



Distracted Driving 2011

Distracted driving is a behavior dangerous to drivers, passengers, and nonoccupants alike. Distraction is a specific type of inattention that occurs when drivers divert their attention from the driving task to focus on some other activity. A distraction-affected crash is any crash in which a driver was identified as distracted at the time of the crash.

- Ten percent of fatal crashes in 2011 were reported as distraction-affected crashes.
- Seventeen percent of injury crashes in 2011 were reported as distraction-affected crashes.
- In 2011, 3,331 people were killed in crashes involving distracted drivers and an estimated additional 387,000 were injured in motor vehicle crashes involving distracted drivers.
- Of those people killed in distraction-affected crashes, 385 died in crashes in which at least one of the drivers was using a cell phone (12% of fatalities in distraction-affected crashes) at the time of the crash. Use of a cell phone includes talking/listening to a cell phone, dialing/texting a cell phone, or other cell-phone-related activities.
- Of those injured in distraction-affected crashes, an estimated 21,000 were injured in crashes that involved the use of cell phones at the time of the crashes (5% of injured people in distraction-affected crashes).
- Eleven percent of all drivers 15-19 years old involved in fatal crashes were reported as distracted at the time of the crashes. This age group has the largest proportion of drivers who were distracted.
- For drivers 15-19 years old involved in fatal crashes, 21 percent of the distracted drivers were distracted by the use of cell phones.
- In 2011, 495 nonoccupants were killed in distraction-affected crashes.

Distraction in Fatal Crashes: New Measure in 2010

In a continuing effort towards data improvement, NHTSA changed the coding for distracted driving in the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) beginning with the 2010 FARS data. For this reason, this document will only include

distraction-affected fatal crash data for 2010 and 2011. With only two years of fatal crash information for distraction under the new coding, the reader should take caution in making conclusions of trends in these data.

The coding for distraction in the National Automotive Sampling System (NASS) General Estimates System (GES) was not revised and therefore GES data is available for years prior to 2010.

Appendix A contains further detail on the change in coding for FARS beginning in 2010. The Research Note containing distracted-driving data for 2010 is available through the NHTSA Web site (Distracted Driving 2010, DOT HS 811 650).

Methodology

The data sources include NHTSA's FARS and NASS GES systems. FARS annually collects fatal crash data from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and is a census of all fatal crashes that occur on the Nation's roadways. NASS GES contains data from a nationally representative sample of police-reported crashes of all severities, including those that result in death, injury, or property damage. The national estimates produced from GES data are based on a probability sample of crashes and are subject to sampling errors.

As defined in the *Overview of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's Driver Distraction Program* (DOT HS 811 299), distraction is a specific type of inattention that occurs when drivers divert their attention from the driving task to focus on some other activity instead. It is worth noting that *distraction* is a subset of *inattention* (which also includes fatigue, physical, and emotional conditions of the driver) as referenced in the *Overview*.

Appendix B contains a table to describe the coding for distraction-affected crashes for FARS and GES.

There are inherent limitations in the data for distraction-affected crashes and the resulting injuries and fatalities. These limitations are being addressed through efforts within and outside of NHTSA as detailed in the *Overview*. Appendix C describes limitations in the distracted driving data.

Data

Fatalities in Distraction-Affected Crashes

In 2011, there were a total of 29,757 fatal crashes in the United States involving 43,668 drivers. In those crashes, 32,367 people were killed. In 2011, 3,020 fatal crashes occurred that involved distraction (10% of all fatal crashes). These crashes involved 3,085 distracted drivers, as some crashes involved more than one distracted driver. Distraction was reported for 7 percent (3,085) of the drivers involved in fatal crashes. In these distraction-affected crashes, 3,331 fatalities (10% of overall fatalities) occurred. Table 1 provides information on crashes, drivers, and fatalities involved in distraction-affected crashes.

Of those drivers distracted during fatal crashes, cell phones are often a leading distraction (of those identified). In 2011, 350 fatal crashes were reported to have involved the use of cell phones as a distraction (12% of all fatal distraction-affected crashes). For these distraction-affected crashes, the police accident report stated the driver used a cell phone to talk, listen, dial, or text (or other cell phone activity) at the time of the crash. Cell phones were reported as a distraction for 12 percent of the distracted drivers in fatal crashes. A total of 385 people died in fatal crashes that involved the use of cell phones as distractions.

