

Traffic Safety Culture Transportation Pooled-Fund (TSC-TPF) Program
Notes
2/17/2016

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

Attendees:

Audrey Allums/MT DOT	Robert Miles/ UT DOT
Dortha Cummins/LA Center for Transportation Safety	Joe Ouellette/CT DOT
Kelly Green/CHSC-WTI	Ned Parrish/ITD
Carole Guzzetta/NHSTA	Jennene Ring/WA DOT
Tim Harmon/NH DOT - Retired	Joshua Ross/IN Criminal Justice Institute
Matt Hansen/Caltrans	Sue Sillick/MT DOT
Jim Hollis/TX DOT	John Tomlinson/ITD
Michelle Marshall/NH DOT	Nic Ward/CHSC-WTI
	Kirk Zeringue/LA DOT

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

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

1. Housekeeping

- Welcome and Introductions- Steve Gent was not able to join today because of a conflict, but he sent Sue his comments on the agenda items.
- Additions/Changes to the Agenda- There were no changes.
- Approval of September 2015 Meeting Notes- A board member commented that they believed the meeting notes are really comprehensive. Audrey mentioned that they are truly the longest meeting notes she has seen. Sue stated she liked the detail, but wanted to know what others thought. Carole mentioned that another board she is involved with develops two versions of meeting notes - one that has all the detail and one that just has the highlighted version of the notes. The highlighted version is the one that is published online. Audrey thought it might be a good idea to have a “scrubbed” version for the website.

Dortha commented that on page 23 there was one change to the paragraph above the heading for new project ideas. She asked to change Washington to Louisiana. Sue said this would be done.

The board did not have any other suggestions and it was decided that moving forward, a condensed version of the meeting notes would be posted online. However, there will still be a comprehensive set of meeting notes available to participants.

2. TPF and Fiscal Update – Financial Sheet and Work Plans Attached

- a. FFY 2015 Fiscal Close-Out (TPF commitments/obligations, project expenditures and unexpended, match) and Work Plan

Sue reviewed the excel spreadsheet. There were no comments

b. FFY 2016 Fiscal Status (TPF commitments/obligations, HSIP funds) and Work Plan

Funds have been transferred from UT and CA. IA is in progress. So hopefully, the rest of the states can transfer the funds in the next month or so. We are overcommitted in what we have obligated. Some of these expenses won't hit until future years. In the future, we will not be able to fully fund research projects until funds have been transferred. We can initiate projects, but will have to amend the contracts as funding is received.

One issue that has arisen is that the passing of the FAST Act could affect the contributions of two pooled funds states, Utah and New Hampshire. These two states are contributing Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds to the pooled fund. The remaining states are transferring State Planning and Research (SPR) funds. The allowable expenses for funds under the FAST Act have changed. There was an AASHTO webinar on the FAST Act which Sue attended. It was noted, the rules regarding the use of HSIP funds have changed. Sue asked if funds could still be used for research. They said yes. However, she is concerned that she was not specific enough. After a discussion with Audrey, perhaps she should have asked if HSIP funds can be used for behavioral research.

New Hampshire is working on transferring funds and ran into this issue with their Division FHWA Office.

Utah transferred funds before the FAST Act was enacted; however, Sue was interested to hear from Utah about whether this would affect future contributions. Robert stated that it was his understanding that Utah can still spend the money on this research. He also believes that since we have done the transfer, the funds pre-date the FAST Act. Sue stated her concern was about future year commitments from Utah. Robert stated that he would look into this issue, but indicated that it is his understanding that Utah DOT is planning on continuing to use these funds for TPF commitments.

Audrey stated that it is great to hear that individual states are allowing this. Her understanding was that these funds could not be used. She thought that some research like safety data and that road safety audits were okay but other types were not. If other regions are allowing other types of research to be funded it is really good for the states to be informed of this. Sue stated that it sounds like different safety offices give different advice. In NH, they are still having discussions about this. Dortha mentioned that Louisiana is still having discussions as well. Robert mentioned he will look into this more just to be sure.

Sue stated that either way, the board needs to know because it could affect future commitments to the pooled fund. She recommended visiting the AASHTO website (<http://fast.transportation.org/Pages/default.aspx>, see 2nd-4th links under "AASHTO Resources"). She will also make a note to send a follow-up email to NH and UT for further clarification. If it is the worst case scenario (UT and NH are not allowed to use these funds in

the future), the board will need to think about options. These options could include decreasing the amount of support the Center provides, removing the in-person meeting option, increasing the group size (find more members), etc. The board will need to think about a plan if the worst case scenario happens.

