

2010
State of Colorado
STATEWIDE
Seat Belt Survey

**Colorado Department of
Transportation**

**SEAT BELT
STUDY**



**Colorado
State
University**

INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	iii
PREFACE	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION	3
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	4
CONCLUSIONS	16
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1: Statewide Survey Design	17
Appendix 2: Site Selection	23
Appendix 3: Methodology	25
Appendix 4: Field Work.....	26
Appendix 5: Weighting and Analyses	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1	2010 Statewide Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	6
2	2010 Seat Belt Usage by Region	6
3	Seat Belt Usage Annual Estimates 2006 - 2010	7
4	2010 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	8
5	2009 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	9
6	2008 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	10
7	2007 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	11
8	2006 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	12
9	Comparison of 2010 and 2009 Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	13
10	Comparison of 2008 and 2007 Seat Belt Usage for Colorado	14
11	County Results for 2010 Colorado Statewide Seat Belt Survey.....	15

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1	Sample Design Summary	24
2	County Site Descriptor Example	26
3	Major Road Descriptor Abbreviations	27
4	Direction of Observation	27
5	Map for Major Roads	28
6	Map for Local Roads	29
7	Observation Schedule Sheet Example	30
8	Seat Belt Usage Field Survey Form Example.....	33
9	Seat Belt Usage Field Survey Form Instructions	34
10	Colorado Seat Belt Usage - Traffic Summary Sheet Example	35
11	Colorado Seat Belt Usage - Traffic Summary Sheet Instructions	36

PREFACE

The primary objective of this study was to conduct a comprehensive statewide seat belt usage survey in order to determine the usage rate for the State of Colorado in 2010. The statewide survey was conducted in the same month (June) as preceding surveys with essentially the same field observers used in previous studies in order to leverage the training and experience and to maintain statistical confidence in the data-gathering task. The survey was conducted by the Institute of Transportation Management, College of Business, Colorado State University under the sponsorship of the Colorado Department of Transportation, Office of Transportation Safety. Observational data were analyzed by the Institute of Transportation Management with the assistance of the Franklin A. Graybill Statistical Laboratory of the College of Natural Sciences.

During the statewide study, seat belt usage was observed during two consecutive weeks (June 6 through June 19, 2010) to determine actual usage among Colorado drivers and outboard front seat passengers. With the data and analyses emanating from this study, the CDOT Office of Transportation Safety will have current and accurate information upon which to base future transportation safety program decisions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Institute of Transportation Management (ITM) at Colorado State University conducted a comprehensive seat belt usage study in the State of Colorado from June 6 through June 19, 2010. Trained staff personally observed vehicles at 385 sites in 25 counties throughout the State. The total of 178,462 vehicles observed for the study included cars, vans, sport utility vehicles (SUVs), and light trucks normally used for personal transportation. Commercial vehicles were excluded from this survey. Drivers and front seat outboard passengers of the eligible (non-commercial) vehicles were observed for seat belt usage at select locations throughout the State.

Raw data were entered into the SAS system database and submitted to the College of Natural Sciences, Franklin A. Graybill Statistical Laboratory for independent analysis. The analyses of the data are included herein. Results for seat belt usage among the various vehicle types are provided below:

	<u>Usage</u>
Cars	85.2%
Vans	87.9%
SUVs	84.6%
Trucks	72.7%
All Vehicle Types	82.9%

The Institute of Transportation Management is pleased to have had the opportunity to work with the Colorado Department of Transportation in the conduct of the 2010 Colorado Statewide Seat Belt Survey. The design of this study is most representative of the population movements and trends within the State of Colorado and thus provides us with a more accurate projection of actual seat belt usage. The data and the analyses that are submitted to CDOT/OTS are, to the best of my knowledge, accurate and complete.

G. James Francis
Principal Investigator
Institute of Transportation Management
Colorado State University

ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

To complete this project and its associated tasks, observers and supervisors received training which emphasized the need for consistency and accuracy in data collection and the survey process. Each observer was supplied with data collection sheets, maps, site locations, and the supervisor's telephone numbers to facilitate completion of the survey of seat belt usage.

Driver seat belt usage data were collected from 385 separate sites in 25 counties. Each site was observed on two different dates during the period of June 6 through June 19, 2010 for the statewide survey.

Overall the project objectives were accomplished within the time parameters and budget agreed to by CDOT and ITM.

As in previous seat belt usage surveys conducted by the Institute of Transportation Management, retired Colorado State Highway Patrol Officers were used as observers whenever possible. This staffing arrangement worked very well and the continued use of the Patrolmen is planned for future studies. Because of their familiarity with interstate and state highways, as well as local and county roads and safety procedures, many potential location and safety problems were minimized. The retired patrol officers have proven to be very conscientious and reliable and have helped strengthen the validity of the results.

The Franklin A. Graybill Statistical Laboratory of the College of Natural Sciences also provided a major contribution to this survey. Besides contributing to the reliability and validity of usage estimates with statistical analyses, the Statistical Laboratory also gives the analysis independence from the survey process.

By using these two groups of independent contractors, the Institute has taken measures to ensure the integrity of the survey and analyses while involving people in the study who have the most relevant skills.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Statewide Survey Results

The 2010 Statewide Seat Belt Usage Survey was conducted at 385 sites on two different dates as a multistage, stratified, random sample. The survey design was developed in compliance with the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration - Guidelines for State Observational Surveys of Safety Belt and Motorcycle Helmet Use - Docket No. 92-12, Notice No. 02, and National Highway Transportation Safety Administration 23 CFR Part 1340 [Docket No. NHTSA-98-4280] RIN 2127-AH46 Uniform Criteria for State Observational Surveys of Seat Belt Use, Final Rule.

A total of 770 observation sites (385 x 2) were used in conducting the 2010 Statewide Seat Belt Survey. As shown in Table 1, the 2010 statewide seat belt usage for Colorado (cars, vans, SUVs and pickup trucks combined) over the sampling period was 82.9 percent. This estimate may vary due to a number of uncontrolled sampling errors that may have entered into the study. Therefore, a 95 percent confidence interval constructed with regard to the overall seat belt usage rate is from 81.2 to 84.6 percent.

Upon examination of the three study design regions, Eastern Plains, Front Range, and Western Slope, the Eastern Region's combined vehicle seat belt usage is estimated to be 79.8 percent, the Front Range seat belt usage is estimated to be 83.9 percent, and the Western Region is estimated to be 81.7 percent (see Table 2).

Table 3 shows the seat belt usage for the last five years in the State of Colorado. Tables 4 through 10 provide comparative data of weighted estimates of seat belt usage for Colorado for the last five years. It should be noted that in secondary law states such as Colorado that have a high seat belt usage, the investment in media and educational efforts must be significant in order to maintain current levels and to continue making even small gains.

Table 11 shows individual county results for 2010. The county data further illustrates the differences in seat belt usage between urban and rural areas of the State. While the more urban counties in the Front Range generally have higher usage rates, these counties also tend to have a more balanced number of vehicle types (cars, SUVs, vans, and pickup trucks). The more rural counties on the Western Slope and Eastern Plains have a higher proportion of pickup trucks which influences the usage rate in a downward manner. However, in those rural counties that have observation sites along one of the interstate highways, the usage rate is much higher.