Table 2 describes 2011 fatal crash data for distraction-affected crashes by driver age. Eleven percent of all drivers 15-19 years old involved in fatal crashes were distracted at the time of the crashes. This age group is the group with the largest proportion of drivers who were distracted. An additional way to look at the age groups is how large a percentage of the total number of drivers involved was in each age group. For all fatal crashes, only 7 percent of the drivers in the fatal crashes were 15-19 years old. However, for distraction, 11 percent of the drivers in fatal distraction-affected crashes were 15-19 years old. Likewise, drivers in their 20s were overrepresented in distraction-affected crashes relative to their proportion in total drivers — 23 percent of all drivers in fatal crashes were in their 20s, but 26 percent of distracted drivers were in their 20s. Both methods of looking at age illustrate the increased prevalence of distracted younger drivers in fatal crashes.

For drivers 15-19 years old, 21 percent of the distracted drivers were distracted by the use of cell phones at the time of the crash. This was the age group that had the highest portion of distracted drivers identified as using cell phones. Among all distracted drivers in fatal crashes using cell phones, those drivers ages 20 to 29 represent 32 percent, which is an overrepresentation of this age group when compared to drivers overall.

Table 1
Fatal Crashes, Drivers in Fatal Crashes, and Fatalities, 2011

	Crashes	Drivers	Fatalities
Total	29,757	43,668	32,367
Distraction-Affected (D-A)	3,020 (10% of total crashes)	3,085 (7% of total drivers)	3,331 (10% of total fatalities)
Cell Phone in Use	350 (12% of D-A crashes)	368 (12% of distracted drivers)	385 (12% of fatalities in D-A crashes)

Source: National Center for Statistics and Analysis (NCSA), FARS 2011 (ARF)

Table 2
Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes by Age, 2011

Age Group	Total Drivers		Distracted Drivers			Drivers Using Cell Phone		
	#	% of total	#	% total drivers	% distracted drivers	#	% of distracted drivers	% of cell phone drivers
Total	43,668	100	3,085	7	100	368	12	100
15-19	3,212	7	344	11	11	72	21	20
20-29	10,160	23	790	8	26	117	15	32
30-39	7,401	17	505	7	16	79	16	21
40-49	7,376	17	464	6	15	49	11	13
50-59	6,783	16	434	6	14	34	8	9
60-69	4,144	9	251	6	8	12	5	3
70+	3,815	9	270	9	9	5	2	1

Source: NCSA, FARS 2011 (ARF); Note: Total includes 60 drivers aged 14 and under, 4 of whom were noted as distracted.

With respect to the vehicles driven by distracted drivers, the distribution of vehicles among distracted drivers is similar to the distribution of vehicles among all drivers (Table 3). For example, 43 percent of distracted drivers were operating a passenger car at the time of the fatal crash, which is similar to 40 percent of all drivers in fatal crashes were driving a passenger car.

In 2011, 85 percent of the fatalities in distraction-affected crashes involved motor vehicle occupants or motorcyclists. This compares to 84 percent of all motor vehicle crash fatalities involving occupants. Thus, the victims of distraction-affected crashes vary little from the victims of crashes overall. Table 4 describes the role of the people killed in distraction-affected crashes in 2011. Distracted drivers were involved in the deaths of 495 nonoccupants during 2011.

Table 3
Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes by Vehicle Type, 2011

Vehicle Type	Total Drivers		Distracted Drivers			Drivers Using Cell Phone		
	#	% of total	#	% total drivers	% distracted drivers	#	% of distracted drivers	% of cell phone drivers
Total	43,668	100	3,085	7	100	368	12	100
Passenger Car	17,335	40	1,316	8	43	178	14	48
Light Truck	16,643	38	1,235	7	40	164	13	45
Motorcycle	4,741	11	265	6	9	3	1	2
Large Truck	3,568	8	202	6	7	22	11	6
Bus	243	1	20	8	1	0	0	0

Source: NCSA, FARS 2011 (ARF)

Table 4
People Killed in Distraction-Affected Crashes, by Person Type, 2011

Occupant			Nonoccupant			
Driver	Passenger	Total	Pedestrian	Pedalcyclist	Other	Total
2,024 (61%)	812 (24%)	2,836 (85%)	408 (12%)	58 (2%)	29 (1%)	495 (15%)

Source: NCSA, FARS 2011 (ARF)

