on a regular basis. As a means of improving State safety grant management and oversight consistency, NHTSA is reinstating the Management Review requirement. This provides clear Agency policy on management reviews of the State Highway Safety Plans and the conditions for requiring a State Performance Enhancement Plan, (formerly titled improvement plans).

A Management Review focuses on three main areas of the highway safety office management: organization and staffing, program management, and financial management. Day-to-day monitoring and periodic informal updates to help ensure efficient operations and fiscal integrity supplement it.

- **Conducting Program Reviews:** For each annual Performance Plan and HSP, the regional office staff reviews the goals and performance measures proposed against the appropriate annual report and the most recent available data to measure State safety performance progress. Reviews are also conducted annually to ensure that each SHSO adequately follows specified requirements and procedures in developing and implementing their Performance Plan and HSP. For example, are goals based on problem

identification? Is each goal measurable/quantitative and accompanied by at least one performance measure that enables the State to track progress, from a specific baseline toward meeting the goal? Does the State select projects and activities based on data and performance analysis?

- **Program Assessments and Mini-Assessments:** The purpose of the assessment and mini-assessments is to allow State management to review all components of a given highway safety program (e.g., occupant protection, impaired driving, traffic records), note the program's strengths and accomplishments and note where improvements can be made. Program assessments are based on national guidelines and conducted by a group of program experts from other States, who are assembled by NHTSA's Office of Program Development and Delivery (PDD). The assessment report can be used as a management tool for planning purposes and for making decisions about how to best use available resources.
- **Fiscal Reviews both Desk and On-site:** The present system allows States to submit consolidated vouchers through the Grants Tracking System (GTS). In compliance with the current highway safety grant program rule, GTS identifies total expenditures by Section 402 program area (e.g., occupant protection) or by incentive grant or transfer program (e.g., Section 405, Section 164). To monitor specific expenditures, NHTSA conducts both on-site and desk audits periodically, not only to ascertain the accuracy of grant program financial records but to also:
 - Monitor the amount of funding assigned (and unassigned) to projects
 - Validate that claims are for costs incurred within the proper fiscal year
 - Assess the rate of liquidation of Federal funds
 - Confirm that changes to the Highway Safety Cost Summary are consistent with the Highway Safety Plan
 - Ensure the adequacy of matching and share-to-local fund assignments
- **Reviews of State Liquidation Rates and Drawdowns:** NHTSA periodically monitors and reports to States on their obligation and liquidation of Federal funds. Using nationwide data from GTS as a benchmark, regional offices compare States' liquidation (spending) rates for each grant category against the national average. Liquidation is often a complex and controversial issue with the States, as funding levels vary from year-to-year and funds are awarded at different times during the year. However, using cumulative data available from GTS from all States helps level the playing field and addresses this issue. Periodically reporting back to States allows them to provide insight to NHTSA as to problems that may exist within or outside of their own organization. Regional offices have helped mitigate slow liquidation rates due

to slow spending at the project level, slow posting and claim submission to the Federal Government, and tardy handling at State budget offices.

- **Reviews of State monitoring practices:** The Department of Transportation's Common Rule for Administration of Grants to State and Local Governments, 49 CFR 18, and NHTSA's Regulation for Highway Safety Agencies, 23 CFR 1251, both require SHSOs to monitor grant activities, but provide little guidance as to *how* to carry out this requirement. NHTSA provides oversight of the highway safety program by ensuring that monitoring activities are indeed carried out by the grantees while at the same time providing technical assistance to them as to *how* to do this more effectively and/or more efficiently. In some instances, this is done with regional staff joining SHSO staff on monitoring visits to sub-grantees, and, on occasion it is done with regional staff reviewing and commenting on existing SHSO policies and procedures and working with them to strengthen and/or better implement them. In cases where program monitoring and reporting issues are acute, regional professionals have conducted grant management/monitoring workshops with their State partners.
- **Sub-Grantee Proposals and Project Vouchers Oversight:** As a regular part of its program development activities, SHSOs will cultivate relationships with key partners and constituencies within the State. SHSOs often work with and through these constituency groups on key highway safety projects. Maintaining a good working relationship with these groups is important to the SHSOs as a means of providing program continuity, achieving safety goals and building support with State elected officials that represent these groups.

In some cases, sub-grantees will submit grant proposals to the SHSO that are marginal in terms of Statewide safety impact but important to the sub-grantee organization or to a key constituency in the State. In such circumstances, the SHSO looks to the NHTSA regional office to provide interpretations of the grant regulations and guidance on whether or not a proposed grant meets the requirements of the grant common rule. Similarly, NHTSA is often asked to provide interpretations on allowable grant costs, again applying Federal rules, and to make determinations on sub-grantee expenses that are eligible for reimbursement and those that are not allowable under the regulations.