The two counties with the highest overall usage rates were Clear Creek and Adams with rates of 89.1 and 88.9, respectively. Kit Carson, a rural county on the Eastern Plains, had the lowest usage rate of 48.5; however, this figure is 3.8% higher than in 2009, a marked improvement.

At this point in time, there could be several reasons for the level of seat belt usage in the State. It is difficult to track the impact of any one specific program or effort, but the following list of possible explanations undoubtedly worked in concert to continue the upward trend in seat belt usage in the State of Colorado.

1. The success of the educational efforts of CDOT and the Department of Public Health and Environment to inform the public of the dangers of not using seat belts.
2. An improvement in the general knowledge of the public of the need for the use of seat belts by vehicle operators and front seat passengers.
3. The "Click It or Ticket" program may have impacted drivers and front seat occupants enough to improve usage rates.
4. Enforcement efforts have impacted drivers and vehicle passengers and caused more awareness of the need to use seat belts.

Travel Variables

The following findings demonstrate the differences in seat belt usage when considering some of the variables involved in travel. For example, seat belt usage was greater on major roads (83.5%) than on local roads (79.0%). Also as demonstrated in previous studies, seat belts are used more at higher speeds than at lower speeds (see below). Both the type of road and vehicle speed showed statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) in the differences in seat belt usage. Seat belt usage during weekends and on weekdays were the same (82.9%).

- Major roads: 83.5 percent
- Local Roads: 79.0 percent
- Speed observations: 0-30 mph 72.4 percent
 31-50 mph 81.2 percent
 50+ mph 85.1 percent

Other comparisons based on time of day and weather conditions were:

- Non-peak hours: 81.7 percent
- Peak hours: 86.2 percent
- Weather related results are 82.9 percent for clear weather; the “non-clear” weather results were 82.7 percent. It should be noted that the “non-clear” seat belt usage was a very small sample size.

Table 1: 2010 Statewide Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

	Percent Usage
Cars	85.2%
Vans	87.9%
SUVs	84.6%
Trucks	72.7%
All Vehicle Types	82.9%

Table 2: 2010 Seat Belt Usage by Region

	Percent Usage				
Region	Cars	Vans	SUVs	Trucks	All
Eastern Plains	81.7%	84.7%	85.0%	65.2%	79.8%
Front Range	86.0%	89.2%	84.3%	76.0%	83.9%
Western Slope	85.1%	85.8%	85.6%	71.7%	81.7%
Statewide Usage	85.2%	87.9%	84.6%	72.7%	82.9%

Table 3: Seat Belt Usage Annual Estimates 2006 - 2010

(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)

		2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
		Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
	Total	82.9%	80.3%	81.7%	81.1%	80.3%
	Standard error	0.8%	0.8%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Region						
	Eastern	79.8%	77.4%	77.4%	77.3%	71.2%
	Front Range	83.9%	82.9%	83.6%	82.9%	82.7%
	Western	81.7%	75.6%	79.4%	79.3%	78.3%
Weather						
	Clear	82.9%	79.8%	81.7%	81.0%	80.3%
	Other*	82.7%	84.3%	80.6%	84.3%	73.4%
Time						
	Non-Peak Hours	81.7%	79.0%	80.6%	80.5%	78.5%
	Peak Hours	86.2%	84.5%	84.5%	82.8%	84.7%
Day of the Week						
	Weekday	82.9%	80.1%	81.2%	81.0%	81.1%
	Weekend	82.9%	80.8%	83.0%	81.3%	77.7%
Speed						
	0-30 mph	72.4%	76.6%	75.5%	72.4%	70.8%
	31-50 mph	81.2%	79.4%	79.4%	78.2%	78.7%
	50+ mph	85.1%	81.7%	84.1%	84.7%	83.2%
Road Class						
	Local	79.0%	78.6%	76.4%	76.0%	74.7%
	Major	83.5%	80.6%	82.5%	82.1%	81.5%

*Based on a small number of observations.

Table 4: 2010 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)

	Number of Observation Sites	Estimate	CV	Standard Error	95 Percent Confidence Limits	
					Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Total	770	82.9%	0.99	0.8	81.2%	84.6%
Region						
Eastern	184	79.8%	5.74	4.6	65.3%	94.4%
Front Range	418	83.9%	1.26	1.1	81.4%	86.4%
Western	168	81.7%	1.79	1.5	77.9%	85.4%
Weather						
Clear	696	82.9%	1.00	0.8	81.1%	84.6%
Other*	74	82.7%	2.14	1.8	78.8%	86.7%
Time						
Non-Peak Hours	635	81.7%	0.94	0.8	80.1%	83.3%
Peak Hours	135	86.2%	1.39	1.2	83.6%	88.8%
Day of the Week						
Weekday	565	82.9%	1.11	0.9	80.9%	84.8%
Weekend	205	82.9%	1.70	1.4	79.8%	86.1%
Speed						
0-30 mph	296	72.4%	2.82	2.0	68.0%	76.7%
31-50 mph	305	81.2%	1.2	1.0	79.2%	83.3%
50+ mph	169	85.1%	1.46	1.2	82.5%	87.7%
Road Class						
Local	366	79.0%	1.85	1.5	75.9%	82.0%
Major	404	83.5%	1.09	0.9	81.6%	85.4%

* Based on a small number of observations.

Table 5: 2009 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)

	Number of Observation Sites	Estimate	CV	Standard Error	95 Percent Confidence Limits	
					Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Total	772	80.3%	0.99	0.8	78.6%	82.0%
Region						
Eastern	184	77.4%	7.77	6.0	58.2%	96.5%
Front Range	420	82.9%	1.06	0.9	80.8%	85.0%
Western	168	75.6%	1.81	1.4	72.1%	79.1%
Weather						
Clear	642	79.8%	1.12	1.0	77.9%	81.7%
Other*	130	84.3%	2.26	2.8	80.0%	88.7%
Time						
Non-Peak Hours	620	79.0%	1.14	0.9	77.1%	80.9%
Peak Hours	152	84.5%	1.13	1.0	82.5%	86.5%
Day of the Week						
Weekday	594	80.1%	1.09	0.9	78.3%	82.0%
Weekend	178	80.8%	3.6	2.9	74.3%	87.3%
Speed						
0-30 mph	322	76.6%	2.83	2.2	72.0%	81.2%
31-50 mph	274	79.4%	1.81	1.4	76.4%	82.5%
50+ mph	176	81.7%	1.28	1.0	79.5%	84.0%
Road Class						
Local	368	78.6%	1.71	1.3	75.8%	81.4%
Major	404	80.6%	1.18	0.9	78.6%	82.6%

* Based on a small number of observations.

Table 6: 2008 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)

		Number of Observation Sites	Estimate	CV	Standard Error	95 Percent Confidence Limits	
						Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Total		772	81.7%	1.15	1.15	79.7%	83.6%
Region							
	Eastern	184	77.4%	7.36	5.7	59.3%	95.5%
	Front Range	420	83.6%	1.28	1.1	81.0%	86.1%
	Western	168	79.4%	2.21	1.8	74.9%	83.9%
Weather							
	Clear	727	81.7%	1.15	0.9	79.7%	83.7%
	Other*	45	80.6%	3.32	2.7	74.3%	86.9%
Time							
	Non-Peak Hours	619	80.6%	1.36	1.1	78.3%	82.9%
	Peak Hours	153	84.5%	1.22	1.0	82.3%	86.7%
Day of the Week							
	Weekday	553	81.2%	1.31	1.1	79.0%	83.5%
	Weekend	219	83.0%	2.16	1.8	79.0%	86.9%
Speed							
	0-30 mph	309	75.5%	4.03	3.0	69.1%	82.1%
	31-50 mph	285	79.4%	1.81	1.4	76.3%	82.4%
	50+ mph	178	84.1%	1.37	1.1	81.7%	86.6%
Road Class							
	Local	368	76.4%	2.92	2.2	71.7%	81.1%
	Major	404	82.5%	1.09	0.9	80.6%	84.5%

* Based on a small number of observations.

