Traffic Safety Facts Research Note

DOT HS 811 140



May 2009

The Increase in Lives Saved, Injuries Prevented, and Cost Savings if Seat Belt Use Rose to at Least 90 Percent in All States

This note examines the potential increase in lives saved, injuries prevented, and cost savings that would be realized if seat belt use hypothetically rose to at least 90 percent in all States. Seat belts saved an estimated 15,147 lives in 2007, when the National Occupant Protection Use Survey (NOPUS) national belt use estimate was 82 percent. Table 1 provides details of the estimated benefits that would have been realized if the 38 States and the District of Columbia that, in 2007, had a seat belt use rate below 90 percent had been able to increase their 2007 seat belt use up to 90 percent. An estimated 1,652 additional lives would have been saved had this increase in seat belt use occurred, and nearly 40,000 more nonfatal injuries would have been prevented, resulting in additional cost savings of about \$5.2 billion dollars.

These benefit estimates have been generated by NHTSA's National Center for Statistics and Analysis (NCSA). The number of lives saved are estimates that

are calculated using the effectiveness of seat belts, and have been produced by NCSA each year since 1975. In 2008, the NOPUS belt use estimate increased to 83 percent. Lives saved estimates for 2008 will be available upon release of the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Annual Report File for 2008.

The 1,652 additional lives saved in all 38 States and the District of Columbia resulting from the increase in seat belt use would represent an increase of 11 percent above the estimate of lives saved by seat belts (15,147) for 2007. Over 50 percent of the total benefits in lives saved (842 out of the total of 1,652 lives saved), non-fatal injuries saved (22,677 out of the total of 39,486 non-fatal injuries), and cost savings (\$3.0 billion out of the total of \$5.2 billion), seen from improving belt use in each State to 90 percent seat, would come from States that do not have primary seat belt laws at the time of this report, as shown in Table 1.

States Covered	# of States	Additional Lives Saved	Additional Serious² Injuries Prevented	Additional Minor ² Injuries Prevented	Additional Total Nonfatal Injuries Prevented	Additional Total Cost³ Savings (in 2007 dollars)
All States Below 90 Percent	38 States and DC	1,652	22,372	17,114	39,486	\$5.2 billion
Non-Primary Law States⁴ Below 90 Percent	22 States	842	12,804	9,873	22,677	\$3.0 billion

Table 1: Benefits of Hypothetical Increase in Seat Belt Use up to 90 Percent, Among States¹ With 2007 Seat Belt Use Below 90 Percent

¹ Lives saved, injuries prevented, and cost savings in this table do not include States and Territories with 2007 seat belt use at 90 percent or higher. These 13 States and Territories include California (2007 belt use = 94.6 percent), Hawaii (97.6 percent), Illinois (90.1), Iowa (91.3), Maryland (93.1), Michigan (93.7), Nevada (92.2), New Jersey (91.4), New Mexico (91.5), Puerto Rico (92.7), Oregon (95.3), Texas (91.8), Washington (96.4). All these States except Nevada have Primary Seat Belt Laws.

² Serious injuries defined as MAIS 2-5. Minor injuries defined as MAIS 1.

³ Cost savings in Table 1 are rounded to the nearest 100 million dollars.

⁴ Maine passed a primary seat belt law during the 2007 year. Maine is not included in the category of non-primary law States.

Table 2 below displays the information from Table 1 individually for all States and the District of Columbia. The States without primary seat belt laws are *shaded*. The first column of Table 2 is the percentage point increase that would be required to push the seat belt use rate

up to 90 percent. The second column displays the seat belt use reported in 2007. The 13 States and Territories with seat belt use above 90 percent were not included in Table 2. The belt use of these 13 States and Territories is listed immediately below Table 2.

 Table 2: Benefits of Hypothetical Increase in Seat Belt Use up to 90 Percent, Among States¹ With 2007 Seat Belt Use

 Below 90 Percent. States Without Primary Seat Belt Laws Are Shaded.

