



2012

Observational Survey of Seat Belt Use in Ohio

**Applied Research Center
Miami University**

John R. Kasich, Governor
Thomas P. Charles, Director



Ohio Department of Public Safety
Office of Criminal Justice Services

Observational Survey of Seat Belt Use in Ohio

Submitted by:

Robert L. Seufert, PhD, Director
Amy J. Walton, Project Analyst and IT Coordinator
Kaitlin A. Kubiilus, Senior Research Associate

Applied Research Center
2 South Main Street
Middletown, Ohio 45044
(513) 217-4306
seufferrl@muohio.edu

John R. Kasich, Governor

Thomas P. Charles, Director

**Ohio Department of
Public Safety**

**Office of Criminal
Justice Services**

Acknowledgements

Funding provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

The Ohio Department of Public Safety and its Office of Criminal Justice Services (OJCS), with funding from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, demonstrate their professional commitment to reducing highway fatalities and serious injuries throughout Ohio by undertaking this large-scale, statewide observation survey of seat belt use annually. I sincerely appreciate the support provided by Robert Wakefield, OJCS Special Projects Coordinator, and the assistance provided by Felice J. Moretti, Federal Projects Manager, Ohio Department of Public Safety Office and its Office of Criminal Justice Services.

The Ohio Department of Public Safety Office and its Office of Criminal Justice Services administration and the Applied Research Center's Director and staff are grateful to retired officers of the Ohio State Highway Patrol for their professional field observations.

Robert L. Seufert
May, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Background	2
Methodology	4
Sample Stratification.....	4
Sample Size and Allocation to Strata.....	5
Site Selection Procedures.....	6
Data Collection and Observer Training	8
Statistical Analysis.....	11
Statewide Seat Belt Use	16
Regional Seat Belt Use	17
Vehicle Type and Seat Belt Use	19
Driver and Passenger Seat Belt Use.....	21
Sex of Vehicle Occupants and Seat Belt Use	22
Age of Vehicle Occupants and Seat Belt Use.....	23
Race of Vehicle Occupants and Seat Belt Use	25
Observation Site Type and Seat Belt Use	26
Cross-tabulations of Observation Characteristics and Seat Belt Use.....	30
Media and Enforcement Interventions.....	32
Conclusions	33
Recommendations	34
References	36
Appendix A: Site Locations	38
Appendix B: Ohio Average Passenger Vehicle Crash-Related Fatalities by County 2006-2010	43
Appendix C: Ohio Regions, Counties, and DVMT	45
Appendix D: Population of Road Types by County and Number Selected	47
Appendix E: Sampled Road Segments	49
Appendix F: Forms	56

All correspondence regarding this report should be directed to the Office of Criminal Justice Services, by mail at: P.O. Box 182081, Columbus, Ohio 43218-2081, or by phone at: (614) 466-3250.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview: The 2012 baseline *Click It or Ticket* observation survey of seat belt use in Ohio contained 21,029 vehicle occupants – 17,400 drivers and 3,629 passengers. After the *Click It or Ticket* media campaign and enforcement initiatives, another sample of 21,963 occupants was observed at the same sites with 18,073 drivers and 3,890 passengers. A third survey approximately 4.5 months later was conducted for additional analysis resulting in additional data for 20,253 vehicle occupants—17,005 drivers and 3,248 passengers. The final survey was used for the present analysis. Results of the third survey indicate that Ohio’s 2012 seat belt use rate is **82.0%**, somewhat lower than the 2011 belt usage rate of 84.12%. However, because new counties and observation sites were sampled for the 2012 survey, the rates are not directly comparable (see methodology for sample selection procedures, which included a revised rationale for a county’s inclusion in the sample). Consequently, the 2012 survey results, with an overall margin of error of $\pm 1\%$, were derived from the third observational survey conducted approximately 4.5 months after the combined *Click It or Ticket* media campaign and enforcement initiatives had been fully implemented. The above seat belt use rate for Ohio was formally reported to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

In consultation with the Applied Research Center, retired officers of the Ohio State Highway Patrol (OSHP) conducted observation surveys of seat belt use at 237 randomly selected sites in 53 of Ohio’s 88 counties (see methodology). The surveys were conducted on randomly selected days of the week and times of day and included occupants of passenger cars, vans and minivans, sport utility vehicles (SUVs), and light and heavy trucks. Additional findings, which remain generally consistent with previous surveys, include the following:

- The seat belt use rate of light truck (mostly pickup truck) occupants (77%) is significantly lower than that of occupants of passenger cars (82%), minivans (87%), or SUVs (86%).
- The Northeast region has the highest seat belt use rate (83%) while the Southeast region continues to have the lowest (68%).
- The statewide rate for drivers (82%) was someone lower than the passenger rate (85%).
- Female vehicle occupants continue to have a significantly higher rate of seat belt use (87%) than male occupants (78%).
- For vehicle occupants ages 15 and above, there was a steady increase in seat belt use as age increased. Seat belt use is lowest for vehicle occupants ages 15-25 (75%) and highest for occupants ages 65 and above (84%).

Recommendations: The new methodology highlights several populations whose low belt use rates warrant targeted interventions. Similar to previous years, those populations include:

- Southeast Region Vehicle Occupants
- Vehicle Occupants Age 15-25
- Male Vehicle Occupants
- Light Truck Occupants
- Any combination of the above five characteristics

BACKGROUND

Since 1991, Ohio has conducted an annual observational survey to determine seat belt use following guidelines set by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). These guidelines have traditionally given individual states much discretion in survey design and implementation, with the stipulation that each state must generate a probability-based estimate for seat belt usage of front outboard occupants of passenger vehicles. This seat belt use estimate must have a required level of precision of less than 5% relative error and a 95% confidence coefficient. Individual states have been permitted to decide how much additional information to collect based on the resources available.

In 1998, NHTSA requested that states collect vehicle-specific information as part of the survey process. Specifically, all states were asked to collect information that would permit them to generate usage rates for occupants of four types of vehicles: passenger cars, vans/minivans, sport utility vehicles (SUVs), and pickup trucks. Since 1991, and prior to 1998, Ohio's seat belt surveys only collected data from occupants of passenger cars, minivans and SUVs, and results from each site were pooled so that observers did not record seat belt use for specific types of vehicles. Therefore, the only data available were aggregate data from each site that provided overall counts of driver and passenger seat belt use. Thus, in 1998, Ohio's survey required some modifications in the way that seat belt use data were collected in order to provide the vehicle-specific information requested by NHTSA. Also, data on license plate origins (i.e., from which state the plate was issued) have not been collected since 1999, because out-of-state vehicles were only a very small proportion of vehicles observed during previous years. In 2009 through 2011, with the exception of the addition of driver's cell phone use on the observation form, the survey methodology was identical to that used in the 2008 observation surveys.¹

Data were collected from vehicles stopped at randomly selected intersections and freeway off-ramps, so observers had ample opportunity to collect data from each individual vehicle observed. Traffic control devices such as traffic signals or stop signs were present at all observation site locations. This method gives observers not only the opportunity to collect general use data, but to collect additional demographic information on seat belt use in addition to vehicle type. Ohio and other states have found differences in seat belt use as a function of vehicle type, sex, and age. Research also indicates that seat belt use varies as a function of race and ethnicity. Consequently, the race of vehicle occupants was added to the survey in 2004 and has been retained in subsequent surveys. Additionally, as noted previously, the cell phone use of the driver was added to the 2009 through 2011 surveys. Modifying the survey to collect vehicle-specific information (i.e., data on usage in various vehicle types) and demographic data vastly increases our knowledge about the Ohioans who are likely to wear (or not wear) their seat belts.

¹ Information on driver cell phone use will be included in a separate document.

Also, to provide geographical information about regional trends in seat belt use, the survey is structured to estimate seat belt use on a regional level. That is, the sample is stratified by geographic region to allow for the estimation of seat belt use in various parts of the state.

This narrative contains the following sections:

- **Methodology:** The methodology, approved by NHTSA, outlines the manner in which observation sites were chosen and data were collected and analyzed.
- **Results:** Descriptive results of seat belt use (e.g., percent of observations by sex, age, vehicle type, race, and region) are presented first in the same manner as in past *Observational Surveys of Seat Belt Use in Ohio*.
- **Recommendations:** Recommendations are based on the data derived from both the descriptive statistics and the multivariate analysis.
- **References and Appendices** containing observation sites and forms are also included.

The following section contains a full description of the methodological procedures approved by NHTSA to estimate seat belt use in 2012.

METHODOLOGY

Sample Stratification

The new methodology required a more nuanced stratification of the sample. In previous years, the sample was stratified by region. In 2012, the sample was stratified by county and, within each county, by road type (primary, secondary, and municipal/rural). Observation sites were randomly selected road segments from each county depending on the road types available. For example, primary sites could only be selected in counties with at least one freeway off-ramp, while municipal roads could only be sampled in counties with a metropolitan statistical area (MSA). Appendix D details the breakdown of site types and numbers by county. The method of selection described later in this section was used to ensure that all intersections and off-ramps in a given county had *an equal probability of selection*. That is, all road segments, regardless of their location or traffic volumes, had equal likelihoods of selection as survey sites. In some cases, certain selected sites were impractical for observation, in which case a similar site (primary, secondary, or local) was selected to replace it.

As a preliminary measure to eliminate sites with fewer to no consequences to policy implementation, counties with lower overall traffic-related fatalities were omitted from the sample. Federal guidelines permit the exclusion of low-fatality counties (cumulatively accounting for 15% or less of the state's highway fatalities) from the sample space so that the costs of sampling in these areas may be constrained. The present survey methodology excluded 31 low-fatality counties that cumulatively account for approximately 15% of the state's fatalities, reducing the sample of Ohio counties from 88 to 57 (see Figure 1 for counties). In all cases, excluded counties were rural: they had low populations and few roads.

power analysis was performed using data from Ohio's past observational surveys. Based on this analysis, a minimum of 7,600 observations were required to estimate overall seat belt use with the desired amount of precision. See Appendix D for a breakdown of site allocation by strata (counties and road types).

Site Selection Procedures

Our research design conforms to the requirements of the Uniform Criteria and will generate annual estimates of occupant restraint use for adults and children using booster seats in the front seats of specified vehicles. We intend to update the sample of data collection sites every five years in order to have survey results for geographic areas in which more than 85% of crash-related fatalities occur. This sample design was developed in consultation with and approved for Ohio under an agreement with the Statistical Consulting Center at Miami University.

1. All 88 counties in Ohio were listed in descending order of the average number of motor vehicle crash-related fatalities for the period of 2006 to 2010. Ohio State Highway Patrol data, which is provided to the Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS), were used to determine the 5-year average number of crash-related fatalities per county. It was determined that 57 counties accounted for approximately 86 percent of Ohio's total passenger vehicle crash-related fatalities. We selected road segments from each of the 57 counties. Thus, each county is considered a stratum when generating state or regional estimates of seat belt usage. See Appendix D.
2. It is expected that an *average* of 75 to 80 vehicles will be observed at each of 237 observation sites and approximately 17,775 to 18,960 vehicles overall based on past experience with Ohio's annual *Observational Survey of Seat Belt Use*. Estimates from previous surveys suggest the standard error will be well under the threshold of 2.5%. In the event there is a standard error greater than 2.5%, additional data will be collected from existing sites.
3. All 57 counties were stratified by road type (primary, secondary, and local/rural/city). Assuming that all three road types are present in a county, a random sample of road segments was selected from each county as follows: 2 primary segments, 2 secondary segments, and 1 local/rural/city segment, except for counties with 10,000,000 DVMT or higher, in which case 2 local/rural/city segments were selected. As a result, 82 primary, 114 secondary, and 41 local/rural/city segments were selected overall. These sample sizes reflected a logistical constraint of available staffing for observation sites and the time to conduct the study. See Appendix E.
4. Additional stages of selection were and will be used to determine the observation period, travel direction, lane, and vehicles to be observed, at random and with known probability, as appropriate under the Uniform Criteria, as described in Section 4.1.

Sample Size and Precision

A standard error of less than 2.5% on the seat belt use estimates is required by the Final Rule. Since 1999, Ohio has conducted the *Observational Survey of Seat Belt Use* and has historically reported standard errors below the 2.5% threshold. For instance, during the 2011 pre- and post-surveys, the standard error was .28% and .26% with 18,000-19,200 total observation surveys. These surveys have been obtained from previous sample designs using 48 counties and an *average* of 5 observation sites per county with an *average* of 75 to 80 observation surveys per site. Therefore, since the proposed design is expected to yield a minimum sample size of 17,775 observations across 57 counties and an *average* of approximately 4.16 segments per county, the precision objective should be achieved (i.e., $57 * 4.1578 * 75 = 17,775$). In the event that the precision objective is not met, additional observations will be taken starting with sites having the fewest observations, and new data will be added to existing valid data until the desired precision is achieved. That step was unnecessary in the current survey.

County Selection

Of Ohio's 88 counties, 57 counties account for nearly 86 percent of all fatalities. In consultation with SCC staff, we decided to include all 57 counties in the final sample of counties. For practical purposes, the Ohio Department of Transportation assigns each of Ohio's counties to one of five geographical regions; although the sample of counties is not stratified by region in the analysis, seat belt use rates will be reported regionally as well as overall. See Appendix D.