Table 5
Estimated Number of People Injured in Crashes and People Injured in Distraction-Affected Crashes

Year	Overall	Distraction	
		Estimate (% of Total Injured)	Cell Phone Use (% of People Injured in Distraction-Affected Crashes)
2007	2,491,000	448,000 (18%)	24,000 (5%)
2008	2,346,000	466,000 (20%)	29,000 (6%)
2009	2,217,000	448,000 (20%)	24,000 (5%)
2010	2,239,000	416,000 (19%)	24,000 (6%)
2011	2,217,000	387,000 (17%)	21,000 (5%)

Source: NCSA, GES 2007-2011

Estimates of People Injured in Distraction-Affected Crashes

In 2011, an estimated 2,217,000 people were injured in motor vehicle traffic crashes (Table 5). The number of people injured in a distraction-affected crash in 2011 was estimated at 387,000 (17% of all the injured people). An estimated 21,000 people were injured in distraction-affected crashes in 2011 involving cell phones. These injured people comprised 5 percent of all people injured in distraction-affected crashes.

Over the past five years, the estimated number of people injured in distraction-affected crashes has fallen from 448,000 to 387,000, a 14-percent decline (compared to an 11% decline in the number of people injured overall during this time period). However, the percentage of injured people in distraction-affected crashes as a portion of all injured people has remained relatively constant (a high of 20% in 2008 and 2009 to a low of 17% in 2011).

Table 6
Estimates of Distraction-Affected Injury Crashes, Drivers, and Injured People, 2011

Distraction-Affected Injury Crashes	Distracted Drivers in Distraction-Affected Injury Crashes	People Injured in Distraction-Affected Injury Crashes
260,000 (17% of all injury crashes)	266,000 (10% of all drivers in injury crashes)	387,000 (17% of all injured people)

Source: NCSA, GES 2011

Crashes of All Severity

Table 7 provides information for all police-reported crashes from 2007 through 2011 including injury crashes, and property-damage-only (PDO) crashes for the year. During this time period, the percentage of injury crashes that were distraction-affected fluctuated slightly, but remained relatively

constant. The percentage of PDO crashes that were distraction-affected remained at 16 percent for from 2007 through 2010 and dropped to 15 percent in 2011 years. The percentage of total crashes that were distraction-affected crashes also fell to 15 percent after remaining at 17 percent from 2007 through 2010.

Table 7

Motor Vehicle Traffic Crashes and Distraction-Affected Crashes by Year

Crash by Crash Severity		Overall Crashes	Distraction-Affected Crashes	D-A Crashes Involving Cell Phone Use
2007	Non-Fatal Crashes			
	Injury Crash	1,711,000	309,000 (18%)	17,000 (6%)
	PDO Crash	4,275,000	689,000 (16%)	31,000 (4%)
	Total	6,024,000	1,003,000 (17%)	49,000 (5%)
2008	Non-Fatal Crashes			
	Injury Crash	1,630,000	314,000 (19%)	19,000 (6%)
	PDO Crash	4,146,000	650,000 (16%)	30,000 (5%)
	Total	5,811,000	969,000 (17%)	49,000 (5%)
2009	Non-Fatal Crashes			
	Injury Crash	1,517,000	307,000 (20%)	16,000 (5%)
	PDO Crash	3,957,000	647,000 (16%)	29,000 (5%)
	Total	5,505,000	959,000 (17%)	46,000 (5%)
2010	Non-Fatal Crashes			
	Injury Crash	1,542,000	279,000 (18%)	16,000 (6%)
	PDO Crash	3,847,000	618,000 (16%)	30,000 (5%)
	Total	5,419,000	900,000 (17%)	47,000 (5%)
2011	Non-Fatal Crashes			
	Injury Crash	1,530,000	260,000 (17%)	15,000 (6%)
	PDO Crash	3,778,000	563,000 (15%)	35,000 (6%)
	Total	5,338,000	826,000 (15%)	50,000 (6%)

