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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, the number of motorcyclist fatalities has risen 123 percent, from 2,161 in 1996 to 4,810 in 2006 (NHTSA, 2006). Since the increase in deaths and injuries was first noted in the late 1990s, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has taken a variety of steps aimed at promoting motorcycle safety and understanding the factors that contribute to motorcycle crashes. One key effort initiated by NHTSA is the State Motorcycle Safety Program Technical Assessments (“State Assessments”), which provide comprehensive reviews of State motorcycle safety programs and practices. During the assessments, reviewers examine the policies States have implemented to promote motorcycle safety and offer recommendations for additional steps States may take to encourage safe riding and reduce crashes, injuries, and fatalities.

This report reviews the implementation and barriers to implementation of the nine State Assessments completed by NHTSA at least one year before the start of this project. The nine States surveyed were the following:

1. Florida
2. Hawaii
3. Illinois
4. Michigan
5. Minnesota
6. Missouri
7. Washington
8. West Virginia
9. Wisconsin

Drawing on information collected from follow-up surveys administered to motorcycle safety officials in these States in late 2007 and early 2008, the report addresses the following questions:

- What were the most frequent kinds of recommendations made as part of the State assessments?
- Which types of recommendations were most frequently implemented by the States?
- What is the impact of those recommendations that were implemented according to the States?
- What kinds of recommendations were least likely to be implemented by the States?
- What are the reasons why certain recommendations were not implemented?

The responses from the nine States are valuable for two primary reasons. First, they provide some measure of the impact that the recommendations have had on increasing motorcycle safety in the States. A full impact evaluation would more broadly examine the relationship between the recommendations and State motorcycle safety, but the reports from the

---

States are one important source for gauging how the recommendations implemented by the States have impacted motorcyclist safety.

Second, the results from the review of State Assessments can be used to inform future assessments conducted for other States. By examining both the recommendations that have been implemented as well as those that have not, NHTSA will be better able to understand the factors that contribute to implementation. Certainly, circumstances unique to each State – such as the amount of resources available for motorcycle safety programs – influence whether States are able to act upon selected recommendations. By looking at responses to why States implemented certain recommendations over others, however, NHTSA will gain an appreciation of the types of recommendations that States found more challenging to enact. This information can be applied during subsequent reviews of other State programs, enhancing the utility of the State Assessments.

Of primary interest for the study were outcomes associated with specific recommendations drawn from the Uniform Guidelines for State Highway Safety Programs. Section 3 of the Uniform Guidelines outlines a series of recommendations for States aimed at increasing motorcycle safety. Reviewers who conducted the State Assessments used the Uniform Guidelines as a framework for their evaluations, as well as the recommendations outlined in the National Agenda for Motorcycle Safety (NAMS). Released in 2000, NAMS identifies a range of factors related to motorcycle safety and provides a blueprint for reducing motorcyclist injuries and fatalities.

The section below describes the procedures for collecting data from the selected States regarding their efforts to implement the recommendations described in their State Assessments and the analyses conducted on these data.

Study Design and Methodology

Data Collection

The first step in conducting the review of State Assessments was the identification of States for inclusion in the study. Assessments were conducted in nine States at least one year before the start of this study, allowing sufficient time to have passed for a meaningful follow-up. After identifying the States, NHTSA forwarded the completed State Assessment reports for each State to project staff at the American Institutes for Research (AIR). AIR staff reviewed each of the nine reports and assigned the recommendations to one of seven main topic areas informed by the Uniform Guidelines and NAMS:

1. Program Management
2. Personal Protective Equipment
3. Operator Licensing
4. Rider Education and Training
5. Operation Under the Influence of Alcohol or Other Drugs

---

Each recommendation for a State was assigned to the appropriate topic area and then listed by topic in the survey instrument created for a State. Because the recommendations from the State Assessments were unique to each State, nine surveys were developed.

NHTSA also supplied the list of traffic safety administrators in each State designated to complete the survey. For each recommendation listed in the survey, State officials were asked to answer a series of questions about the implementation of the recommendation. Figure 1.1 shows the questions asked for each recommendation.

**Figure 1.1 Survey format**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Was this recommendation implemented? Select only one answer</th>
<th>If NO, why was this recommendation not implemented? Select one or more answer(s)</th>
<th>If YES, what steps were taken to implement this recommendation?</th>
<th>What impact (if any) has this recommendation had on motorcycle safety in your State?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Recommendation here]</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know ☐ Other (please specify):</td>
<td>☐ Recommendation was never reviewed/considered ☐ Insufficient funding/resources ☐ Time constraints/competing commitments ☐ Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation ☐ Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted in Figure 1.1, survey respondents were encouraged to describe the reasons why certain recommendations were adopted or not adopted. The close-ended options for the question about why certain recommendations were not adopted were selected through consultation with NHTSA staff and two motorcycle safety administrators in States not included in the survey. State officials were asked to select one or more of the following reasons for why certain recommendations were not implemented:

- Recommendation was never reviewed/considered;
- Insufficient funding/resources;
- Time constraints/competing commitments;
- Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation; and
- Other.

These options, referred to as “barriers to implementation” throughout this report, reflect common reasons why States may not implement recommendations. The “Other” option allowed for respondents to identify additional reasons.

Each State official received a copy of the respective survey for their State as well as a cover letter from NHTSA explaining the purpose and significance of the study. Respondents were asked to return their completed surveys via mail, electronically, or fax to project staff at AIR by January 31, 2008. All States returned their surveys before the deadline. AIR staff followed up with selected respondents to clarify answers to selected questions and to request additional information as needed.

**Analyses**

All surveys returned by States were entered into a database for analysis. For each of the seven main topic areas of motorcycle safety, AIR staff reviewed the specific recommendations made as part of the nine State assessments and classified the recommendations into subtopics. Subtopics were used in order to aggregate the specific recommendations made to States into broader categories that capture the focal suggestions made by reviewers. Unique subtopics were developed for each of the main topic areas reflecting the particular recommendations made for different aspects of motorcycle safety.

Following the creation of the subtopics, measures of *implementation* and *barriers to implementation* of the recommendations suggested to States were calculated. For implementation, the percentage of recommendations implemented was calculated by subtopic for each of the seven main topic areas. The tables presented in the following chapters show the percentage of all recommendations associated with each subtopic as well as the percentage of recommendations within a subtopic that were implemented.

The barriers preventing implementation of recommendations were examined in two ways. First, in order to gauge which barriers were more prominent than others, the frequency with which State administrators identified barriers to implementation within the seven main topics areas was calculated. Second, the distribution of barriers by subtopics was computed. The analysis of barriers by subtopics reveals which types of recommendations were least likely to be implemented by States.
Summary of Results

The chapters of this report examine the implementation of recommendations and barriers to implementation by each of the seven main topic areas of motorcycle safety. The analyses below summarize the recommendations made and implemented across the main topic areas, identifying the most frequent types of recommendations made as part of the State assessments. In addition to exploring the frequency of recommendations, the distribution of barriers to implementation across the main topic areas is also presented.

Summary of Recommendations Made and Implemented

Table 1.1 summarizes the number and percentage of recommendations made and implemented across the nine State assessments. Reviewers made a total of 396 recommendations, of which 222 were implemented (56%). The highest frequency of recommendations was made in the area of Rider Education and Training (88 recommendations, or 22% of all recommendations). Following this area, most recommendations made were related to Program Management (83 recommendations, or 21% of all recommendations). The fewest recommendations were in the Conspicuity (6%) and Protective Equipment (8%) categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Total Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Total Recommendations Implemented</th>
<th>Percentage Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Equipment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Licensing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider Education and Training</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Under the Influence</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicuity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information and Education</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Recommendations</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage of recommendations implemented was in the Public Information and Education category (64%). The category with the lowest frequency of recommendations put into practice was Operator Licensing (36%).

Summary of Barriers to Implementation

Table 1.2 summarizes the barriers that prevented the implementation of recommendations within the States. The most frequent barrier to implementation was that the Recommendation
Was Never Reviewed/Considered (25%), followed by Time Constraints/Competing Commitments (22%).