Road Segment Selection

For each of the 57 counties, road segments were randomly selected within each county. Ohio employed the Census TIGER data for the selection of road segments. Also, Ohio exercised the available exclusion option and removed rural local roads in counties that are not within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), and other non-public roads, unnamed roads, unpaved roads, vehicular trails, access ramps, cul-de-sacs, traffic circles, and service drives from the dataset. We stratified segments by road type and selected 2 primary segments, 2 secondary segments, and 1 local/rural/city segment from each county. When a county's DVMT was 10,000,000 or more, we selected 2 local/rural/city segments. As shown in Appendix D, primary and local segments were not always available for each county.

Appendix D contains the population of segments and number of segments sampled by county. Appendix E presents the selected road segments within each county and their probabilities of selection.

Reserve Sample

In the event that an original road segment is permanently unavailable, a reserve road segment was used. The reserve road segment sample consists of one additional road segment per original road segment selected, resulting in a reserve sample of 237 road segments. After data were sorted by segment length, road type, and county, the segment immediately following each selected segment was obtained as a backup sample, thus duplicating as closely as possible the segment characteristics of the original sample. Historically, Ohio has had great success using nearly all of the original site selections and one set of reserve sites was sufficient.

Data Collection and Observer Training

Road segments were mapped according to the latitude and longitude of their midpoints. The selected road segment was identified by an intersection or interchange that occurred within or just beyond the segment. If no intersection or interchange occurred within the segment, then any suitable point on that road could be used for observation. Data collection sites were deterministically selected such that traffic could be observed with optimum accuracy. Therefore, whenever possible, sites were assigned to locations relatively close to controlled intersections (e.g., within 50 yards). Such locations allow for safely and more accurately collecting detailed vehicle, driver, and occupant information of ongoing interest to the Ohio Department of Public Safety. Such detailed information has been historically (i.e., 2000 through 2011) used by Ohio to successfully plan, implement, evaluate, and adjust its interventions. For interstate highways, data collection will occur on a ramp carrying traffic that is exiting the highway. The observed direction of travel was randomly assigned for each road segment. The locations of the data collection sites were described on Site Assignment Sheets for each county and maps were developed to aid the Data Collectors and QC Monitors in travelling to the assigned locations.

Training

Ohio has a crew of 18 data collectors with several years' experience observing seat belt use of front-seat vehicle occupants on its roadways. After consulting with Ohio Department of Transportation personnel, it was determined that increasing the survey coverage of counties to 57 from the historic 48 would not be a problem for the current crew. However, Ohio additional data collectors and/or assistants were hired when an observer was temporarily unable to collect data for various reasons. Also, Ohio used trained Applied Research Center personnel and Ohio Law Enforcement Liaisons from the Ohio State Highway Patrol as QC Monitors.

Data Collector and QC Monitor training was conducted at the Ohio Department of Public Safety during the two weeks prior to the first data collection period year. Two additional observation survey were undertaken in June

and November. Data Collector and QC Monitor training included lecture, classroom, and field exercises. Previous training for Ohio observers does not differ significantly from new stipulations in the Final Rule. The updated Ohio training manual included a list of any differences and highlighted those during the training session.

Six (6) quality control monitors (qualified Applied Research Center staff) were given an additional half day training focusing on their specific duties. These include conducting unannounced site visits data collectors at 5% of sites (a minimum of 12 randomly selected sites, i.e. $237 \text{ sites} * .05 = 11.85 \text{ sites}$ to be visited) and reviewing the field protocol during the visit. The QC Monitors were also be available throughout the survey to respond to questions and offer assistance to Data Collectors as needed.

Observation Periods and Quality Control

All seat belt and booster seat use observations were be conducted during weekdays and weekends between 7 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. The schedule included rush hour (before 9:30 a.m. and after 3:30 p.m.) and non-rush hour observations. Data collection was conducted for 50 minutes immediately following a 5-minute traffic count; a second 5-minute traffic count immediately followed the observation. Observers recorded seat belt use information and demographic information of interest to Ohio, both while vehicles are stopped in the designated lane at the traffic control device (if applicable), and while traffic was moving through the intersection or ramp or road segment whenever possible. When traffic was moving, observers recorded data for as many vehicles as possible. Approximately 8 counties were covered per day with an average of four or five sites scheduled for each county. Start times were organized to ensure that a representative number of weekday versus weekend and rush hour versus non-rush hour sites were included.

Maps showing the location of all observation sites and Site Assignment Sheets were provided to the Data Collectors and QC Monitors. These indicated the observed road name, the crossroad included within the road segment (or nearest crossroad), assigned date, assigned time, and assigned direction of travel. Sites within relatively close geographic proximity were assigned as data collection clusters. The first site within each cluster was assigned a random day and time for completion. Next, all other sites within a cluster were assigned to the same day by geographic proximity in order to minimize travel costs.

Data Collection

All passenger vehicles, including commercial vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of less than 10,000 pounds, were eligible for observation. The Seat Belt Survey Site Description Form and the Observation Form are shown as Appendix F. The Site Description Form obtains descriptive information for each site, including: date, site location, site number, alternate site data, assigned traffic flow, number of lanes available and observed, start and end times for observations, and weather conditions. This form was completed by the Data Collector at each observation site.

The Seat Belt Survey Observation Form was used to record seat belt use by drivers and front seat passengers. Additional forms were provided for each observer since some sites had a significantly higher traffic volume than the average. After being reviewed by QC Monitors, the forms were scanned and the data were imported directly into a database for analysis.

The data collector observed as many lanes of traffic as s/he could accurately monitor while obtaining data on 99% of the vehicles. Only one direction of traffic will be observed at any given site. This direction is pre-determined (see Section 4.1).

Observations were made of all drivers and right front seat occupants. This included children riding in booster seats. The only right front seat occupants excluded from the analysis were child passengers who are traveling in child seats with harness straps.

Alternate Sites and Rescheduling

When a site was temporarily unavailable due to a crash or inclement weather, data collection was rescheduled for a corresponding time of day and day of week. In the event that the site was permanently unworkable, such as located within a gated community, then an alternate site, selected as part of the reserve sample, was used as a permanent replacement. The alternate for each site was clearly identified and listed on the Site Assignment Sheet and additional site selection support was provided by the staff member responsible for site selection.

Quality Control Procedures

The QC Monitors made unannounced visits to at least twelve data collection sites throughout the state. During these visits, the QC Monitor first evaluated the Data Collector's performance from a nonintrusive distance (if possible), and then observed alongside the Data Collector. This procedure helped ensure that the Data Collector followed survey protocol including: being on time at assigned sites, completing the Site Description Form and observation forms, and making accurate observations of seat belt use.

In the event it is discovered that a Data Collector has falsified data, the Data Collector will be replaced by a back-up Data Collector. The back-up Data Collector will revisit all sites proven to be or suspected to be falsified and recollect all data. As in the past, there was no data falsification in 2012.

At the end of each day, the Data Collector shipped the forms by overnight service to Miami University's Applied Research Center in Middletown, Ohio. The QC Monitors reviewed the forms. If the rate of unknowns exceeded 10% for any site (potentially leading to an overall nonresponse rate of 10% or more), then the Data Collector was sent back to that site for an additional observation period. (This was not necessary in 2012.)

Statistical Analysis

The **Site Description Forms** and **Data Collection Forms** were returned directly to the Miami University Applied Research Center and a cursory review of the forms and data from each observer and site was performed. Site and vehicle-specific information were linked in the final dataset used for statistical analysis. All analyses were performed using a combination of Microsoft Excel, Access, and SPSS.

Estimation and Variance Estimation

Imputation

Imputation on missing data was unnecessary, per the protocol and Ohio's past experience with observational surveys.

Sampling Weights

We selected a stratified random sample within road type strata in each county. In addition, the number of segments selected was small relative to the number of possible road segments. As a consequence, finite population correction factors were not used. Initial sampling weights were defined as the reciprocal of the proportion of segments sampled within a stratum.

Nonresponse Adjustment

The data collection protocol in this plan includes a provision for the use of alternate observation sites and road segments with non-zero eligible traffic volume; consequently, zero observations at a site will be unlikely. However, if no vehicles pass a site during the 50 minute observation period or if the site is closed for some other reason, an alternate site that is paired with the selected site will be used. Consequently, a nonresponse adjustment in these cases will be unnecessary, since the alternative observation site is already associated with the selected observation site. If the alternate site is also unavailable, the site's sampling weight will be redistributed over the other segments of the same road type in its county. Let p_{isj} be the road segment selection probability for observation site j of segment s in county i , and

$$w_{isj} = \frac{1}{p_{isj}}$$

be the road segment weight. Weights for non-missing road segments of the same road type within the same county will be multiplied by the adjustment factor for a nonresponding site,


$$f_{is} = \frac{\sum_{all\ j} w_{isj}}{\sum_{responding\ j} w_{isj}}$$

and the missing road segments will be dropped from the analysis file. Moreover, since we will be left with fewer than two observed sites of segment type s within county i , we adjust our estimates by combining strata within the county. In other cases of nonresponse (e.g. cars with unobservable seat belt status), each site's initial sampling weight will be adjusted by multiplying by the reciprocal of its observed response rate. These adjustments are described in Section 5.4.


Estimators

5.4.1: Stratification and Allocation

County "i" can be considered a population comprised of 3 strata ($i=1, \dots, 57$): "P" = primary; "S" = secondary; and "L" = local segments. The numbers of segments in each stratum are N_{iP} , N_{iS} and N_{iL} , respectively. A county is represented as:



When a country does not have any primary road segments, it is represented as:



The size of the sample from each stratum is $n_{iP}=2$, $n_{iS}=2$ and $n_{iL}=1$, except for counties with 10,000,000 or higher DMVT, in which case $n_{iL}=2$.

5.4.2: Estimators

Within an observation site, the estimated seat belt use rate $\hat{\pi}_{isj}$ is calculated as:

$$\hat{\pi}_{isj} = \sum \frac{u_{dlv|isj} y_{dlv|isj}}{u_{dlv|isj}},$$

where $u_{dlv|isj}$ is the sampling weight of vehicle v in lane l travelling in direction d , and $y_{dlv|isj} = 1$ if a seat belt is in use and 0 if not. The vehicle sampling weight is defined as $u_{dlv|isj} = \frac{1}{p_{dlv|isj}} = \frac{1}{p_{d|isj} p_{l|isjd} p_{v|isjdl}}$, where, $p_{d|isj}$ represents the probability of traffic direction selection, $p_{l|isjd}$ is the probability of lane selection within direction, and $p_{v|isjdl}$ is the probability of vehicle selection within the lane.

County estimate (stratified estimator, adjusted for nonresponse)

The initial sampling weight for observation site j in stratum s within county i is the reciprocal, $\frac{N_{is}}{n_{is}}$, of the proportion of segments sampled within the stratum. If the response rate at the site is denoted r_{isj} , the nonresponse-adjusted weight, w_{isj} , is obtained by multiplying the initial sample weight by r_{isj}^{-1} ; hence, $w_{isj} = \frac{N_{is}}{n_{is} r_{isj}}$. The county estimate for the rate of seat-belt use is then

$$\hat{\pi}_{C_i} = \frac{\sum_{s \in \{P,S,L\}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{is}} w_{isj} \hat{\pi}_{isj}}{\sum_{s \in \{P,S,L\}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{is}} w_{isj}}.$$

Region estimate

Suppose counties C_1, \dots, C_R comprise a region. Then the region seat belt use estimate is given by

$$\hat{\pi}_{region} = \sum_{i=1}^R \left(\frac{N_{C_i}^*}{N_{region}^*} \right) \hat{\pi}_{C_i},$$

where $N_{region}^* = \sum_{i \in region} N_i^*$.

State estimate

The Ohio seat belt use estimate and its variance are similarly defined:

$$\hat{\pi}_{state} = \sum_{i=1}^{57} \left(\frac{N_i^*}{N_{state}^*} \right) \hat{\pi}_{C_i},$$

where $N_{state}^* = \sum_{i=1}^{57} N_i^*$.

5.4.3: Variance Estimation

To derive an estimate for the variance of $\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*$, we first note that the county seat-belt use estimate above can be re-expressed as the algebraically-equivalent weighted-average of stratum-specific estimates

$$\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^* = \sum_{s \in \{P,S,L\}} W_{is}^* \hat{\pi}_{is} = \frac{1}{N_i^*} \sum_{s \in \{P,S,L\}} N_{is}^* \hat{\pi}_{is}.$$

In addition to suggesting that counties are strata in the state, we are suggesting the use of stratified sampling of segment type $\{P,S,L\}$ within each county. Thus, the county estimate is constructed as a weighting of estimates from each segment strata in a county. Here W_{is}^* is the (non-response adjusted) proportion of road segments in county “i” that are of types. Note that this differs from the N_i^*/N_{state}^* weights that are used to combine county estimates into a state or region estimate.