	Percentage			Additional	Additional	Additional	Additional Total
	Point Increase	2007 Seat Belt	Additional	Serious ³	Minor ³ Injuries	Total Nonfatal	Cost ^₄ Savings
State	to Reach 90%	Use Rate ² (%)	Lives Saved	Injuries Saved	Saved	Injuries Saved	(in 2007 Dollars)
Alabama	7.7%	82.3	68	489	348	837	\$131,554,000
Alaska	7.6%	82.4	4	58	41	99	\$17,936,000
Arizona	9.1%	80.9	59	731	500	1,231	\$176,879,000
Arkansas	20.1%	69.9	82	856	675	1,531	\$178,930,000
Colorado	8.9%	81.1	32	407	280	687	\$111,164,000
Connecticut	4.2%	85.8	7	182	141	323	\$49,105,000
D.C.	2.9%	87.1	1	21	15	35	\$5,119,000
Delaware	3.4%	86.6	3	46	33	79	\$11,282,000
Florida ⁵	10.9%	79.1	184	2,580	1931	4,511	\$605,472,000
Georgia	1.0%	89.0	13	189	126	315	\$43,848,000
Idaho	11.5%	78.5	20	181	124	305	\$47,729,000
Indiana	2.1%	87.9	15	194	126	320	\$42,973,000
Kansas	15.0%	75.0	44	446	337	783	\$115,336,000
Kentucky	18.2%	71.8	97	1,105	912	2,017	\$253,368,000
Louisiana	14.8%	75.2	98	1,387	1054	2,442	\$274,347,000
Maine ⁶	10.2%	79.8	13	194	150	344	\$44,096,000
Massachusetts	21.3%	68.7	46	1,655	1475	3,130	\$419,781,000
Minnesota	2.2%	87.8	15	175	123	298	\$48,985,000
Mississippi	18.2%	71.8	114	783	626	1,409	\$191,749,000
Missouri	12.8%	77.2	85	1,003	780	1,783	\$239,168,000
Montana	10.4%	79.6	21	159	112	271	\$42,471,000
Nebraska	11.3%	78.7	23	381	281	662	\$76,270,000
New Hampshire	26.2%	63.8	17	347	313	661	\$84,267,000
New York	6.5%	83.5	47	1,453	1090	2,543	\$353,385,000
North Carolina	1.2%	88.8	15	244	169	413	\$50,199,000
North Dakota	7.8%	82.2	8	60	40	100	\$16,248,000
Ohio	8.4%	81.6	69	1,682	1294	2,976	\$319,136,000
Oklahoma	6.9%	83.1	41	467	305	773	\$100,996,000
Pennsylvania	3.3%	86.7	33	480	359	839	\$110,927,000
Rhode Island	10.9%	79.1	4	93	78	171	\$21,825,000
South Carolina	15.5%	74.5	108	1,006	758	1,764	\$246,702,000
South Dakota	17.0%	73.0	16	136	99	235	\$36,369,000
Tennessee	9.8%	80.2	85	894	671	1,565	\$207,770,000
Utah	3.2%	86.6	7	105	65	170	\$21,701,000
Vermont	2.9%	87.1	1	7	5	12	\$2,633,000
Virginia	10.1%	79.9	72	1,093	807	1,901	\$262,219,000
West Virginia	0.4%	89.6	1	11	7	19	\$2,355,000
Wisconsin	14.7%	75.3	67	960	780	1,740	\$220,680,000
Wyoming	17.8%	72.2	18	111	81	192	\$36,665,000
United States Total			1,652	22,372	17,114	39,486	\$5,221,638,000
Non-Primary Law Stat	es		842	12,804	9,873	22,677	\$3,018,281,000

¹ States and Territories with 2007 seat belt use at 90 percent or higher are not included in this table. These 13 States and Territories include California (2007 seat belt use = 94.6 percent), Hawaii (97.6 percent), Illinois (90.1), Iowa (91.3), Maryland (93.1), Michigan (93.7), Puerto Rico (92.7), Nevada (92.2), New Jersey (91.4), New Mexico (91.5), Oregon (95.3), Texas (91.8), Washington (96.4). All these States and Territories except Nevada have primary seat belt laws.

² State belt use rates for 2007 in this table were first published in NHTSA report DOT HS 810 949.

³ Serious injuries defined as MAIS 2-5. Minor injuries defined as MAIS 1.

4- Cost Savings rounded to the nearest thousand dollars.

⁵ Florida's Primary Belt Law goes into effect June 30, 2009.

⁶ The citation phase for Maine's primary seat belt law went into effect April 1, 2008.

As shown in Table 2, 100 additional lives would have been saved in three States if seat belt use would have improved to 90 percent in 2007. These States are Florida (184 additional lives saved by this increase in seat belt use), Mississippi (114 additional lives saved), and South Carolina (108 additional lives saved). Two other States, Louisiana (98 additional lives saved) and Kentucky (97 additional lives saved) would have saved nearly 100 additional lives each. These five States alone would have saved a total of over 600 lives if their seat belt use had been at 90 percent.