Source: NCSA, GES 2007-2011; PDO – Property Damage Only

Appendix A

In keeping with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's distraction plan (*Overview of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's Driver Distraction Program*, April 2010, DOT HS 811 299), the agency continues to refine collection of information about the role of distracted driving in police-reported crashes. This includes an improvement to the coding of distraction in the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). Prior to 2010, FARS, which contains data about fatal motor vehicle crashes, and the National Automotive Sampling System (NASS) General Estimates System (GES), which contains data about a sample of all severities of police-reported crashes, coded distraction information in different formats. FARS was more general and inclusive of generally inattentive behavior, whereas GES identified specific distracted driving behaviors. In 2010, the two systems' coding of distraction was unified. Beginning in 2010 for both systems, when looking at distraction-affected crashes, the driver in both FARS and GES is identified as "Yes-Distracted," "No-Not distracted," or "Unknown if distracted." If the driver is identified as distracted, further coding is performed to distinguish the specific activity that was distracting the driver. This was not a change for data cod-

ing for GES, but was in FARS. The data collected on the PAR did not change; rather, it is the way the data is classified in FARS to focus the fatal crash data on the set of distractions most likely to affect the crash. Prior to 2010 in FARS, distraction was not first identified in a Yes/No/Unknown manner. Rather, specific behaviors of the driver as coded on the PAR were combined and categorized as "distracted."

Because of this change in data coding in FARS, distraction-affected crash data from FARS beginning in 2010 cannot be compared to distracted-driving-related data from FARS from previous years. GES data can be compared over the years, as the data coding did not change in this system.

Of additional note is the terminology regarding distraction. For FARS and GES data, beginning with 2010 data, any crash in which a driver was identified as distracted at the time of the crash is referred to as a distraction-affected crash. Discussion of cell phones is also more specific starting with the 2010 data. Starting in 2010, FARS no longer offers "cell phone present in vehicle" as a coding option, thus this code cannot be considered a distraction within the data set. From discussion with law enforcement officers, this code in years past was used when it was believed that the driver was using

a cell phone at the time of the crash and thus contributed to the crash, but proof was not available. The use of a cell phone is more specific with the current coding and if the specific involvement cannot be determined, law enforcement has other options available to discuss the role of the cell phone and thus the coding would reflect such. Because of these changes, the current language referring to cell phones is that

the crash involved the *use of a cell phone* as opposed to the generic *cell-phone-involvement* used previously.

Appendix B

As discussed in the Methodology section of this Research Note, FARS and GES were accessed to retrieve distraction-affected crashes. Table B1 contains every variable attribute

Table B1

Attributes Included in “Driver Distracted By” Element and Indication of Inclusion in Distraction-Affected Definitions, GES and FARS; Frequency of Distraction Attributes for FARS 2011

Attribute	Examples	Included in:			Frequency of Driver Distraction
		Distraction-Affected Crashes	Devices/Controls Integral to the Vehicle	Electronic Device Use	
Not distracted	Completely attentive to driving; no indication of distraction or noted as Not Distracted				
Looked but did not see	Driver paying attention to driving but does not see relevant vehicle, object, etc.				
By other occupant	Distracted by occupant in driver’s vehicle; includes conversing with or looking at other occupant	X			135
By moving object in vehicle	Distracted by moving object in driver’s vehicle; includes dropped object, moving pet, insect, cargo.	X			16
While talking or listening to cellular phone	Talking or listening on cellular phone	X		X	114
While dialing cellular phone	Dialing or text messaging on cell phone or any wireless email device	X		X	39
Other cellular phone-related (2007 and later)	Used when the Police Report indicated the driver is distracted from the driving task due to cellular phone involvement, but none of the specified codes are applicable (e.g., reaching for cellular phone, etc.). This code is also applied when specific details regarding cellular phone distraction/usage are not provided.	X		X	218
Adjusting audio and/or climate controls	While adjusting air conditioner, heater, radio, cassette, using the radio, using the cassette or CD mounted into vehicle	X	X		47
While using other devices/controls integral to vehicle	Adjusting windows, door locks, rear/side view mirrors, seat, steering wheel, seat belts, on-board navigational devices, etc.	X	X		30
While using or reaching for device/object brought into vehicle	Radar detector, CDs, razors, portable CD player, headphones, a navigational device, cigarette lighter, etc.; if unknown if device is brought into vehicle or integral, use Object Brought Into Vehicle	X			53
Distracted by outside person, object, or event	Animals on roadside or previous crash. Do not use when driver has recognized object/event and driver has taken evasive action	X			188
Eating or drinking	Eating or drinking or actively related to these actions	X			52
Smoking related	Smoking or involved in activity related to smoking	X			15
No driver present	When no driver is in this vehicle				
Distraction/inattention, details unknown	Distraction and/or inattention are noted on the PAR but the specifics are unknown	X			1,398
Not reported	No field available on PAR; field on PAR left blank; no other information available				
Inattentive or lost in thought	Driver is thinking about items other than the driving task (e.g., daydreaming)	X			586
Other distraction	Details regarding the driver’s distraction are known but none of the specified codes are applicable	X			267
Unknown if distracted	PAR specifically states unknown				

available for coding for driver distraction along with examples to illustrate the meaning of the attribute. This is the coding scheme available for FARS and GES. Table B1 further indicates whether that attribute was included in the analysis for distraction-affected crashes.