In defining the component quantities, of $\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*$ above, we take advantage of the fact that any stratum will have at most two observation sites (that is, $n_{is} \leq 2$). For a stratum with two observation sites, we define the nonresponse-adjusted effective stratum size as $N_{is}^* = \frac{N_{is}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{r_{is1}} + \frac{1}{r_{is2}} \right)$ and the nonresponse-adjusted stratum seat belt use estimate as $\hat{\pi}_{is} = \hat{\pi}_{is1} \left(\frac{r_{is2}}{r_{is1}+r_{is2}} \right) + \hat{\pi}_{is2} \left(\frac{r_{is1}}{r_{is1}+r_{is2}} \right)$. For a stratum with only one observation site, these quantities are defined as $N_{is}^* = \frac{N_{is}}{r_{is1}}$ and $\hat{\pi}_{is} = \hat{\pi}_{is1}$. The overall effective county size is $N_i^* = N_{iP}^* + N_{iS}^* + N_{iL}^*$, and the final weights for in the formula above are given by $W_{iP}^* = \frac{N_{iP}^*}{N_i^*}$, $W_{iS}^* = \frac{N_{iS}^*}{N_i^*}$, and $W_{iL}^* = \frac{N_{iL}^*}{N_i^*}$, the nonresponse-adjusted effective proportion of each segment type sampled in county i .

When $n_{iL} = 1$, we combine the local and secondary sites together into a new strata (denoted with a subscript “N”) to obtain the estimated variance of $\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*$, i.e., there are two stratum considered in the variance estimation, primary and secondary/local. Then estimated variance of $\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*$ can then be expressed as

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*) = \sum_{s \in \{P,N\}} \left[\frac{W_{is}^{*2}}{n_{is}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{is}} \frac{(\hat{\pi}_{isj} - \hat{\pi}_{is})^2}{n_{is} - 1} \right].$$

- assuming the secondary and local sites are homogeneous
- $W_{iP}^* = \frac{N_{iP}^*}{N_i^*}$, $W_{iN}^* = \frac{N_{iS}^* + N_{iL}^*}{N_i^*}$
- ignoring FPC since $N_{iS} \gg n_{iS}$

If $n_{iL} = 0$ because of nonresponse, i.e., neither the initially sampled site nor the reserve sample site is available, cells will be collapsed across strata within county in a similar manner.

Bound on error of estimate = $2 \sqrt{\hat{V}(\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*)}$

Confidence interval: $\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^* \pm 2 \sqrt{\hat{V}(\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*)}$

The variance of the region estimate is given by

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\pi}_{region}) = \sum_{i=1}^R \left(\frac{N_{C_i}^*}{N_{region}^*} \right)^2 \hat{V}(\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*).$$

Error bounds and confidence intervals for the regional estimates are defined similarly to those for county estimates.

The variance of the state estimate is given by

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\pi}_{state}) = \sum_{i=1}^{57} \left(\frac{N_i^*}{N_{state}^*} \right)^2 \hat{V}(\hat{\pi}_{C_i}^*).$$

The error bound and confidence interval for the state estimate is defined similarly to those for county estimates.

All computations will be performed using standard statistical software, such as SPSS, proc surveyreg in SAS, or the survey package in R.

RESULTS

Statewide Seat Belt Use

The official 2012 overall seat belt use rate for vehicle occupants from Ohio is 82.0% (Table 3). This rate is a slight improvement over the 2009 rate of 82%. Due to the large sample size of 17,005 observations (20,253 total occupants – 17,005 drivers plus 3,248 passengers), the survey has a confidence interval of approximately plus or minus 1.6%.

Alone, the 2012 rate is a point estimate of seat belt use. Applying a confidence interval determines a range of values that allows seat belt use to be estimated with a desired amount of certainty. NHTSA guidelines specify a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of plus or minus 5%. By applying Formula 5, we can be **95% certain** that Ohio's seat belt usage for all vehicle occupants is within $\pm 1.6\%$ of **82.0%**.

95% Confidence Interval: **80.4% - 83.6%**

A total of 17,005 drivers and 3,248 passengers were observed at 237 observation sites. An average of 72 vehicles and 85 occupants were observed per site.

Regional Seat Belt Use

As illustrated in Table 1 and Figure 2, the Southeast region has a significantly lower seat belt use rate than all other regions, as seen in previous years. (Table 4 shows the unweighted rates by OSHP district, and the low rates of the Southwest Region are reflected in the low rates for the East Central and Southeast OSHP districts.)

Table 1: Regional Usage Rates

Region	Usage Rate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Unweighted n
			Upper Bound	Lower Bound	
Central	82.36%	0.0277	0.7693	0.8780	3,144
Northeast	82.99%	0.0095	0.8113	0.8486	7,295
Northwest	81.01%	0.0137	0.7833	0.8369	2,518
Southeast	68.44%	0.0194	0.6465	0.7224	969
Southwest	82.17%	0.0168	0.7889	0.8546	3,525
Statewide	82.00%	0.0082	0.8039	0.8362	20,080

Figure 2 Seat Belt Use by Region





Table 2: OSHP District Usage Rates (Unweighted)

OSHP	Unweighted Usage Rate	Unweighted n
Central	85.8%	3,090
East Central	70.6%	1,264
West Central	86.0%	2,117
North Central	82.3%	2,851
Northeast	88.5%	6,076
Northwest	85.0%	1,929
Southeast	79.5%	845
Southwest	83.8%	1,908
Statewide	82.0%	20,080

It is important to note that the overall estimate is based on all front outboard occupants observed in five vehicle types.² Because pickup trucks were excluded from the survey until 1998, the 2012 rate is only comparable to rates since 1998. Calculating the unweighted 2012 rate without pickup trucks indicates a usage rate of approximately 86.4%, highlighting the detrimental effect of low seat belt use rates among pickup truck occupants on the overall seat belt use rate. Figure 3 represents unweighted seat belt usage excluding pickup trucks (in blue). The weighted rate including pickup trucks (in green) shows that while the rate without pickup trucks is higher than when pickups are included, the rates converged until 2012, when the new methodology was implemented.

Commercial vehicles were excluded from these historically comparable rates as specified by NHTSA.

Figure 3 Seat Belt Use for Passenger Car, Van/Minivan, and SUV Occupants



² Data on four vehicle types—passenger cars, vans/minivans, sport utility vehicles, and pickup/light trucks—have been collected since the 1998 survey. The 2012 methodology update subdivided trucks into “light” and “heavy” classes; both are excluded from the unweighted rate without pickup trucks in Figure 4.

Vehicle Type and Seat Belt Use


Following the pattern of previous surveys and expectations, light truck occupants had a significantly lower seat belt use rate than occupants of other vehicles types during 2012, presenting an opportunity to increase overall seat belt use in the future (see Table 3).

Table 3: Seat Belt Use by Vehicle Type³

Vehicle Type	Usage Rate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Unweighted n
			Upper Bound	Lower Bound	
Passenger Car	82.41%	0.0147	0.7954	0.8529	10,153
Van/Minivan	86.90%	0.0215	0.8269	0.9111	2,175
SUV	86.33%	0.0115	0.8408	0.8858	4,171
Light Truck	77.97%	0.0231	0.7345	0.8249	2,814
Statewide	82.00%	0.0082	0.8039	0.8362	20,080

Figure Figure 4 illustrates the extent to which van/minivan and SUV occupant seat belt use exceeds the passenger car occupant use rate and especially the light truck occupant use rate.

Figure 4 Seat Belt Use Statewide and by Vehicle Type



The results for each vehicle type by region are presented in Table 4 and the unweighted rates by district in Table 5.⁴ As shown, occupants of light trucks had a significantly lower rate of seat belt use than occupants in all other vehicle types, regardless of region. Seat belt use was lowest among pickup truck occupants in the Southeast region.

³ Insufficient heavy truck observations for accurate weighting. Unweighted rate is 77.12%.

⁴ "Unweighted N" indicates the total number in observations of that category.

Table 4: Vehicle Type Regional Usage Rates

Region	Passenger Car	Unweighted N	Van / Minivan	Unweighted N	SUV	Unweighted N	Light Truck	Unweighted N
Central	81.10%	1,487	84.32%	292	89.95%	806	0.8926	410
Northeast	83.91%	4,439	85.13%	887	84.33%	1,687	0.7715	1,038
Northwest	79.59%	1,466	92.41%	320	84.59%	550	0.7824	537
Southeast	66.83%	649	87.68%	93	78.32%	315	0.5926	231
Southwest	83.94%	2,112	88.65%	583	87.91%	813	0.6959	598
Statewide	82.41%	10,153	86.90%	2,175	86.33%	4,171	77.97%	2,814

Table 5: Vehicle Type Usage Rates by OSHP District

Region	Passenger Car	Unweighted N	Van / Minivan	Unweighted N	SUV	Unweighted N	Light Truck	Unweighted N
Central	87.40%	1,465	90.10%	284	88.30%	800	79.50%	3,089
East Central	70.40%	611	80.20%	91	75.70%	284	63.10%	1,264
West Central	86.20%	1,094	92.10%	303	91.20%	341	75.00%	2,117
North Central	83.60%	1,367	89.40%	302	87.30%	644	68.10%	2,850
Northeast	89.10%	3,298	89.40%	634	90.20%	1,169	83.40%	6,076
Northwest	83.20%	953	93.50%	215	89.00%	318	78.70%	1,929
Southeast	77.80%	401	80.20%	116	86.10%	180	73.70%	845
Southwest	88.40%	964	69.10%	230	85.50%	435	78.80%	1,908
Statewide	85.60%	10,153	87.30%	2,175	87.70%	4,171	76.50%	2,814

Driver and Passenger Seat Belt Use

Ohio's seat belt observation survey has traditionally found differences between drivers and passengers in their rates of seat belt use, although the two rates are strongly correlated and reciprocal. Table 6 summarizes the results for drivers and passengers, respectively, by region, while Table 7 summarizes the unweighted results by OSHP district. Meanwhile, Figure 5 illustrates the weighted differences by region.


Table 6: Driver and Passenger Usage Rates by Region

Region	Drivers	Unweighted N	Passengers	Unweighted N
Central	82.51%	2,724	86.84%	420
Northeast	82.44%	6,828	83.63%	1,563
Northwest	82.27%	2,661	83.31%	356
Southeast	67.81%	1,147	73.33%	196
Southwest	82.19%	3,552	87.12%	633
Statewide	81.97%	16,912	86.84%	3,248

Table 7: Driver and Passenger Usage Rates by OSHP District (Unweighted)

Region	Drivers	Unweighted N	Passengers	Unweighted N
Central	86.20%	2,681	82.90%	409
East Central	71.10%	1,075	67.70%	189
West Central	86.60%	1,788	82.40%	329
North Central	82.00%	2,181	83.10%	670
Northeast	87.80%	5,073	91.70%	1,003
Northwest	85.00%	1,768	85.10%	161
Southeast	82.10%	671	69.50%	174
Southwest	83.70%	1,675	84.50%	233
Statewide	81.97%	16,912	84.30%	3,168

Figure 5 Seat Belt Use by Occupant Type



Sex of Vehicle Occupants and Seat Belt Use

Separate estimates were generated for male and female front outboard occupants. Consistent with past Ohio survey results, female occupants had higher rates of seat belt use than did male occupants. The disparity varied between approximately 6 and 16 percentage points for each region (Table 8). Unweighted results by OSHP district are summarized in Table 9 while Figure 6 illustrates a comparison of the weighted results by region.


Table 8: Male and Female Occupants Usage Rates by Region

Region	Males	Unweighted N	Females	Unweighted N
Central	76.74%	1,771	89.18%	1,383
Northeast	80.53%	4,495	86.50%	3,892
Northwest	74.30%	1,870	89.26%	1,275
Southeast	61.10%	735	77.90%	613
Southwest	79.93%	2,318	85.81%	1,872
Statewide	78.39%	11,189	86.96%	9,035

Table 9: Male and Female Usage Rates by OSHP District (Unweighted)

Region	Male	Unweighted N	Female	Unweighted N
Central	82.40%	1,725	90.10%	1,363
East Central	66.40%	693	75.70%	569
West Central	83.40%	1,223	89.50%	891
North Central	78.50%	1,591	87.10%	1,256
Northeast	85.30%	3,229	92.20%	2,838
Northwest	82.20%	1,134	89.00%	794
Southeast	75.80%	434	83.50%	411
Southwest	81.70%	1,061	86.40%	847
Statewide	81.50%	11,090	88.60%	8,969

Figure 6 Seat Belt Use by Sex



Age of Vehicle Occupants and Seat Belt Use

Compared to other age groups, seat belt use was lowest (75%) among vehicle occupants age 15-25. However, seat belt use increases among older occupants, reaching 84% among occupants age 26-64 and 85% among those who are age 65 and older. Table 10 summarizes the results for each age group by region. A comparison of these results by region is contained in Figure 7. Meanwhile, Table 11 shows the unweighted results by OSHP district.