Sue returned to reviewing the excel spreadsheet and specifically discussed the amount of funds expended thus far; to date a little over \$169,000 (two projects, last year support contract) and there is \$348,000 obligated in total, including the funds that have already been expended. She asked if board members had any questions, to which there were none.

Sue also reviewed the work plans for 2015 and 2016. The only question/comment about the work plans was whether the funds could be extended at any period of time. Sue stated that the pooled fund program is open until June 2020 which gives them 9 months to close out the final projects and bills. This should be plenty of time.

3. Management Plan

The revised management plan was reviewed by the board in its entirety to see if anyone had any comments based on the discussion in September. Sue walked through each of the changes and asked if there were any issues. The following notes only include pages for which the board had additional changes, comments, or objections. The rest of the changes were accepted by the board.

Page viii- It was noted that it is very helpful to have interested parties listed.

Page 4- Sue provided explanation as to why AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety asked to be removed from the paragraph. They thought this addition implied that they were needed to be continually involved, so they asked to be removed. Staff will participate as they can.

Page 7- Add U.S. entities to second to last bullet point. Sue added this change into the document.

Page 8- A board member had a question about what the fourth bullet meant. Are board members responsible for attending three quarterly web meetings or four? Sue explained that there are three quarterly web meetings and one quarterly in-person meeting. Board members are expected to attend four meetings. This clarified the issue, and there was not a request for content changes.

Page 13- Sue changed the language and made it clear that the program would not be funding part of a project. They would be funding in total.

Page 22- Joe O asked, is there a minimum number of states present to consist of a quorum? Sue responded that a quorum occurs when more than one-half of the board is present (6 out of 11 members). The board member asked for clarification. For example, if only four states were present on a call, would two states make up the quorum or would the vote be rescheduled. Sue

stated that for voting purposes, half of the states must be present (at least 6) so the vote would be rescheduled.

The board had no other questions, comments, or changes. They decided to move forward with formal approval. Last year, the board decided to hold off on formal approval of the management plan because they wanted to get a year under their belts before items were finalized. The logical next step is to approve the document in its entirety. No one on the board disagreed with that direction. Sue will make the final changes and send the management plan to the board for a vote.

4. Related Efforts - Relevant Information and Events

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

Nic stated that the project is at the midway point. The Center submitted a revised interim report which was approved and is now moving forward with the remaining tasks. The interim report was a summary of the work the Center has completed thus far and included the definition of traffic safety culture. The remaining tasks include:

- Task 5- Integration with safety planning processes
- Task 6- Document best practice examples of strategies to transform traffic safety culture
- Task 7- Support work force development

The project timeline has also been updated and will now formally conclude on Nov. 15th, 2016. Sue asked if the definition was formally approved, and Nic said yes.

NCHRP 14-03 - Successful Approaches for the Development of an Organization-Wide Safety Culture on Transportation Agencies

NCHRP 14-03 is the domestic scan Nic was involved in along with a panel including a number of other states. This project is nearing completion. The final report has been submitted and is being prepared for publication. The purpose of this project was to try to identify:

- the key conditions within an organization that lead to a strong safety culture,
- a process that supports the development, and
- strategies that can enable a strong safety culture.

Once the final document is published, the Center will share the report with the board.

National Center for Rural Road Safety

Nic stated that he completed a webinar for the Center on roadway safety culture which Sue shared with the board. The Center is hosting an upcoming webinar, An Overview of the Factors and Processes that Increase Organization Safety Culture. This webinar will review the work Nic and others did on NCHRP Domestic Scan 14-03 which examined the factors and processes that can support the success of developing a strong safety culture in transportation safety agencies. This free webinar will take place on March 22nd. For more information, please visit,

<http://events.r20.constantcontact.com/register/event?oeidk=a07ec6cefdg999eb318&llr=ngyya wuab>.

The Center is contracted to conduct a research project that will look at how organizations' safety culture and culture about staff training and education impacts the integration and use of decision making and safety performance within the state. The Center has developed a survey and is in the process of recruiting states to participate in that study.

The National Center for Rural Road Safety is hosting the Rural Road Safety Summit in Denver, CO September 7th-9th. For more information, please visit <http://ruralsafetycenter.org/news-events/moving-rural-america-summit/>.

TRB Subcommittee on Traffic Safety Culture

Nic did not attend TRB this year but connected with folks from this subcommittee. It seems there was a lot of conversation about a sense of anxiety and urgency for actionable deliverables from projects like NCHRP 14-03 and 17-69.