Where grant proposals and/or voucher submissions for reimbursement address difficult or controversial issues regarding State partners or key constituencies, the SHSO and State officials often seek regional office guidance and direction to resolve these issues before they become problems or controversies. NHTSA has traditionally assumed the role of final authority in applying Federal requirements to potentially sensitive grant and/or voucher issues thus assisting SHSOs with potentially difficult decisions involving State partners.

- **Trip Briefings after State Visit:** Trip briefings either in writing or orally are required by the regional offices summarizing key issues relating to best practices, areas of concerns and needed follow-up actions. These briefings serve as a record of the trip and the meetings and discussions held, with State officials and sub-grantees.

Process for Questioning Planned State Expenditures of Federal Grant Funds and Examples of State Use of Section 402 Funds

The conferees have asked what steps NHTSA would undertake if, in reviewing a State's plan, the Agency had a conflict with the way in which States planned to obligate Federal grant funds. During the development of the Performance Plan and the HSP, if the regional office staff had questions concerning planned expenditures, they would typically provide them orally through discussions at regional meetings or trips to States; at the same time, they would provide the State with highway safety data, regulatory language, or research results to support the regional position that an alternative use of the funding would be more effective. It is the practice in some regions to send formal written guidance to the SHSO during the first quarter of the fiscal year with recommendations for consideration in the State's subsequent fiscal year HSP. It is expected that working with States in the development of the plans would preclude objections to the content of the final plans.

After the Performance Plan and HSP have been formally submitted, oral and/or written comments are provided to SHSOs recommending potential areas for improvement or discussing issues raised by the review of the HSP. When the regions have a concern about any proposed equipment expenditure that exceeds \$5,000, the regions are in a position to disallow that expenditure. This will be done if the State fails to or is unable to provide an acceptable explanation to the region of how that equipment serves a highway safety function or benefit.

In certain regions, the practice has been in place of documenting the NHTSA analysis of States' highway safety plans in formal review letters. Beginning with the FY 2005 Highway Safety Plans in September 2004, this practice will be expanded to include all regions, for all States. Making this a uniform practice will improve the overall quality of the program and technical assistance to States and also serve to address the issue of consistency in NHTSA program management and oversight practices.

As requested by the conferees, a detailed spectrum of examples, since FY 2000, for which States used Section 402 funds, including items that NHTSA considers exemplary and items NHTSA has questioned, are provided as attachments to this report. Attachment A shows annual expenditures in the 402 program, by program area and State, since 2000. Attachment B contains examples of NHTSA review comments on items included in HSPs that NHTSA considered exemplary. Attachment C contains examples of NHTSA review comments on items included in HSPs that NHTSA has questioned.

Policy on Management Review of State Highway Safety Plans

In response to the GAO Highway Safety Report titled “*Better Guidance Could Improve Oversight of State Highway Safety Programs*,” NHTSA has developed a clear policy on management review of State highway safety plans, including when a State Performance Enhancement Plan (formerly known as improvement plan) should be required. A new set of program management and oversight guidelines has been developed in conjunction with representatives of the SHSOs and the GHSA. The policy document is contained in Attachment D. The new policy covers such areas as:

- **Management Reviews**, which will be scheduled and conducted in every State at least every three years. These reviews are conducted on the SHSO systems and programs for the purpose of improving and strengthening highway safety practices to ensure efficient administration and implementation of effective programs that have the potential for saving lives.
- **Special Management Reviews**: Special management reviews are triggered by an analysis of Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) data and scheduled as a result of a State’s substandard performance or lack of progress in achieving established safety goals. These reviews focus on State management and operation of countermeasure programs as a means of identifying barriers to progress and recommendations for improved program performance.
- **Performance Enhancement Plans** (Formerly known as Improvement Plans): When special management reviews and other relevant information do not provide adequate justification for a State’s failure to meet performance goals or failure to show improvement toward priority program goals over a three year period, a Performance Enhancement Plan is developed. This Plan, which includes planned actions or strategies and targeted dates, will be developed collaboratively between the regional office and State.

Detailed instructions and training are being developed for regional staff that will prepare the Management Reviews, Special Management Reviews and Performance Enhancement Plans. These will ensure that program and management oversight processes are conducted in a consistent manner in every NHTSA Region.