Table 10: Occupants' restraint use by age group


Region	15 – 25		26 – 64		65 +	
	Rate	Unweighted N	Rate	Unweighted N	Rate	Unweighted N
Central	75.20%	355	80.70%	2,249	85.02%	547
Northeast	76.01%	833	83.42%	6,531	83.14%	1,021
Northwest	77.88%	589	80.85%	2,064	84.74%	494
Southeast	72.70%	161	67.74%	1,001	69.44%	183
Southwest	72.46%	583	83.91%	2,770	84.54%	837
Statewide	75.06%	2,521	82.29%	14,615	83.76%	3,082

Table 11: Age Group Usage Rates by OSHP District (Unweighted)

Region	15-25	Unweighted N	26-64	Unweighted N	65+	Unweighted N
Central	83.30%	354	85.30%	2,194	89.20%	539
East Central	68.10%	138	70.40%	947	73.90%	176
West Central	77.10%	249	87.70%	1,524	85.10%	343
North Central	69.40%	265	83.90%	2,095	82.30%	487
Northeast	79.40%	601	89.60%	4,822	88.90%	640
Northwest	83.80%	463	85.30%	1,224	85.80%	240
Southeast	82.10%	117	78.90%	530	79.80%	198
Southwest	87.00%	316	83.20%	1,169	83.00%	423
Statewide	79.90%	2,503	85.40%	14,505	85.00%	3,046

There were too few occupants younger than 15 to accurately estimate seat belt use for children. Historically, however, children's restraint use has been relatively low and may be hampered by parents' misunderstanding of, or simply not owning, booster and/or safety seats for the youngest passengers.

Figure 7 **Seat Belt Use by Age**



Race of Vehicle Occupants and Seat Belt Use

Beginning in 2004, the observation survey assessed seat belt use by race: Caucasian, African-American, and individuals of other races (“other”). The present observation methodology precluded the collection of more detailed race information; therefore, these surveys provide data on seat belt use primarily by Caucasians and African-Americans. Also, due to the demographic characteristics of Ohio and the difficulty of clearly determining race with the current methodology, the number of vehicle occupants identified as African-American was relatively small (940 occupants, a decrease of approximately 200 occupants since 2011) and is almost certainly an undercount. Due to the low number of African-Americans in the survey, an accurate weighted estimate of their seat belt use rate was unable to be performed. Table 12 shows unweighted rates for both African-Americans and Caucasians, but these results should be interpreted with caution. The weighting procedure has consistently produced lower estimates of seat belt use rates among all groups than the unweighted data alone, so we expect the percentages depicted in Table 12 to be higher than they would if they were subject to weighting.

The lack of observed data for African-Americans presents both a challenge and opportunity for increasing overall seat belt use in Ohio, and reducing the number of fatalities and serious injuries suffered by African-Americans.

Table 12: Unweighted Seat Belt Use Rates of African-American and Caucasian Occupants by Region

Region	African-American	Unweighted N	Caucasian/Weighted	Caucasian/Unweighted	Unweighted N
Central	81.03%	116	82.32%	85.79%	2,983
Northeast	81.07%	581	84.60%	87.38%	7,726
Northwest	67.65%	68	81.13%	83.93%	2,931
Southeast	100.00%	13	68.43%	71.93%	1,318
Southwest	70.37%	162	83.93%	84.81%	3,985
Statewide	78.51%	940	83.06%	84.98%	18,943

Table 13: Racial/Ethnic Group Usage Rates by OSHP District (Unweighted)

Region	African-American	Unweighted N	Caucasian	Unweighted N
Central	81.60%	114	86.10%	2,933
East Central	88.90%	9	70.60%	1,243
West Central	74.40%	43	86.30%	2,067
North Central	70.70%	75	82.60%	2,758
Northeast	82.00%	521	89.10%	5,485
Northwest	71.20%	52	85.40%	1,867
Southeast	78.90%	19	79.50%	814
Southwest	68.20%	107	84.80%	1,776
Statewide	78.50%	940	85.00%	18,943

Observation Site Designation and Seat Belt Use

Table 14 summarizes the results for usage by observation site designation and by region. Unweighted rates by OSHP district are presented in Table 15.

Table 14: Seat Belt Use by Site Designation and Region

		95% Confidence Interval				Unweighted n
	Rate	Standard Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Intersection	Central	81.61%	0.0302	0.7569	0.8752	1,684
	Northeast	82.64%	0.0099	0.8070	0.8459	4,966
	Northwest	80.67%	0.0144	0.7784	0.8351	1,735
	Southeast	67.11%	0.0188	0.6343	0.7079	674
	Southwest	82.12%	0.0170	0.7879	0.8546	2,801
	Statewide	81.61%	0.0302	0.7569	0.8752	11,860
Freeway Ramp	Central	89.13%	0.0083	0.8750	0.9076	1,460
	Northeast	90.38%	0.0033	0.8974	0.9103	3,425
	Northwest	80.70%	0.0021	0.8030	0.8110	1,178
	Southeast	83.82%	0.0132	0.8124	0.8641	669
	Southwest	85.73%	0.0257	0.8069	0.9076	1,384
	Statewide	89.13%	0.0083	0.8750	0.9076	8,116


Table 15: Seat Belt Use by Site Designation and OSHP District (Unweighted)

Region	Intersection	Unweighted N	Freeway	Unweighted N
Central	83.50%	1,630	88.30%	1,460
East Central	69.90%	702	71.40%	562
West Central	84.90%	1,262	87.60%	855
North Central	79.30%	1,914	88.50%	937
Northeast	87.00%	3,467	90.40%	2,609
Northwest	83.40%	1,046	86.90%	779
Southeast	78.20%	738	88.80%	107
Southwest	82.70%	1,101	85.40%	807
Statewide	82.80%	11860	87.30%	8,116

As seen in previous years, seat belt use is higher on limited access roadways (i.e., interstates and expressways). This most likely due to the greater perceived risk and subsequent behavior associated with travel at higher speeds on limited access roadways and, on average, with traveling relatively longer distances on such roadways.

A comparison of weighted seat belt use rates by site designation and region is illustrated in Figure 8.

Figure 8 **Seat Belt Use by Site Designation**



Observation Road Type and Seat Belt Use

Table 16 summarizes the results for usage by observation site designation.

The 2012 analysis also included a separate road type category, distinguishing “primary” routes (interstate highways) and “secondary” routes (U.S. and state routes) from municipal/rural routes. Since there are fewer municipal roads in the survey and comparatively fewer observations for municipal routes, the weighted estimate for such roads was unable to be accurately determined.

Table 16: Seat Belt Use by Road Type and Region


		95% Confidence Interval				Unweighted n
		Rate	Standard Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Primary (Interstates)	Central	84.79%	0.0054	0.8372	0.8585	1,098
	Northeast	91.09%	0.0078	0.8955	0.9262	3,299
	Northwest	75.94%	0.0036	0.7523	0.7664	958
	Southeast	72.48%	0.0433	0.6400	0.8097	562
	Southwest	85.73%	0.0257	0.8069	0.9076	1384
	Statewide	84.26%	0.0053	0.8322	0.8530	7301
Secondary (U.S. and State Routes)	Central	84.52%	0.0137	0.8184	0.8720	1,551
	Northeast	84.03%	0.0102	0.8203	0.8604	4,015
	Northwest	83.31%	0.0182	0.7976	0.8687	1,781
	Southeast	68.58%	0.0211	0.6443	0.7272	722
	Southwest	81.03%	0.0126	0.7855	0.8351	2,236
	Statewide	82.56%	0.0063	0.8133	0.8379	10,305

The unweighted rates for primary, secondary, and local roads are contained in Table 17. Figure 9 illustrates the weighted results by road type and region.

Table 17: Seat Belt Use by Road Type and OSHP District (Unweighted)

Region	Primary	Unweighted N	Secondary	Unweighted N	Local	Unweighted N
Central	89.30%	1,098	84.80%	1,497	80.60%	495
East Central	71.40%	562	70.10%	643	67.80%	59
West Central	88.20%	730	84.40%	1,091	86.10%	296
North Central	89.30%	810	78.60%	1,786	86.30%	255
Northeast	89.40%	2,580	88.90%	2,649	84.50%	847
Northwest	85.90%	714	84.40%	962	85.00%	253
Southeast	85.40%	807	79.50%	845	81.80%	269
Southwest	87.10%	7,301	82.90%	832	83.50%	2,474
Statewide	89.30%	1,098	83.20%	10,305	80.60%	495

Figure 9 **Seat Belt Use by Road Type**



Cross-tabulations of Observation Characteristics and Seat Belt Use

Table 18 through Table 20 illustrate seat belt use rates based on several demographic, occupant, and vehicle characteristics. As indicated and consistent with previous survey results, male pickup truck drivers age 15-25 had the lowest seat belt usage rate of all drivers, while female van/minivan drivers aged 65 years or older had higher rates than other drivers. Many of the passenger seat belt use rates are based on relatively few observations and thus have a larger sampling error. That caveat should be kept in mind when interpreting data in those categories. However, these rates do indicate that passengers of light trucks had relatively low usage rates.

Table 18: Driver and Passenger Usage Rates by Age and Sex

		Drivers	Unweighted N	Passengers	Unweighted N
Ages 15-25	Males	74.04%	1,202	68.87%	212
	Females	85.48%	1,295	80.82%	318
Ages 26-64	Males	82.97%	7,573	73.47%	54
	Females	89.35%	4,909	88.91%	1,271
Ages 65+	Males	83.56%	1,326	90.55%	127
	Females	91.03%	580	89.71%	486

Table 19: Driver and Passenger Usage Rates by Age and Vehicle Type

		Drivers	Unweighted N	Passengers	Unweighted N
Ages 15-25	Passenger Car	79.94%	1,650	75.87%	315
	Van / Minivan	82.95%	129	89.58%	48
	SUV	84.53%	433	80.00%	90
	Light Truck	72.09%	258	64.18%	67
Ages 26-64	Passenger Car	86.95%	5,868	85.75%	814
	Van / Minivan	87.68%	1,404	88.75%	240
	SUV	88.14%	2,758	86.60%	418
	Light Truck	77.33%	1,853	75.36%	280
Ages 65+	Passenger Car	87.55%	1,060	91.42%	338
	Van / Minivan	83.98%	231	87.95%	83
	SUV	90.38%	312	90.76%	119
	Light Truck	77.86%	271	84.38%	64

Table 20: Driver and Passenger Usage Rates by Sex and Vehicle Type

		Drivers	Unweighted N	Passengers	Unweighted N
Males	Passenger Car	83.39%	4,667	77.14%	420
	Van / Minivan	85.10%	926	81.73%	104
	SUV	85.31%	1,695	80.40%	199
	Pickup Truck	76.35%	2,173	68.06%	191
Females	Passenger Car	88.39%	3,912	88.51%	1,140
	Van / Minivan	88.70%	841	92.08%	303
	SUV	90.31%	1,806	89.55%	469
	Light Truck	82.30%	209	81.09%	238

Figure 10 through Figure 12 summarize these results in charts.

Figure 10 Seat Belt Use by Age and Sex




Figure 11 Seat Belt Use by Age and Vehicle Type






Figure 12 Seat Belt Use by Sex and Vehicle Type



Media and Enforcement Interventions

The 2012 Observational Seat Belt Study reports only results from the third observational survey which occurred in November, after multiple interventions, including media campaigns and enforcement initiatives such as *Click It or Ticket*. Therefore, it is useful to compare usage rates between surveys 1, 2, and 3, shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 2012 Seat Belt Use by Survey Number



CONCLUSIONS

As reported, the 2012 overall Ohio seat belt use rate is 82.0%. Due to the new weighting methodology, this rate is not directly comparable to prior years', but does show a small decrease from 2011. Due to the absence of a primary seat belt law in Ohio, to increase overall seat belt use, significantly greater compliance with the present secondary seat belt law must occur among those populations that consistently have relatively low rates of seat belt use. Hence, media and enforcement initiatives; which promote greater seat belt use, must be strengthened; become ongoing, rather than periodic; and be directed disproportionately at the following populations:

- Southeast Region Vehicle Occupants
- Vehicle Occupants Age 15-25
- Male Vehicle Occupants
- Light Truck Occupants
- As well as any combination of the above

One approach to increasing seat belt use is cited by Williams and Wells (2004: 179). They maintain that what is necessary in the United States to achieve seat belt use rates of 90% or greater is widespread, methodical, and sustained application of enforcement programs, augmented by the use of creative publicity campaigns. Another approach is the passage of a primary seat belt law, which could initially increase overall use rates by as much as 6%. A primary law could continue to increase seat belt use in diminishing increments thereafter, until a state maximum level is reached. The passage of a primary seat belt law could give Ohioans the "push" they need to comply with seat belt laws. A recent policy white paper by the Applied Research Center outlined Ohioans' support for a primary law and their intent to obey it, based on statewide telephone surveys conducted yearly (Seufert, Kubiilius, & Walton, 2007). Public support for a primary law is very promising. However, in absence of a primary seat belt law, Ohio can only strive to achieve a seat belt use rate of 85% or greater through widespread, methodical, and sustained enforcement programs and creative media campaigns directed disproportionately at the above groups who are least compliant with Ohio's existing seat belt law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2012 Observation Survey of Seat Belt Use increases and reaffirms knowledge about Ohioans who are and are not using seat belts. While the survey results show incremental gains in seat belt use overall and in many subpopulations, the following groups have again been identified as meriting special attention due to relatively low usage rates: Southeast Ohio vehicle occupants and those from other rural areas; young drivers and their passengers; male drivers and their passengers; pickup truck occupants (both drivers and passengers); and African-American vehicle occupants. For the most part, these groups are identical to those identified during previous surveys. Furthermore, without a state primary seat belt law, increasing compliance with existing law by occupants with these characteristics is necessary to achieve a statewide seat belt use rate of 85% or greater.