NHTSA/NCREP – Audrey

Audrey is working with NCREP. The funding source started with MAP 21- 15 and different research projects they have prioritized in the last 3 years with 6 million dollars to fund those projects. More traditional research - we are trying to flush out what kind of risk communication strategies to deliver safety messages for impaired and occupant protection. Looking into electric speed feedback signs, underway through Volpe. We are looking at use of oral fluid testing and social media for highway traffic safety (benefits and challenges). We are getting ready for our call for next year. If you have research projects ideas and would like to put it in for suggestions send them to the highway traffic safety office.

Sue asked if the TSC-TPF could submit research topics to NCREP. Audrey responded, yes.

Other Efforts and Upcoming Events – All

None

5. RFI/Q Update (5 minutes)

Sue has received one response to the RFI/Q. It was from Tom Welch who is interested in becoming a peer reviewer. There have been no responses for research needs. She did receive a project specific list of recommended peer reviewers from Nic. This list will be shared with the board members following the meeting, but in the interim Sue shared the recommendations online.

Sue asked the board members to think about the first two research projects and determine what products they think the peer reviewers should start with. Audrey mentioned that she liked

the idea of having a peer reviewer for each project, and specifically was interested in the recommended reviewer from Washington for the Cannabis project. Sue stated that ideally, they would bring on reviewers before the start of a project, potentially even have a reviewer evaluate a proposal to ensure they have not missed anything. Sue asked Kelly to review the remaining deliverables for each project.

Kelly indicated that the following deliverables are due for the Cannabis project:

Task 3 Report

Survey implementation and analysis- Due on April 30th

Task 4 Report

Draft final report- Due on June 30th

Final report- Due on September 30th

Citizenship deliverables:

Task 3 Report

Survey implementation and analysis- Due on May 31st

Task 4 Report

Draft final report- Due on July 31st

Final report- Due on October 31st

Nic stated that he would propose to have a peer reviewer look at the draft final reports for both projects. The board members agreed. Sue mentioned that there has been a suggestion for the person from Washington to review the Cannabis project. She asked if the board was comfortable with that, and wanted to know how many they thought should be asked for each project.

Joe O asked if the budget can support more than one peer reviewer. Sue stated that the peer reviewer costs are outside of the Center's current contracts so the board would need to consider this cost separately. The person who contacted Sue via the RFQ stated it would cost less than \$1000. Nic indicated that typically peer reviewers are paid between \$500-1500 per piece depending on skill level.

Audrey suggested the board consider the person who contacted Sue and Dr. Kilmer from Washington. Sue stated that they need to review the expertise of the reviewer who contacted her and proceeded to share his qualifications on the screen. Audrey stated that she would like to have him review one or the other or both. Another board member asked if anyone thought his skill set aligns with the cannabis project. Dortha indicated that he looks like a better fit for the citizenship project.

Sue asked if the board was okay with Dr. Kilmer for the cannabis project and the interested reviewer for the citizenship project. Carole noted that some of the proposed reviewers are from different countries and wondered if they work on the same issues in their home countries or are they involved with work that is being conducted in the U.S. Nic stated that their work was being conducted in their home countries, but they are published researchers in the specific

topics areas. For example, Bahar Oz is a researcher completely working in Turkey, but her dissertation was on organizational safety culture and she would understand the citizenship concept.

Sue indicated that this discussion and choices of peer reviewers can be finalized through email. Audrey agreed and stated that she would like Steve's input on the potential reviewer. Nic stated that two reviewers per project would be good, but worries that three might require more time management than necessary. He does recommend including an international person so they are capturing knowledge of what is happening in other parts of the world as well.

Sue stated that she has extended the due date for responses to the RFI since she has not received many at this time. Audrey mentioned that she has received some interesting calls from researchers after circulating the RFI through the GHSA. They mentioned that they didn't want to share their research ideas if they weren't guaranteed the research. Sue stated they had anticipated that type of reaction. She mentioned that she could share the RFI with her AASHTO committee but needs to confirm the new due date. Audrey stated that all states have a strategic highway safety meeting coming up, and it would be a good idea to keep this research in mind. Everyone has a strategic highway safety plan with emphasis areas that are chosen by data. It would be a good idea for each board member to look at their highway safety plans for research ideas. Audrey thinks that the motorcycle issue is worth adding to the list.