In some NHTSA distracted driving discussions and publications, there is reference to electronic device use as well as use of devices integral to the vehicle. Table B1 includes indication of which attributes are used when referencing either electronic device use or use of devices integral to the vehicle.

If there are no indications of usage for either the distraction-affected crashes, devices/controls integral to the vehicle, or electronic device use, the attribute was not considered as a type of distraction behavior and therefore not included in the analysis.

Data users often request information regarding the frequency of each attribute with respect to distracted drivers. Table B1 provides the frequency of driver distraction reported for distracted drivers in FARS 2011. Each driver could potentially have multiple distraction behaviors noted in the PAR and thus these attributes *are not* mutually exclusive. This column *will not* sum to the number of distracted drivers in 2011.

Appendix C

NHTSA recognizes that there are limitations to the collection and reporting of FARS and GES data with regard to driver distraction. The data for FARS and GES are based on PARs and investigations conducted after the crash has occurred.

One significant challenge for collection of distracted driving data is the PAR itself. Police accident reports vary across jurisdictions, thus creating potential inconsistencies in reporting. Many variables on the police accident report are nearly universal, but distraction is not one of those variables. Some police accident reports identify distraction as a distinct reporting field, while others do not have such a field and identification of distraction is based upon the narrative portion of the report. The variation in reporting forms contributes

to variation in the reported number of distraction-affected crashes. Any national or State count of distraction-affected crashes should be interpreted with this limitation in mind due to potential under-reporting in some States/primary sampling units and over-reporting in others.

The following are potential reasons for underreporting of distraction-affected crashes.

- There are negative implications associated with distracted driving—especially in conjunction with a crash. Survey research shows that self-reporting of negative behavior is lower than actual occurrence of that negative behavior. There is no reason to believe that self-reporting of distracted driving to a law enforcement officer would differ. The inference is that the reported driver distraction during crashes is lower than the actual occurrence.
- If a driver fatality occurs in the crash, law enforcement must rely on the crash investigation in order to report on whether driver distraction was involved. Law enforcement may not have information to indicate distraction. These investigations may rely on witness account and oftentimes these accounts may not be available either.

Also to be taken into consideration is the speed at which technologies are changing and the difficulty in updating the PAR to accommodate these changes. Without broad-sweeping changes to the PAR to incorporate new technologies and features of technologies, it is difficult to capture the data that involve interaction with these devices.

In the reporting of distraction-affected crashes, oftentimes external distractions are identified as a distinct type of distraction. Some of the scenarios captured under external distractions might actually be related to the task of driving (e.g., looking at a street sign). However, the crash reports may not differentiate these driving-related tasks from other external distractions (looking at previous crash or billboard). Currently, the category of external distractions is included in the counts of distraction-affected crashes.



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

This research note and other general information on highway traffic safety may be accessed by Internet users at: www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/CATS/index.aspx

Government/Social Studies Safe Driving Lesson Plan

How Federalism Works: Fiscal Federalism

Created by Mike Baczynski
Stuarts Draft High School, Stuarts Draft, VA

How Federalism Works: Fiscal Federalism

Purpose: The purpose of this lesson is to teach the students how fiscal federalism works.

Standards:

Center for Civic Education, *National Standards for Civics and Government*, Standard III, A, 2: Students should be able to evaluate, take, and defend positions on issues regarding the distribution of powers and responsibilities within the federal system.

Objectives:

1. Students will define the concept of **fiscal federalism**.
2. Students will be able explain how grants and mandates can be used by the federal government to influence laws in the states.
3. Students will be able to explain how the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) influenced state policies and contributed to higher seat belt use, fewer alcohol-related driving fatalities, and fewer total fatalities.
4. Using the TEA-21 model, students will develop a public policy proposal addressing the issue of districted driving, following the model of fiscal federalism.