Table 7: 2007 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)

		Number of Observation Sites	Estimate	CV	Standard Error	95 Percent Confidence Limits	
						Lower Limit	Upper Limit
	Total	772	81.1%	1.42	1.1	78.6%	83.5%
Region							
	Eastern	184	77.3%	8.14	6.3	57.3%	97.4%
	Front Range	420	82.9%	1.45	1.2	80.0%	85.7%
	Western	168	79.3%	2.02	1.6	75.2%	83.5%
Weather							
	Clear	753	81.0%	1.46	1.2	78.5%	83.5%
	Other*	19	84.3%	3.08	2.6	77.6%	91.0%
Time							
	Non-Peak Hours	612	80.5%	1.63	1.3	77.7%	83.2%
	Peak Hours	150	82.8%	1.69	1.4	79.9%	85.8%
Day of the Week							
	Weekday	547	81.0%	1.72	1.4	78.0%	83.9%
	Weekend	225	81.3%	2.20	1.8	77.3%	85.3%
Speed							
	0-30 mph	295	72.4%	5.47	4.0	64.0%	80.7%
	31-50 mph	282	78.2%	1.95	1.5	75.0%	81.5%
	50+ mph	195	84.7%	1.33	1.1	82.3%	87.1%
Road Class							
	Local	368	76.0%	2.86	2.2	71.5%	80.6%
	Major	404	82.1%	1.46	1.2	79.6%	84.7%

* Based on a small number of observations.

Table 8: 2006 Weighted Estimates of Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)

	Number of Observation Sites	Estimate	CV	Standard Error	95 Percent Confidence Limits	
					Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Total	764	80.3%	1.4	1.1	77.9%	82.7%
Region						
Eastern	184	71.2%	9.85	7.0	48.9%	93.5%
Front Range	412	82.7%	1.13	0.9	80.5%	84.9%
Western	168	78.3%	3.15	2.5	71.9%	84.6%
Weather						
Clear	756	80.3%	1.42	1.1	77.9%	82.8%
Other*	8	73.4%	5.42	4.0	56.3%	90.6%
Time						
Non-Peak Hours	592	78.5%	1.7	1.3	75.7%	81.4%
Peak Hours	172	84.7%	1.83	1.5	81.4%	88.0%
Day of the Week						
Weekday	537	81.1%	1.4	1.7	78.1%	84.0%
Weekend	227	77.7%	2.3	2.9	72.2%	82.7%
Speed						
0-30 mph	311	70.8%	4.62	3.3	63.9%	77.8%
31-50 mph	260	78.7%	2.47	1.9	74.6%	82.9%
50+ mph	193	83.2%	0.96	0.8	81.5%	84.9%
Road Class						
Local	362	74.7%	3.48	2.6	69.3%	80.2%
Major	402	81.5%	1.38	1.1	79.1%	83.8%

* Based on a very small number of observations.

Table 9: Comparison of 2010 and 2009 Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

	(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)							
	Adult 2010 Survey				Adult 2009 Survey			
	# of Observation Sites	Estimate	95 Percent Confidence Limits		# of Observation Sites	Estimate	95 Percent Confidence Limits	
Lower Limit			Upper Limit	Lower Limit			Upper Limit	
Total	770	82.9%	81.2%	84.6%	772	80.3%	78.6%	82.0%
Region								
Eastern	184	79.8%	65.3%	94.4%	184	77.4%	58.2%	96.5%
Front Range	418	83.9%	81.4%	86.4%	420	82.9%	80.8%	85.0%
Western	168	81.7%	77.9%	85.4%	168	75.6%	72.1%	79.1%
Weather								
Clear	696	82.9%	81.1%	84.6%	642	79.8%	77.9%	81.7%
Not Clear*	74	82.7%	78.8%	86.7%	130	84.3%	80.0%	88.7%
Time								
Non-Peak	635	81.7%	80.1%	83.3%	620	79.0%	77.1%	80.9%
Peak	135	86.2%	83.6%	88.8%	152	84.5%	82.5%	86.5%
Day of the Week								
Weekday	565	82.9%	80.9%	84.8%	594	80.1%	78.3%	82.0%
Weekend	205	82.9%	79.8%	86.1%	178	80.8%	74.3%	87.3%
Speed								
0-30 mph	296	72.4%	68.0%	76.7%	322	76.6%	72.0%	81.2%
31-50 mph	305	81.2%	79.2%	83.3%	274	79.4%	76.4%	82.5%
<50 mph	169	85.1%	82.5%	87.7%	176	81.7%	79.5%	84.0%
Road Class								
Local	366	79.0%	75.9%	82.0%	368	78.6%	75.8%	81.4%
Major	404	83.5%	81.6%	85.4%	404	80.6%	78.6%	82.6%

*Based on a very small number of observations.

Table 10: Comparison of 2008 and 2007 Seat Belt Usage for Colorado

	(Cars, Vans, SUVs, and Trucks Combined)							
	Adult 2008 Survey				Adult 2007 Survey			
	# of Observation Sites	Estimate	95 Percent Confidence Limits		# of Observation Sites	Estimate	95 Percent Confidence Limits	
Lower Limit			Upper Limit	Lower Limit			Upper Limit	
Total	772	81.7%	79.7%	83.6%	772	81.1%	78.6%	83.5%
Region								
Eastern	184	77.4%	59.3%	95.5%	184	77.3%	57.3%	97.4%
Front Range	420	83.6%	81.0%	86.1%	420	82.9%	80.0%	85.7%
Western	168	79.4%	74.9%	83.9%	168	79.3%	75.2%	83.5%
Weather								
Clear	727	81.7%	79.7%	83.7%	753	81.0%	78.5%	83.5%
Not Clear*	45	80.6%	74.3%	86.9%	19	84.3%	77.6%	91.0%
Time								
Non-Peak	619	80.6%	78.3%	82.9%	612	80.5%	77.7%	83.2%
Peak	153	84.5%	82.3%	86.7%	150	82.8%	79.9%	85.8%
Day of the Week								
Weekday	553	81.2%	79.0%	83.5%	547	81.0%	78.0%	83.9%
Weekend	219	83.0%	79.0%	86.9%	225	81.3%	77.3%	85.3%
Speed								
0-30 mph	309	75.5%	69.1%	82.1%	295	72.4%	64.0%	80.7%
31-50 mph	285	79.4%	76.3%	82.4%	282	78.2%	75.0%	81.5%
<50 mph	178	84.1%	81.7%	86.6%	195	84.7%	82.3%	87.1%
Road Class								
Local	368	76.4%	71.7%	81.1%	368	76.0%	71.5%	80.6%
Major	404	82.5%	80.6%	84.5%	404	82.1%	79.6%	84.7%

*Based on a very small number of observations.