An increase in seat belt use up to 90 percent would have saved in excess of \$200 million each in 11 States in 2007, including Florida (\$605 million), Massachusetts (\$420 million), New York (\$353 million), Ohio (\$319 million), Louisiana (\$274 million), Virginia (\$262 million), Kentucky (\$253 million), South Carolina (\$247 million), Missouri (\$239 million), Wisconsin (\$221 million), and Tennessee (\$208 million).

These estimates in additional total cost savings are based on the methodology of the NHTSA technical report titled "The Economic Impact of Motor Vehicle Crashes, 2000," which can be viewed at <u>http://wwwnrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/809446.PDF</u>. The costs are inflation-adjusted to represent dollar values for the year 2007. The cost components include productivity losses, medical costs, rehabilitation costs, legal and court costs, emergency services (such as medical, police, and fire services), insurance administration costs, and the costs to employers. Values for more intangible consequences such as physical pain or lost quality of life are not included in this estimate.

If seat belt use had reached 100 percent, then a total of 5,024 lives would have been saved in 2007. Nearly one-

third (32.9%) of these 5,024 potential lives saved would be achieved with each State improving its seat belt use to 90 percent.

More information on 2007 lives saved estimates for each State can be viewed at <u>http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.</u> <u>gov/Pubs/811049.PDF</u>. This NHTSA document presents lives saved estimates for each State for child restraints, seat belts, frontal air bags, motorcycle helmets, and the minimum drinking age law.

While this Research Note focuses on the impact of improving seat belt use in each individual State up to 90 percent in 2007, Table 3 provides baseline estimates for lives saved and cost savings due to the *actual* seat belt use that was recorded for each State in 2007. This table includes States with 2007 seat belt use above 90 percent, as well as States with seat belt use below 90 percent. The total United States cost savings is \$74.4 billion, with \$21.6 billion coming from States that don't have a primary seat belt law. The total lives saved estimate is 15,147, with 4,401 lives saved in States that don't have a primary seat belt law.

The far right column in Table 3 is a subset of the lives saved in the 13 States and Territories with seat belt use in 2007 over 90 percent. This column shows the estimate for the number of lives saved in these 13 States and Territories that is due to seat belt use being above 90 percent. For example, 123 lives were saved in California (2007 seat belt use of 94.6%) due to their seat belt use being 4.6 percentage points above 90 percent. These 123 lives are a subset of the total number of 1,791 lives saved in California. A total of 301 lives were saved by these 13 States and Territories having seat belt use above the baseline of 90 percent in 2007.

U.S. Department of Transportation

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration This Research Note was written by Marc Starnes, Mathematical Statistician and Lawrence Blincoe, Division Chief, Regulatory Analysis Divsion, of the National Center for Statistics and Analysis (NCSA), NHTSA. For any questions on this Research Note e-mail NCSAWEB@dot.gov.