1. **Southeast Region Vehicle Occupants:** During 2012, compared to other Ohio regions, the Southeast had the lowest usage rate (68%). Since much of Southeast Ohio is rural, a comparatively greater proportion of its observation sites are intersections, which typically have a lower usage rate than freeway ramps. Also, a higher proportion of occupants were observed in light trucks in the Southeast than in the other regions. Once again, light truck drivers and their passengers are a high risk subpopulation. However, it is important to emphasize that vehicle occupants in the Southeast Region had relatively lower levels of seat belt use for every vehicle type and occupant characteristic (i.e., driver and passenger, male and female, age and race).
2. **Vehicle Occupants Age 15 -25:** Vehicle occupants age 15-25 continued to exhibit a relatively low seat belt usage rate of 75%. The Southeast seat belt usage rate of 73% for occupants age 15-25 is lowest of the five regions. Since motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death among people age 15-20 (NHTSA, 2005), increasing seat belt use among young drivers and passengers is especially imperative. Therefore, increased statewide and targeted law enforcement and education initiatives should be directed toward this population. The life-saving rationale for greater seat belt use should be clearly emphasized. Also, innovative drivers' education programs and other initiatives aimed at increasing driving skill, knowledge, judgment, and personal responsibility among novice drivers would be highly beneficial.
3. **Male Vehicle Occupants:** Overall, male drivers and passengers are significantly less likely to wear seat belts in comparison with female drivers and passengers. For instance, during 2012, male driver and passenger seat belt usage rates were significantly lower than rates for female passengers regardless of vehicle type. Thus, messages designed to promote belt use should be directed specifically to males and their "significant others." By appealing to their sense of responsibility toward their families, children, and friends, as well as emphasizing the tangible safety benefits, male seat belt use should increase. Coupled with strict law enforcement, this multi-faceted effort would increase seat belt use among males both while driving and riding as passengers.

4. **Light Truck Occupants:** As in previous years, pickup truck occupants are one of the most important groups on which to focus media and enforcement initiatives. These individuals, and especially male pick-up truck drivers and their passengers of all ages, generally have significantly lower seat belt usage rates than occupants of other vehicles. For example, the seat belt usage rate among male pickup truck drivers is 76% and for male pickup truck passengers it is 68%. In contrast, usage rates are 82% for female pickup truck drivers and 81% for female pickup truck passengers (bearing in mind the relatively small number of observations in these categories). The usage rate is also low (72%) for pickup truck drivers and passengers ages 15 to 25. Overall, pickup trucks accounted for 14% of the vehicles observed during the 2012 survey. Based on the percentage of all registered vehicles in Ohio that are pickup trucks, the percent that are involved in fatal crashes, and the low compliance with seat belt law among pickup truck occupants, this group is at higher risk for death or serious injury from crashes. Therefore, increasing seat belt use among pickup truck drivers and passengers, especially males, is very important to reduce Ohio's traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries.

In summary, innovative and sustained actions by the ODPS and the OJCS on the above four recommendations should be directed disproportionately at the above "high risk" groups in order to achieve significantly higher seat belt use in Ohio. In addition, concerned Ohioans should continue to pursue the passage of a primary seatbelt law. For instance, surveys of a representative sample of Ohioans with valid driver's licenses illustrate that a majority would favor a primary seat belt law for the state, would obey such a law, and believe a primary law would have a significant positive impact on highway safety in Ohio (Seufert et. al., 2003-2009). Furthermore, a state can expect to experience a marked increase in seat belt use—perhaps 5% or more—with the passage of a primary seat belt use law. This may be particularly important in light of the fact that seat belt use has increased only incrementally during the last decade. Therefore, positive outcomes on seat belt use resulting from ODPS and OJCS actions on the above six recommendations would be further enhanced and sustained by passage of a primary seatbelt law.

REFERENCES

- Eby, D. W., and Streff, F. M. (1994). *How to Conduct a Seat Belt Survey: A Step by Step Guide*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute.
- Eby, D. W., Streff, F. M., and Christoff, C. (1996). A comparison of two direct-observation methods for measuring daytime seat belt use. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 28(3), 403-407.
- Eby, D.W., and Hopp, M. L. (1997). *Direct Observation of Safety Belt Use in Michigan: Fall 1997*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute.
- Hosmer, D. W. & Lemeshow, S. (2000). *Applied Logistic Regression, Second Edition*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Center for Transportation Analysis (2001). *National Household Travel Survey 2001*. Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2008). "Traffic Safety Facts: 2007 Data." Washington, D.C.: National Center for Statistics and Analysis, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Retrieved 24 September 2008 from <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/810949.PDF>.
- Norusis M. J. (1999). *Logistic regression: SPSS Regression Models 10.0*, 2, 3-8, Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.
- Seufert, R. L. (2004). "Public Policy Issues: A Primary Seat Belt Law for Ohio." *Governor's Highway Safety Office, Partnering For Safer Ohio Roadways, Winter 2004*. 2.
- Seufert, R. L. (2004). "Public Policy Issues: African-American Support of a Primary Seat Belt Law for Ohio." Prepared for the Ohio Department of Public Safety, Governor's Highway Safety Office, Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University Middletown.
- Seufert, R. L. (2007). "Public Policy Issues: Passage of a Primary Seat Belt Law: What's Holding Ohio Back?" Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University.
- Seufert, R. L., Kubilius, K. A., Newton, T. D., and Walton, A. J. (2007). *2007 Observational Survey of Seat Belt Use in Ohio*. Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University.
- Seufert, R. L., & Walton, A. J. (2007). *Statewide Telephone Survey of Seat Belt Use and Alcohol-Impaired Driving 2006*. Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University.
- Seufert, R. L., & Walton, A. J., and Kubilius, K. A. (2007). *Statewide Telephone Survey of Seat Belt Use and Alcohol-Impaired Driving 2007*. Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University.
- Seufert, R. L., Walton, A. J., and Kubilius, K. A. (2006). *Statewide Telephone Survey of Seat Belt Use and Alcohol-Impaired Driving 2006*. Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University Middletown.
- Seufert, R. L., Walton, A. J., and Kubilius, K. A. (2005). *Statewide Telephone Survey of Seat Belt Use and Alcohol-Impaired Driving 2005*. Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University Middletown.

- Seufert, R. L., Walton, A. J., Elswick, T. L., and Kubilius, K. A. (2004). *Statewide Telephone Survey of Seat Belt Use and Alcohol-Impaired Driving 2004*. Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University Middletown.
- Seufert, R. L., Walton, A. J., and Elswick, T. L. (2003). *Statewide Telephone Survey of Seat Belt Use and Alcohol-Impaired Driving 2003*. Middletown, OH: Applied Research Center, Miami University Middletown.
- Shults, R. A., Nichols, J. L., Dinh-Zarr, Tho, B., Sleet, D. A., and Elder, R. W. (2004). Effectiveness of primary enforcement seat belt laws and enhanced enforcement of seat belt laws: A summary of the guide to community preventive services systematic reviews. *Journal of Safety Research*, 35, 189-196.
- Wald, M.L. (2000, April 28). Safety; Ticketing the Unbelted: Will Blacks Be Targets? *New York Times*.
- Williams, A. F., and Wells, J. K. (2004). The role of enforcement programs in increasing seat belt use. *Safety Research*. 35(2), 175-180.

APPENDIX A: SITE LOCATIONS

Site Number	OHSP Region	Geographical Region	County	Road to be Observed
1	CN	CN	Delaware	I-71
2	CN	CN	Delaware	I-71
3	CN	CN	Delaware	US Hwy 42
4	CN	CN	Delaware	S Old State Rd (County Rd 10)
5	CN	CN	Delaware	SR 37 / E Cherry St
6	CN	CN	Fairfield	I- 70
7	CN	CN	Fairfield	I- 70
8	CN	CN	Fairfield	N Memorial Dr
9	CN	CN	Fairfield	SR-256
10	CN	CN	Fairfield	Fairfield Beach Rd NE
11	CN	CN	Franklin	I-71
12	CN	CN	Franklin	I- 270
13	CN	CN	Franklin	Southeast Expressway
14	CN	CN	Franklin	W Innerbelt (OH 315)
15	CN	CN	Franklin	Farmers Dr
16	CN	CN	Franklin	Foster Ave
17	CN	CN	Knox	Martinsburg Rd (Market St in Martinsburg) / OH-586
18	CN	CN	Knox	SR-3
19	CN	CN	Licking	I-70
20	CN	CN	Licking	I-70
21	CN	CN	Licking	Marion Rd NW
22	CN	CN	Licking	Worthington Rd
23	CN	CN	Licking	N 21st St
24	CN	CN	Madison	I- 71
25	CN	CN	Madison	I- 70
26	CN	CN	Madison	State Rte 323
27	CN	CN	Madison	OH-29 / Urbana-West Jefferson Rd
28	CN	CN	Madison	W Jefferson-Kiousville Rd
29	NC	CN	Marion	SR -47 (W Water St)
30	NC	CN	Marion	SR-423
31	CN	CN	Morrow	I- 71
32	CN	CN	Morrow	I- 71
33	CN	CN	Morrow	State Rte 288
34	CN	CN	Morrow	SR-95
35	CN	CN	Morrow	S Cherry St
36	CN	CN	Pickaway	Harrisburg Pike / Brownfield Hwy / US-62
37	CN	CN	Pickaway	State Rte 752
38	CN	CN	Pickaway	W Mill St
39	NC	NE	Ashland	I- 71
40	NC	NE	Ashland	I- 71
41	NC	NE	Ashland	State Rte 58
42	NC	NE	Ashland	US Rte 30
43	NE	NE	Ashtabula	I- 90
44	NE	NE	Ashtabula	US-322
45	NE	NE	Ashtabula	SR-531
46	NE	NE	Ashtabula	S Ridge Rd E
47	EC	NE	Columbiana	Lisbon St
48	EC	NE	Columbiana	Jerome St
49	NE	NE	Cuyahoga	I- 71
50	NE	NE	Cuyahoga	I- 77

Site Number	OHSP Region	Geographical Region	County	Road to be Observed
51	NE	NE	Cuyahoga	Chester Ave
52	NE	NE	Cuyahoga	Lorain Ave
53	NE	NE	Cuyahoga	Crestine Ave
54	NE	NE	Cuyahoga	E 39th St
55	NC	NE	Erie	I- 80
56	NC	NE	Erie	I- 80
57	NC	NE	Erie	State St / OH-60 N
58	NC	NE	Erie	State Rte 2
59	NC	NE	Erie	Mason Rd
60	NE	NE	Geauga	US Hwy 422
61	NE	NE	Geauga	US Hwy 422
62	NE	NE	Geauga	Tavern Rd
63	NE	NE	Geauga	Kinsman Rd
64	NE	NE	Geauga	Sherman Rd
65	NC	NE	Huron	Conwell Ave
66	NC	NE	Huron	OH-103
67	NE	NE	Lake	I- 271 (I-90)
68	NE	NE	Lake	I- 90
69	NE	NE	Lake	Reynolds Rd
70	NE	NE	Lake	S State St
71	NE	NE	Lake	Bayridge Blvd
72	NC	NE	Lorain	I- 80
73	NC	NE	Lorain	I- 80
74	NC	NE	Lorain	N Ashland-Oberlin Rd
75	NC	NE	Lorain	W Erie Ave
76	NC	NE	Lorain	Whitman Blvd
77	NE	NE	Mahoning	I-680
78	NE	NE	Mahoning	I- 680
79	NE	NE	Mahoning	Market St
80	NE	NE	Mahoning	N Main St
81	NE	NE	Mahoning	Sheridan St
82	NE	NE	Medina	I- 71
83	NE	NE	Medina	I- 76
84	NE	NE	Medina	N Court St
85	NE	NE	Medina	Center Rd / OH-303
86	NE	NE	Medina	West St
87	NE	NE	Portage	I- 76
88	NE	NE	Portage	I- 76
89	NE	NE	Portage	Church St
90	NE	NE	Portage	E Main St
91	NE	NE	Portage	Tallmadge Rd
92	NC	NE	Richland	I- 71
93	NC	NE	Richland	I- 71
94	NC	NE	Richland	State Rte 181
95	NC	NE	Richland	Park Ave W
96	NC	NE	Richland	Poorman Rd
97	NE	NE	Stark	I- 77
98	NE	NE	Stark	I- 77
99	NE	NE	Stark	Waynesburg Dr SE
100	NE	NE	Stark	Market Ave N
101	NE	NE	Stark	Main St
102	NE	NE	Summit	I-271
103	NE	NE	Summit	I- 77
104	NE	NE	Summit	Manchester Rd
105	NE	NE	Summit	State Rte 8