Table 1.2  Summary of barriers to implementation, by classification of barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Total Barriers to Implementation</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organization of the Report

The results from the review of State Assessments are organized into seven chapters, one for each of the main topic areas. Each chapter is comprised of three sections. The first section identifies the subtopics associated with the recommendations made as part of the State assessments and provides an overview of the recommendations captured by each subtopic. The second section examines the percentage of recommendations that were implemented within each subtopic and offers examples of key accomplishments associated with the subtopics. Finally, the third section explores the barriers to the implementation of recommendations, analyzing the frequency with which certain barriers prevented the implementation of recommendations and the distribution of barriers by subtopics.
CHAPTER 2: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Recommendations Related to Program Management

The Program Management category captures characteristics of the administrative organization of a State’s motorcycle safety program and the means by which activities and program initiatives are implemented.

Reviewers made 83 recommendations in the area of Program Management. These recommendations were organized into the following 10 subtopics summarized in Table 2.1 and described in detail below.

Table 2.1  Number of recommendations made in Program Management, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrative Reorganization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comprehensive Strategic Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conduct Research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establish/Increase Funding and/or Resources</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Full-time Coordinator Position</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meet Training Demand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prepare Summary Reports</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Program Evaluation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Reorganization

Reviewers made nine recommendations related to an administrative reorganization of a State’s motorcycle safety program. These recommendations involved integrating functions across different offices in order to streamline the delivery of information and training and changing or enhancing organizational roles and responsibilities in order to meet program goals. Specific examples of recommendations for Administrative Reorganization included:

- Integrate motorcycle safety activities into other crash and injury control safety programs and projects supported by the State.
- Merge rider education, training, and licensing functions to form one-stop operations by waiving skills and knowledge tests upon successful completion of Motorcycle Rider and Safety Education Program Basic Rider Course or License Waiver Experienced Rider Course.
**Comprehensive Strategic Plan**

Reviewers made 10 recommendations related to the development of a comprehensive strategic plan to guide a State’s motorcycle safety program. Strategic plans serve as a blueprint for program operations over the span of several years and are comprised of milestones that can be measured in order to assess the degree to which program goals have been met. Examples of recommendations related to a comprehensive strategic plan included:

- Develop a comprehensive State motorcycle safety strategic plan that addresses rider training, impaired riding, helmet and protective gear use, unlicensed riders, and motorist awareness.
- A comprehensive strategic plan must be developed for the Motorcycle Safety Education Program with goals, objectives, and projects that are achievable and time-specific. This strategic plan must also address continued funding for the Program.

**Conduct Research**

Reviewers made five recommendations related to conducting research in order to better guide a State’s motorcycle safety activities. States were encouraged to conduct research on motorcycle safety and rider training issues in order to gauge the impact of State programs and to assess areas in need of attention. Research may be conducted specifically on program management or on documenting the relationship between crashes and characteristics of riders (e.g., previous traffic violations). Examples of proposed research projects included:

- Initiate a study to link student training records to driver history files to determine the effects of rider training on traffic violations and crash involvement.
- Study the staffing needs of the motorcycle safety effort and make adjustments based on the results of the study.

**Cooperation With Other Organizations**

Reviewers made six recommendations related to increasing cooperation with other organizations on issues of motorcycle safety. Under this subtopic, reviewers suggested that States work with other organizations, both public and private, to disseminate information about motorcycle safety and rider training opportunities. Specific examples of these recommendations included:

- Expand the State Department of Transportation and Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles network to encourage the exchange of information with other State agencies, local organizations, and course sponsors.
- Modify the current State Motorcycle Safety Advisory Committee membership policy to include representatives of the motoring public in order to make the committee a truly comprehensive resource for the State Motorcycle Safety Program.
**Data Collection and Analysis**

Reviewers made 11 recommendations related to data collection and analysis activities aimed at strengthening motorcycle safety within a State. These recommendations focused on measuring a variety of outcomes associated with motorcycle safety such as linking crash data with other information about riders (e.g., completion of rider training, vehicle registration records) in order to construct a more complete picture of the factors related to motorcycle crashes. Examples of data collection and analysis activities included:

- A computerized database should be created to link the training, crash, licensing, vehicle registration, and hospital files so that research may be completed.
- Work with other State agencies to develop a system that collects motorcycle safety data and allows easy access and linking of this data.

**Establish/Increase Funding and/or Resources**

Reviewers made 13 recommendations related to establishing or increasing funding for motorcycle safety efforts. These recommendations focused on securing a steady revenue source from one year to the next in order to sustain program activities over time and ensure that they consistently reach the public. Examples of recommendations in this subtopic included:

- Establish a funding process that can adequately and consistently support a comprehensive motorcycle safety program.
- Establish a fixed percentage of annual funding for public information and education relating to motorcycle safety issues.

**Full-time Coordinator Position**

Reviewers made five recommendations related to a full-time coordinator position for motorcycle safety within selected States. This recommendation was designed to provide greater leadership and oversight for motorcycle safety and included the following example: Fund a full-time coordinator position to: (1) oversee all aspects of the motorcycle safety program, (2) provide vision for program expansion, (3) serve as the key motorcycle safety contact for the State, and (4) represent motorcycle interests in the development of the State's comprehensive highway safety plan.

**Meet Training Demand**

Reviewers made three recommendations related to meeting the demand for rider training opportunities. These recommendations focused on changes that could be made to the administrative structure of a State’s motorcycle safety program in order to expand training opportunities. Examples of these recommendations included:

- Increase the number of private enterprise sponsors and establish a maximum amount they can charge each student for rider training.
- Explore ways to attract additional motorcycle safety program providers to help handle anticipated increases in the demand for training courses and reduce the number of potential students who are on waiting lists.
**Prepare Summary Reports**

Reviewers made six recommendations related to the preparation of summary reports detailing various outcomes associated with motorcycle safety as well as the accomplishments of the safety program. Reviewers suggested that these reports discuss the allocation of program resources, the impact of program activities on improving motorcycle safety, and list accomplishments in key areas of interest identified by the program. Examples of these recommendations included:

- Establish and publicize motorcycle-relevant rates using registered motorcycles, licensed operators, motorcycle crashes as a percentage of all crashes, etc., to establish baselines for analyzing improvements in motorcycle crash reduction efforts in the absence of Vehicle Miles Traveled for motorcycles.
- Publish an annual report that includes an analysis of spending and a detail of the accomplishments in designated priority areas.

**Program Evaluation**

Reviewers made 15 recommendations related to conducting program evaluations of the motorcycle safety program. States were encouraged to conduct both internal evaluations as well as evaluations of third party sponsors and other contractors who deliver training and services. Specific examples included:

- Implement a comprehensive annual evaluation that: (1) identifies accomplishments, (2) evaluates the effectiveness of services provided, (3) includes financial audits of program contractors, and (4) includes an annual report of the evaluation findings that recommends actions for further improvement.
- Develop an evaluation process for yearly comprehensive program review. This must include financial audits of the program contractor.

**Implementation of Program Management Recommendations**

State administrators reported that 46 of the 83 recommendations under Program Management were implemented (55%). Of the 10 subtopics of Program Management, most recommendations concerned Conducting Program Evaluations (18%), followed by the Establishment/Increase of Funding and/or Resources (16%). As noted in Table 2.2, the recommendations in these two subtopics accounted for approximately one-third of all Program Management recommendations.
Table 2.2  Percentage of recommendations made and implemented, by subtopic of Program Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Percentage of Recommendations Implemented Within Suptopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/Increase Funding and/or Resources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Strategic Plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Reorganization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Summary Reports</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Coordinator Position</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Training Demand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States implemented an average of 54 percent of the recommendations within subtopics, including two-thirds of the recommendations made in the Cooperation With Other Organizations, Meet Training Demand, and Program Evaluation subtopics. The fewest recommendations implemented were in the Administrative Reorganization and Prepare Summary Reports subtopics (33% for each subtopic).