Abbama 82.3% 400 \$1078.598.000 Atska 82.4% 27 \$168.149.000 Artzona 80.9% 238 \$13.09.821.000 California 94.6% 1.791 \$88.951.200.000 123 Colorado 81.1% 201 \$884.165.000 Connecticut 65.8% 101 \$924.160.000 Delaware 66.6% 49 \$250.183.000 Eorida 79.1% 857 \$3.831.580.000 Eorida 79.1% 857 \$3.843.000 Havait 97.6% 45 \$225.440.000 Isinis 90.1% 436 \$2.825.340.000 Havait 97.6% 377 \$1.535.443.000 Isinis 90.1% 436 \$2.826.535.000 Isinia 77.6% 377 \$1.556.449.00 Louisian 75.0% 308 \$1.265.37	State	2007 Seat Belt Use Rate (%)	Lives Saved	Total Cost Savings (in 2007 Dollars)	Lives Saved Due to Seat Belt Use Above 90 Percent
Arbona 80.9% 288 \$1.399.621.000 Arkansas 69.9% 219 \$561.521.000 California 94.6% 1.791 \$80.91.200.00 123 Colorado 81.1% 201 \$89.4165.000 Connecticut 83.8% 101 \$124.60.000 D.C. 87.1% 10 \$142.804.000 Debararo 86.6% 49 \$250.185.000 Havaii 97.6% 45 \$252.440.000 6 Idaio 78.5% 86 \$228.340.000 Indiaa 87.9% 377 \$1.535.449.000 Indiaa 87.9% 377 \$1.535.449.000 Invai 91.3% 184 \$826.26.55.000 1 1 Indiaa 87.9% 377 \$1.535.449.000 1 Invai 91.3% 160 \$510.146.000 1 Invai 91.3% <td>Alabama</td> <td>82.3%</td> <td>400</td> <td>\$1,078,598,000</td> <td>-</td>	Alabama	82.3%	400	\$1,078,598,000	-
Arkanssis 69.9% 219 551.521.000 - California 94.6% 1,761 58.951.263.000 123 Colorado 61.1% 201 58.94.165.000 - Connecticut 65.6% 101 59.924.00.00 - D.C. 67.1% 101 51.224.00.00 - Delavara 66.6% 49 52.00.185.000 - Fiorida 79.1% 857 53.831.580.000 - Georgia 69.0% 613 53.248.036.000 - Hawaii 97.6% 45 52.65.350.000 - Illinois 90.1% 436 52.65.350.000 - Illinois 90.1% 164 52.65.350.000 - Iowa 91.3% 164 52.65.350.000 - Iowa 91.3% 164 52.65.350.000 - Iowa 91.3% 165 \$1.25.373.000 - Iowa 91.3% 264 \$1.460.061.000	Alaska	82.4%	27	\$168,149,000	-
California 94 6% 1.791 98 851 208.000 123 Colorado 81 1% 201 \$894,165.000 - Connecticut 65 6% 101 \$\$24,280,000 - Delaware 86 6% 49 \$\$260,185,000 - Florida 79,1% 857 \$\$3,831,580,000 - Georgia 89,0% 613 \$\$2,242,086,000 - Hawaii 97,6% 45 \$\$255,446,000 6 Itinois 90,1% 435 \$\$2,625,50,00 1 Indiana 87,9% 377 \$\$1,535,449,000 - Icova 91,3% 184 \$\$26,510,00 - Icova 91,3% 184 \$\$26,200,00 - Icova 91,3% 292 \$\$00,445,000 - Icova 91,3% 254 \$\$1,460,000 - Mareadi 75,2% 308 \$\$1,265,373,000 - Maryland 93,1% 254 \$\$1,460,000	Arizona	80.9%	298	\$1,309,621,000	-
Colorado 81.1% 201 S894,165,000 - Connecticut 85.6% 101 S124,160,000 - D.C. 87.1% 10 S124,284,000 - Delaware 86.6% 49 S260,185,000 - Forda 79.1% 857 S3,31,580,000 - Georgia 89.0% 613 S256,446,000 - Hawaii 97.6% 45 S255,446,000 - Italiao 78.7% 86 S266,535,000 1 Italiana 87.7% 151,535,449,000 - Iowa 91,3% 184 S825,442,000 - Iowa 91,3% 184 S825,412,000 - Iowa 91,3% 186 S810,146,000 - Asnasa 75.0% 106 S11,460,081,000 - Maire 79.8% 72 S303,058,000 - Misscolussetts 68.7% 105 S1,265,30,060,00 34 <tr< td=""><td>Arkansas</td><td>69.9%</td><td>219</td><td>\$561,521,000</td><td>-</td></tr<>	Arkansas	69.9%	219	\$561,521,000	-
Connecticut 85 8% 101 S824,160,000 - D.C. 87,1% 10 S142,804,000 - Delaware 86,6% 49 S260,185,000 - Florida 79,1% 857 S3,831,580,000 - Georgia 89,0% 613 S3,244,086,000 - Havaii 97,6% 45 S255,446,000 6 Itinois 90,1% 436 S2,654,000 - Itinois 90,1% 436 S2,654,000 - Itinois 90,1% 436 S2,654,000 - Itinois 90,1% 436 S2,62,635,000 1 Indian 87,9% 377 \$1,53,549,000 - Icwa 91,3% 160 \$510,146,000 - Kentucky 71,8% 292 \$300,558,000 - Mariand 93,1% 254 \$1,460,001,000 13 Massachussetts 68,7% 105 \$1,285,373,000 <td< td=""><td>California</td><td>94.6%</td><td>1,791</td><td>\$8,951,208,000</td><td>123</td></td<>	California	94.6%	1,791	\$8,951,208,000	123
D.C. 87.1% 10 \$142.894.000 - Delaware 86.6% 49 \$260.185.000 - Florida 79.1% 857 \$3.83.1580.000 - Georgia 89.0% 613 \$3.240.056.000 - Havaii 97.6% 445 \$255.446.000 66 Idaho 78.5% 866 \$266.3340.000 - Ininais 90.1% 436 \$252.85.500 1 Indana 67.5% 186 \$268.349.000 - Iowa 91.3% 184 \$252.85.530.00 - Iowa 91.3% 184 \$252.412.000 5 Kansas 75.0% 1060 \$51.146.000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$1.205.37.000 - Marke 78.8% 72 \$306.58.000 - Minsesta 68.7% 105 \$1.285.37.3000 - Misseingia 77.8% 546 \$2.655.006.000 -	Colorado	81.1%	201	\$894,165,000	-
Delaware 86.6% 49 \$2201,15,000 Fiorida 79.1% 857 \$3,831,580,000 Georgia 68.0% 613 \$3,240,036,000 Hawaii 97.6% 45 \$255,446,000 6 Illinois 90.1% 436 \$226,848,000 Illinois 90.1% 436 \$226,848,000 Illinois 90.1% 436 \$2,626,535,000 -1 Indiana 67.9% 377 \$1,535,449,000 Iowa 91.3% 184 \$825,412,000 Kansas 75.0% 100 \$510,146,000 Kanisas 75.2% 308 \$1,206,394,000 Louislana 75.2% 308 \$1,400,061,000 13 Maryland 93.1% 254 \$1,460,061,000 -3 Maryland 93.7% 546 \$2,653,006,000 - Maryland 93.7% 546 \$2,650	Connecticut	85.8%	101	\$924,160,000	-