Site Number	OHSP Region	Geographical Region	County	Road to be Observed
106	NE	NE	Summit	Co Hwy 2
107	NE	NE	Summit	Main St
108	NE	NE	Trumbull	State Rte 11
109	NE	NE	Trumbull	State Rte 11
110	NE	NE	Trumbull	SR-46
111	NE	NE	Trumbull	Belmont Ave
112	NE	NE	Trumbull	Warren-Sharon Rd
113	NC	NE	Wayne	I- 71
114	NC	NE	Wayne	I- 71
115	NC	NE	Wayne	Congress Rd
116	NC	NE	Wayne	Massillon Rd / OH 241
117	NW	NW	Allen	I- 75
118	NW	NW	Allen	I- 75
119	NW	NW	Allen	E Suthoff St
120	NW	NW	Allen	Harding Hwy
121	NW	NW	Allen	Augsburger Rd
122	WC	NW	Auglaize	I- 75
123	WC	NW	Auglaize	I- 75
124	WC	NW	Auglaize	State Rte 66
125	WC	NW	Auglaize	US Hwy 33
126	NC	NW	Crawford	E Main St (SR 103)
127	NC	NW	Crawford	Bucyrus Bypass / US-30
128	NW	NW	Defiance	US Hwy 24
129	NW	NW	Defiance	Defiance Ave
130	NW	NW	Fulton	I- 80
131	NW	NW	Fulton	I- 80
132	NW	NW	Fulton	State Rte 120 (Morenci St)
133	NW	NW	Fulton	SR 2
134	NW	NW	Fulton	Co Rd F
135	NW	NW	Hancock	I- 75
136	NW	NW	Hancock	I- 75
137	NW	NW	Hancock	W Main Cross St
138	NW	NW	Hancock	E Main St
139	WC	NW	Logan	US Hwy 33
140	WC	NW	Logan	State Rte 273
141	NW	NW	Lucas	I-75
142	NW	NW	Lucas	I- 280
143	NW	NW	Lucas	Airport Hwy
144	NW	NW	Lucas	W Central Ave / US 20
145	NW	NW	Lucas	Birchwood Ave
146	NW	NW	Lucas	Spring Meadow Dr
147	NC	NW	Ottawa	I- 80
148	NC	NW	Ottawa	SR 19 (S Locust St)
149	NC	NW	Ottawa	W Harbor Rd
150	NC	NW	Ottawa	N Crogan St
151	NC	NW	Sandusky	I- 80
153	NC	NW	Sandusky	Dunwald Dr
154	NC	NW	Sandusky	Pemberville Rd
155	NC	NW	Seneca	S Washington St / SR 231
156	NC	NW	Seneca	N Countyline St
157	NW	NW	Wood	I- 75
158	NW	NW	Wood	I- 75
159	NW	NW	Wood	Haskins Rd
160	NW	NW	Wood	SR-25 / Dixie Hwy
161	NW	NW	Wood	Fort Meigs Rd

Site Number	OHSP Region	Geographical Region	County	Road to be Observed
162	SE	SE	Athens	SR-682 / S Plains Rd
163	SE	SE	Athens	US Hwy 33
164	EC	SE	Belmont	I- 70
165	EC	SE	Belmont	I- 70
166	EC	SE	Belmont	Sunset Hts / US-250 / Cadiz Rd
167	EC	SE	Belmont	SR-148 / E Captina Hwy
168	EC	SE	Belmont	Woodrow Ave
169	EC	SE	Muskingum	I- 70
170	EC	SE	Muskingum	I- 70
171	EC	SE	Muskingum	Adair Ave (SR 60 N)
172	EC	SE	Muskingum	SR-284
173	CN	SE	Perry	State Rte 204
174	CN	SE	Perry	SR-668
175	EC	SE	Tuscarawas	I- 77
176	EC	SE	Tuscarawas	I- 77
177	EC	SE	Tuscarawas	State Rte 39
178	EC	SE	Tuscarawas	State Rte 93
179	SW	SW	Brown	State Rte 763
180	SW	SW	Brown	US Hwy 52
181	SW	SW	Brown	Old State Rte 68
182	SW	SW	Butler	I- 75
183	SW	SW	Butler	I- 75
184	SW	SW	Butler	Reinartz Blvd
185	SW	SW	Butler	High St
186	SW	SW	Butler	Church St
187	WC	SW	Clark	I-70
188	WC	SW	Clark	I- 70
189	WC	SW	Clark	N Limestone St
190	WC	SW	Clark	Mechanicsburg Rd
191	WC	SW	Clark	N Western Ave
192	SW	SW	Clermont	I- 275
193	SW	SW	Clermont	I- 275
194	SW	SW	Clermont	US Hwy 52
195	SW	SW	Clermont	State Rte 132
196	SW	SW	Clermont	Woodville Pike
197	SW	SW	Clinton	I- 71
198	SW	SW	Clinton	I- 71
199	SW	SW	Clinton	W Main St / US 22
200	SW	SW	Clinton	Wayne Rd
201	WC	SW	Darke	SR-722
202	WC	SW	Darke	State Rte 118
203	WC	SW	Greene	I-675
204	WC	SW	Greene	I- 675
205	WC	SW	Greene	N Central Ave
206	WC	SW	Greene	E Xenia Dr
207	WC	SW	Greene	Indian Ripple Rd
208	SW	SW	Hamilton	I- 75
209	SW	SW	Hamilton	I- 71
210	SW	SW	Hamilton	Wooster Pike
211	SW	SW	Hamilton	E Mehring Way
212	SW	SW	Hamilton	Kenwood Rd
213	SW	SW	Hamilton	Winchell Ave
214	WC	SW	Miami	I- 75
215	WC	SW	Miami	I- 75
216	WC	SW	Miami	N Miami St

Site Number	OHSP Region	Geographical Region	County	Road to be Observed
217	WC	SW	Miami	E US Rte 36
218	WC	SW	Miami	Peters Rd
219	WC	SW	Montgomery	I-70
220	WC	SW	Montgomery	I- 75
221	WC	SW	Montgomery	S Ludlow St / OH-48
222	WC	SW	Montgomery	National Rd
223	WC	SW	Montgomery	Sycamore St (SR 725)
224	WC	SW	Montgomery	Meadowcreek Dr
225	WC	SW	Preble	I- 70
226	WC	SW	Preble	I- 70
227	WC	SW	Preble	State Rte 732 W
228	WC	SW	Preble	US-127 N (N Barron St)
229	WC	SW	Preble	E Main St
230	SE	SW	Ross	Western Ave
231	SE	SW	Ross	N Bridge St
232	SE	SW	Scioto	US Hwy 52
233	SE	SW	Scioto	SR 104
234	SW	SW	Warren	I- 75
235	SW	SW	Warren	I- 75
236	SW	SW	Warren	S Main St
237	SW	SW	Warren	US Hwy 42 Byp
238	SW	SW	Warren	Harold St

APPENDIX B: OHIO AVERAGE PASSENGER VEHICLE CRASH-RELATED FATALITIES BY COUNTY 2006-2010

County	Average Fatalities	Percent of State Fatalities Within County	Cumulative Percent
Franklin	79.0	6.82%	6.82%
Cuyahoga	70.2	6.06%	12.88%
Hamilton	53.8	4.65%	17.53%
Montgomery	46.2	3.99%	21.52%
Lucas	42.8	3.70%	25.21%
Summit	35.6	3.07%	28.29%
Butler	31.0	2.68%	30.96%
Stark	30.6	2.64%	33.60%
Lorain	28.0	2.42%	36.02%
Trumbull	25.8	2.23%	38.25%
Mahoning	20.8	1.80%	40.04%
Clark	20.0	1.73%	41.77%
Licking	19.2	1.66%	43.43%
Wood	18.6	1.61%	45.04%
Medina	18.4	1.59%	46.62%
Portage	17.8	1.54%	48.16%
Ashtabula	17.4	1.50%	49.66%
Delaware	16.8	1.45%	51.11%
Clermont	15.6	1.35%	52.46%
Ross	14.6	1.26%	53.72%
Wayne	14.0	1.21%	54.93%
Muskingum	13.8	1.19%	56.12%
Lake	13.4	1.16%	57.28%
Warren	13.2	1.14%	58.42%
Columbiana	13.0	1.12%	59.54%
Fairfield	12.6	1.09%	60.63%
Pickaway	11.6	1.00%	61.63%
Richland	11.6	1.00%	62.63%
Geauga	11.4	0.98%	63.62%
Greene	11.2	0.97%	64.58%
Miami	11.2	0.97%	65.55%
Allen	10.8	0.93%	66.48%
Scioto	10.6	0.92%	67.40%
Tuscarawas	10.4	0.90%	68.30%
Preble	10.4	0.90%	69.19%
Seneca	9.8	0.85%	70.04%
Logan	9.8	0.85%	70.89%
Knox	9.6	0.83%	71.71%
Ashland	9.2	0.79%	72.51%
Fulton	9.2	0.79%	73.30%
Sandusky	9.0	0.78%	74.08%
Belmont	9.0	0.78%	74.86%
Perry	9.0	0.78%	75.63%
Brown	8.8	0.76%	76.39%
Athens	8.8	0.76%	77.15%
Marion	8.8	0.76%	77.91%
Huron	8.4	0.73%	78.64%
Hancock	8.4	0.73%	79.36%
Defiance	8.0	0.69%	80.06%
Crawford	8.0	0.69%	80.75%
Clinton	8.0	0.69%	81.44%

County	Average Fatalities	Percent of State Fatalities Within County	Cumulative Percent
Erie	8.0	0.69%	82.13%
Darke	8.0	0.69%	82.82%
Ottawa	8.0	0.69%	83.51%
Morrow	7.8	0.67%	84.18%
Madison	7.8	0.67%	84.86%
Auglaize	7.6	0.66%	85.51%
Highland	7.6	0.66%	86.17%
Jefferson	7.2	0.62%	86.79%
Washington	7.0	0.60%	87.39%
Pike	7.0	0.60%	88.00%
Coshocton	7.0	0.60%	88.60%
Lawrence	7.0	0.60%	89.21%
Williams	6.8	0.59%	89.79%
Henry	6.6	0.57%	90.36%
Champaign	6.6	0.57%	90.93%
Mercer	6.4	0.55%	91.49%
Shelby	6.4	0.55%	92.04%
Holmes	6.4	0.55%	92.59%
Fayette	6.2	0.54%	93.13%
Wyandot	6.2	0.54%	93.66%
Paulding	6.2	0.54%	94.20%
Jackson	6.2	0.54%	94.73%
Guernsey	5.8	0.50%	95.23%
Hardin	5.6	0.48%	95.72%
Adams	5.6	0.48%	96.20%
Union	5.2	0.45%	96.65%
Putnam	5.0	0.43%	97.08%
Carroll	4.6	0.40%	97.48%
Hocking	4.6	0.40%	97.88%
Meigs	4.2	0.36%	98.24%
Gallia	4.2	0.36%	98.60%
Vinton	3.2	0.28%	98.88%
Van Wert	3.2	0.28%	99.15%
Harrison	2.8	0.24%	99.40%
Monroe	2.8	0.24%	99.64%
Noble	2.2	0.19%	99.83%
Morgan	2.0	0.17%	100.00%

APPENDIX C: OHIO REGIONS, COUNTIES, AND DVMT

Region	County	2010 DVMT	Regional DVMT Total
Central	Franklin	30,468,040	
	Licking	5,018,660	
	Delaware	4,413,660	
	Fairfield	3,144,130	
	Madison	2,111,160	
	Pickaway	1,882,050	
	Marion	1,802,010	
	Morrow	1,794,240	
	Knox	1,138,670	51,772,620
Northeast	Cuyahoga	28,966,690	
	Summit	15,782,120	
	Stark	8,547,820	
	Lorain	6,681,770	
	Mahoning	6,509,030	
	Trumbull	6,186,980	
	Lake	6,016,920	
	Portage	4,762,580	
	Medina	4,578,630	
	Richland	3,593,350	
	Wayne	3,093,620	
	Erie	2,973,120	
	Ashtabula	2,956,900	
	Columbiana	2,563,780	
	Geauga	2,148,870	
	Ashland	1,895,360	
Huron	1,296,540	108,554,080	
Northwest	Lucas	11,744,210	
	Wood	4,982,630	
	Allen	3,172,480	
	Hancock	2,864,660	
	Sandusky	2,684,720	
	Fulton	1,658,090	
	Auglaize	1,576,620	
	Logan	1,333,800	
	Ottawa	1,258,160	
	Seneca	1,257,920	
	Crawford	1,075,800	
Defiance	1,018,130	34,627,220	
Southeast	Tuscarawas	2,908,920	
	Muskingum	2,888,180	
	Belmont	2,576,240	
	Athens	1,540,820	
	Perry	747,110	10,661,270
Southwest	Hamilton	21,244,430	
	Montgomery	14,265,500	
	Butler	7,078,190	
	Warren	4,711,380	
	Clark	4,451,950	
	Greene	4,374,730	
	Clermont	4,180,210	
	Miami	3,055,230	

	Ross	2,277,130	
	Clinton	1,918,680	
	Scioto	1,681,730	
	Preble	1,486,790	
	Darke	1,316,990	
	Brown	1,195,240	73,238,180

APPENDIX D: POPULATION OF ROAD TYPES BY COUNTY AND NUMBER SELECTED

Due to errors in the road designation variable in the segment database obtained from NHTSA, three (3) counties (Athens, Columbiana, and Darke) each had one (1) local segment mislabeled as a primary segments. Marion County had ten (10) local segments mislabeled as primary segments. Each of these mislabeled segments was checked on a map to ensure they were actually local segments. Because Athens, Columbiana, Darke, and Marion County were each counties without an MSA, these local roads were discarded from selection process. Additionally, while two (2) counties (Ottawa and Sandusky) had multiple primary segments, due to the rural nature of the counties, in each there was only one legal place (i.e., exit ramp) for observers to safely observe the primary traffic. Finally, Pickaway County had primary segments, but no exit ramps. Therefore, although our sampling program drew primary segments from Ottawa, Sandusky, and Pickaway, some were unusable, so the number of primary sites (and the total number of sites to be observed) is four (4) fewer than the sampling program selected. See the “Totals” and “Actual Number to be Observed” lines at the end of the following table.