Table 11: County Results for 2010 Colorado Statewide Seat Belt Survey

County	Sites	Seat Belt Usage Estimate	Standard Error	Lower 95% Conf Int	Upper 95% Conf Int	
Adams	48	88.9	1.1	86.8	91.1	
Arapahoe	38	82.0	0.5	80.9	83.0	
Boulder	40	85.5	1.0	83.5	87.4	
Clear Creek	12	89.1	1.3	86.4	91.9	
Denver	68	81.5	0.6	80.2	82.7	
Douglas	32	84.7	0.9	83.0	86.5	
Eagle	22	88.5	1.1	86.1	90.9	
El Paso	60	84.6	0.7	83.1	86.0	
Garfield	14	85.5	1.0	83.4	87.6	
Gunnison	22	76.1	1.2	73.6	78.7	
Huerfano	30	67.5	1.9	63.5	71.4	
Jefferson	60	84.8	0.7	83.4	86.2	
Kit Carson	20	48.5	5.7	36.5	60.4	Note 1
Larimer	30	84.2	1.0	82.3	86.2	
Lincoln	12	87.0	3.5	79.3	94.8	
Logan	32	65.5	0.6	64.2	66.8	
Mesa	20	76.9	1.0	74.8	78.9	
Montezuma	24	82.3	1.4	79.3	85.3	
Montrose	20	73.9	1.1	71.5	76.2	
Morgan	30	73.4	1.6	70.1	76.6	
Pueblo	20	75.5	2.7	69.9	81.2	
Routt	22	83.8	2.1	79.5	88.2	
Sedgwick	30	60.9	4.3	52.2	69.6	
Summit	24	86.3	1.0	84.2	88.4	
Weld	40	84.4	2.2	80.0	88.9	

Note 1. Kit Carson County's estimate of seat belt usage, while useful, can be questioned because of the magnitude of the Standard Error. A Standard Error over 5 is generally suspect; the sample of seat belt usage was too small.

CONCLUSIONS

The 385 observation sites were surveyed twice during the two-week period from June 6 through June 19, 2010. Total observations of 178,462 vehicles from the 770 sites (385 x 2) yielded a statewide estimate of 82.9%. This finding represents an improvement with the usage rates over the past four years. Although the movement from 80.3% in 2006 to 82.9% in 2010 does not seem like a major improvement, it should be noted that this trend has come as a result of significant effort and investment by the Occupant Safety and Protection Program of the Office of Transportation Safety. The relative stability over the past five years of the overall State seat belt usage rate may reinforce the possibility that Colorado is near a “ceiling” which will likely require greater investment to achieve even small gains.

During the last five years, the usage rate for the Western Slope has moved upward from 78.3% to 81.7%. The Eastern Plains has shown an even greater results improving from 71.2% in 2006 to 79.8% in 2010. Both regions are still below the 83.9% of the Front Range. As mentioned earlier in the report, a higher percentage of cars, vans, and SUVs in the Front Range result in a higher usage rate than the other two regions where the relatively higher number of pickup trucks negatively impact the usage rates.

The challenges of maintaining a high seat belt usage rate in a secondary law state will likely continue, but the investment in education and enforcement are proving worthwhile. The value of return on investment, in terms of lives saved and social and economic savings, makes the effort one of the most important endeavors of the State of Colorado.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Statewide Survey Design

Introduction

This study was designed to achieve the objective of optimizing the amount and quality of information at a lower cost than could be accomplished through traditional experimentation. The aim in designing surveys and experiments is to meet a desired degree of reliability at the lowest possible investment given the existing budgetary, administrative and physical limitations within which the work must be conducted. Thus, the goal is to maximize *efficiency* in the process of gathering the most information with the smallest error for the time and money invested.

Through the use of statistical theory, the aim is to find a balance between two types of errors:

1. The plan could yield more precision than is needed and may thus be too costly, too slow, and perhaps excessively burdensome for the public.
2. The plan could yield insufficient precision, in which case significant results would not be attained, and the efforts and expense of the survey would, for the most part, be wasted.

A third type of error that has even greater negative impact, is to design a plan that elicits irrelevant information. Therefore, the first step is to accurately define the problem: *what is wanted/needed?* By examining what is needed (a statewide overall estimate of seat belt usage in all vehicles), with the application of statistical theory, an economic balance can be achieved which will minimize the occurrence of the above-stated errors. Also, enough data will be obtained with the necessary precision to prevent losses in carrying out meaningless surveys, data gathering, and analyses.

In the following sections of this report, the survey design is discussed and the data with accompanying analyses are presented.

Survey Design

The sample design for the Statewide Colorado Seat Belt Survey is a statewide, multistage area, probability-based sample of road segments. The steps involved in drawing the sample sites where observations were conducted were as follows:

1. Region (Eastern Region, Front Range, and Western Region)
2. Sample County
 - a. Selection probability-based on 2000 Census data
3. Selection of Major Roads and Local Roads
 - a. Major Roads selection: probability-based – Sample Road Segments
 - b. Local Roads selection: probability-based – Census Tracts

For the purposes of this survey, an observational site is a specific road intersection or freeway ramp where observations take place; an observation time period is a 40-minute time period in which seat belt usage is observed at a specific site. Each site was observed during two different time periods.

The survey was designed to produce an overall state estimate of seat belt usage, and also to provide a regional estimate for each of the three sample regions. The Western Slope Region consists of nine counties, the Front Range Region consists of ten counties, and the Eastern Plains Region includes six counties. The Western Slope Region covers an area from the western border of the State to the Continental Divide; the Front Range includes the counties through which Interstate 25 makes its way from the northern border to the southern border of Colorado. The Eastern Region consists of the counties of the Front Range to the Eastern state line.

The population of Colorado grew from 3,294,473 in 1990 to 4,301,261 in 2000; a 30.6 percent increase. This growth was mostly along Interstate Highway corridors of I-25, I-70 and I-76. In each region counties were randomly selected from those counties that bordered the Interstate Highways. Sampling in this manner included areas wherein at least 85 percent of the population of the State is located.

The selection of county groupings formed the primary strata. These strata were then used to select the individual counties used in the next sampling stage. The counties were then chosen based upon the percentage of the State's population. Within these counties, sites are selected where the actual observations take place.

Prior to sampling, roads were grouped based upon the State's classifications of Major Roads and Local Roads. The Major Roads were included taking into account the road's length and volume of traffic, as reported in the State's CORIS database. All road segments in the sample counties were identified and samples of segments were identified for observation. The local roads were chosen within sample tracts and the number of tracts selected was proportional to the population of the county. It was determined that there would be 385 sites (road segments) on major roads and local roads from which the sample would be drawn. For each site where the observations are conducted, a traffic direction was assigned. The traffic was always observed from inside the sample road segment at or near (for safety reasons) the point where the traffic was leaving the segment. It has been estimated that approximately 30 percent of the State's Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (DVMT) are on local roads. Nearly 40 percent of observation time is allocated to local roads due to the variability in seat belt usage noted in prior State surveys. Statistically, it is wise to allocate more observation time to those areas in which more variability potentially exists due to strata selection, thereby minimizing some of the sampling error.