Table 2.3 provides examples of some of the key accomplishments associated with the subtopics of Program Management. These accomplishments range from activities focused on administrative reorganization, such as the requirement that the State coordinator receive training certification, to steps taken to secure additional program funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrative Reorganization                | • Formed Motorcycle Task Force  
• Required RiderCoach Trainer certification for State coordinator  
• Implemented online class scheduling, registration, and information  
• Hired technical specialists to assist with rider education |
| Comprehensive Strategic Plan                 | • Completed Motorcycle Safety Program Policies and Procedures manual  
• Developed motorcycle safety strategic plan  
• Developed Action Plan for rider training with long- and short-term goals |
| Conduct Research                             | • Working with law enforcement to study motorcycle crash causation  
• Sponsored observational study of motorcycle helmet use |
| Cooperation With Other Organizations         | • Established formal relationship with Rider’s Edge training programs |
| Data Collection and Analysis                 | • Established data links between training, licensing, crash, and vehicle registrant data  
• Introduced data system that links crash data, location, and criminal records  
• Required State sponsors to record data in a spreadsheet returned to the program office  
• Introduced scanned student evaluation forms |
| Establish/Increase Funding and/or Resources   | • Increased appropriations for rider training program  
• Implemented $1 surcharge on all criminal offenses involving county ordinances or violations of traffic laws to help fund motorcycle training program  
• Increased legislative funding and raised student fees  
• Re-established motorcycle safety program with funding from motorcycle registrations  
• Purchased additional training motorcycles and sponsored media campaign for motorcycle awareness |
| Full-Time Coordinator Position               | • Appointed full-time coordinator  
• Hired full-time motorcycle safety director |
| Meet Training Demand                         | • Increased the number of private rider training sponsors |
| Prepare Summary Reports                       | • Publish annual internal report analyzing program spending |
| Program Evaluation                           | • Required annual audits of program sponsors, including random on-site audits  
• Conducting yearly audits of vendors  
• Introduced formal process for evaluating the effectiveness of the rider training program  
• Developed comprehensive evaluation process that included survey of rider attitudes and behaviors, student evaluations, and review of crash data |
Barriers to Implementation

As indicated in Table 2.4, State administrators reported that the greatest barrier to the implementation of Program Management recommendations were Time Constraints/Competing Commitments (32% of all barriers). Following this barrier, the second greatest obstacle to the implementation of recommendations were Concerns About Feasibility and/or Implementation (19%).

Table 2.4  Percentage of barriers to Program Management, by classification of barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5 summarizes the barriers to implementation by each subtopic of Program Management. Of the recommendations not implemented, most (16%) were related to Administrative Reorganization. When combined together, the subtopics of Administrative Reorganization, Data Collection and Analysis, Establish/Increase Funding and/or Resources, and Program Evaluations represented nearly 60 percent of all barriers. The fewest barriers to implementation were associated with the Meet Training Demand subtopic (3% of all barriers).

Table 2.5  Barriers to implementation of Program Management recommendations, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Reorganization</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/Increase Funding and/or Resources</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Strategic Plan</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Summary Reports</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Coordinator Position</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Training Demand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3: PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

Recommendations Related to Protective Equipment

The Protective Equipment category captures efforts made by State motorcycle safety programs to promote the use of proper protective gear by motorcyclists.

Reviewers made 33 recommendations in the area of Protective Equipment. These recommendations were organized into the following six subtopics summarized in Table 3.1 and described in detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conduct Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enact/Maintain Helmet Law</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public Outreach</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Standards/Legislation for Eye Protection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training/Technical Assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conduct Research**

Reviewers made three recommendations related to conducting research on protective equipment for motorcyclists. All recommendations under this subtopic suggested annual observational studies as the most effective means of measuring the degree to which riders used protective gear. A typical example of a recommendation for conducting research would be to design and conduct annual observational surveys to determine use of helmets and other protective gear.

**Cooperation With Other Organizations**

Reviewers made five recommendations related to cooperation with other organizations on issues concerning protective equipment. Reviewers emphasized the importance of linking efforts to promote the use of protective gear across a variety of organizations, including other State agencies, law enforcement, non-profit groups, and motorcycle dealerships. Specific examples included the following:

- Coordinate statewide efforts between public, private, and nonprofit groups to encourage the use of proper protective gear by motorcyclists; and
- Create task force of representatives from insurance industry, law enforcement, medical professionals, motorcycle dealers and organizations, safety advocates, and other interested entities to explore ways to increase the use of helmets and protective clothing.
**Enact/Maintain Helmet Law**

Reviewers made nine recommendations related to enacting or maintaining mandatory helmet laws within the States assessed. States with helmet laws were encouraged to maintain the legislation; States without such laws were encouraged to work toward making helmet use mandatory for all riders. Examples of these recommendations included continuing to seek support for passage of a helmet law for all motorcycle operators and passengers, and maintaining the current motorcycle helmet use law that covers all riders.

**Public Outreach**

Reviewers made 11 recommendations related to public outreach activities for protective equipment. Suggestions for public outreach included the development of material focused on appropriate protective gear, placing protective equipment messages in publications that would reach riders, and working with other organizations to disseminate messages about protective gear. Specific examples included:

- Provide funding to develop and implement stand-alone public information and educational programs that encourage the use of personal protective equipment by all motorcyclists.
- Continue to encourage the usage of all protective equipment by motorcyclists through ongoing public information and education campaigns.

**Standards/Legislation for Eye Protection**

Recommendations made in two States called for the implementation of standards or legislation for eye protection for riders. An example of this recommendation would be to establish and publish standards for eye protection.

**Training and Technical Assistance**

Reviewers made three recommendations related to training and technical assistance on Protective Equipment for motorcyclists. These recommendations focused on providing law enforcement and court personnel with information about helmet standards and the detection of non-compliant helmet use. Specific examples of these recommendations included:

- Provide training material to all law enforcement agencies to identify noncompliant helmets.
- Provide technical assistance about helmet standards to prosecutors and judges.
Implementation of Protective Equipment Recommendations

State administrators reported that 18 of the 33 recommendations under Protective Equipment were implemented (55%). Of the six subtopics of Protective Equipment, most recommendations concerned Public Outreach (33%), followed by Enacting/Maintaining a Helmet Law (27%). As noted in Table 3.2, the recommendations in these two subtopics accounted for well over half of all Protective Equipment recommendations.

Table 3.2  Percentage of recommendations made and implemented, by subtopics of Protective Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Percentage of Recommendations Implemented Within Subtopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enact/Maintain Helmet Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Technical Assistance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards/Legislation for Eye Protection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States implemented an average of 59 percent of the recommendations within subtopics, including 100 percent of the recommendations made in the Conduct Research and Training/Technical Assistance subtopics. The fewest recommendations implemented were in the Standards/Legislation for Eye Protection and Public Outreach subtopics (0 and 36% respectively).

Table 3.3 provides examples of some of the key accomplishments associated with the subtopics of Protective Equipment. These accomplishments range from conducting research, such as administering an annual observational survey of helmet use, to public outreach efforts, including funding a public information campaign on the importance of protective gear.
Table 3.3  Summary of key accomplishments in Protective Equipment, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research</td>
<td>• Designed and administered observational survey of helmet use and protective gear conducted annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funded study that examined helmet use compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conducted random survey of riders about use of protective equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enact/Maintain Helmet Law</td>
<td>• Distribute helmets to riders without DOT-approved helmets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintained helmet law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>• Funded public information campaign on the importance of protective gear, including posters, billboards, and print materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Included information on motorcycle protective gear on the Department of Transportation Web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distributed brochure emphasizing protective gear and included content on State Web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reprinted brochures and posters emphasizing protective gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Technical Assistance</td>
<td>• Provide information to court officials about proper helmet use and identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provided literature and conducted law enforcement training on identifying noncompliant helmets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of protective gear taught to over 15,000 motorcyclists annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers to Implementation

As indicated in Table 3.4, there was no single barrier to the implementation of recommendations related to Protective Equipment. Instead, a combination of factors (captured under Multiple Reasons) resulted in States’ inability to put recommendations into practice. The Multiple Reasons response accounted for one-third of all barriers to implementation. Beyond Multiple Reasons, State administrators reported that most suggestions from the assessments were not implemented because the Recommendation Was Never Reviewed or Considered (27% of all barriers).

Table 3.4  Percentage of barriers related to Protective Equipment, by classification of barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5 summarizes the barriers to implementation by each subtopic of Protective Equipment. Of all recommendations under Protective Equipment that were not implemented, nearly half (47%) were related to Public Outreach activities. Following Public Outreach, the second highest frequency of recommendations not implemented were associated with the Enact/Maintain Helmet Law subtopic (27% of all recommendations not implemented).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enact/Maintain Helmet Law</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards/Legislation for Eye Protection</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4: OPERATOR LICENSING

Recommendations Related to Operator Licensing

The Operator Licensing category captures the systems employed by States to license motorcyclists as well as the steps taken to encourage unlicensed riders to obtain the appropriate required endorsement for operating a motorcycle.