6. Projects Updates (15 minutes)

Nic provided a brief update on the progress of each project, indicating the surveys for both projects have been approved and CHSC has released the cannabis survey and will soon release the safety citizenship survey. Following the updates for the cannabis project, Nic asked the board members if they had any questions. One board member wondered if there were any preliminary indications from the survey returns. Nic stated that it was too early for data analysis. Sue confirmed with the Center staff that the end date for this project has been amended. The final draft report is now due on June 30th. The board did not have any comments or questions about the citizenship project. Sue stated that the final draft report for this project will be due on July 31st.

TraSaCu, Visiting Researcher Schedules and Nic Travel

Nic will be traveling for the next TraSaCu project meeting at the end of April in Vienna, Austria. Austria is the home base for KfV. The purpose of this meeting is for the participants to provide updates on tasks and projects that have been completed so far. They will also provide a debrief on their definition of TSC. Hopefully it will be published and publicly available soon. Nic has reviewed the draft definition and it is very different from NCHRP. NCHRP wanted a pragmatic definition that could be utilized by practitioners. The European project definition is very academic. Nic will find out what he is able to share from the meeting and discuss upon his return. Any materials that are publicly available will be shared on the pooled fund website.

Researcher schedule:

KFV- They are sending two researchers this summer. Gerald is a KFV senior researcher from and will be joining the Center for the month of July. Susanne Kaiser will be returning this summer for the month of August.

METU- Is interested in sending two research students to visit from September until mid-November. They are choosing to re-arrange their dates (originally expected in April) so this new plan has not been approved at this time.

7. New Project Ideas – Review 9/2015 Discussion and National Needs, RFI/RFQ (45 minutes)

This following summarizes a number of ideas for next phases of research in the TSC pooled fund project. These ideas are based on the notes from the last pooled fund meeting and ideas generated by the Center for Health and Safety Culture (CHSC) based on its awareness of issues raised in the TSC community.

These ideas are summarized under three headings: Extension Research (research ideas that build and expand from the current projects on cannabis and safety citizenship, Gap Research (research ideas that explore new topics that represent gaps in our current knowledge about TSC), Strategy Research (research ideas that apply research to designing – and perhaps evaluating – strategies intended to transform TSC).

Extension Research

These are examples of research ideas that extend and expand from the current projects using the developed methodologies.

1. Extend safety citizenship project to assess and compare cultures within different levels of the social ecology (e.g., family, school, workplace, etc.).
2. Extend safety citizenship project with additional behaviors (e.g., bystander intervention with drunk drivers).
3. Extend cannabis project to assess and compare cultures within different levels of the social ecology (e.g., family, school, workplace, etc.).
4. Extend cannabis project to other drugs (e.g., prescription drugs that cause drowsiness).
5. Extend cannabis project to focus on poly-drug use (e.g., driving after consuming both alcohol and cannabis).

Nic asked if board members had any questions or comments. There were none.

Gap Research

These are examples of research ideas to address gaps in our current knowledge about TSC.

6. Teens are identified as a target group in the SHSP of most states. This is logical given that statistics indicate that vehicle crashes are the largest source of injury and death for young people. However, much of the attention on this topic is given to driver education and hazard perception. This project would give the states an opportunity to look at the social

factors within teen culture that are promoting other risk factors such as distraction, speeding, and seat-belt non-compliance. This project would measure the culture of teens regarding their roles both as drivers and passengers. The anticipated results would not only identify culture transformation strategies for teen drivers and teen passengers, it would also provide information to support existing driver education and training programs.

7. Research project about culture of motorcycle riders.
8. Examine the traffic safety culture around older drivers and giving up driving. This would look not only at the culture of older drivers, but also the culture of younger generations regarding older drivers. This would include the perceived role of retaining a license and independent driving as part of quality of life and sense of value. The results of this survey would be helpful to individuals responsible for licensing of older persons, and designing transportation systems that value older persons.
9. Develop surveys, implement, and analyze TSC for other critical road user behaviors identified by committee including:
 - a. Distracted driving
 - b. Speeding
 - c. Seat belt usage

Nic asked if the board had any questions about the gap research ideas. Carole asked what about drowsy driving. It is an issue and possibly something the board would want to consider. Nic stated that they hadn't selected it, but is a great idea and will add to the list. It would be interesting to look at the culture of different groups, for example, drowsy driving among general road users compared to professional drivers.

Strategy Research

These are examples of research ideas that develop strategies to transform TSC.