Key Words:

federalism *fiscal federalism* *grants-in-aid* *mandates*

Materials:

1. Overhead with copy of key terms defined.
2. Student handout: *Selected Motor Vehicle Statistics 1996, 2011*
3. Student handout: *TEA-21 – Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century Summary*
4. Student handout: NHTSA, *Distracted Driving 2011*
5. Student handout: *Public Policy Proposal Instructions*
6. Student Computers with Internet Access

Procedures:

1. **Warm-up:** Distribute copies of the handout, *Selected Motor Vehicle Statistics 1996, 2011*. Students will look at the statistics to determine the trends in driving fatalities and seat belt use.

Questions asked on the handout will include:

- What trends can be seen in the data provided?
- Explain what the relationship might be among the four categories based on the data?
- What do you think the cause of these trends might have been?
(Students will return to this handout later in the lesson.)

2. Display the overhead with the definitions of key terms, and explain how fiscal federalism functions.

Federalism is the system by which power is shared between national (federal), state, and local governments. The national government has authority over certain things, for example: declaring war, making treaties, coining money, etc., and the state and local governments have power over other things, for example: issuing licenses, overseeing elections, providing police and fire

protection, etc. The state governments and national governments do not always agree on what policies are best for the people. The national government's primary means of influencing state governments is giving money to states in the form of grants-in-aid. States often need money from the federal in order to provide for the needs of their citizens. However, in accepting money from the federal government, states must agree to mandates or rules that the states must follow in order to receive the funds. An example of how this works is the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

3. Refer students to the summary of TEA-21 that you have provided. Have students read the summary, and then, in groups or with a partner, have students discuss and answer the following questions:
 - What did the national government offer to the states for implementing provisions of the law?
 - How did the law propose to improve safety on the nation's roads?
 - Review the chart that you were given at the start of class. How might this law have led to the trends you observed in the data?
4. After discussing and developing answers with a partner or group, lead the whole class in a discussion of their answers and the role of fiscal federalism in US government. Explain that to comply with this law and receive the federal funding for highway improvement associated with it, states have adopted initiatives, including higher standards for licensing, driver education, etc., passed new laws to increase seat belt usage (primary seat belt laws, "click-it or ticket"), and all states, by 2004, adopted a .08 blood alcohol concentration standard for defining drunk driving.
5. Explain to students that TEA-21 represented just one of many examples of fiscal federalism. Distribute the NHTSA, *Distracted Driving 2011* and *Public Policy Proposal Instructions*. Explain that their assignment will be to review the information provided about distracted driving and develop a public policy proposal to deal with the issue, using TEA-21 as a model. Remind students that in crafting their proposal, that the federal government must offer funding some a specific state need, and mandate some type(s) of program and/or new law(s) at the state level in order to receive the funding.

Federalism:

A system of government with a national government, state governments, and local governments. The powers of the national, state, and local governments are divided and balanced.

Fiscal Federalism

A system by which the national government can influence state governments by providing grants-in-aid in exchange for the state government following a specific policy initiative.

Grants-in-aid

Process by which the national government gives money to the states to fund a particular project or policy.

Mandates

Requirements that the federal government imposes as a condition for receiving federal funds.

Selected Motor Vehicle Statistics 1996, 2011

	1996	2011
Motor Vehicle Fatalities	41,907	32,367
Safety Belt Use	61.3%	84%
Alcohol-Impaired Driving Fatalities	13,451	9,878
U.S. Population (estimate)	265,299,000	312,009,000

Sources: [National Highway Traffic Safety Administration](#) (NHTSA), United States Census Bureau (census.gov)

1. What trends can be seen in the data provided?
2. Explain what the relationship might be among the four categories based on the data?
3. What do you think the cause of these trends might have been?



TEA-21
THE TRANSPORTATION
EQUITY ACT FOR
THE 21ST CENTURY

Summary



MAY 29, 1998

THE TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: TEA-21

The landmark Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century affirms President Clinton's key priorities: improving safety, protecting public health and the environment, and creating opportunity for all Americans. It provides record levels of investment to continue rebuilding America's highways and transit systems, doing so within a balanced budget and without cutting education, Social Security, and other vital Presidential priorities.