County	Population of Primary Segments	Number of Primary Segments Sampled	Population of Secondary Segments	Number of Secondary Segments Sampled	Population of Local Segments	Number of Local Segments Sampled	Total Population of Segments	Total Number of Segments Sampled
Allen	166	2	1731	2	10869	1	12766	5
Ashland	120	2	2324	2	0	0	2444	4
Ashtabula	392	2	1797	2	0	0	2189	4
Athens	0	0	1836	2	0	0	1836	2
Auglaize	87	2	1686	2	0	0	1773	4
Belmont	237	2	2654	2	11184	1	14075	5
Brown	0	0	1577	2	7382	1	8959	3
Butler	88	2	1782	2	18288	1	20158	5
Clark	240	2	1253	2	9028	1	10521	5
Clermont	72	2	1507	2	9915	1	11494	5
Clinton	75	2	1090	2	0	0	1165	4
Columbiana	0	0	2920	2	0	0	2920	2
Crawford	0	0	1969	2	0	0	1969	2
Cuyahoga	1071	2	4109	2	43018	2	48198	6
Darke	0	0	2506	2	0	0	2506	2
Defiance	0	0	1581	2	0	0	1581	2
Delaware	86	2	1388	2	10167	1	11641	5
Erie	132	2	1388	2	6316	1	7836	5
Fairfield	34	2	1439	2	10985	1	12458	5
Franklin	1799	2	3333	2	58672	2	63804	6
Fulton	146	2	1311	2	6279	1	7736	5
Geauga	14	2	723	2	4271	1	5008	5
Greene	209	2	1108	2	11412	1	12729	5
Hamilton	752	2	2393	2	33334	2	36479	6
Hancock	179	2	1174	2	0	0	1353	4
Huron	0	0	2251	2	0	0	2251	2
Knox	0	0	2799	2	0	0	2799	2
Lake	379	2	1683	2	9723	1	11785	5
Licking	221	2	3320	2	17268	1	20809	5
Logan	0	0	1543	2	0	0	1543	2
Lorain	302	2	1976	2	15148	1	17426	5
Lucas	592	2	1647	2	22312	2	24551	6
Madison	106	2	945	2	2904	1	3955	5
Mahoning	581	2	2125	2	14952	1	17658	5

Marion	0	0	918	2	0	0	918	2
Medina	153	2	1135	2	7776	1	9064	5
Miami	163	2	1463	2	8273	1	9899	5
Montgomery	414	2	1817	2	32557	2	34788	6
Morrow	101	2	717	2	3281	1	4099	5
Muskingum	127	2	1393	2	0	0	1520	4
Ottawa	35	2	952	2	5647	1	6634	5
Perry	0	0	1235	2	0	0	1235	2
Pickaway	11	2	810	2	3674	1	4495	5
Portage	251	2	2586	2	12107	1	14944	5
Preble	88	2	1567	2	5540	1	7195	5
Richland	163	2	2856	2	12447	1	15466	5
Ross	0	0	1322	2	0	0	1322	2
Sandusky	174	2	1318	2	0	0	1492	4
Scioto	0	0	1669	2	0	0	1669	2
Seneca	0	0	1249	2	0	0	1249	2
Stark	190	2	3079	2	30770	1	34039	5
Summit	922	2	2270	2	29232	2	32424	6
Trumbull	502	2	1899	2	12157	1	14558	5
Tuscarawas	139	2	1759	2	0	0	1898	4
Warren	315	2	1486	2	12694	1	14495	5
Wayne	42	2	2080	2	0	0	2122	4
Wood	496	2	1808	2	11082	1	13386	5
Totals	12366	86	102256	114	520664	41	635286	241
Actual Number to be Observed		82		114		41		237

APPENDIX E: SAMPLED ROAD SEGMENTS

Site No.	County	Road Types	Latitude	Longitude	Segment length in miles	Probability of Selection
Central Region						
1	Delaware	Primary Roads	40.14745	-82.97041	0.089	0.0233
2	Delaware	Primary Roads	40.1849	-82.9462	0.502	0.0233
3	Delaware	Secondary Roads	40.2803	-83.0684	0.023	0.0014
4	Delaware	Secondary Roads	40.1546	-82.996	0.122	0.0014
5	Delaware	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.3017	-83.1145	0.031	0.0001
6	Fairfield	Primary Roads	39.9323	-82.7955	0.040	0.0588
7	Fairfield	Primary Roads	39.9381	-82.7707	0.254	0.0588
8	Fairfield	Secondary Roads	39.717	-82.607	0.087	0.0014
9	Fairfield	Secondary Roads	39.8679	-82.6825	0.088	0.0014
10	Fairfield	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.9108	-82.4711	0.039	0.0001
11	Franklin	Primary Roads	39.8585	-83.0717	0.018	0.0011
12	Franklin	Primary Roads	40.0327	-83.1235	0.074	0.0011
13	Franklin	Secondary Roads	39.8584	-82.8287	0.085	0.0006
14	Franklin	Secondary Roads	39.9592	-83.0187	0.112	0.0006
15	Franklin	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.9349	-83.1349	0.080	0.0000
16	Franklin	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.0737	-83.0121	0.087	0.0000
17	Knox	Secondary Roads	40.2721	-82.3553	0.018	0.0007
18	Knox	Secondary Roads	40.4832	-82.3595	0.073	0.0007
19	Licking	Primary Roads	39.9459	-82.6162	0.192	0.0090
20	Licking	Primary Roads	39.9488	-82.6847	0.215	0.0090
21	Licking	Secondary Roads	40.2117	-82.5429	0.057	0.0006
22	Licking	Secondary Roads	40.0724	-82.5797	0.151	0.0006
23	Licking	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.0769	-82.4283	0.033	0.0001
24	Madison	Primary Roads	39.7571	-83.3054	0.227	0.0189
25	Madison	Primary Roads	39.9802	-83.2524	0.305	0.0189
26	Madison	Secondary Roads	39.7305	-83.3337	0.063	0.0021
27	Madison	Secondary Roads	40.0433	-83.5111	0.096	0.0021
28	Madison	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.8878	-83.2811	0.015	0.0003
29	Marion	Secondary Roads	40.4553	-83.1898	0.024	0.0022
30	Marion	Secondary Roads	40.6808	-83.1506	1.044	0.0022
31	Morrow	Primary Roads	40.3746	-82.8286	0.115	0.0198
32	Morrow	Primary Roads	40.4187	-82.8206	0.943	0.0198
33	Morrow	Secondary Roads	40.6806	-82.8112	0.176	0.0028
34	Morrow	Secondary Roads	40.3812	-82.8286	0.602	0.0028
35	Morrow	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.6013	-82.8941	0.078	0.0003
36	Pickaway	Secondary Roads	39.8056	-83.1751	0.353	0.0025
37	Pickaway	Secondary Roads	39.7233	-82.8809	0.989	0.0025
38	Pickaway	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.5984	-82.9492	0.073	0.0003
Northeast Region						
39	Ashland	Primary Roads	40.8571	-82.2577	0.053	0.0167
40	Ashland	Primary Roads	40.8543	-82.2606	0.180	0.0167

Site No.	County	Road Types	Latitude	Longitude	Segment length in miles	Probability of Selection
41	Ashland	Secondary Roads	40.994	-82.2229	0.162	0.0009
42	Ashland	Secondary Roads	40.7849	-82.2386	0.240	0.0009
43	Ashtabula	Primary Roads	41.8501	-80.7031	0.124	0.0051
44	Ashtabula	Primary Roads	41.529	-80.7132	0.188	0.0051
45	Ashtabula	Secondary Roads	41.9003	-80.7935	0.027	0.0011
46	Ashtabula	Secondary Roads	41.8616	-80.7675	0.282	0.0011
47	Columbiana	Secondary Roads	40.627	-80.5909	0.021	0.0007
48	Columbiana	Secondary Roads	40.7778	-80.7668	0.042	0.0007
49	Cuyahoga	Primary Roads	41.4467	-81.7399	0.052	0.0019
50	Cuyahoga	Primary Roads	41.3106	-81.6479	0.399	0.0019
51	Cuyahoga	Secondary Roads	41.5036	-81.6776	0.045	0.0005
52	Cuyahoga	Secondary Roads	41.4175	-81.92	0.167	0.0005
53	Cuyahoga	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.4451	-81.6874	0.048	0.0000
54	Cuyahoga	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.4947	-81.6583	0.251	0.0000
55	Erie	Primary Roads	41.3396	-82.7538	0.546	0.0152
56	Erie	Primary Roads	41.3239	-82.624	0.757	0.0152
57	Erie	Secondary Roads	41.4149	-82.3655	0.086	0.0014
58	Erie	Secondary Roads	41.4102	-82.7457	0.113	0.0014
59	Erie	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.3617	-82.7815	0.416	0.0002
60	Geauga	Primary Roads	41.3841	-81.2316	1.435	0.1429
61	Geauga	Primary Roads	41.3893	-81.3666	1.743	0.1429
62	Geauga	Secondary Roads	41.3817	-81.0753	0.101	0.0028
63	Geauga	Secondary Roads	41.4589	-81.0127	0.914	0.0028
64	Geauga	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.537	-81.2275	0.253	0.0002
65	Huron	Secondary Roads	41.0437	-82.7157	0.154	0.0009
66	Huron	Secondary Roads	41.1793	-82.6409	0.179	0.0009
67	Lake	Primary Roads	41.5852	-81.4482	0.036	0.0053
68	Lake	Primary Roads	41.6436	-81.3613	0.786	0.0053
69	Lake	Secondary Roads	41.699	-81.3776	0.030	0.0012
70	Lake	Secondary Roads	41.7151	-81.2327	0.043	0.0012
71	Lake	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.636	-81.4566	0.076	0.0001
72	Lorain	Primary Roads	41.3602	-82.2841	0.005	0.0066
73	Lorain	Primary Roads	41.3815	-82.2067	0.350	0.0066
74	Lorain	Secondary Roads	41.2077	-82.2186	0.313	0.0010
75	Lorain	Secondary Roads	41.4327	-82.2588	0.708	0.0010
76	Lorain	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.396	-82.0842	0.018	0.0001
77	Mahoning	Primary Roads	41.1117	-80.6916	0.078	0.0034
78	Mahoning	Primary Roads	41.0282	-80.6279	0.179	0.0034
79	Mahoning	Secondary Roads	41.0946	-80.6534	0.010	0.0009
80	Mahoning	Secondary Roads	40.924	-80.9937	0.030	0.0009
81	Mahoning	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.0839	-80.6508	0.065	0.0001
82	Medina	Primary Roads	41.009	-81.9461	0.570	0.0131
83	Medina	Primary Roads	41.0448	-81.7355	0.587	0.0131
84	Medina	Secondary Roads	41.154	-81.8628	0.217	0.0018
85	Medina	Secondary Roads	41.2376	-81.912	0.853	0.0018
86	Medina	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.0334	-81.737	0.023	0.0001