Reviewers made 50 recommendations in the area of Operator Licensing. These recommendations were organized into the following 10 subtopics summarized in Table 4.1 and described in detail below.

Table 4.1  Number of recommendations made in Operator Licensing, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Examiner Certification</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expand Waivers and Agency Integrations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permit Restrictions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public Outreach</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality Assurance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Revise/Clarify Legal Definition of Motorcycles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strengthen Provisional/Graduated Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Testing Availability</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Testing Standards and Criteria</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Track/Coordinate Applicant Status</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examiner Certification**

Reviewers made three recommendations related to examiner certification. These recommendations called upon States to certify motorcycle licensing examiners using the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrator's Certified Motorcycle Examiner programs. Specific examples of the subtopic included:

- Certify all license examiners through the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrator's Certified Motorcycle Examiner programs.
- All driver license examiners should be trained by a certified examiner trainer to conduct the Alternate Motorcycle Operator Skills Test.
Expand Waivers and Agency Integration

Reviewers made six recommendations related to the expansion of waivers for riders and greater integration between State offices charged with licensing. Under these recommendations, States would waive certain licensing requirements for riders who successfully completed approved rider training programs. Examples of these recommendations included:

- Waive the motorcycle knowledge test for individuals over the age of 18 who have successfully completed the Motorcycle Rider Course.
- Study the feasibility of a motorcycle knowledge test waiver for individuals completing the basic rider course.

Permit Restrictions

Reviewers made 10 recommendations related to permit restrictions for motorcyclists learning to ride. These recommendations were aimed at providing States with greater oversight of novice motorcycle operators by limiting the number of renewals, the number of days for which permits were valid, and tightening the procedures for renewing permits. Specific examples included:

- Limit the number of learner permit renewals to no more than one renewal without testing.
- Limit the number of instructional permits an individual may obtain within a specific time period, for example, one every two years.
- Limit the Temporary Instruction Permit to 90 days, as recommended by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators Motorcycle Operator Licensing System.

Public Outreach

Reviewers made five recommendations related to public outreach efforts for motorcyclist operator licensing. These recommendations focused primarily on media campaigns aimed at getting improperly licensed riders to apply for licensing, making the licensing process more customer friendly, and reminding all motorists of the importance of sharing the road with motorcyclists. Specific examples included:

- Develop communication strategies to encourage unlicensed riders to become licensed or endorsed.
- Include additional information in the State Driver Guide regarding sharing the road with motorcycles.

Quality Assurance

Reviewers made five recommendations related to steps to increase the quality assurance of States’ licensing practices. These recommendations focused on maintaining consistency and fairness in the administration of licensing tests, including the following examples:

- Implement a quality assurance effort to ensure consistency and objectivity in the administration of the Alternate Motorcycle Operator Skill Test.
• Implement a quality assurance effort to ensure consistency and objectivity in the administration of the in-traffic skills test.

**Revise/Clarify Legal Definitions of Motorcycles**

Reviewers made three recommendations related to revising or clarifying the legal definitions of motorcycles for licensing purposes. Examples of these recommendations included the following:

- Clarify the differences in definition, registration and licensing requirements among motor-driven cycles, scooters and mopeds.
- Revise the motorcycle operator license to differentiate between two- and three-wheel motorcycles.

**Strengthen Provisional/Graduated Licensing**

Reviewers made two recommendations related to the provisional or graduated licensing programs for motorcycle operators in certain States. These recommendations encouraged States to refine and strengthen their provisional/graduated licensing programs, and included the following example: Introduce legislation to address motorcyclists with the Graduated Driver's License. Legislation should require the 30-hour classroom driver education component plus successful completion of the Motorcycle Rider Course, and not require 50 hours of parental supervision.

**Testing Availability**

Reviewers made four recommendations related to the availability of testing for motorcycle operators seeking licensing. These recommendations called upon States to make certain that adequate testing was available for riders and, when necessary, to increase the availability of testing. Specific examples of this subtopic included:

- Review the demand for motorcycle testing to ensure that limited availability of testing does not contribute to the problem of unlicensed riders.
- Increase the number of motorcycle license testing locations and examiners.

**Testing Standards and Criteria**

Reviewers made nine recommendations related to the standards and criteria used by States as part of licensing both motorcyclists and automobile motorists. These recommendations were aimed at modifying the content of licensing tests to include new topics, revising the procedures for selecting questions included on the tests, and implementing systems for making the administration of the tests more efficient. Specific examples of recommendations under this subtopic included the following:

- The current motorcycle operator driving test should be updated to test Quick Stop and swerving skills against a standard that considers the rider's speed.
- Increase the number of questions in the knowledge test pool to reduce the possibility of applicants memorizing the test.
**Track/Coordinate Applicant Status**

Reviewers made three recommendations related to efforts to track or coordinate the licensing status of motorcyclists. These recommendations are designed to give States better oversight of the licensing of riders and included the following examples:

- Develop an electronic tracking system that allows License Service Representatives to verify an applicant's licensing status.
- Develop a process to track license applicants through the system and encourage them to complete the licensing process or risk the loss of their instructional permits.

**Implementation of Operator Licensing Recommendations**

State administrators reported that 18 of 50 recommendations under Operator Licensing were implemented (36%). Of the 10 subtopics of Operator Licensing, most recommendations concerned Permit Restrictions (20%), followed by Testing Standards and Criteria (16%). As noted in Table 4.2, the recommendations in these two subtopics accounted for well over one-third of all Operator Licensing recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Percentage of Recommendations Implemented Within Subtopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Restrictions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Standards and Criteria</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Waivers and Agency Integrations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Availability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner Certification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise/Clarify Legal Definition of Motorcycles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Coordinate Applicant Status</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Provisional/Graduated Licensing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States implemented an average of 39 percent of recommendations within subtopics, though this fails to capture the variation across different subtopics. Three-quarters of the recommendations related to Testing Availability were put into practice and two-thirds of recommendations in the Examiner Certification, Quality Assurance, and Revise/Clarify Legal Definition of Motorcycles subtopics were also implemented. However, no recommendations
were implemented in the Permit Restrictions subtopic, despite the fact that these recommendations accounted for one-fifth of all recommendations made.

Table 4.3 provides examples of some of the key accomplishments associated with the subtopics of Operator Licensing. These accomplishments range from activities focused on Examiner Certification, such as implementing a train-the-trainer program, to testing availability, including the opening of new offices to reduce wait time for applicants.

Table 4.3 Summary of key accomplishments in Operator Licensing, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examiner Certification</td>
<td>• Implemented train-the-trainer program for motorcycle license examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Required certification of motorcycle license examiners every five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>• Added section to driver’s education handbook regarding motorist awareness and rider conspicuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Published brochures and posters promoting licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conducted study investigating why riders do not get licensed in order to reach out to these riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>• Improved readability of motorcycle operator’s manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiated evaluations of Alternate Motorcycle Operator Skill Test sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise/clarify legal definition of motorcycles</td>
<td>• Clarified the legal distinctions between motor-driven cycles, scooters, and mopeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Availability</td>
<td>• Established third-party testing to reduce wait time in licensing offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opened four new regional offices offering motorcycle license testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Offering Alternate Motorcycle Operator Skill Test at new offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Standards and Criteria</td>
<td>• Increased number of questions on knowledge test and randomized question selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revised licensure requirements for trike/three-wheel motorcycles and regular motorcycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduced computerized motorcycle knowledge test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Streamlined licensing process for motorcyclists who complete Basic Rider Course (BRC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Barriers to Implementation**

As indicated in Table 4.4, State administrators reported that the greatest barrier to the implementation of Operator Licensing recommendations was that a Recommendation was Never Reviewed or Considered (50% of all barriers). Following this barrier, the second greatest obstacle to the implementation of recommendations were Concerns About Feasibility and/or Implementation (19%).
Table 4.4  Percentage of barriers to Operator Licensing, by classification of barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 summarizes the barriers to implementation by each subtopic of Operator Licensing. Of the recommendations not implemented, nearly one third concerned Permit Restrictions for novice motorcycle operators (31%). In most cases, the suggestions for Permit Restrictions were not implemented because the Recommendation Was Never Reviewed/Considered (60% of all barriers to Permit Restrictions, data not shown). With the exception of Permit Restrictions, most recommendations that were not implemented were distributed evenly across the remaining subtopics of Operator Licensing.