Florida 71 % 867 \$3.831 £80.000 - Georgia 69.0% 613 \$3.248.036.000 - Hawaii 97.6% 445 \$255.446.000 6 Idaho 76.5% 866 \$268.348.000 - Ilinois 90.1% 436 \$2.626.335.000 1 Indiana 67.9% 377 \$1.356.449.000 - Iowa 91.3% 184 \$265.11.000 5 Kansas 75.0% 160 \$51.01.46.000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$1.206.394.000 - Maine 79.8% 72 \$308.558.000 - Markand 93.1% 254 \$1.400.061.000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1.285.373.000 - Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$943.176.000 - Mississipip 71.78% 277 \$60.01,173.000 - Mississipip 71.78% 284 \$146.000<	D.C.	87.1%	10	\$142,804,000	-
Georgia 80 0% 613 \$3 248,08,000 - Hawaii 97,6% 45 \$255,446,000 6 Illinois 90,1% 436 \$268,348,000 - Illinois 90,1% 436 \$2626,535,000 1 Iowa 91,3% 184 \$825,442,000 - Iowa 91,3% 184 \$825,412,000 - Kanasa 75,0% 160 \$510,146,000 - Kanasa 75,0% 160 \$510,146,000 - Louisiana 75,2% 308 \$1,206,340,000 - Mariand 63,1% 224 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 63,1% 254 \$1,460,661,000 13 Masschussetts 68,7% 105 \$1,285,37,000 - Missispi 71,8% 227 \$308,3176,000 - Missispi 71,8% 287 \$120,371,000 - Missispi 71,8% 287 \$13,00 <td< td=""><td>Delaware</td><td>86.6%</td><td>49</td><td>\$260,185,000</td><td>-</td></td<>	Delaware	86.6%	49	\$260,185,000	-
Hawaii 97.6% 45 \$255,446,000 6 Idaho 78.5% 86 \$268,346,000 - Indiana 87.9% 377 \$1,535,449,000 - Iowa 91.3% 184 \$825,412,000 - Iowa 91.3% 184 \$825,412,000 - Iowa 91.3% 184 \$825,412,000 - Kantas 75.0% 160 \$51,046,000 - Kantas 75.2% 308 \$1,266,384,000 - Miarian 79.8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 63.7% 105 \$1,255,373,000 - Minesota 67.7% 201 \$943,176,000 - Minesota 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Mississippi 77.1% 282 3146,000 - Mississippi 77.8% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Netraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 -	Florida	79.1%	857	\$3,831,580,000	-
Idaho 78.5% 86 \$268,348,000 - Illinois 90.1% 436 \$2,626,535,000 1 Indiana 87.9% 377 \$1,535,449,000 - Iowa 91.3% 184 \$822,612,000 5 Kansas 75.0% 160 \$510,146,000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$1,206,394,000 - Maine 79.8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 93.1% 254 \$1,460,061,000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1,226,337,000 - Minesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Missispipi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$120,0371,000 - Netraska 78.% 28 \$168,786,000 - Netraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Netraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000	Georgia	89.0%	613	\$3,248,036,000	-
Ilinois 90.1% 436 \$2,626,535,000 1 Indiana 87,9% 377 \$1,535,449,000 - Iowa 91,3% 184 \$825,412,000 5 Kansas 75,0% 160 \$510,146,000 - Kentucky 71,8% 292 \$902,445,000 - Maine 75,2% 308 \$1,206,394,000 - Maine 79,8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 93,1% 254 \$1,460,001 0 - Massachussetts 68,7% 1005 \$1,285,373,000 - Michigan 93,7% 546 \$2,653,006,000 34 Minnesota 87,8% 210 \$843,176,000 - Mississippi 71,8% 227 \$2,285,370,000 - Mississippi 71,8% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Netaka 78,7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Nevada 92,2% 149	Hawaii	97.6%	45	\$255,446,000	6
Indiana 87.9% 377 \$1,535,449,000 - lowa 91.3% 184 \$825,412,000 5 Kansas 75.0% 160 \$\$510,146,000 - Kentucky 71.8% 292 \$\$02,445,000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$\$1,266,394,000 - Maine 79.8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryand 93.1% 254 \$1,460,061,000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1,285,373,000 - Minesota 93.7% 546 \$2,653,000 34 Minesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$6001,173,000 - Nessari 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,360,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,360,000 - Nev Jersey 91.4% 260 \$2,806,822,00	Idaho	78.5%	86	\$268,348,000	-
Iowa 91.3% 184 \$825,412,000 5 Kansas 75.0% 160 \$\$10,146,000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$\$1,206,394,000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$\$1,206,394,000 - Maine 78.8% 72 \$308,656,000 - Maine 78.8% 105 \$\$1,480,061,000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$\$1,285,373,000 - Michigan 93.7% 546 \$\$2,650,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$\$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$\$1,203,71,000 - Nestaka 78.7% 88 \$\$457,421,000 - New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$\$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$\$2,806,822,000 6 New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$\$2,806,822,000 6 New Jersey 91.4% 303	Illinois	90.1%	436	\$2,626,535,000	1