Conclusion

NHTSA is fully committed to implementing the guidance of the Congress and recommendations of the GAO regarding effective, uniform, and consistent oversight of State highway safety grant programs. The Agency will continue its efforts to provide States with meaningful technical assistance; timely information and technology transfer; and data-driven, science-based countermeasure strategies to reduce highway crashes, injuries, and fatalities.

**FY04 CONFERENCE REPORT
Attachment B**

The following are examples of NHTSA review comments on items included in Highway Safety Plans (HSP) that NHTSA considered exemplary:¹

National Priority Program Areas

- The xGOHS staff is to be commended for their efforts in addressing priority program areas in the State of xxxx. The State shows significant improvements in the areas of safety belt use and impaired driving. The HSP clearly reflects an expanded emphasis on problem identification at the State and local level to identify target areas for highway safety programming.
- We commend you for focusing on safety belts and impaired driving during 2004. We are pleased to see xXXXXX using paid media to promote the *Click It or Ticket* message during the upcoming 2004 mobilization periods.
- XXDOT should continue its leadership role in improving and modernizing the Xxxx Traffic Records System, and dedicate appropriate personnel and resources to support the system.
- A review of the FY 2004 XXXXXXXX HSP shows the State plans to continue the successful programs of highly publicized enforcement to increase safety belt use and reduce impaired driving that were used in previous years. It is clear the projects being funded in 2002 and 2003 have made significant gains towards XXXXxxxx's performance goals. XXxxxx has reduced total fatalities through Xxxxx Xxxx Over and the *Click It or Ticket and You Drink & Drive You Lose* campaigns, using innovative techniques for law enforcement against unrestrained and impaired drivers. The results of these well-publicized enforcement campaigns have been fewer traffic deaths in Xxxxxxx during 2002, than at any time since 1928. The projects for 2004 planned will continue these campaigns.
- The number of alcohol-related fatalities in Xxxxxxx has been reduced from 385 in 1998 to 269 in 2002, a 30 percent reduction.
- The State has done an excellent job in occupant protection with its continued emphasis on Traffic Occupant Protection Strategies and Standardized Child Passenger Safety technician training.

¹ State names have been replaced with X's.

- The XX occupant protection program has made a positive and dramatic turnaround in the past two years. The 8 percent increase in safety belt use to 70.8 percent in 2002 and to 74.2 percent in 2003 achieved as a result of your May mobilization is a model for the Nation in terms of cost effectiveness. We also applaud you for expanding your paid media to include electronic media in the May 2003 mobilization cycle. Training and sustained high visibility safety belt enforcement in between mobilizations has been key to your success. Your efforts to reach out to minority populations through your innovative *Buckle Up Faithfully* program are to be commended.

Program Planning

- It is important that projects be funded that have a high probability of impacting the performance goals. Based on the review of the FY 2004 HSP, the XXXXXXxxx is commended for its planning process. The XXXX has instituted a process to link projects to performance goals and continues to design its grant projects and activities for maximum program effectiveness and to reach those areas where the greatest need for improvement exists. As future projects are developed, please continue to provide the regional office with the rationale that connects projects to the attainment of the State's performance goals before implementing project activities. (*Section 1200.10(a) Performance Plan*)
- The Division is to be commended for the new targeting approach proposed and the submission of a streamlined HSP for FY 2004. Although it is not possible to know if key enforcement agencies and other partners within these counties will participate in the various alcohol and safety belt campaigns, it is encouraging to see the State take a new approach that targets the majority of the population and fatalities.

Organization and Program Management

- The reorganization to move the NHTSA funded traffic safety program into the Department of Transportation (DOT) under Public Affairs in the Director's Office is a positive step to increase both the visibility and oversight of the program. It should also improve coordination with related functions in DOT, including public education and outreach, accounting and fiscal services, data analysis, and input on traffic safety-related legislation.
- Our review disclosed that Xxxxxxx's XOHS was administering its highway safety grants in accordance with Federal requirements. Compliance testing of eight active projects noted in-depth project and financial management oversight by applicable XOHS staff. The review also disclosed that Xxxxxxx's XOHS does not use Federal funds, directly or indirectly, to lobby congressional or State legislators, in accordance with the new Federal fund lobbying restrictions imposed by Congress in October 1999.

Program Evaluation

- Entering into a contract with XXXXX University to provide for analytic and evaluation services should be a definite plus for the XHSO. Projects that the XHSO should request XXXXX University for evaluation assistance on are the Cops in Shops, the County Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Task Forces and the sustained impaired driving enforcement campaign; XXxxxx University should be examining the means to expedited reporting between local law enforcement agencies and the XHSO.