Table 4.5  Percentage of barriers to Operator Licensing, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Restrictions</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Waivers and Agency Integration</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Standards and Criteria</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Coordinate Applicant Status</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Provisional/Graduated Licensing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner Certification</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise/Clarify Legal Definition of Motorcycles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Availability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: RIDER EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Recommendations Related to Rider Education and Training

The Rider Education and Training category captures efforts made by States to provide training on the safe operation of a motorcycle and compliance with State laws for motorcyclists.

Reviewers made 88 recommendations in the area of Rider Education and Training, the most of any category. These recommendations were organized into the following 12 subtopics summarized in Table 5.1 and described in detail below.

Table 5.1  Number of recommendations made in Rider Education and Training, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Data and Logistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish/Refine Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluate/Expand Equipment and Training Sites</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase/Reallocate Training Funds</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instructor Training and Certification</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Oversight of Course Sponsors/Contractors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Program Evaluation/Quality Assurance</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public Outreach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Purchase Insurance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Strategic Planning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Training Delivery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cooperation With Other Organizations

Reviewers made seven recommendations related to increasing cooperation with other organizations in order to promote rider training. These recommendations encouraged States to work with both other State agencies as well as external organizations, and included the following examples:

- Network with the Community Traffic Safety Teams to promote rider training courses and awareness of rider safety issues.
- Enter into cooperative agreements with military bases to maximize the availability of instructors and facilities and extend the benefits of the State Motorcycle Safety Education Program approved program to military personnel.
Data and Logistics

Reviewers made four recommendations related to the collection of data about rider training activities and outcomes as well as suggestions for improving the logistics of delivering training to students. Specific examples of recommendations under this subtopic included:

- Create or adopt a standardized in-course accident/incident report form to limit program liability, provide a means of tracking accidents/incidents, and allow the development of countermeasures.
- Create a system to control the storage, issuance, and tracking of the beginner course completion cards.

Establish/Refine Policies and Procedures

Reviewers made seven recommendations related to establishing or refining the policies or procedures that guide the delivery of motorcycle rider training in selected States. These recommendations focused on administrative changes to the structure of the rider education program, bringing them up to date with current standards or altering roles and responsibilities in order to increase program effectiveness. Examples of this subtopic included the following:

- Create a policies and procedures manual that will revise and simplify the outdated 1989 Administrative Rules that do not meet the needs of the Motorcycle Rider and Safety Education Program.
- Publish a comprehensive policies and procedures manual for the State Motorcycle Safety Program rider education program that includes job descriptions and selection criteria for all program personnel.

Evaluate/Expand Equipment and Training Sites

Reviewers made seven recommendations related to evaluating or expanding the equipment or training sites used as part of the rider training program. These recommendations focused primarily on updating the condition and quality of the motorcycles used during training as well as considering changes to be made to mobile training sites. Examples of recommendations made as part of this subtopic included:

- Address the age and poor condition of the training motorcycles by purchasing new and/or used (like new) units. A goal should be set for a satisfactory number of motorcycles required along with a three- to five-year replacement plan depending on usage.
- Conduct a feasibility study to determine whether select mobile sites should be converted to permanent sites to enhance the cost effectiveness of the program.

Increase/Reallocate Training Funds

Reviewers made 10 recommendations related to increasing or reallocating the funds used by States to support motorcyclist rider training. These recommendations encouraged States to reevaluate the allocation of funds to certain activities and to secure funds for other activities or material designed to strengthen the delivery of rider education. Specific examples of recommendations under this subtopic included:
• Fund the implementation of the Beginner Rider Course. Funding should cover instructor updates, additional instructor preparation courses, material for instructors and students, new audio-visual material, and repainting all ranges.

• Evaluate the relationship between program expenses and students trained to establish a reimbursement schedule for items and services that directly impact Motorcycle Rider and Safety Education Program costs.

**Instructor Training and Certification**

Reviewers made 14 recommendations related to instructor training and certification. These recommendations focused on ensuring that rider training instructors received proper training as part of the certification process, steps for recruiting new instructors, and suggestions for ongoing professional development for instructors. Examples of specific recommendations under the topic of instructor training and certification included:

• Conduct four to six Instructor Preparation Courses per year targeted to the areas in the state with the greatest need for more instructors. Offer alternative schedules and develop a mechanism for recruiting instructors.

• Revise the job description for the Senior Highway Safety Specialist to require that he/she must be a current Motorcycle Safety Foundation-certified instructor.

**Oversight of Course Sponsors/Contractors**

Reviewers made six recommendations related to oversight of the course sponsors or contractors that deliver rider training to students. These recommendations were designed to help standardize training across sites and included the following examples:

• Set maximum tuition limits that a private enterprise may charge for training programs.

• Revise the course sponsor contract to include a provision for the sponsors to maintain records for an appropriate length of time.

**Program Evaluation and Quality Assurance**

Reviewers made 16 recommendations related to conducting evaluations or quality assurance checks of different aspects of States’ rider training programs. These recommendations covered a variety of dimensions of rider training, including monitoring the delivery of training at course sites, studying the funding sources for training programs, and the implementation of formal systems for measuring the effectiveness of training opportunities. Specific examples of these recommendations included the following:

• Conduct an evaluation of the reimbursement process to determine the most efficient use of existing resources.

• Implement a quality assurance plan that increases the number of site and instructor visits and standardizes the review and remediation process.

**Public Outreach**

Reviewers made four recommendations related to public outreach for rider training opportunities. These recommendations were designed to raise the profile of rider education courses and included the following examples:
• Develop an extensive promotional plan for rider education.
• Apply for continuing education credits for the rider training course so that law enforcement officials have an incentive to enhance knowledge of motorcycle safety issues.

**Purchase Insurance**
Reviewers made two recommendations related to purchasing insurance for the rider training program in order to protect the program from liability. The following is an example of this type of recommendation: Investigate the possibility of purchasing a statewide comprehensive insurance package whereby the Motorcycle Rider and Safety Education Program initiates the policy as a cost-saving measure.

**Strategic Planning**
Reviewers made nine recommendations related to strategic planning on the part of the rider training program. These recommendations encouraged States to develop long range (generally three- to five-year) goals and plans for rider education that would help meet demand and ensure the delivery of quality training. Specific examples of recommendations under this subtopic included the following:

• Implement a long-range (three- to five-year) strategic plan to train additional instructors, expand course offerings, and establish additional training sites.
• Develop and implement a long range plan to establish additional fixed training sites, increase the number of certified instructors and purchase additional training motorcycles.

**Training Delivery**
Reviewers made two recommendations related to altering specific features in the way in which training was delivered to riders, including the following example: Eliminate specific range dimensions and number of students allowed per range from the program’s rules to allow more flexibility.

**Implementation of Rider Education and Training Recommendations**

State administrators reported that 54 of the 88 recommendations under Rider Education and Training were implemented (61%). Of the 12 subtopics of Rider Education and Training, most recommendations concerned Program Evaluation/Quality Assurance (18%), followed by Instructor Training and Certification (16%). As noted in Table 5.2, the recommendations in these two subtopics accounted for over one-third of all Rider Education and Training recommendations.
Table 5.2  Percentage of recommendations made and implemented, by subtopic of Rider Education and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Percentage of Recommendations Implemented Within Subtopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation/Quality Assurance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Training and Certification</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/Reallocate Training Funds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/Refine Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate/Expand Equipment and Training Sites</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of Course Sponsors/Contractors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Logistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Insurance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States implemented an average of 56 percent of the recommendations within subtopics, including 100 percent of all recommendations made in the Public Outreach subtopic (though these recommendations comprised only 5 percent of all recommendations made). No recommendations in the Purchase Insurance or Training Delivery subtopics were implemented, however, these two subtopics accounted for only 4 percent of all recommendations suggested under Rider Education and Training.