The 2010 Colorado Statewide Seat Belt Usage Survey has been designed to meet all the criteria set by the Uniform Criteria for State Observational Surveys of Seat Belt Use, 23 CFR Part 1340, Docket No. NHTSA-98-4280. RIN 2127-AH46, Final Rule. Specifically:

1. Samples are probability based on population and vehicle miles; therefore estimates are representative of seat belt usage for the State's driver and front outboard passenger population.
2. The sample data are collected through direct observation of seat belt usage on selected roadways by qualified and trained observers (mostly former Colorado State Patrol Troopers). Observation times are assigned and rescheduled if weather interferes. Likewise, if there is construction on an assigned site, a safer site is selected for the observation within the road segment.
3. Training occurs one week to ten days prior to the actual survey and includes observation of traffic flow, time periods for the observations, counting seat belt usage, and filling out forms.
4. The population of interest for the survey is the driver and outboard front seat passenger of cars, light trucks (non commercial), vans, and SUVs.
5. Observations are made in daylight hours during the month of June.
6. Observational data are recorded on counting sheets, summarized and reported to Colorado State University, Institute of Transportation Management (CSU/ITM), whereupon a digital record is created. The digital record serves as input into SAS programs for data reduction. The reduced data are then returned to CSU/ITM for analysis and interpretation by Dr. Walter Hivner.

Sample Size Determination

Sample size determination was, in large measure, governed by the resources made available for field observations, the time constraints placed on the survey and the precision requirements of the study (the relative error: standard error divided by the parameter estimate ≤ 0.05). The survey was to be completed and reported by August 31, 2010. A decision as to how many roadways to select and assign for observation during the observation period required finding a balance between issues of statistical reliability and observer productivity. Statistical theory, which considers correlations and the need for independent observation, suggests that the number of roadway locations be as large as possible. However, there is a practical need to select a small enough number of road segments for study so that observers will not spend too much time traveling from site to site. With these conditions in mind, as well as the precision requirements and the time and cost constraints, it was established that a total sample of 770 observational time periods and sites would be used (385 individual sites to be observed on two different occasions). The Front Range was allotted 418 of these time periods since the vast majority of DVMTs are on the Front Range. The Eastern Region was assigned 184 observational time periods and 168 for the Western Region.

Stratification of Roadways

All roads in Colorado were eligible as sites for selection and observation. Detailed tract maps provided by the Census Bureau were used to identify local roadways. State highway maps and traffic maps were used to list and sample major roadways. Roadways dropped from consideration included:

1. Private streets and driveways
2. Unnamed streets
3. Roads named as courts, circles, and cul-de-sacs

Prior to determining the sample from the eligible roadways, a classification system was adopted so that all roadways were assigned to one of the two primary strata: 1) major roads and 2) local roads. This produced a more efficient sample design than simple random sampling. The major roads consisted of State-maintained roads such as Interstate highways, U.S. highways and state routes. All other roads were assigned to the local roads stratum. The traffic volume on roads in this latter class varies considerably with many being quiet residential streets or rural roads that serve low numbers of vehicles per day.

The sampling plan was designed to select the roadways from the two strata using differential selection probabilities. The objective was to produce a design that is efficient in the production of a large number of vehicle occupants for observation and provides a comprehensive coverage of the State's travel so that reliable estimates of the seat belt usage rate could be derived. The stratification and differential selection of roadways was a compromise between two extreme approaches to the sampling of roadways. In one extreme, it would be desirable to observe only on high-volume roads so that the greatest number of vehicles could be counted and the observers are never idle. This would require sampling as many high-volume interstate highways as possible. The other extreme is sampling all roads with equal probability, which would bring into the sample a large number of rural roads or neighborhood roads where the traffic load would be light.

Multistage Selection of Roadways

While most roads in Colorado were eligible for inclusion in the survey, it was neither feasible nor necessary to compile a list of all roads in the State for use as a sampling frame. Instead, a three-stage selection approach was used to designate the final sample of roads. The selection procedure was designed to achieve two important advantages of cluster sampling. First, in constructing the sampling frame it was desirable to include only geographically compact areas rather than list all roads in the State. Second, it was important to cluster the sample roads so that field observers would not incur substantial travel time in going from one observation location to another. The first stage in the sampling procedure for both major roads and local roads involved the selection of 25 counties, 6 in the Eastern Region, 10 in the Front Range and the remainder (9) in the Western Region. The sampling of local roads was further confined to a smaller geographic cluster – Census Tract (CT) or Enumeration District (ED) – since it would be impractical to list all local roads in a county. Thus, within the sample counties, the second-stage units, CTs/EDs, were selected. The third stage of sampling for local roads was the selection of roads within the sample tracts. For major roads the second stage was the selection of road segments within the sample counties. This approach allowed a better representation of major roads than if they had been clustered at the Census Tract level.

Selection of First and Second Stage Units

In the Eastern Region, Lincoln, Logan, Kit Carson, Morgan, Sedgwick, and Weld Counties were included in the sample. Larimer, Boulder, Clear Creek, Denver, Douglas, Adams, Arapahoe, El Paso, Jefferson, and Pueblo were selected for the Front Range survey. For the Western Region, Eagle, Garfield, Gunnison, Huerfano, Mesa, Montezuma, Montrose, Routt, and Summit Counties were chosen. Some of these counties were selected with certainty in that these counties were included as self-representing because of their populations and their corresponding average DVMT. To achieve implicit geographic stratification, the remaining counties were structured, before sampling, in order of their population and in a geographic fashion. Three strata of approximately equal population, and by correlation with DVMT, were defined within each region. The exception was the Eastern Region where two strata were defined. This was done because of the sparse population in this region. Counties were selected from each stratum with probability proportional to population (2000 Census) in the county.

Next, census tracts were allocated to each of the regions through the eight strata. To quote Josefina Lago, Washington Consulting Group regarding the allocation of census tracts, "tracts were allocated ... approximately in proportion to the squared root of the total average DVMT in the region." Based on the 2000 Census, a fixed number of tracts were allocated to each county. This number was determined by the number of local roads to be allocated to the county, with a minimum of two tracts per county. Tracts were then selected with probability proportional to the square root of population (as a representative for vehicle miles of travel in the tract). Prior to actual sampling, the list was ordered by tract number within the county to provide implicit geographic stratification of the sample tracts.

The allocation between major roads and local roads was then made based on the estimated annual VMT for the State of Colorado. A comparison was made of the proportion of population of counties in 1990 and 2000. From this comparison it was determined that the proportion of major roads to local roads would remain the same. As in previous surveys it has been found that there is more variability in seat belt usage on local roads than on major roads. Under these conditions it is desirable, from a sampling efficiency point of view, to allocate more observations to the stratum with greater variability than would be proposed with strictly proportional allocation.

Selection of Roads

The sampling frame of major roads was constructed by segmenting the roads appearing on the State of Colorado Road Maps. County and city maps were used where the level of detail on large-scale maps was not sufficient to carry out the road segmentation. For each sample county the road segments, their length and average daily traffic of each segment were recorded. The road segments were sampled systematically with probability proportional to average daily VMT.

To construct the sampling frame for local roads, all local roads in sample tracts were listed, excluding major roads. Within each county an equal probability sample of local roads was selected. The sample size was determined by the allocation process described in the previous section.