- **Rebuilding America**
 - Record, guaranteed \$198 billion in surface transportation investment while protecting our commitment to a balanced budget and to President Clinton's other vital priorities.
 - Balanced investment in highways, transit, intermodal projects, and technologies such as Intelligent Transportation Systems; strong state and local flexibility in the use of funds.
- **Improving Safety**
 - Incentive grants to increase seat belt use and to fight drunk driving by encouraging states to adopt 0.08 blood alcohol concentration standards.
 - National "One Call" notification program for pipeline safety.
 - Strong programs to continue making roads and rail-highway grade crossings safer.
 - Improved truck safety program to get bad drivers and vehicles off the road.
- **Protecting the Environment**
 - Expanded Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement and Transportation Enhancements programs to help communities improve the environment.
 - Advanced Vehicle Program to develop clean, fuel-efficient trucks.

- Continued programs for National Scenic Byways, bicycle and pedestrian paths, recreational trails, and roadside wildflower plantings.
- Increased tax-free transit benefits to encourage transit ridership.
- **Creating Opportunity**
 - Innovative jobs access program to help those moving from welfare to work.
 - Continued, effective Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program.
 - Strong labor protections for transportation workers.

IMPROVING SAFETY

More than 40,000 Americans die and three million are injured in highway crashes each year, inflicting a tragic toll and costing our economy \$150 billion annually. The fatality rate is at an historic low under President Clinton's leadership, and our challenge is to continue this progress even as traffic increases.

- **Protecting Drivers and Passengers:** \$583 million in incentives to promote seat belt and child safety seat use. An ambitious timetable to develop and implement advanced air bag technologies that protect children and smaller adults while preserving the lifesaving benefits for everyone else.
- **Fighting Drunk Driving:** \$500 million incentive program to encourage states to adopt tough 0.08 blood alcohol concentration standards for drunk driving. \$219 million in grants to encourage graduated licensing and other alternative strategies.
- **Improving Road and Rail-Highway Grade Crossing Safety:** \$3 billion for safety construction, including road hazard reduction and improved safety at rail-highway grade crossings.
- **Motor Carrier Safety:** Restructures the National Motor Carrier Safety Program to give states the ability to tailor solutions to their own needs. Continues the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program to improve trucking and hazardous materials safety.
- **One Call:** Establishes incentives for states to establish or improve "One Call" notification systems to prevent excavation damage to pipelines and other underground facilities.

PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT

The quality of our nation's environment continues to improve under President Clinton's stewardship. TEA-21, this year's most significant environmental legislation, reaffirms the President's commitment to protecting and enhancing our environment.

- **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program:** Continues this as an independent program, with funding increased by about 35 percent to \$8.1 billion. Helps communities meet national standards for healthy air.
- **Transportation Enhancements:** \$3 billion for transportation projects to improve communities' cultural, aesthetic, and environmental qualities.
- **Transit Benefits:** Increases tax-free employer-paid transit benefits from \$65 to \$100 per month, promoting transit ridership.
- **Advanced Vehicle Program:** \$250 million, matched by private funding, to develop clean, fuel-efficient trucks and other heavy vehicles.
- **Clean Fuels:** \$500 million to buy or lease buses using low-polluting fuels.

- **Sustainable Communities:** Establishes a pilot program to help state and local governments plan environmentally-friendly development.
- **National Scenic Byways:** \$148 million for improvements to roads of scenic or historic value.
- **Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths:** Expands provisions to make bicycling and walking safer and more viable ways of travel.
- **Recreational Trails:** \$270 million to create and maintain recreational trails.
- **Environmental Streamlining:** Reduces red tape and paperwork in project reviews without compromising environmental protections.

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY

President Clinton believes that transportation is about more than concrete, asphalt, and steel: it is about people, and about providing them with the opportunity to lead more fulfilling lives. TEA-21 expands opportunity for all Americans.

- **Access to Jobs:** Creates a \$750 million Job Access and Reverse Commute program to help lower-income workers and those making the transition from welfare rolls to payrolls get to jobs.
- **Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program:** Ensures that minority- and women-owned businesses have continued opportunity to participate in transportation projects.
- **Protecting American Workers:** Continues vital labor protections for transportation workers, such as Davis-Bacon and 13 (c).
- **Training the Workforce of the Future:** Allows states to reserve highway training positions specifically for welfare recipients.
- **University Transportation Centers:** \$228 million to support university-level education and research programs, a 93 percent increase.
- **Accessibility:** Provides incentive grants to make intercity buses accessible, and enables Surface Transportation Program funds to be used to make sidewalks accessible. Continues the 90 percent federal share for projects to meet Americans with Disabilities Act requirements.