Table 5.3 provides examples of some of the key accomplishments associated with the subtopics of Rider Education and Training. These accomplishments range from cooperation with other organizations, including the expansion of motorcycle networks to include law enforcement, dealerships, and emergency personnel, to evaluating/expanding equipment and training sites, in which one state replaced 75 percent of its motorcycle training fleet.
Table 5.3  Summary of key accomplishments in Rider Education and Training, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cooperation With Other Organizations             | • Expanded motorcycle network to include rider groups, the State dealers’ association, motorcycle shops, licensing offices, law enforcement, prosecutors, and emergency personnel  
• Opened channels of communication with law enforcement and motorcycle riders’ groups  
• Continued and expanded partnerships between the Motorcycle Safety Program and other organizations                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Data and Logistics                               | • Created database of students who enroll in training classes  
• Established formulas for calculating per student costs for some aspects of training                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Establish/Refine Policies and Procedures         | • Approved Basic Rider Course curricula  
• Developed selection criteria for RiderCoaches  
• Implemented Basic Rider Course (BRC)  
• Developed and implemented security procedures for rider course completion cards  
• Published policies and procedures manual with job descriptions and selection criteria for program staff                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Evaluate/Expand Equipment and Training Sites     | • Awarded 2010 grant to third-party provider to purchase motorcycles and other equipment  
• Replaced 75 percent of motorcycle training fleet  
• In the process of converting four mobile training sites to permanent sites  
• Increased number of permanent sites from 6 to 21  
• Added seven permanent training sites, plus three temporary sites and five military sites                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Increase/Reallocate Training Funds               | • Established trust fund to support training  
• Increased funding for rider education                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Instructor Training and Certification            | • Revised position description for Senior Highway Safety Specialist to include stipulation that he/she be a certified instructor  
• Conduct instructor preparation courses annually  
• Implemented rewards program for instructors who maintain certification  
• Organize yearly instructor update forum each Spring  
• Certified 69 new RiderCoaches since 2001                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Oversight of Course Sponsors/Contractors         | • Required course sponsor to retain records for three years                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
Table 5.3  Summary of key accomplishments in Rider Education and Training, by subtopic  (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program Evaluation/Quality Assurance | • Conducted program review of rider training program and established goals and objectives  
• Developed and distributed end-of-course evaluations to students  
• Introduced annual evaluations of the training program  
• Assigned two staff members to monitor quality control throughout the training season  
• Implemented random quality assurance visits to training sites |
| Public Outreach              | • Developed and distribute annual report on program accomplishments  
• Initiated media campaign promoting rider training and licensing                        |
| Strategic Planning           | • Developed long-term plan for site development and instructor training  
• Developed rider training promotion plan                                             |
| Training Delivery            | • Introduced a split training schedule for students and instructors  
• Hired part-time staff to help expand rider training opportunities                    |

Barriers to Implementation

As indicated in Table 5.4, State administrators reported that the greatest barrier to the implementation of Rider Education and Training recommendations was that a Recommendation was Never Reviewed or Considered (35% of all barriers). Following this barrier, the second greatest obstacle to the implementation of recommendations were Concerns about Feasibility and/or Implementation (24%).

Table 5.4  Percentage of barriers to Rider Education and Training, by classification of barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 summarizes the barriers to implementation by each subtopic of Rider Education and Training. Of the recommendations not implemented, approximately one-quarter concerned Program Evaluations/Quality Assurance activities (24%). With the exception of the Program
Evaluations/Quality Assurance subtopic, most recommendations that were not implemented were distributed evenly across the remaining subtopics of Rider Education and Training.

Table 5.5  Percentage of barriers to Rider Education and Training, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation/Quality Assurance</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/Reallocate Training Funds</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Training and Certification</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Logistics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish/Refine Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate/Expand Equipment and Training Sites</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of Course Sponsors/Contracts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Insurance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivery</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6: OPERATION UNDER THE INFLUENCE

Recommendations Related to Operation Under the Influence

The Operation Under the Influence category captures efforts made by States to combat impaired riding by motorcyclists, including public information activities and the education of law enforcement and court personnel on issues associated with operating a motorcycle while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

Reviewers made 40 recommendations in the area of Operation Under the Influence. These recommendations were organized into the following 5 subtopics summarized in Table 6.1 and described in detail below.

Table 6.1 Number of recommendations made in Operation Under the Influence, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allocate Funds for Impaired Riding Countermeasures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Information and Education</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategic Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Training and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocate Funds for Impaired Riding Countermeasures

Reviewers made four recommendations related to the allocation of funds to support impaired riding countermeasures. These recommendations would provide States with the money necessary to combat riding under the influence and included the following examples:

- Request funding from the Drunk Driving Fund and other sources to assist with impaired riding programs.
- Fund the development and implementation of motorcycle-specific impaired riding countermeasures.

Cooperation With Other Organizations

Reviewers made 13 recommendations related to increasing cooperation with other organizations in order to strengthen impaired riding countermeasures. These recommendations encouraged States to work with both other State agencies as well as external organizations (e.g., Mothers Against Drunk Driving) and included the following examples:

- Work with Safe Community partners and groups such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving and rider organizations to administer activities to prevent impaired riding.
- Use the law enforcement liaisons to increase awareness within the law enforcement community regarding impaired riding issues and strategies.
**Public Information and Education**

Reviewers made 11 recommendations related to public information and education efforts to combat the operation of motorcycles by riders under the influence. These recommendations focused on promoting impaired riding messages across a variety of venues, such as public service announcements and as part of rider training classes. Specific examples of public information and education recommendations included the following:

- Develop and implement motorcycle-specific impaired riding countermeasures. This could include outreach via schools, creating or adapting material to be distributed in rider education classes, public service advertisements, etc.

- Work with community task forces and groups to develop and administer grassroots activities to prevent impaired riding, especially in areas where alcohol-involved crashes are most prevalent.

**Strategic Planning**

Reviewers made three recommendations related to the development of a strategic plan aimed at reducing impaired riding. These recommendations called upon States to identify the steps to be taken as part of a comprehensive countermeasures plan, including the following example: Develop and implement motorcycle-specific impaired riding countermeasures. Include in this plan the appropriate staff and hours needed to successfully execute the countermeasures.

**Training and Technical Assistance**

Reviewers made nine recommendations related to conducting training and technical assistance on issues concerning impaired riding by motorcyclists. States were encouraged to provide training to law enforcement on the detection of impaired riders and to discuss issues of impaired riding with court personnel (i.e., prosecutors and judges). Specific examples of training and technical assistance recommendations included the following:

- Implement the NHTSA training program on identifying impaired motorcyclists for state and local law enforcement agencies.

- Incorporate technical assistance about impaired riders into ongoing prosecutor training and judicial education.

**Implementation of Operation Under the Influence Recommendations**

State administrators reported that 23 of the 40 recommendations under Operation Under the Influence were implemented (58%). Of the 5 subtopics of Operation Under the Influence, most recommendations concerned Cooperation With Other Organizations (33%), followed by Public Information and Education (28%). As noted in Table 6.2, the recommendations in these two subtopics accounted for over three-fifths (61%) of all Operation Under the Influence recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Percentage of Recommendations Implemented Within Subtopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information and Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Funds for Impaired Riding Countermeasures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States implemented approximately half (53%) of the recommendations within subtopics, including 69 percent of all recommendations made in the Cooperation With Other Organizations subtopic. The percentage of recommendations implemented within a subtopic was 50 percent or greater for all subtopics with the exception of Public Information and Education (45%).