It is noted that sample allocation of roadways and road selection in the 2010 survey was based on a methodology originally designed by the Washington Consulting Group, Josefina Lago, and examined, modified, and updated by CSU/ITM to conform to the 2000 Census information.


APPENDIX 2: Site Selection

Once a random sample of counties was selected, the selection of the sample sites was then determined. For purposes of sample selection, roads were grouped into two strata: 1) major roads (State, U.S. and Interstates) and 2) local roads. As depicted in Figure 1, the major roads were sampled across an entire county, while the local roads were selected from within small geographic areas: Census Tracts/Enumeration Districts.

The sample of major roads was selected taking into account a road's length and volume of traffic. Based on the CORIS database, all road segments in the sample counties were identified and then a sample of segments was selected for observation. The local roads were selected within sample tracts and the number of tracts selected was proportional to the population of the county. A total of 385 sites (road segments) on major roads and local roads were chosen to determine the final sample.

For each observation site a specific traffic direction was assigned. The traffic was always observed leaving from inside the sample road segment at or near the point where the traffic was leaving the segment.

Figure 1: Sample Design Summary



APPENDIX 3: Methodology

ITM makes use of a statistical system provide by SAS Institute that has been available since the mid 1970s and is widely used and respected throughout the survey statistician community. Within SAS there exists a procedure called PROC SURVEYREG. The SURVEYREG procedure performs statistical analysis for survey data. This analytical procedure takes into account the design used to select the sample. The sample design can be a complex sample design such as Clustering and unequal weighting. In order to employ this methodology, the design of the survey was specified; the first stage stratum consisted of three strata in the Western Region, three in the Front Range, and two in the Eastern Region. Next were the county clusters from each stratum followed by the observational data. Sampling weights were also included as an integral part of the process.

The procedure SURVEYREG fits linear models for survey data and computes regression coefficients and the variance-covariance matrix. The procedure also provides significance tests for the regression model effects and for any specified estimable linear functions of the model parameters.

Variance Estimation

The SURVEYREG procedure uses the Taylor Expansion Method to estimate sampling errors in complex designs. This method obtains a linear approximation for the estimator and then uses the variance estimate for this approximation to estimate the variance of the estimate itself. When there are clusters in the sample design, the procedure estimates the differences in the variation among the clusters. For a multistage design such as this, the variance estimation depends only on the first stage stratum (the eight strata of counties).

Analysis

Using the procedures discussed in the previous sections, estimates of usage rates were computed along with estimates of the standard errors. The Colorado survey was designed to produce an overall State estimate and estimates for the three regions: 1) Eastern Plains Region, 2) Front Range, and 3) Western Slope Region (refer to Table 2). The overall State estimate of seat belt usage rate in Colorado for 2010 is 82.9 percent. This estimate may vary by 0.8 percent due to sampling error, as not all roads were observed. A 95 percent confidence interval of the estimated usage establishes a range from 81.2 to 84.6 percent usage.

The usage rate for the Eastern Plains Region was 79.8 percent, the Front Range was 83.9 percent and the Western Slope Region was 81.7 percent. Notice that the sampling error was 4.6 percent in the Eastern Plains Region and 1.1 percent and 1.5 percent for the Front Range and the Western Slope Region, respectively. This indicates a greater degree of variability in the usage rate in the Eastern Plains Region versus the other two regions.

APPENDIX 4: Field Work

This section identifies the observation sites and provides maps showing the exact location of each site as well as the traffic direction to be observed.

Site Description Sheets

The description for an observation location gives the intersection at or near where the observation is to be conducted. An example of a description sheet is shown in Figure 2. The first road named indicates the road segment of interest, that is, the road on which seat belt usage will be observed. The second road named is the intersecting road which marks the end of the segment. For example, in the description of site E112, seat belt usage is to be observed in vehicles traveling on State Highway 96 at the intersection with County Road 27. Figure 3 explains abbreviations used in the county site descriptor tables.

Figure 2: County Site Descriptor Example


KIOWA COUNTY		
VOL	ROAD ID	DESCRIPTION
L	E112	SH 96 at CO RD 27
L	E113	SH 96 at Rush Creek
L	E114	SH 96 at Enter Sheridan Lake
L	E115	SH 96 at Jct SH 385 (Colorado Ave)
L	E116	SH 96 at CO RD 78.5 (Towner)
L	E117	SH 287 at Kiowa Cty Rd A
L	E118	SH 287 at Ramp On Jct SH 96
L	E119	SH 287 at Maine St
L	E120	SH 287 at JCT SH 96 (Wansted St)
L	E121	SH 28 at Rush Creek
L	E122	SH 385 at Prowers Cty Rd W
L	E205	11 th St at Kerr St
L	E206	Wansted St at 10th St
L	E207	14 th St at Kerr St
L	E208	Lowell Ave at Maine St

Figure 3: Major Road Descriptor Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
CL	City Limits
CO or Cty	County
Jct	Junction
STR	Structure, (i.e., bridge, overpass or underpass)
SH	State Highway
(D-16-C)	Parenthesis containing this similar sequence refers to the points of reference on the Colorado State Map.
IR	Indian Reserve
NF	National Forest
RRF	Railroad Crossing
SH 2 NE RD SE	The RD SE indicates there is an intersecting road other than the first one listed (SH 2 NE). The name of the second intersecting road is usually given in parenthesis at the end of the description.

The direction of the traffic is not explicitly specified in the description, but it is indicated on the map by the direction of the arrow marking the intersection. Referring to Figure 4, a road segment is the segment of road between two intersecting streets. Seat belt usage will be observed for eligible vehicles on 12th Street and the observer will stand at the corner of 12th and Slater Street. The arrows indicate both the side of the road on which the observer is to stand and the direction of the traffic to be observed. Standing at this point enables the observer to record or count seat belt usage in vehicles coming from inside the segment at or near the point where the vehicles are leaving that segment.

Figure 4: Direction of Observation



Maps for Major Roads

Major roads are identified on county level maps. Each map displays a sample county. As shown in Figure 5, each site on the map is identified with an arrow and a site number. The arrow indicates the traffic direction to be observed. The site number is a four-digit identifier that ties the observation points to the region and site description. The first character of the site number identifies the region (Front, Western, and Eastern) and the other three characters are assigned sequentially within a road type. Major roads are assigned sequence numbers from 101 to 199.





Figure 5: Map for Major Roads

Census Tract Maps for Local Roads

As indicated earlier, local roads were sampled within sample Census Tracts (CTs) and Enumeration Districts (EDs). On each map the tract or ED is highlighted in yellow. The arrow again indicates the traffic direction to be observed. Sites on local roads were assigned a sequential number from 201 to 299 within the region. A typical census tract map is shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Map for Local Roads



Observation Schedule Sheet

Based on the number of observations in an assigned county, a schedule was prepared that indicates the day, time and site number of observation assignments (see Figure 7). Substitutions – observing traffic on a different road than that specified – were not acceptable as sites were selected and assigned to days of the week and times of the day by probability methods (see notes below).