FY04 CONFERENCE REPORT Attachment C

The following are examples of NHTSA review comments on items included in Highway Safety Plans (HSP) that NHTSA has questioned:²

Meals

- The Highway Safety Grant Funding Policy for Field Administered Grants dated January 2001, provides guidance on funding eligibility factors for NHTSA-field administered grants. See Part II. Allowable Costs under Specified Conditions or Limitations for Selected Items, D. Program Administration, Item #4, states that **“costs of meetings and conferences, where the primary purpose is the dissemination of technical information, are allowable, including meals, transportation, rental of meeting facilities, and other incidental costs. Adequate records must be maintained to document that the primary purpose of the meeting was for dissemination of technical information.”**

This policy limits food expenditures to meetings or conferences (examples of meetings or conferences would be a State highway safety conference or a neighborhood coalition planning meeting, or a law enforcement summit). There was never the intent to utilize these funds for community events or educational programs to provide food for the general public. Please note that this was one of the deficiencies cited in our recent program review of your office; that is, grantees were reimbursed for food expenditures that are unallowable under the program (health fairs, community awareness programs).

Promotional Items

- This office has discovered a questionable expenditure of Federal funds for the use of bobblehead dolls to promote the impaired driving campaign in xxxxxxxxxx. I encourage everyone to use good judgment when purchasing promotional items. This office will be monitoring closely the purchase of promotional items in the future.
- In our review of the Plan, we noted the State is proposing to expend \$813,654 for public information education “commodities.” This compares with a total of \$800,000 for paid media. Due to the documented effectiveness of paid media, we encourage the State to review the distribution of its public information and education planned expenditures.

Program Analysis

² State names have been replaced with X's.

- Given that the pedestrian death rate in xxxxxx exceeds the national rate and xxxxxx metro areas current ranking as one of the 10 most dangerous communities for pedestrians, more strategic planning should be conducted to address this issue. Xxxxxxx XOHS should consider organizing a planning committee comprised of Federal and State partners to address pedestrian safety in the State. Innovative solutions (education/engineering) should be addressed in the xxxxxx metro area, which could then be transferred to other programs throughout the State.
- Review of the XHSO project agreements/contracts indicate that many do not contain quantified or measurable objectives in order for tracking progress and evaluating project results. Additionally, a number of project objectives do not correspond to the primary activity planned and funded in the project. For example, a project was being funded to pay for an overtime Driving Under the Influence (DUI) enforcement unit. The objectives of the project related to ongoing traffic safety activities of that specific police department, such as conducting presentations to high school students, issuing traffic-related citations by its regular traffic units, etc.
- Program Area (DE) 03-12 the Xxxxxx Drivers Education Simulators activity in the amount of \$100,000 is withheld; This activity is withheld pending review and approval of documentation as stated in *Section 1205.4 Funding Requirements*. “A State may use funds available under 23 U.S.C. 402 to support projects and activities within any other highway safety program area (outside of the National priority program area) that is identified in the Highway Safety Plan required under 1200.10(b) of this chapter as encompassing a major highway safety problem in the State and for which effective countermeasures have been identified.” Therefore, further documentation is needed to support funding in the Driver Education area, plus documentation indicating that this countermeasure will be effective in solving the problem identified will also be required.
- Pg PS-4, Task E: Bicycle Helmet Promotion Project – Please justify the use of Federal highway safety funds to target in-line skaters and skate boarders for this project. Such activities are prohibited from streets and most sidewalks. Without sufficient justification, it is suggested that the skater and boarder-related activities be excluded or funded with non-Federal funds.
- The XHSO should evaluate the extent of judicial diversion programs to determine their impact on the State’s ability to reduce Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) fatalities and injuries. The evaluation should address diversion programs offered by the District Attorney offices, which allow DWI charges to be dropped after paying a fee and attending a training course.

The XHSO should determine the feasibility of developing a statewide DWI violation tracking system. This would help the State determine why its conviction rate has dropped 36 percentage points over the last six years. The State of XXX currently has a DWI violation tracking system and could be a resource for developing a Xxxxxx system. The XHSO should also determine if it could be incorporated into the Trial

Court Case Management Information system currently being developed by the Xxxxxx Supreme Court.”