REBUILDING AMERICA

President Clinton has made good on his pledge to rebuild America: the conditions and performance of our transportation system have been steadily improving. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century furthers the President's legacy of rebuilding America by providing record, balanced transportation investment.

- **Record Investment:** Guarantees \$198 billion of investment from FY 1998-2003 while protecting our commitment to a balanced budget and to President Clinton's other vital priorities, such as education, child care, and Social Security.
- **Expanded Highway Programs:** Expands core highway programs, including the National Highway System (\$28.6 billion); Interstate Highway Maintenance (\$23.8 billion); Surface Transportation Program (\$33.3 billion); Bridges (\$20.4 billion); Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (\$8.1 billion); and Federal Lands Highways (\$4.1 billion).
- **Balanced Investment:** Invests not only in highways and bridges but also in transit systems and intermodal projects. \$42 billion authorized for transit.

- **More Flexible Use of Funds:** Gives states and localities greater flexibility in the use of federal funds. Publicly-owned bus terminals and Intelligent Transportation Systems are among the possible uses.
- **Intelligent Transportation Systems:** \$1.3 billion to develop and deploy advanced ITS technologies to improve safety, mobility, and freight shipping. Expanded ability to use other major program funds for ITS.
- **Research and Technology:** \$592 million for transportation research, \$250 million for technology deployment. \$1 billion to develop magnetic levitation trains.
- **Streamlined Planning:** Streamlines the metropolitan and statewide transportation planning processes and includes freight shippers and transit riders as stakeholders. Strengthens the role of local officials and improves public involvement in the planning processes.

PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TRADE

Under President Clinton's leadership, America is once again the most economically-competitive nation in the world, and this is due in great measure to our transportation system's low costs and reliability. In an increasingly-global economy, keeping transportation efficient is crucial to our continued competitiveness.

- **Border Crossings and Trade Corridors:** \$700 million to support trade and improve security at borders and to design and construct corridors of national significance.
- **Intermodalism:** Promotes balanced, integrated, and efficient transportation to advance America's economic competitiveness. Examples include funding for projects to connect highways with intermodal transportation facilities.
- **Innovative Financing:** Creates a \$530 million credit assistance program to leverage \$10.6 billion for construction projects. Gives states and others greater flexibility in meeting the matching requirements for federal grants.
- **Freight Involvement:** Ensures that freight shippers can participate in the metropolitan and statewide transportation planning processes, so that their interests will be properly considered.
- **Bureau of Transportation Statistics:** \$186 million to support such activities as commodity flow studies and analyses of transportation's role in supporting trade.

Distracted Driving, 2011 or

<http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/CATS/listpublications.aspx?Id=B&ShowBy=DocType>

Public Policy Proposal Instructions

The purpose of this assignment is to examine one issue facing society, outlining its causes, its effects, and differing opinions on the issue, and proposing a public policy initiative to address this problem. The topic for this assignment will be “Distracted Driving.” Students will write a minimum of a **three-page** essay using the following guidelines.

Background In the opening section, the student should outline the problem, and discuss why it is of national importance. This section should include an examination of the causes and effects of the issue, what, if anything, the government or private groups are currently doing to address the issue.

Statement of Opinion

This section should examine the differing arguments surrounding the issue. What opinions are expressed in terms of supporting or opposing certain types of government action on the issue? Are there contradictory opinions relating to the causes or effects of the issue? (This question could also be addressed in the first section.)

Public Policy

Using the arguments and evidence in the previous section, the student should design a public policy addressing their issue that includes the use of fiscal federalism. The policy should aim at alleviating the causes of the problem, the effects of the problem, or both. The components of this program should be clearly outlined, along with the expected effects that the policy would have. If helpful, the program may be written in outline form, with each part explained and its effects clearly delineated.

Bibliography

The student is required to site all of his/her sources using MLA style as discussed in class. A minimum of 3 sources are required for this assignment (1 has been provided; two must be found through the student’s own research).

Format & Grammar

This assignment requires a minimum of a three-page essay, using 12-point Times New Roman font, and 1-inch margins. Proper grammar and punctuation are expected. In addition, as this is a formal paper, avoid using abbreviations, slang, and contractions.

*Lesson created by Mike Baczynski
Stuarts Draft High School
Stuarts Draft, VA*