Table 6.3 provides examples of some of the key accomplishments associated with the subtopics of Operation Under the Influence. These accomplishments range from allocating funds for impaired riding countermeasures, including using such money to sponsor radio ads, banners, posters, and other publications, to training and technical assistance efforts, including providing training to law enforcement on identifying impaired riders.
Table 6.3  Summary of key accomplishments in Operation Under the Influence, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Allocate Funds for Impaired Riding Countermeasures | • Used 2010 funds to sponsor radio ads, banners, posters, and other material  
• Awarded funds for an impaired riding countermeasures program, including a component for public information and education |
| Cooperation With Other Organizations       | • Encouraged Community Traffic Safety Teams to partner with motorcycle clubs and organizations  
• Established communication between State agencies to coordinate impaired riding messages  
• Coordinating efforts between State agencies for Safe and Sober campaign  
• Formed Coalition for Roadway Safety, which brings together representatives from the state, public, and private sectors to address highway safety  
• Partnered with other organizations to make presentations about the dangers of impaired riding |
| Public Information and Education           | • Added component about impaired riding to material distributed by Community Traffic Safety Teams  
• Included impaired riding messages in media campaigns  
• Produce brochures for motorcyclists about impaired riding  
• Initiated “Ride Straight” campaign to promote alcohol awareness among motorcyclists |
| Training and Technical Assistance          | • Distributed training booklet on detecting impaired riders to law enforcement officers  
• Distributed Fatal Vision goggles to all permanent training sites  
• Developed material for judges and county clerks informing them of the motorcycle safety program  
• Implemented the NHTSA training program on identifying impaired riders for State and local law enforcement agencies |

Barriers to Implementation

As indicated in Table 6.4, there was no single barrier to the implementation of recommendations related to Operation Under the Influence. Instead, factors unique to each State (captured under the Other category) resulted in States’ inability to put recommendations into practice. The Other response accounted for over one-third of all barriers to implementation (35%). Beyond barriers classified as Other, State administrators reported that most suggestions from the assessments were not implemented because of Time Constraints/Competing Commitments (24% of all barriers).
Table 6.4  Percentage of barriers to Operation Under the Influence, by classification of barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 summarizes the barriers to implementation by each subtopic of Operation Under the Influence. Of all recommendations under Operation Under the Influence that were not implemented, approximately one-third (35%) were related to Public Information and Education activities. Following Public Information and Education, the second highest frequency of recommendations not implemented were associated with the Cooperation With Other Organizations subtopic (24% of all recommendations not implemented). When combined, the recommendations associated with these two subtopics accounted for over half of all recommendations related to Operation Under the Influence that were not implemented (59%).

Table 6.5  Percentage of barriers to Operation Under the Influence, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Information and Education</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Funds for Impaired Riding Countermeasures</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7: CONSPICUITY

Recommendations Related to Conspicuity

The Conspicuity category captures efforts made by States to increase the conspicuity of motorcyclists, both through steps taken by riders to make themselves more visible in traffic and by educating automobile drivers on motorcyclist awareness.

Reviewers made 24 recommendations in the area of Conspicuity. These recommendations were organized into the following four subtopics summarized in Table 7.1 and described in detail below.

Table 7.1 Number of recommendations made in Conspicuity, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allocate Funds for Conspicuity Efforts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promote Motorcyclist Conspicuity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promote Motorist Awareness</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public Information and Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocate Funds for Conspicuity Efforts

Reviewers made two recommendations related to the allocation of funds to support conspicuity efforts for motorcyclists. These recommendations encouraged States to identify dedicated funds to support conspicuity messages and included the following example: Request grant funds or earmark a portion of the motorcycle safety education fund for continued public information and education efforts related to motorcyclist conspicuity.

Promote Motorcyclist Conspicuity

Reviewers made five recommendations related to the promotion of conspicuity messages directed at motorcyclists. These recommendations encouraged States to initiate public awareness efforts focused on the use of high visibility riding gear and daytime running lights. Specific examples of recommendations under this subtopic included:

- Undertake an awareness campaign aimed at motorcyclists, encouraging the use of daytime lights and high visibility garments.
- A public awareness campaign should be aimed at motorcyclists encouraging use of retro-reflective and high visibility garments.

Promote Motorist Awareness

Reviewers made 13 recommendations related to the promotion of conspicuity messages directed at automobile drivers. These recommendations encouraged States to take steps to alert motorists about motorcyclists, using strategies such as incorporating “Share the Road” messages as part of driver’s education classes. Specific examples of recommendations aimed at promoting motorist awareness included:
• Require a minimum of one hour of formal motorcycle awareness training in driver education classes.
• Provide copies of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's Common Road video to distribute to all driver education classes. The video can also be played on television monitors in licensing centers.

Public Information and Education
Reviewers made four recommendations related to public information and education campaigns emphasizing motorcyclist conspicuity. These recommendations were designed to target both motorcyclists and vehicle motorists and included the following examples:
• Develop and implement a comprehensive and coordinated statewide plan to address both conspicuity and motorist awareness.
• Increase use of billboards, public service announcements, and coordinate with the media to amplify outreach efforts related to motorcyclist conspicuity.

Implementation of Conspicuity Recommendations
State administrators reported that 13 of the 24 recommendations under Conspicuity were implemented (54%). Of the four subtopics of Conspicuity, most recommendations concerned promoting motorist awareness (54%), followed by promoting motorcycle conspicuity (21%). As noted in Table 7.2, the recommendations in these two subtopics accounted for three-fourths (75%) of all recommendations in the area of Conspicuity.

Table 7.2 Percentage of recommendations made and implemented, by subtopic of Conspicuity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Percentage of Recommendations Implemented Within Suptopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote Motorist Awareness</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Motorcyclist Conspicuity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information and Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Funds for Conspicuity Efforts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States implemented an average of 51 percent of the recommendations within the subtopics, including 62 percent of all recommendations made in the Promote Motorist Awareness subtopic. The only subtopic in which less than 50 percent of recommendations were implemented was Promote Motorcyclist Conspicuity (40%).

Table 7.3 provides examples of some of the key accomplishments associated with the subtopics of Conspicuity. These accomplishments range from activities related to promoting motorist awareness, such as including motorist awareness content in driver’s education classes, to public information and education efforts such as distributing banners emphasizing motorist awareness of motorcycles to law enforcement agencies.
Table 7.3 Summary of key accomplishments in Conspicuity, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments Across Nine States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Funds for Conspicuity Efforts</td>
<td>• Purchase public media yearly for motorist awareness education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Motorcyclist Conspicuity</td>
<td>• Produced promotional brochures, PSAs, etc., about wearing brightly colored protective gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Motorist Awareness</td>
<td>• Sponsored media campaign with message about motorist awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Included motorcycle awareness content in driver’s education classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implemented Share the Road with Motorcyclists campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provided “Share the Road” modules to driver’s education instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information and Education</td>
<td>• Distributed banners emphasizing motorist awareness of motorcycles to law enforcement agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct a Share the Road Media campaign each Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mail DVD with Share the Road message to high schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers to Implementation

As indicated in Table 7.4, State administrators reported that the greatest barrier to the implementation of Conspicuity recommendations were Time Constraints/Competing Commitments (45% of all barriers). Following this barrier, the second greatest obstacle to the implementation of recommendations was Insufficient Funding/Resources (28%).

Table 7.4 Percentage of barriers to Conspicuity recommendations, by classification of barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.5 summarizes the barriers to implementation by each subtopic of Conspicuity. Of the recommendations not implemented, nearly half (45%) were related to the Promote Motorist Awareness subtopic. In most cases, the suggestions under Promote Motorist Awareness were not implemented because of Time Constraints/Competing Commitments (80% of all barriers to Promote Motorist Awareness, data not shown). Following the Promote Motorist Awareness subtopic, the second highest frequency of recommendations not implemented were
associated with the Promote Motorcyclist Conspicuity subtopic (27% of all recommendations not implemented). When combined, the recommendations associated with these two subtopics accounted for 72 percent of all recommendations related to Conspicuity that were not implemented.

Table 7.5  Percentage of barriers to Conspicuity recommendations, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote Motorist Awareness</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Motorcyclist Conspicuity</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information and Education</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Funds for Conspicuity Efforts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 8: PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Recommendations Related to Public Information and Education

The Public Information and Education category captures efforts made by States to promote motorcycle safety and licensing through a variety of channels aimed at both motorcyclists and the general public.

Reviewers made 78 recommendations in the area of Public Information and Education. These recommendations were organized into the following 9 subtopics summarized in Table 8.1 and described in detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allocate Funds for Public Information and Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct Research</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop Media Kit/Expand Media Relations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop/Distribute Material for Motorcycle Dealers and Licensing Offices</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. General Public Information and Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reorganize/Reassign Administrative Duties</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Strategic Planning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocates Funds for Public Information and Education

Reviewers made six recommendations related to allocating funds for public information and education campaigns. These recommendations called upon States to identify funding sources to promote messages about motorcycle safety, including the following examples:

- Request injury prevention and impaired driving incentive funds to develop and implement impaired riding countermeasures and to promote helmet and protective gear use.
- Fund and develop a coordinated, statewide public information and education plan to promote motorcycle safety issues. The plan should include research and evaluation components.
**Conduct Research**

Reviewers made 12 recommendations related to conducting research on public information and education campaigns. These recommendations focused on research designed to identify the most effective means of reaching audiences as well as monitoring the impact of public information and education activities. Specific examples of recommendations under this subtopic included:

- Use research to determine the most effective means of reaching target audiences with motorcycle safety messages.
- Measure media response by creating specific Web pages or phone numbers to measure the audience.