- **The XXX assess its problem identification process, its project selection process, and content of project agreements and then implement strategies to focus the available resources effectively to impact the State’s impaired driving problem. The XXX should take steps to ensure that highway safety grants are distributed to cities and counties, based on the severity of their specific traffic safety problems as evidenced by the State’s problem identification, and the potential to help the State achieve its goals. During the project selection process, the XXX should evaluate each of the proposals based upon the need for and the cost effectiveness of the services offered. The State is urged to develop agreements that are specific to alcohol/impaired driving and not general traffic safety enforcement grants that may only touch on alcohol issues. The State should consider ways to better channel resources to agencies that can make significant impact. The State should also consider fully participating in the national impaired driving campaigns by adopting the *You Drink & Drive. You Lose* theme and mobilization dates.**
- It is recommended that XXX assess the current status of Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST) in the State of Xxxxx. (NHTSA can assist in identifying issues for the assessment.) Utilizing this information, it is recommended that the State work toward revitalizing the program to ensure there is a sufficient cadre of certified instructors to service the State and the availability of the most up-to-date training to law enforcement agencies across the State. It is further recommended that an appropriate agency be designated as the lead coordinating entity and that information be disseminated to the traffic law enforcement community. Federal highway safety funds such as 410 or 164 would be appropriate to use, should resources be needed to implement such a project.

It is also recommended that the Traffic Safety Bureau re-institute a written requirement in all DWI Special Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) project agreements and other traffic enforcement projects in which DWI enforcement is a key activity, that patrol officers be trained and certified in SFST. NHTSA can assist with suggesting appropriate language.

- The Youth Alcohol countermeasures implemented in 2000, did not appear to be effective. During FY 2000, the following negative results were reported:
 - Youth DUI’s increased 44 percent from 1999 to 2000; 60 percent more youths were arrested for DUI during traffic stops; 37.5 percent increase in youth-related DUI crashes; no youth were found to be DUI at sobriety checkpoints.
- During that meeting, it was requested that the FY 2004 HSP be amended to:

- Identify the target counties where highway safety projects will and should be focused to reduce crashes, fatalities and serious injuries.
 - Identify the programs and projects that will be developed and implemented that are known to successfully impact the reduction of crashes, fatalities and serious injuries, increase safety belt use and reduce impaired driving.
 - Explain the grant(ee) selection criteria.
 - Identify the projects and programs that will be funded outside of the targeted areas. The Region XXXX office requests a letter to justify these activities.
 - Realign the Federal funding allocations for FY2004.
- Emergency Medical Services (EMS) - \$50,000 has been set-aside for EMS Public Information and Education (PI&E) for several years now. What has been the impact of this project?
 - In reviewing the FY 2004 HSP, it has become apparent that projects are being funded that are not within the targeted 23 counties and do not appear to have a high probability of impacting the performance goals. Please provide the regional office, before implementing project activities, with the rationale that connects these activities to the attainment of the State's performance goals. (Section 1200.10(a) Performance Plan)
 - Please provide the rationale for the following project(s):
 - Task 04-02-20 Occupant Protection (\$125,000)
 - Task 04-04-01 Police Traffic Training (\$85,000)
 - Task 04-09-04 Traffic Sign Upgrade (\$250,150)
 - Task 04-12-01 Xxxxxxx Bicycle Program (\$286,756)
 - Task 04-14-04 Local Grants for Youth Alcohol (\$85,630)
 - Task 04-16-03 Safe Community Evaluator (\$40,000)
 - Task 04-13-14 Public Information & Education (\$225,200)
 - Task 04-99-10 Driver Education Video (\$50,000)

Equipment

- Review of selected XHSO project files indicated that sub-grantees were purchasing equipment and commodities that were not originally authorized in the project agreement or in any written approved budget modification. For example, a police department was authorized two in-car videos for \$10,000 but instead purchased three for the same amount. In another project, commodities, such as office supplies, keyless entry locks, etc., were purchased without authorization. This problem may be attributed in part to a XHSO policy of permitting sub-grantees to make changes within line budgeted items without approval from XHSO so long as the sub-grantee does not exceed the approved total budgeted amount.

Additionally, we discovered that a sub-grantee double billed for the same piece of equipment under two separate vouchers. Apparently, both vouchers were paid.