Kansas 75.0% 160 \$510,146,000 - Kentucky 71.8% 292 \$302,445,000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$1,206,394,000 - Maine 79.8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 93.1% 254 \$1,400,661,000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1,285,373,000 - Minnesota 93.7% 546 \$2,653,006,000 34 Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$394,3176,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Nebraska 78.7% 88 \$457,21,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Askico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 - New Askico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 - New Askico 91.5% 133	Indiana	87.9%	377	\$1,535,449,000	-
Kentucky 71.8% 292 \$902,445,000 - Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$1,206,334,000 - Marie 79.8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 93.1% 254 \$1,460,061,000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1,285,373,000 - Michigan 93.7% 546 \$2,683,006,000 34 Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Nebraska 78.7% 88 \$4457,421,000 - Newada 92.2% 149 \$8143,81,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,766,000 - New Jarsey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Jarsey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 - New Jarsey 91.4% 250	Iowa	91.3%	184	\$825,412,000	5
Louisiana 75.2% 308 \$1.206,394,000 - Maine 79.8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 93.1% 254 \$1.460,061,000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1.285,373,000 - Michigan 93.7% 546 \$2.653,006,000 34 Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$1200,371,000 - Netaska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Harpshire 63.8% 28 \$166,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Jersey 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$32,465,000 - North Carolina 81.6% 409<	Kansas	75.0%	160	\$510,146,000	-
Maine 79.8% 72 \$308,558,000 - Maryland 93.1% 254 \$1,460,061,000 13 Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1,285,373,000 - Michigan 93.7% 546 \$2,653,006,000 34 Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Missispipi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Netraska 78.7% 88 \$4457,421,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jarsey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Varko 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 729 \$3,224,655,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217	Kentucky	71.8%	292	\$902,445,000	-
Maryland 93.1% 254 \$1,460,061,000 13 Massachussetts 66.7% 105 \$1,285,373,000 - Michigan 93.7% 546 \$2,653,006,000 34 Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$843,176,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Nontana 79.6% 72 \$234,146,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jarsey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 North Zaolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Orio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Orio 81.6% 412	Louisiana	75.2%	308	\$1,206,394,000	-
Massachussetts 68.7% 105 \$1,285,373,000 - Michigan 93.7% 546 \$2,653,000,000 34 Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 217 \$601,173,000 - Missisouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Montana 79.6% 72 \$234,146,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 Newada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Jarsey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,826,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Okianoma 83.1% 303 \$1,28,365,64,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Okianoma 83.1% 3	Maine	79.8%	72	\$308,558,000	-
Michigan 93.7% 546 \$2,653,006,000 34 Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Montana 79.6% 72 \$234,146,000 - Netraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,38,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2	Maryland	93.1%	254	\$1,460,061,000	13
Minnesota 87.8% 210 \$943,176,000 - Missispipi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Montana 79.6% 72 \$234,146,000 - Nebraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Newdad 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,212,238,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvaria 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 <td>Massachussetts</td> <td>68.7%</td> <td>105</td> <td>\$1,285,373,000</td> <td>-</td>	Massachussetts	68.7%	105	\$1,285,373,000	-