Site No.	County	Road Types	Latitude	Longitude	Segment length in miles	Probability of Selection
87	Portage	Primary Roads	41.1057	-81.1562	0.011	0.0080
88	Portage	Primary Roads	41.1059	-81.0798	0.938	0.0080
89	Portage	Secondary Roads	41.2053	-81.1475	0.014	0.0008
90	Portage	Secondary Roads	41.1546	-81.3308	0.025	0.0008
91	Portage	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.0996	-81.1384	0.081	0.0001
92	Richland	Primary Roads	40.7887	-82.4076	0.106	0.0123
93	Richland	Primary Roads	40.7454	-82.4491	0.327	0.0123
94	Richland	Secondary Roads	40.7694	-82.71	0.021	0.0007
95	Richland	Secondary Roads	40.7589	-82.5306	0.045	0.0007
96	Richland	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.6165	-82.5196	0.031	0.0001
97	Stark	Primary Roads	40.7821	-81.3821	0.147	0.0105
98	Stark	Primary Roads	40.7979	-81.3917	0.199	0.0105
99	Stark	Secondary Roads	40.7865	-81.3486	0.055	0.0006
100	Stark	Secondary Roads	40.8711	-81.364	0.074	0.0006
101	Stark	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.88	-81.4196	0.081	0.0000
102	Summit	Primary Roads	41.3357	-81.5145	0.014	0.0022
103	Summit	Primary Roads	40.9595	-81.4602	0.294	0.0022
104	Summit	Secondary Roads	41.0536	-81.549	0.005	0.0009
105	Summit	Secondary Roads	41.2127	-81.4875	0.435	0.0009
106	Summit	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.0157	-81.6879	0.028	0.0001
107	Summit	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.9672	-81.5692	0.367	0.0001
108	Trumbull	Primary Roads	41.2046	-80.7078	0.150	0.0040
109	Trumbull	Primary Roads	41.3466	-80.7013	0.168	0.0040
110	Trumbull	Secondary Roads	41.3124	-80.7311	0.027	0.0011
111	Trumbull	Secondary Roads	41.1813	-80.6644	0.054	0.0011
112	Trumbull	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.2173	-80.5839	0.496	0.0001
113	Wayne	Primary Roads	40.9315	-82.1167	0.407	0.0476
114	Wayne	Primary Roads	40.9598	-82.0627	1.363	0.0476
115	Wayne	Secondary Roads	40.9173	-82.0518	0.028	0.0010
116	Wayne	Secondary Roads	40.6996	-81.6919	0.384	0.0010
Northwest Region						
117	Allen	Primary Roads	40.8569	-83.9372	0.090	0.0120
118	Allen	Primary Roads	40.8228	-83.9917	0.388	0.0120
119	Allen	Secondary Roads	40.8367	-84.3393	0.033	0.0012
120	Allen	Secondary Roads	40.7307	-84.0779	0.071	0.0012
121	Allen	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.8994	-83.9118	0.091	0.0001
122	Auglaize	Primary Roads	40.5544	-84.1697	0.038	0.0230
123	Auglaize	Primary Roads	40.6502	-84.1315	0.303	0.0230
124	Auglaize	Secondary Roads	40.4775	-84.3771	0.070	0.0012
125	Auglaize	Secondary Roads	40.5587	-84.2106	0.316	0.0012
126	Crawford	Secondary Roads	40.9605	-82.8437	0.006	0.0010
127	Crawford	Secondary Roads	40.8179	-82.9402	0.321	0.0010
128	Defiance	Secondary Roads	41.3078	-84.3653	0.055	0.0013
129	Defiance	Secondary Roads	41.2963	-84.5522	0.119	0.0013
130	Fulton	Primary Roads	41.5908	-84.2538	0.455	0.0137
131	Fulton	Primary Roads	41.5906	-84.1077	0.703	0.0137

Site No.	County	Road Types	Latitude	Longitude	Segment length in miles	Probability of Selection
132	Fulton	Secondary Roads	41.6991	-84.085	0.044	0.0015
133	Fulton	Secondary Roads	41.5434	-84.2415	0.236	0.0015
134	Fulton	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.558	-84.2491	0.012	0.0002
135	Hancock	Primary Roads	41.0899	-83.6597	0.278	0.0112
136	Hancock	Primary Roads	41.0681	-83.664	0.326	0.0112
137	Hancock	Secondary Roads	40.8921	-83.656	0.010	0.0017
138	Hancock	Secondary Roads	41.1077	-83.7907	0.030	0.0017
139	Logan	Secondary Roads	40.3787	-83.7508	0.086	0.0013
140	Logan	Secondary Roads	40.5086	-83.6479	0.808	0.0013
141	Lucas	Primary Roads	41.6937	-83.5031	0.037	0.0034
142	Lucas	Primary Roads	41.6376	-83.4923	0.157	0.0034
143	Lucas	Secondary Roads	41.63	-83.6017	0.054	0.0012
144	Lucas	Secondary Roads	41.6749	-83.7054	0.227	0.0012
145	Lucas	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.6075	-83.6196	0.055	0.0001
146	Lucas	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.6231	-83.7107	0.066	0.0001
147	Ottawa	Primary Roads	41.4722	-83.3272	0.147	0.0571
148	Ottawa	Secondary Roads	41.4997	-83.1453	0.054	0.0021
149	Ottawa	Secondary Roads	41.5202	-82.9927	0.095	0.0021
150	Ottawa	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.5832	-82.8364	0.066	0.0002
151	Sandusky	Primary Roads	41.3813	-83.0146	0.253	0.0115
152	Sandusky	Secondary Roads	41.3055	-82.959	0.048	0.0015
153	Sandusky	Secondary Roads	41.4532	-83.3712	0.083	0.0015
154	Seneca	Secondary Roads	41.0918	-83.1748	0.116	0.0016
155	Seneca	Secondary Roads	41.2162	-83.4204	0.182	0.0016
156	Wood	Primary Roads	41.2123	-83.6497	0.136	0.0040
157	Wood	Primary Roads	41.2851	-83.638	0.347	0.0040
158	Wood	Secondary Roads	41.3941	-83.674	0.096	0.0011
159	Wood	Secondary Roads	41.4816	-83.646	0.514	0.0011
160	Wood	Local, Rural, and City Roads	41.532	-83.6555	0.070	0.0001
Southeast Region						
161	Athens	Secondary Roads	39.331	-82.1288	0.012	0.0011
162	Athens	Secondary Roads	39.3315	-82.0824	0.029	0.0011
163	Belmont	Primary Roads	40.0715	-80.7418	0.021	0.0084
164	Belmont	Primary Roads	40.0725	-80.9694	0.075	0.0084
165	Belmont	Secondary Roads	40.0826	-80.7469	0.024	0.0008
166	Belmont	Secondary Roads	39.8674	-80.8225	0.074	0.0008
167	Belmont	Local, Rural, and City Roads	40.1545	-80.9545	0.053	0.0001
168	Muskingum	Primary Roads	39.9757	-81.8478	0.062	0.0157
169	Muskingum	Primary Roads	39.9557	-81.9438	0.371	0.0157
170	Muskingum	Secondary Roads	39.953	-82.0068	0.055	0.0014
171	Muskingum	Secondary Roads	39.8599	-81.8049	0.478	0.0014
172	Perry	Secondary Roads	39.9073	-82.3609	0.388	0.0016
173	Perry	Secondary Roads	39.7433	-82.3056	0.425	0.0016
174	Tuscarawas	Primary Roads	40.5082	-81.4833	0.025	0.0144
175	Tuscarawas	Primary Roads	40.2726	-81.5443	0.100	0.0144
176	Tuscarawas	Secondary Roads	40.4781	-81.3576	0.004	0.0011

Site No.	County	Road Types	Latitude	Longitude	Segment length in miles	Probability of Selection
177	Tuscarawas	Secondary Roads	40.5818	-81.6164	0.067	0.0011
Southwest Region						
178	Brown	Secondary Roads	38.8035	-83.723	0.017	0.0013
179	Brown	Secondary Roads	38.6557	-83.762	0.043	0.0013
180	Brown	Local, Rural, and City Roads	38.7847	-83.8623	0.057	0.0001
181	Butler	Primary Roads	39.363	-84.3683	0.100	0.0227
182	Butler	Primary Roads	39.351	-84.3778	0.154	0.0227
183	Butler	Secondary Roads	39.5205	-84.4014	0.044	0.0011
184	Butler	Secondary Roads	39.3913	-84.538	0.103	0.0011
185	Butler	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.5613	-84.6389	0.039	0.0001
186	Clark	Primary Roads	39.93396	-83.63198	1.009	0.0083
187	Clark	Primary Roads	39.8933	-83.8228	0.109	0.0083
188	Clark	Secondary Roads	39.9307	-83.8066	0.066	0.0016
189	Clark	Secondary Roads	40.0037	-83.7186	0.582	0.0016
190	Clark	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.9275	-83.8273	0.003	0.0001
191	Clermont	Primary Roads	39.0616	-84.3131	0.095	0.0278
192	Clermont	Primary Roads	39.1809	-84.2656	0.161	0.0278
193	Clermont	Secondary Roads	38.8955	-84.2342	0.015	0.0013
194	Clermont	Secondary Roads	39.0305	-84.1981	0.067	0.0013
195	Clermont	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.2018	-84.2162	0.081	0.0001
196	Clinton	Primary Roads	39.4629	-83.9848	0.275	0.0267
197	Clinton	Primary Roads	39.4947	-83.915	0.836	0.0267
198	Clinton	Secondary Roads	39.4454	-83.8457	0.042	0.0018
199	Clinton	Secondary Roads	39.4489	-83.8506	0.205	0.0018
200	Darke	Secondary Roads	40.0498	-84.7565	0.050	0.0008
201	Darke	Secondary Roads	40.3244	-84.6369	0.140	0.0008
202	Greene	Primary Roads	39.7761	-84.0327	0.047	0.0096
203	Greene	Primary Roads	39.818	-84.0003	0.228	0.0096
204	Greene	Secondary Roads	39.8291	-84.0198	0.059	0.0018
205	Greene	Secondary Roads	39.8182	-84.0048	0.086	0.0018
206	Greene	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.695	-84.082	0.062	0.0001
207	Hamilton	Primary Roads	39.1227	-84.5354	0.020	0.0027
208	Hamilton	Primary Roads	39.1623	-84.4356	0.058	0.0027
209	Hamilton	Secondary Roads	39.1427	-84.3894	0.055	0.0008
210	Hamilton	Secondary Roads	39.0987	-84.5028	0.118	0.0008
211	Hamilton	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.1774	-84.3831	0.100	0.0001
212	Hamilton	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.1212	-84.5348	0.201	0.0001
213	Miami	Primary Roads	40.0171	-84.2303	0.036	0.0123
214	Miami	Primary Roads	40.1333	-84.2157	0.425	0.0123
215	Miami	Secondary Roads	39.9721	-84.33	0.022	0.0014
216	Miami	Secondary Roads	40.147	-84.1491	0.839	0.0014
217	Miami	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.9219	-84.2672	0.149	0.0001
218	Montgomery	Primary Roads	39.8489	-84.4247	0.060	0.0048
219	Montgomery	Primary Roads	39.8121	-84.189	0.132	0.0048
220	Montgomery	Secondary Roads	39.7551	-84.1925	0.015	0.0011

Site No.	County	Road Types	Latitude	Longitude	Segment length in miles	Probability of Selection
221	Montgomery	Secondary Roads	39.8901	-84.2075	0.098	0.0011
222	Montgomery	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.6453	-84.2875	0.065	0.0001
223	Montgomery	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.6149	-84.1749	0.171	0.0001
224	Preble	Primary Roads	39.8372	-84.5341	0.079	0.0227
225	Preble	Primary Roads	39.8361	-84.5712	0.911	0.0227
226	Preble	Secondary Roads	39.6927	-84.7098	0.099	0.0013
227	Preble	Secondary Roads	39.7631	-84.6365	0.118	0.0013
228	Preble	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.8389	-84.7944	0.097	0.0002
229	Ross	Secondary Roads	39.3348	-83.0008	0.062	0.0015
230	Ross	Secondary Roads	39.3597	-82.9763	0.066	0.0015
231	Scioto	Secondary Roads	38.7394	-83.0028	0.006	0.0012
232	Scioto	Secondary Roads	38.9302	-83.0432	0.284	0.0012
233	Warren	Primary Roads	39.4926	-84.3244	0.011	0.0063
234	Warren	Primary Roads	39.4375	-84.3377	0.351	0.0063
235	Warren	Secondary Roads	39.2793	-84.1126	0.040	0.0013
236	Warren	Secondary Roads	39.4137	-84.2032	0.232	0.0013
237	Warren	Local, Rural, and City Roads	39.5656	-84.2883	0.147	0.0001

APPENDIX F: OHIO SEAT BELT SURVEY – SITE DESCRIPTION FORM

Statewide Seat Belt Survey - Site Description Form 2012

DATE: _____ Day of Week: _____ Observer: _____

Site Number: _____ County: _____
 Site Location: _____ Region: _____
 Alt Location: _____ City: _____

Weather

- Sunny/Mostly Sunny
- Cloudy/Mostly Cloudy
- Light Rain
- Heavy Rain
- Snow
- Other

Visibility

- Poor
- Satisfactory
- Excellent

Site

- Primary
- Alternate
- Other

Site Type

- Intersection
- Freeway Ramp

Start Time: _____ End Time: _____ Interruptions: _____

Description of observation location: _____

1st Traffic Count (5 minutes): _____

2nd Traffic Count (5 minutes): _____

Draw diagram of site and indicate location and lane observed in the space below

Total number of lanes at site in direction being observed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Observer Comments: _____

OHIO SEAT BELT SURVEY – OBSERVATION FORM

<p>Site # <input style="width: 60px; height: 30px;" type="text"/></p> <p>Vehicle</p> <p>Car <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Light <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Van <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Heavy <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>SUV <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Age</p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Cell Phone</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> No Passenger. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Age</p> <p>0-4 <input type="checkbox"/> 26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>5-14 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Vehicle</p> <p>Car <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Light <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Van <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Heavy <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>SUV <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Age</p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Cell Phone</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> No Passenger. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Age</p> <p>0-4 <input type="checkbox"/> 26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>5-14 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Vehicle</p> <p>Car <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Light <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Van <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Heavy <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>SUV <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Age</p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Cell Phone</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> No Passenger. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Age</p> <p>0-4 <input type="checkbox"/> 26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>5-14 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Vehicle</p> <p>Car <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Light <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Van <input type="checkbox"/> Truck - Heavy <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>SUV <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Age</p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Driver Cell Phone</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Belted</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown... <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> No Passenger. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Sex</p> <p>Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Age</p> <p>0-4 <input type="checkbox"/> 26-64 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>5-14 <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>15-25 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Passenger Race</p> <p>Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>African American <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Applied Research Center Miami University</p>	<p>ODPS 2012 Data Collection Form</p>		