- 23 CFR Part 1200, NHTSA Final Rule for State Highway Safety Programs, requires that all equipment with an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more must receive prior written approval from the NHTSA Regional Administrator. Upon submission of the FY 2001 XXXXXXXXXXXX HSP, an initial listing of equipment purchases was submitted to the NHTSA regional office for approval. However, during our review of FY 2001 projects sampled, we discovered 12 projects where equipment costing \$5,000 or more had been purchased without prior approval of the NHTSA regional office. The total cost of these purchases was approximately \$200,000 in Federal funds.
- Skid Car System – Xxxxxx DPS: NHTSA cannot authorize the purchase of this item. Skid car systems are considered a general training aid used in training law enforcement officers and cadets in pursuit driving and skid avoidance/recovery. As a general rule, NHTSA does not fund training equipment or can only fund the prorated share of training equipment applicable to highway safety programs.
- After a lengthy consultation with experts in our Headquarters Office and a subsequent detailed review, I regret to inform you that I cannot approve Project 2003-03-07, XXXXXXXX Law Enforcement Academy (Driving Simulator) at a cost of \$121,000.00 for a single driving simulator.

The problem identification used for project justification does not support an expenditure of the magnitude requested. An annual average of 73 reported crashes (property damage, personal injury, and fatality), involving law enforcement, several resulting in large monetary awards from civil litigation, is worthy of attention. However, the proposal is questioned when the funding amount is compared to funding proposed for other projects addressing more widespread problems.

Program Management

- New program managers (highway safety specialists) should attend necessary training, including out-of-State travel as required, to acquire necessary knowledge and skills, in program management, financial management, and specific traffic safety program areas, as appropriate to their positions.
- The high rate of turnover of XTS staff, and unfilled vacancies, have been a cause for concern. In just the past two to three years, at least seven key managers have left their positions: two successive highway safety coordinators, four key program managers, and a financial manager.
- Problems still exist concerning law enforcement officer training in SFST. Despite the passage of State legislation that relaxes the absolute adherence to the NHTSA standardized presentation of SFST tests, questions are raised regarding officer competence in the administration of the SFST. The XHSO should consider conducting a survey of the law enforcement officers in Xxxxo to assess what SFST training they have received and when they received it. Based on the results of this assessment, a new priority should be established for providing basic or refresher training in SFST to the officers in Xxxxx.
- November 1, 2001 FY02 XX HSP letter to GR – withholding approval pending resolution of several issues including proportionate funding, vague or incomplete descriptions, improper program area coding.
- Xxxxx needs to review internal processes, procedures and guidance to grantees to ensure grantees are billing in a timely fashion.
- XTS needs to establish performance expectations for law enforcement grantees that receive grant funds for overtime enforcement activity. Consistent with XXXX State Law, a philosophy of strict enforcement needs to be embraced by agency administrators and the enforcement personnel working the grant funded activity. Warnings should not be acceptable during overtime (premium) enforcement activity. Part of the answer may be provided by additional education to law enforcement administrators on the relative value of warnings versus citations in saving lives and preventing injuries, and through similar training for enforcement personnel working the grants.

Evaluation

- The XHSP is funding several projects that may lead to some success in improving the effectiveness of the impaired driving adjudication system. These projects are the (1) Prosecutors and Law Enforcement Training through the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of XXX (PAAX), (2) Judicial Training through the XXXXX Judicial Institute (XJI) and (3) Youth Alcohol Liaison through PAAX. In FY 2003, it was

recommended that an evaluation of the Prosecutor and Law Enforcement Training be conducted. The purpose of the evaluation was to compare the old conviction rate with the new conviction rate to determine if this program is a successful tool for improving conviction rates among those prosecutors, judges and law enforcement officers who participate in the PAAX training courses. It is requested that a review and/or assessment of all of the above projects be conducted to determine if they are having an impact on Xxxxxxx's impaired driving adjudication problem.

FY04 CONFERENCE REPORT
Attachment D

**NHTSA Policy on Program Management Reviews and
Performance Enhancement Plans (Improvement Plans)**

Criteria for Initiation

Purpose

This document was developed in response to findings in the April 2003 General Accounting Office (GAO) report titled, "*Better Guidance Could Improve Oversight of State Highway Safety Programs.*" NHTSA has developed the guidelines needed to respond to a critical finding that recommended, "NHTSA provide more specific guidance to its regional offices on when it is appropriate to use management reviews and improvement plans to assist States with their highway safety programs." Following are guidelines that outline the criteria for the use of Management Reviews and Improvement Plans, hereinafter called "Performance Enhancement Plans."

Materials will be developed to support implementation of this document that will include: Performance Enhancement Plan Guidelines, Management Review Guidelines, Alcohol and Occupant Protection Program Area Review Questions, Performance Enhancement Plan Template, and a sample Memorandum of Understanding for acceptance and implementation of the Performance Enhancement Plan. Implementation will also be supported by training for both the State Highway Safety Offices (SHSOs) and NHTSA field staff.