Mississippi 71.8% 277 \$601,173,000 - Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Montana 79.6% 72 \$234,146,000 - Nebraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$8143,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Verk 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Dakota 73.0% 36	Michigan	93.7%	546	\$2,653,006,000	34
Missouri 77.2% 297 \$1,200,371,000 - Montana 79.6% 72 \$234,146,000 - Nebraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$\$143,81,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Vark 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Orio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - South Carolina 78.6% 313 \$970,602,000 - South Dakota 73.0% 36 \$120,065,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 313	Minnesota	87.8%	210	\$943,176,000	-
Montana 79.6% 72 \$234,146,000 - Nebraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2.806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Okahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - Teas 91.8% 1,622	Mississippi	71.8%	277	\$601,173,000	-
Nebraska 78.7% 88 \$457,421,000 - Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$136,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,54,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 39	Missouri	77.2%	297	\$1,200,371,000	-
Nevada 92.2% 149 \$814,381,000 6 New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,54,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 - Vashington 96.4% 264 \$2,050,317,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 </td <td>Montana</td> <td>79.6%</td> <td>72</td> <td>\$234,146,000</td> <td>-</td>	Montana	79.6%	72	\$234,146,000	-
New Hampshire 63.8% 28 \$186,756,000 - New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - South Dakota 73.0% 36 \$120,065,000 - Texnas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 - Varbina 86.8% 1	Nebraska	78.7%	88	\$457,421,000	-
New Jersey 91.4% 250 \$2,806,822,000 6 New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - Fennessee 80.2% 395 \$1,391,552,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 - Varin Carolina 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Texas 91.8%	Nevada	92.2%	149	\$814,381,000	6
New Mexico 91.5% 133 \$524,628,000 5 New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - South Dakota 73.0% 36 \$120,065,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 395 \$1,391,552,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 48 Utah 86.8% 137 \$525,609,000 - Vermont 87.1% 29	New Hampshire	63.8%	28	\$186,756,000	-
New York 83.5% 521 \$4,413,093,000 - North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 395 \$1,391,552,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 48 Utah 86.8% 137 \$525,609,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,67,7381,000 - Washington 96.4% 264	New Jersey	91.4%	250	\$2,806,822,000	6
North Carolina 88.8% 729 \$3,294,655,000 - North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 395 \$1,391,552,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 48 Utah 86.8% 137 \$525,609,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Washington 96.4% 264<	New Mexico	91.5%	133	\$524,628,000	5
North Dakota 82.2% 33 \$121,320,000 - Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - South Dakota 73.0% 36 \$120,065,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 395 \$1,391,552,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 48 Utah 86.8% 137 \$525,609,000 - Vermont 87.1% 29 \$65,249,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Washington 96.4% 264 \$2,050,317,000 29 West Virginia 89.6% 163	New York	83.5%	521	\$4,413,093,000	-
Ohio 81.6% 409 \$2,812,238,000 - Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - South Carolina 73.0% 36 \$120,065,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 395 \$1,391,552,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 48 Utah 86.8% 137 \$525,609,000 - Vermont 87.1% 29 \$65,249,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Washington 96.4% 264 \$2,050,317,000 29 West Virginia 89.6% 163 \$562,717,000 - Wisconsin 75.3% 237	North Carolina	88.8%	729	\$3,294,655,000	-