Figure 7: Observation Schedule Sheet Example

Observer Name: <u>Michael Smith</u> Observer Code: <u>12</u> County Name: <u>Kiowa</u>									
County Code: <u>45</u>									
	8:00 am -	9:00 am -	10:00 am -	11:00 am -	12:00 am -	1:00 pm -	2:00 pm -	3:00 pm -	4:00 pm -
Date	8:40 am	9:40 am	10:40 am	11:40 am	12:40 pm	1:40 pm	2:40 pm	3:40 pm	4:40 pm
8 / 8 / 00	E113	E119	E210	E116	E211	LUNCH	E122	E115	E117
8 / 9 / 00	E212	E114	E118	E112	LUNCH	E121	E209	E120	
/ /									
/ /									
/ /									
/ /									
/ /									
Remarks: _____									

NOTES:									
1. This schedule is designed to allow for the required 40 minutes of observation at each site and 20 minutes for paperwork and travel to the next site.									
2. All high volume sites should be scheduled on the same day. A supervisor or high volume assistant will be assigned to work with you.									
3. If for a given road it is not possible to observe at the intersection indicated on the Site Description Sheet — because of construction or because it is not safe — you may conduct the observation at a nearby location on that road. Please indicate exceptions on the back of the Traffic Recording Sheet with a brief explanation. Make corrections to street names, milepost markers, etc. on the Site Description Lists.									
4. If on a one-way street the direction indicated by the arrow contradicts the traffic flow, ignore the direction specified by the arrow.									

Instructions for Conducting the Observations for Seat Belt Usage

The Traffic Recording Sheet shown in Figure 8 will be used to record total counts of drivers and outboard front seat passengers using and not using shoulder belts.

Vehicle Eligibility

In counting belted and unbelted drivers and outboard front seat passengers, please follow the eligibility rules specified below:

- Eligible vehicles include private automobiles, vans, SUVs, and trucks; exclude buses, commercial trailers, police vehicles, ambulances, postal delivery vehicles, and all other delivery vehicles.
- Belt usage will be observed for front-seat occupants only.
- If there is more than one front seat passenger observe only the "outside" passenger, and if a child in a child restraint seat is present in the front seat, do not record anything. However, children riding in the front seat, regardless of age, who are not in child restraint seats, should be observed as any other front-seat passenger.

Procedures

The following procedures will be used in conducting observations of seat belt use at high volume sites:

- If a vehicle is equipped with shoulder belts and the person has the belt buckled but has the shoulder strap under his/her arm, this person is not considered to be wearing a shoulder belt.
- If a vehicle is so old that it is not equipped with shoulder straps it should not be included as an "eligible" vehicle in the survey.
- Determine how many lanes of traffic in the assigned direction you can observe. Observe traffic only on these lanes throughout the observation time period. If you can observe only one lane, designate the lane closest to you as the observation lane.
- For safety reasons, you should observe belt use on interstates from an exit ramp or overpass.
- In most situations it should be possible to observe every vehicle in the designated lane. However, if traffic is moving too fast to observe every vehicle, you should determine which vehicle can be observed, i.e. every second car, every third car, etc. This pattern must be followed for the entire observation period and noted in the comments section of the form.
- At the end of the observation period record the number of persons observed using shoulder belts and the number observed not using shoulder belts on the Traffic Summary Sheet. If no eligible vehicles were observed during the 40-minute observation time period, record zero for "using" and zero for "not using shoulder belt." Also record zero for the speed but record the other information specific to that observation site and time period.

Seat belt Usage Field Survey Form Information

Use the Seat Belt Usage Field Survey Form (see Figure 8) at observation sites where speeds are low enough (<45 mph) to record seat belt usage.

Figure 9 provides instructions on how to properly use the Field Survey Form.

Figure 8: Seat Belt Usage Field Survey Form Example

1

2

Page _____ of _____

Colorado Seat Belt Usage - Field Usage Form

SITE INFORMATION				Site Number: 3				Observer: 4								
Site Location: 5				Date (Month/Day) 6												
Day of Week M T W R F S N 7				Weather		Speed		Start Time		End Time						
				1 = Clear 2 = Rain 3 = Snow 4 = Fog 8		1 = 0-30 MPH 2 = 31-50 MPH 3 = >50 MPH 9		10 a.m.		11 a.m.						
								p.m.		p.m.						
12	CARS				VANS				SUVs				Light Trucks			
	Driver		Passenger		Driver		Passenger		Driver		Passenger		Driver		Passenger	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
OBS #																
1																
2																
19																
20																
TOTAL THIS PAGE	13															
TOTAL THIS PAGE	14															

Figure 9: Seat Belt Usage Field Survey Form Instructions

Item #	Item Description
1	Page _____ : Enter the page number of the sheet you are completing for the current observation site.
2	of _____ : Enter the total number the sheets used for the current site after observation is complete.
3	Site Number : Transfer the site number from your survey schedule sheet and indicate the direction of the traffic you are observing. N = north E = east S = south W = west (i.e. if the traffic is coming from the east you would mark an “E” in the Site Number cell adjacent to the specific site number)
4	Observer Name : Enter your last name.
5	Site Location : Enter the site description from the Site Description Sheet.
6	Date : The date the observation is being conducted using MM/DD (i.e., on August 7th you would enter 08/07).
7	Day of Week : Circle the letter that indicates what day of the week you are making the observation (R = Thursday and N = Sunday).
8	Weather : Circle the number that best indicates the weather conditions during the observation period.
9	Speed : Circle the number that best indicates approximate average speed you think the vehicles along this road are traveling. DO NOT record the speed limit since this can be obtained from other sources. In recording speed for an interstate you should record the speed of vehicles on the interstate not that of vehicles on the exit ramp.
10	Start Time : Record the time you begin the observation. Follow the format HH:MM. Do not use military time (i.e., 2:00 pm is recorded as 2:00 pm versus 1400 hrs). Circle either a.m. or p.m.
11	End Time : Record the time you begin the observation. Follow the format HH:MM. Do not use military time (i.e., 2:00 pm is recorded as 2:00 pm versus 1400 hrs). Circle either a.m. or p.m.
12	OBS# : (Observation Number) Each vehicle observed will be documented on a separate line. a. Determine if the observed vehicle is a car, van, SUV or light truck. b. Place a mark in the column indicating whether the driver is (YES) or is not (NO) using a shoulder belt. c. Place a mark in the column indicating whether the passenger is (YES) or is not (NO) using a shoulder belt. If there is no passenger leave these columns blank.
13	Total this Page : At the conclusion of the observation, total each column on the survey form
14	Total this Site : Place the overall column totals for all sheets at the bottom of page 1 for each site.
15	Summary : Record the site information and seat belt usage totals on the traffic recording sheet.

Traffic Summary Sheet Information

The Traffic Summary Sheet (Figure 10) summarizes observations for an entire day. However, if you work in more than one county on a given day, a separate recording sheet for each county is required. Use this form to record results from high volume sites. Also transfer site totals from Field Survey Forms to this form. Step-by-step instructions for completing the form are provided in Figure 11.