Definitions

Management Review – A review of a State Highway Safety Agency's (SHSA) systems and programs and operational practices for the purpose of improving and strengthening highway safety practices to ensure efficient administration and effective programs that have potential for saving lives. A management review shall be scheduled and conducted at least every three years.

Special Management Review - A system of review that examines management and operational practices in specific program areas to determine other relevant information related to program performance and progress. Special management reviews are triggered by analyses of the

most current and best data available from Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), mileage death rates, alcohol death rates and safety belt surveys, and are scheduled as a result of a State's substandard performance or minimal progress.

Performance Enhancement Plan (Formerly known as Improvement Plan) - A plan developed in response to a State's failure to meet performance goals; substandard performance; or failure to show improvement toward priority safety program goals over a three-year period. The Performance Enhancement Plan is developed collaboratively between the regional office and the State. The Performance Enhancement Plan details strategy for implementation of the recommendations resulting from the Special Management Review, or a regularly scheduled Management Review.

Conversion Rate – A rational measure for determining improvement in safety belt use by computing a rate for reduction in the number of non-users. For example, if a State has a safety belt use rate of 63 percent, it has a non-use rate of 37 percent (100 percent – 63 percent = 37 percent). If the State increased its use rate from 63 percent to 66 percent, it would have a conversion rate of 8 percent (i.e., $(66-63)/(100-63) = 0.08$). Eight percent of non-users were converted to users when the rate increased from 63 percent to 66 percent.

Authority: 23 CFR § 1200.25 Improvement Plan

- If a review of the Annual Report required under § 1200.33 of this part or of other relevant information indicates little or no progress toward meeting State goals, the Approving Official and State officials will jointly develop an improvement plan. This plan will detail strategies, program activities, and funding targets to meet the defined goals.

Authority: GAO Report GAO-03-474

- GAO recommends that NHTSA provide more specific written guidance to its regional offices on when it is appropriate to use management reviews and improvement plans to assist States with their highway safety programs.

Process for Selection for Action

Management Review

- Conduct a Management Review of SHSOs in all States every three years as a minimum. Management Reviews should focus on all or part of the following areas:
 - Organization, Management and Staffing
 - Program Management
 - Financial Management

Special Management Review

- Conduct annual analysis or review of States performance based on a uniform data set from the FARS file and State certified safety belt survey
- Normalize performance data to correct for population, mileage or other influences
- Use at least three years of data
- During the initial pilot of this process a State's performance will be analyzed and ranked in the following areas:

Performance Review Areas

- Mileage death rate
- Alcohol-related fatality rate
- Safety belt use rate

Other Potential Performance Areas *

*based on individual State's issues

- Pedestrian/Bicycle fatality rate
 - Motorcycle fatality rate
 - Other safety or program management areas as appropriate
- States will be selected for consideration for special management review and possible further assessment by first identifying all States that have consistently ranked worse than the national average for three consecutive years in a specific program area.
 - Next, evaluate how much performance improvement the State has made in that specific program area during those three consecutive years (improvement in year 1, plus improvement in year 2, plus improvement in year 3 – this requires looking at data over a 4-year span).
 - When assessing safety belt use performance, use the conversion rate as the effective measure for determining improvement. States consistently below the national average that also show a low non-use conversion rate would be likely candidates for a Performance Enhancement Plan.

- States that rank among the 15 lowest in performance improvement and that have consistently been worse than the national average are the priority States for a special management review in that specific program area.
- Conduct special management review of program area(s) or State management review to identify other information relevant to program progress.
- A special management review does not automatically translate to the development of a Performance Enhancement Plan.
- As a minimum, States failing to show progress over three years and consistently ranking below the national average over those same three years shall be subject to a special management review. However, other States with lower-than or near-average performance or improvement records may request a special management review, and the regional office will honor such requests, as resources permit.

Initiation of Performance Enhancement Plan

Performance Enhancement Plan (Improvement Plans)

- If a State ranks among the lowest 15 performing States, has shown little or no progress toward meeting goals and the information gathered in the Special Management Review and other relevant information does not provide adequate justification for lack of improvement, the State and the region shall develop a Performance Enhancement Plan.
- Enhancement Plans can be implemented in a single program area or multiple areas.
- The Performance Enhancement Plan should include: program recommendations, planned actions or strategies, target dates, and a status report on progress.