Oklahoma 83.1% 303 \$1,028,481,000 - Oregon 95.3% 217 \$865,364,000 20 Pennsylvania 86.7% 412 \$2,385,554,000 - Rhode Island 79.1% 15 \$142,043,000 - South Carolina 74.5% 313 \$970,602,000 - South Dakota 73.0% 36 \$120,065,000 - Tennessee 80.2% 395 \$1,391,552,000 - Texas 91.8% 1,622 \$7,754,239,000 48 Utah 86.8% 137 \$525,609,000 - Vermont 87.1% 29 \$65,249,000 - Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Washington 96.4% 264 \$2,050,317,000 29 West Virginia 89.6% 163 \$562,717,000 - Wisconsin 75.3% 237 \$1,007,452,000 - Wyoming 72.2% 59	North Dakota	82.2%	33	\$121,320,000	-
Oregon95.3%217\$865,364,00020Pennsylvania86.7%412\$2,385,554,000-Rhode Island79.1%15\$142,043,000-South Carolina74.5%313\$970,602,000-South Dakota73.0%36\$120,065,000-Tennessee80.2%395\$1,391,552,000-Texas91.8%1,622\$7,754,239,00048Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wyoming72.2%59\$131,415,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	Ohio	81.6%	409	\$2,812,238,000	-
Pennsylvania86.7%412\$2,385,554,000-Rhode Island79.1%15\$142,043,000-South Carolina74.5%313\$970,602,000-South Dakota73.0%36\$120,065,000-Tennessee80.2%395\$1,391,552,000-Texas91.8%1,622\$7,754,239,00048Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wyoming72.2%59\$131,415,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	Oklahoma	83.1%	303	\$1,028,481,000	-
Rhode Island79.1%15\$142,043,000-South Carolina74.5%313\$970,602,000-South Dakota73.0%36\$120,065,000-Tennessee80.2%395\$1,391,552,000-Texas91.8%1,622\$7,754,239,00048Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wyoming72.2%59\$131,415,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	Oregon	95.3%	217	\$865,364,000	20
South Carolina74.5%313\$970,602,000-South Dakota73.0%36\$120,065,000-Tennessee80.2%395\$1,391,552,000-Texas91.8%1,622\$7,754,239,00048Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wisconsin75.3%237\$1,007,452,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	Pennsylvania	86.7%	412	\$2,385,554,000	-
South Dakota73.0%36\$120,065,000-Tennessee80.2%395\$1,391,552,000-Texas91.8%1,622\$7,754,239,00048Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wisconsin75.3%237\$1,007,452,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	Rhode Island	79.1%	15	\$142,043,000	-
Tennessee80.2%395\$1,391,552,000-Texas91.8%1,622\$7,754,239,00048Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wisconsin75.3%237\$1,007,452,000-Wyoming72.2%59\$131,415,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	South Carolina	74.5%	313	\$970,602,000	-
Texas91.8%1,622\$7,754,239,00048Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wisconsin75.3%237\$1,007,452,000-Wyoming72.2%59\$131,415,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	South Dakota	73.0%	36	\$120,065,000	-
Utah86.8%137\$525,609,000-Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wisconsin75.3%237\$1,007,452,000-Wyoming72.2%59\$131,415,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	Tennessee	80.2%	395	\$1,391,552,000	-
Vermont87.1%29\$65,249,000-Virginia79.9%320\$1,767,381,000-Washington96.4%264\$2,050,317,00029West Virginia89.6%163\$562,717,000-Wisconsin75.3%237\$1,007,452,000-Wyoming72.2%59\$131,415,000-Puerto Rico92.1%84\$522,673,6595	Texas	91.8%	1,622	\$7,754,239,000	48
Virginia 79.9% 320 \$1,767,381,000 - Washington 96.4% 264 \$2,050,317,000 29 West Virginia 89.6% 163 \$562,717,000 - Wisconsin 75.3% 237 \$1,007,452,000 - Wyoming 72.2% 59 \$131,415,000 - Puerto Rico 92.1% 84 \$522,673,659 5	Utah	86.8%	137	\$525,609,000	-
Washington 96.4% 264 \$2,050,317,000 29 West Virginia 89.6% 163 \$562,717,000 - Wisconsin 75.3% 237 \$1,007,452,000 - Wyoming 72.2% 59 \$131,415,000 - Puerto Rico 92.1% 84 \$522,673,659 5	Vermont	87.1%	29	\$65,249,000	-
West Virginia 89.6% 163 \$562,717,000 - Wisconsin 75.3% 237 \$1,007,452,000 - Wyoming 72.2% 59 \$131,415,000 - Puerto Rico 92.1% 84 \$522,673,659 5	Virginia			\$1,767,381,000	-
Wisconsin 75.3% 237 \$1,007,452,000 - Wyoming 72.2% 59 \$131,415,000 - Puerto Rico 92.1% 84 \$522,673,659 5	Washington	96.4%	264	\$2,050,317,000	29
Wyoming 72.2% 59 \$131,415,000 - Puerto Rico 92.1% 84 \$522,673,659 5	West Virginia	89.6%	163	\$562,717,000	-
Puerto Rico 92.1% 84 \$522,673,659 5	Wisconsin	75.3%	237	\$1,007,452,000	-
Puerto Rico 92.1% 84 \$522,673,659 5	Wyoming	72.2%	59	\$131,415,000	-
		92.1%	84		5
US IUIAI (Excluding Fuerto Rico) 15,147 \$74,303,419,000 501	US Total (Excluding P	uerto Rico)	15,147	\$74,385,419,000	301
Non-Primary-Law States 4,401 \$21,576,528,000 6	· · ·	· · ·			6

Table 3: Seat Belt Use Rate, Lives Saved and Total Cost Savings in 2007. States Without Primary Seat Belt Laws Are Shaded

NHTSA's National Center for Statistics and Analysis

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590