Figure 10: Colorado Seat Belt Usage - Traffic Summary Sheet Example

Colorado Seat belt Usage — Traffic Summary Sheet 2005

WCG Use		County 1 e:				County Code: 2		OBSERVATION SUMMARY							
Observer Name: 3						Code: 4		CAR		TRUCK		VAN		SUV	
Date (MM/DD)	# Lanes Avail	Site Number	Weather (1,2,3,4)	Speed (1,2,3)	Time Began	Road Name	Intersecting Street	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	# Observed														
1. /	6 7	8	9	10	11 a.m. p.m.	12	13	14	15	14	15	14	15	14	15
2. /					a.m. p.m.			D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P
6. /					a.m. p.m.			D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P
7. /					a.m. p.m.			D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P
8. /					a.m. p.m.			D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P	D P

Date: Record date as MM/DD
e.g. Nov. 17 = 11/17

Weather Condition Codes:
1 = Clear 2 = Rain 3 = Snow
4 = Fog

Speed Codes:
1 = 0-30 MPH 2 = 31-50 MPH
3 = >50 MPH

Time: Record time using 12-hour clock,
DO NOT use 24-hour clock
e.g. 2 PM = 2:00 PM, NOT 14:00

Please place any comments on the back of this form. Traffic-Recording-Sheet-2005.doc (6/01)

16

Figure 11: Colorado Seat Belt Usage - Traffic Summary Sheet Instructions

Item #	Item Description
1	County Name: Enter the county name (from the description sheet). Remember that all results recorded on a given sheet should relate to the same county
2	County Code: Enter the county code (from the description sheet). Remember that all results recorded on a given sheet should relate to the same county
3	Observer Name: Enter your last name.
4	Observer Code: Enter your assigned observer code. The code is located on your survey schedule sheet in parenthesis next to your name.
5	Date: The date the observation is being conducted using MM/DD (i.e., on August 7th = 08/07).
6	# of Lanes: Record the total number of lanes with traffic traveling in the direction you are observing.
7	# Observed: Enter the total number of lanes observed at this observation site. Note that this number must be smaller or equal to the number of lanes with traffic traveling in the direction you are observing. In most cases this entry will be one (1) lane.
8	Site Number: Transfer the site number from your survey schedule sheet.
9	Weather Conditions: Record the weather conditions during the observation period using the codes shown at the bottom of the sheet. You may enter different weather conditions on the same sheet if the weather changes between observation periods.
10	Road Speed: Record the appropriate code, shown at the bottom of the sheet, to indicate approximate average speed you think the vehicles along this road are traveling. DO NOT record the speed limit since this can be obtained from other sources. In recording speed for an interstate you should record the speed of vehicles on the interstate not that of vehicles on the exit ramp.
11	Time Began: Record the time you begin the observation. Follow the format HH:MM. Do not use military time (i.e., 2:00 pm is recorded as 2:00 pm versus 1400 hrs). Circle either a.m. or p.m.
12	Road Name: Record the name of the road or street on which you are observing belt use (from the site descriptor sheet).
13	Intersecting Street Name: Record the name of the intersecting street,(from the site descriptor sheet).
14	Observation Summary – Car – Van – SUV – Truck - Yes: Record the number from the field usage form on which you have been recording car occupants using a shoulder belt.
15	Observation Summary – Car – Van – SUV – Truck - No: Record the number for truck occupants NOT using a shoulder belt.
16	Remarks: Should be included on the back of the form (i.e., reason for changing an observation location due to construction, incorrect site description, etc.).

APPENDIX 5: Weighting and Analyses

This section discusses weighting, estimation, and analyses. As described in the previous sections, the sample design for the Colorado Seat Belt Usage Survey is a probability sample of counties, tracts, and road segments. With probability sampling, the weight associated with a particular observation is the reciprocal of its probability of selection. Details on weighting are discussed below.

The estimate of interest from the Colorado Survey is the estimate of seat belt usage for all drivers and front-seat occupants of vans, sport utility vehicles (SUVs), and light trucks.

Weighting

The sample design for the Colorado Seat Belt Usage Survey is a probability sample of counties, tracts and road segments. With probability sampling, the weight associated with a particular observation (site) is the reciprocal of its probability of selection.

The base weight associated with an observed road segment for the Colorado survey is the inverse of its probability of selection. The expression for the probability of selection of a road segment on major roads is similar to that for local roads, except that the latter includes an additional component, the census tract selection probability.

Major roads were selected with probability proportional to their average daily VMT within sample counties. Local roads were first selected by tracts within sample county and then by roads within the sample tracts. All local roads within a sample tract were listed and a subsample was selected with equal probability within the tract.

Let

h --- identify a sample county;

i --- identify a sample census tract (when applicable);

j --- identify a sample road or road segment;

P_h = probability of selecting the county h

$P_{i|h}$ = within-county probability of selecting tract i (when applicable; 1 otherwise)

$P_{j|hi}$ = Probability of selecting road or road segment j, conditioned on the tract and county.

The overall probability of selecting road segment j in county h is given by

$$P_{hij} = P_h \cdot P_{i|h} \cdot P_{j|hi}$$

Hence, the corresponding base weight, W_{hij} , is given by

$$W_{hij} = 1/P_{hij}$$

Weights for the Colorado State Seat Belt Usage Observational Survey

County	Weight	Probability (P_{hij})
Adams	1.41856	0.70494
Arapahoe	1.8	0.55556
Boulder	1.86983	0.53481
Clear Creek	3	0.33333
Denver	1	1
Douglas	2.02257	0.49442
Eagle	2.9	0.34483
El Paso	1	1
Garfield	4.5	0.22222
Gunnison	4.3	0.23256
Huerfano	4.733890	0.21124
Jefferson	1	1
Kit Carson	2.53	0.40
Larimer	1.75	0.57143
Lincoln	8.75	0.11429
Logan	3.95	0.25316
Mesa	3.75	0.26667
Montezuma	3.5	0.28571
Montrose	2.33	0.43
Morgan	5.23	0.19
Pueblo	2	0.5
Routt	5.2	0.19231
Sedgwick	6.67556	0.1498
Summit	3.28605	0.30432
Weld	1.63913	0.61008

Estimation

The basic estimate from the Colorado survey is the estimate of seat belt usage for all drivers and outboard front seat passengers of cars, vans, sport utility vehicles (SUVs), and light trucks. This estimate is the rate of observed front seat occupants (driver and passenger) who are using seat belts in eligible vehicles in the State of Colorado.

The Seat Belt Usage Rate for Colorado in 2010 was determined by using a survey sampling methodology to obtain information about a large population of Colorado, adult vehicle drivers (16 years old or older), by selecting and measuring a sample for that population. By applying scientific probability-based designs to select the sample, the risk of a distorted view of the population is reduced and statistically valid inferences can be made from the sample. The preceding sections explained the procedures that CSU/ITM used to select a probability-based sample from the study population.

Analyses

The fundamental basis for the analyses of this survey lies in the concept of Cluster Analysis. Cluster Analysis is a loose collection of statistical methods that can be used to assign cases to groups (clusters). Group members will share certain properties in common and it is hoped that the resultant classification will provide some insight into the research topic. The classification has the effect of reducing the dimensionality of the data by reducing the number of cases. In the Seat Belt Study, the cases referred to above are the vehicles that were observed and the classification in clusters is the grouped counties which were surveyed.

The SAS System was employed to reduce the observed data into usable information. SAS is the most widely used statistical for analysis of survey data. While several SAS procedures are used in the estimation of the seat belt usage, the primary proc used is SURVEYREG. The SURVEYREG procedure performs regression analysis for sample survey data such as the seat belt usage data. The current seat belt study, as with the past years' statistical design, includes stratification, clustering and unequal weighting of county and region data. SURVEYREG is ideal for this application. The procedure can take the stratified, regional data and provide interval estimates (95% Confidence Intervals for this experiment) and can compute predicted seat belt usage from the sample seat belt survey data.