An Example Using Safety Belt Survey Data: How This Process Would Work

Thirty States consistently had safety belt use rates over the period from 2001 to 2003 below the population-weighted average of all the States' use rates. Those States are listed in Table 1, using randomly assigned alphanumeric name codes to mask the States' identities. Table 2 shows the 15 States that had the lowest improvement in belt use, based on their conversion rate from 2000 to 2003 (the percentage of non-belt users in 2000 who were converted to users by 2003). Eight States appear in both Tables, and are highlighted. Those eight States would be subjects of special

management reviews for their safety belt programs, which might lead to development of Performance Enhancement Plans for occupant protection.

It is instructive that the process would “flag” for management review the only four States that actually saw belt use drop from 2000 to 2003. But even here, the special management review might lead to a decision that a Performance Enhancement Plan is not required in all cases. State F3, for example, appears to have gotten back on track in 2003, with a gain of 6.5 percentage points over 2002. Similarly, State C9 may be returning to a historic upward trend after a three-year decline. State and NHTSA reviewers might well reach consensus that those States’ belt programs are progressing adequately, and no performance enhancement is needed.

**Table 1 States Consistently Below National Average
From 2001 through 2003**

STATE	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
USA	66.4	67.4	69.3	70.6	73.2	75.2	77.4	79.0
B8	56	57.7	58.5	57.9	60.1	50.8	65.5	49.6
A6	50	61	61.3	64.3	66.8	69.4	59.2	59.2
D5	54	53	51	52	50	56	51	62
B7	43.7	45.8	58	54.5	50.4	61.6	62	62.2
A1	48	50.5	52.6	57.2	52.4	54.5	63.7	62.8
A5	54	56	58.7	62.6	61.6	60.8	61.3	63.6
D8	41.8	49.4	39.9	46.7	47.7	57.9	63.4	63.7
B5	54.3	53.3	54.3	58.6	60	61.9	62	65.5
E8	58.5	59.5	50.1	45.7	66.8	54.1	66.6	66.6
E4	60.1	58.2	56.7	61	59	68.3	66.7	68.5
F7	58.5	51.6	61.9	65.1	65.4	68.7	66.1	69.8
F4	47	68	43.5	38.6	53.4	63.3	64	69.9
C4	50	49	57.3	57.9	58.6	60.4	62.9	71.7
C3	62.7	60	58.7	59	64.8	69.5	75.1	72.6
F3	61.1	60.8	64.8	65.2	73.9	69.6	66.3	72.8
A7	58.3	62.6	60.4	60.8	67.7	67.9	69.4	72.9
F8	63.2	66.1	57.7	51.9	49.8	52.3	71.6	73.6
C5	59	67	65.6	67	68.2	68.1	68.6	73.8
E3	59	59	58.6	67.3	64.4	63.2	70.8	74.2
E6	69.6	67.1	73.6	69.9	69.9	72.3	70.4	74.6
D9	60	62.7	60.6	64.8	65.3	66.9	70.3	74.7
B3	62	59	62.3	64.4	66.1	67.3	71.2	74.9
B6	64	64.8	64.2	65.4	68.3	69.7	72	76.1
C8	64.6	62.9	65.1	67.9	70.5	70.2	69.7	76.1
D4	61.9	62.1	64.5	65.9	70.2	71.4	73.8	76.2
E1	47.5	60	56	60.7	67.5	67.9	70.1	76.7
A2	55.6	59.6	66	65.2	65.1	72.1	73.2	77.7
C9	70.1	69.4	76.2	79.8	78.5	74.5	74.9	78.7
C1	53	56	57	60.6	61	62.6	65.8	78.9
F2	65	65	66.2	69.7	70.7	70.5	75.6	79

**Table 2 States with Lowest
3-year Conversion Rates**

STATE	2000	2003	3YR conv
B8	60.1	49.6	-26.3%
A6	66.8	59.2	-22.9%
F3	73.9	72.8	-4.2%
E8	66.8	66.6	-0.6%
E2	87	87	0.0%
C9	78.5	78.7	0.9%
C6	83.5	83.9	2.4%
B9	86.6	87.2	4.5%
A5	61.6	63.6	5.2%
C2	76.3	78	7.2%
F7	65.4	69.8	12.7%
B2	82.6	84.9	13.2%
B5	60	65.5	13.8%
E6	69.9	74.6	15.6%
C7	75.6	79.5	16.0%

*In Table 1, the “USA” use rates are the population-weighted averages of the belt use rates of the 50 States, D.C. and Puerto Rico for each of the indicated years. They do not derive from the annual National Occupant Protection Usage Survey. The States’ individual rates are obtained either from observational surveys conforming to NHTSA’s uniform national criteria or (in a few instances) from imputations derived from analyses of FARS data.