10. Develop a standard survey of TSC that all states could use to collect data. This would allow TSC to be compared across states and related to state highway safety performance. States with similar cultures regarding certain risk behaviors may then be able to combine resources in common solutions. Note that pooled fund would only create the survey and combine results across states. Each state would have to fund its own data collection and analysis. This type of data would serve as the foundation for developing strategies that are unique to the culture of each participating state. As part of this foundation, effective and acceptable strategies depend on alignment between different layers of the social ecology. For example, we could measure the actual culture (beliefs and behaviors) of a population and then assess how members of a DOT, elected officials, and law enforcement personnel perceive the beliefs and behaviors. These misperceptions often inhibit adoption of best practices to address certain behaviors (like consistent enforcement, new policies, etc.).
11. Conduct a review of published literature about existing or proposed strategies to transform culture (change beliefs) across the social environment / social ecology with respect to a few

key dangerous road user behaviors. For example, what are the best methods to change beliefs about road user behavior among:

- d. Individuals (general, population wide)
- e. Individuals (indicated populations like repeat offenders, etc.)
- f. Families
- g. Workplaces
- h. Students / Schools
- i. Law enforcement agencies
- j. DOTs
- k. Elected officials

12. Research project to develop a national campaign, understand the feasibility of a national campaign compared to a local campaign, and compare a national campaign to a local campaign to determine which would be more effective.

Nic asked if any board members had questions about these ideas. There were none.

Sue followed up by asking if the board members had additional research ideas to contribute. She mentioned that Audrey suggested each member go through their state's HSP to identify potential research needs. There is also the possibility that there will be more responses to the RFI indicating research needs. Sue does think these ideas need to be shared before the next meeting. Audrey asked what our timeline is for determining research ideas. It looks like the timeline in the management plan indicates that the one page project summaries are due in June. Sue stated that the board doesn't have to stick to that timeline. However, she thinks there should be discussion before the next quarterly meeting in May to narrow down the year two research topics and flesh out research ideas. Audrey stated that she liked the timeline and is fine with sticking to it. Nic stated if they are able to move quicker it is fine as well. Sue reminded the board that the Utah and NH funds might be an issue, and that needs to be resolved before contracting for more projects.

Sue recommended all the board members review their safety plans and submit ideas to the board by the end of March. The board members (ID, UT, LA, and MT) agreed with this timeline. Audrey asked what was needed by the end of March. Sue responded the board should send a paragraph description of the potential research project. Then the board can have discussion via email to determine which project ideas they would like to see a one page project summary. The Center can put these together prior to the May quarterly meeting.

8. Recurring Quarterly Meeting Schedule and Next Steps – (10 minutes)

In-Person Meeting Discussion – When and Where?

Sue stated that Steve said he liked MT. If there is a problem with funding, the board might need to consider not meeting in person to save money. Joe O asked if Sue thought the meeting in Montana is a significant savings than other places. Sue stated yes, it did save the board money

last year. Mainly because 4 people (two from MDT and two from the Center) do not have to travel. However, travel in and out of Montana airports can be pricey. Kelly agreed with Sue. There were significant savings last year because of travel, use of WTI facilities, MDT transportation and timing of the training.

Sue asked if there is a time of year folks would prefer for the face to face meeting. Last year, the meeting was held in September and the timeframe seemed to work out nicely for the projects. Steve stated that the timeframe was good for him. Sue wondered if there were any other meetings in which the board might want to consider combining. Audrey mentioned that GHSA conference is in Seattle at the end of August or the first week of September. Sue commented that she will be out of the country from August 18th until September 5th.

Ned asked if the rural safety summit was going to host another conference, and Nic responded that they are going to host one every two years so there will not be one this year. Another board member stated that the face to face meeting should happen when Sue is in the country. Sue stated that she would be able to do early August or after September 5th. Board members stated that the timing of last year's face to face worked for them.

Next Scheduled Meeting: May 18th

Other Updates:

Sue mentioned that Steve asked her to share a notice in the federal register about an upcoming NHTSA conference on March 10th-11th in Washington D.C. Sue will send the link to the group. Audrey mentioned that NHTSA is actually doing a series of summits across the country and the next one is in Colorado. Carole agreed, and said they had completed two and will be doing a series of five. The summaries will feed into the national meeting to be held in March. Sue asked if there were any others of which the board should be aware. Carole stated that there would be one in Fort Worth, TX on March 1st and in Atlanta, Ga, but needs to verify the dates. She will send this information out to the whole group. Nic is presenting at the summit in Texas on March 1st and Dortha will be in attendance as well. Results of the series of meetings will be presented in a meeting at the national meeting March 10th and 11th.