**Cooperation With Other Organizations**

Reviewers made seven recommendations related to cooperation with organizations on public information and education activities. Motorcycle safety programs were encouraged to work with other State agencies as well as the private sector in order to promote motorcyclist safety messages. Examples of recommendations emphasizing cooperation with other organizations included:

- Encourage businesses and private organizations to participate in motorcycle safety public information and education campaigns.
- Use the Motorcycle Safety Education Advisory Committee to coordinate public information and education efforts among agencies that involve the motorcycle safety program.

**Develop Media Kit/Expand Media Relations**

Reviewers made 11 recommendations related to the development of a media kit or expanding efforts at media relations. Under these recommendations, States were encouraged to create material for the media addressing issues in motorcycle safety and to identify and train staff for handling media relations. Specific examples of recommendations under this subtopic included:

- Develop an action plan to respond in the event of high profile motorcycle safety issues, making information and spokespersons available to the media.
- Develop and distribute a media kit with information about motorcycle safety. Update the media kit regularly.

**Develop/Distribute Material for Motorcycle Dealers and Licensing Offices**

Reviewers made 6 recommendations related to the development and distribution of promotional material for motorcycle dealers and State licensing offices. These recommendations focused on creating a variety of material emphasizing issues in motorcycle safety that could be disseminated in both State offices as well as private business. Examples of these recommendations included:

- Develop point-of-purchase displays and/or posters that promote the value of motorcycle rider education. Distribute the material to motorcycle dealerships and driver license offices.
• Posters and other display items for use by motorcycle dealers should be developed specifically to include point-of-purchase displays, showroom posters, and a State motorcycling touring map.

**General Public Information and Education**

Reviewers made 10 recommendations related to general public information and education efforts on the part of state motorcycle safety programs. These recommendations covered a diverse set of topics in motorcycle safety, including the following:

- Create a motorcycle safety web page as part of the coordinated Public Information and Education efforts.
- Use existing public information and education material from other States, including those that address impaired riding, use of helmets and protective gear, motorist awareness, conspicuity, and rider education.

**Incorporate Motorcycle Safety in Traffic Safety Messages and Planning**

Reviewers made 13 recommendations related to the incorporation of motorcycle safety in traffic safety messages and planning activities. Under these recommendations, States were encouraged to work toward placing messages about motorcycle safety in other public relations campaigns emphasizing traffic safety. Specific examples of these recommendations included:

- Motorcycle safety information should be incorporated in other traffic safety public information and education campaigns.
- A central public information and education person, with experience in marketing/communications, should be assigned to ensure that motorcycle safety issues are included in other traffic safety efforts.

**Reorganize/Reassign Administrative Duties**

Reviewers made eight recommendations related to the reorganization or reassignment of administrative duties concerned with public information and education. These recommendations focused on altering the administrative structure of the motorcycle safety program in order to increase the effectiveness of public information and education activities. Examples of these recommendations included:

- Task the Safety Management Steering Committee with serving as a central point of contact for motorcycle safety Public Information and Education material within the State.
- Create, at a minimum, a part-time position dedicated to statewide motorcycle public information and education efforts.

**Strategic Planning**

Reviewers made five recommendations related to strategic planning for public information and education activities. Under these recommendations, States were encouraged to develop plans for creating effective motorcycle safety messages and consider the best means for disseminating outreach material. Examples of strategic planning recommendations included:

- Develop motorcycle specific communication strategies and related activities through the Office of Highway Safety Planning.
Develop and implement a strategic communication plan that addresses outreach efforts regarding protective gear and helmet use, impaired riding, licensing, rider education, motorist awareness, and conspicuity.

**Implementation of Public Information and Education Recommendations**

State administrators reported that 50 of the 78 recommendations under Public Information and Education were implemented (64%). Of the 9 subtopics of Public Information and Education, most recommendations concerned Incorporating Motorcycle Safety in Traffic Safety Messages and Planning (17%), followed by Conducting Research (15%). As noted in Table 8.2, the recommendations in these two subtopics accounted for nearly one-third (32%) of all Public Information and Education recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Recommendations Made</th>
<th>Percentage of Recommendations Implemented Within Subtopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate Motorcycle Safety in Traffic Safety Messages and Planning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Media Kit/Expand Media Relations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public Information and Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganize/Reassign Administrative Duties</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Distribute Material for Motorcycle Dealers and Licensing Offices</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Funds for Public Information and Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States implemented an average of 63 percent of the recommendations within the subtopics, including 86 percent of the recommendations made in the Cooperation With Other Organizations subtopic. These recommendations, however, represented only 9 percent of all recommendations related to Public Information and Education activities. The fewest percentage of recommendations implemented were associated with the Allocate Funds for Public Information and Education subtopic (33%).

Table 8.3 provides examples of some of the key accomplishments associated with the subtopics of Public Information and Education. These accomplishments range from activities...
related to expanding media relations, including distributing a media news release concerning the riding season each year, to reorganizing/reassigning administrative duties such as designating a program technical specialist for outreach activities.

Table 8.3  Summary of key accomplishments in Public Information and Education, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Allocate Funds for Public Information and Education| • Requested and received funds allocated for public information and education campaigns  
• Used 2010 funds for media campaign on motorcyclist awareness, licensing, and training  
• Funded statewide public information and education plan to promote motorcycle safety |
| Conduct Research                                   | • In the process of measuring the effectiveness of public information campaigns  
• Produce monthly reports on user activity of motorcycle safety program Website |
| Cooperation With Other Organizations               | • Encouraged communication between motorcycle groups, Department of Transportation staff, and emergency medical services  
• Facilitated collaborations between state agencies and motorcycle riders’ groups |
| Develop Media Kit/Expand Media Relations            | • Developed media kit containing information about motorcycle safety  
• Facilitated strengthening of Information Officer’s communication skills  
• Distribute media news release concerning the riding season each year |
| Develop/Distribute Material for Motorcycle Dealers and Licensing Offices | • Included motorcycle safety messages in PSAs played in driver license offices.  
• Working with motorcycle clubs and dealerships to promote motorcycle safety public information and education campaigns  
• Distribute point-of-purchase/point-of-service material to State offices and motorcycle dealerships |
| General Public Information and Education           | • Created motorcycle safety and information Web site  
• Works with marketing firm to target messages to public  
• Included message in media campaigns about the requirement of wearing a DOT approved helmet |
| Incorporate Motorcycle Safety In Traffic Safety Messages and Planning | • Incorporated motorcycle safety messages into appropriate traffic safety campaigns |
| Reorganize/reassign administrative duties           | • Established the Motor Vehicle Safety Office within the Department of Transportation as the central point of contact for the motorcycle safety program  
• Designated program staff member to support public information and education efforts  
• Designated program technical specialist for outreach activities |
Barriers to Implementation

As indicated in Table 8.4, State administrators reported that the greatest barrier to the implementation of Public Information and Education recommendations were Time Constraints/Competing Commitments (29% of all barriers). Following this barrier, the second greatest obstacle to the implementation of recommendations were combinations of factors classified as Multiple Reasons (25%).

Table 8.4  Percentage of barriers to Public Information and Education, by classification of barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints/competing commitments</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was never reviewed/considered</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about feasibility and/or implementation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding/resources</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4 summarizes the barriers to implementation by each subtopic of Public Information and Education. As evident from the table, the recommendations not implemented were, for the most part, distributed evenly across the nine subtopics. Slightly more barriers were associated with the General Public Information and Education subtopic (18% of all barriers to Public Information and Education). Of the barriers to General Public Information and Education, 80 percent were the result of Time Constraints/Competing Commitments (data not shown).

Table 8.5  Percentage of barriers to Public Information and Education, by subtopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Percentage of All Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public Information and Education</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate Funds for Public Information and Education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Media Kit/Expand Media Relations</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate Motorcycle Safety in Traffic Safety Messages and Planning</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Distribute Material for Motorcycle Dealers and Licensing Offices</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganize/Reassign Administrative Duties</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation With Other Organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>