

Both studies found that crash risk was about four times greater when using a cell phone.

when cell phone calls were made. Both studies found that crash risk was about four times greater when using a cell phone. Hands-free phones did not appear to be any safer than hand-held phones.

In the only other study to use phone records directly linked to driving, Young and Schreiner (2009) studied vehicles with OnStar equipment that included a hands-free phone. OnStar call centers record and store all hands-free calls and all airbag deployments. Airbag deployments per driver-minute were lower during hands-free call periods than during call-free periods. Young and Schreiner concluded that "for personal conversations using a hands-free embedded device the risk of an airbag crash is somewhere in a range from a moderately lower risk to a risk near that of driving without a recent personal conversation. ... These results are not consistent with the large increase in crash risk reported in epidemiological studies using the case-crossover method [referring to the Redelmeier and McEvoy studies summarized above]".

A review of the Young and Schreiner study (Braver et al., 2009) noted several flaws that call these conclusions into question: driving with and without calls may have occurred under different conditions with differing crash risks; driver use of cell phones other than OnStar was not known; and driving time during no-call periods was only estimated from fleet-level data and not measured directly.

Two other studies (Violanti & Marshall, 1996; Laberge-Nadeau et al., 2003) combined cell phone records, crash records, and survey responses from drivers in New York and Québec, respectively. They did not have data to link cell phone use directly to crashes but instead compared overall crash rates of cell phone users and non-users. Both studies concluded that crash risks were higher for cell phone users than for non-users.

These crash data studies point out how difficult it is to reach definitive conclusions about the effect of cell phone use on crash risk. Braver et al. raise the key point regarding the Young and Schreiner study: driving with and without calls may occur under conditions with different crash risks. The Redelmeier and McEvoy studies present a similar issue. A crash-involved driver may have faced different crash risks while driving at the same time of day the week before the crash.

Naturalistic studies. The only evidence on the general-population crash risk produced by secondary task distractions other than cell phones and texting comes from two analyses of the 100-car study data (Klauer et al., 2006; Klauer et al., 2010). Both studies classified secondary tasks as simple (requiring at most one glance away from the forward roadway and/or at most one button press), moderate (at most two glances and/or two button presses, including talking on or listening to a cell phone), or complex (multiple glances and/or button presses, including dialing a cell phone). The two studies used different control groups with which to compare drivers involved in crashes

and near-crashes. The 2006 study used randomly chosen drivers and driving situations in a case-control study design. The 2010 study used the same drivers involved in crashes or near-crashes in previous driving at the same time of day in a similar location in a case-crossover design. Both studies found that complex secondary tasks increased the risk of crashes and near-crashes substantially: twice as high in the case-crossover study (odds ratio 2.1) and three times as high in the case-control (3.1). Moderate secondary tasks also increased risk: odds ratios of 1.3 and 2.1, respectively. Simple secondary tasks did not affect risk: odds ratios of 0.8 and 1.2, neither of which was significantly different from 1 (Klauer et al., 2010, p. iv).

Analyses of the two commercial vehicle naturalistic studies used the same classification of secondary tasks into simple, moderate, and complex. Using a case-control study design, they found that complex secondary tasks increased the risk of safety-critical events substantially, with odds ratios ranging from 4.0 for reading a book or newspaper to 23.2 for texting (the effects on crashes were not analyzed because there were only 21 in the combined data). Some moderate tasks increased risk, for example using or reaching for a 2-way radio (odds ratio 6.7) and personal grooming (4.5) while others did not, for example talking on a CB radio (0.6) and looking at something outside the vehicle (0.5). Dialing a cell phone increased risk (odds ratio 5.9) while talking on or listening to a hand-held cell phone had no effect (1.0) and talking or listening to a hands-free phone reduced risk (0.4) (Olson et al., 2009, p. xxi, Table 3).

Elvik (2011) conducted a meta-analysis of 12 crash data and naturalistic studies of cell phone effects on crash risk. He concluded that studies that do not have precise information on cell phone use at the time of a crash "are almost worthless as far as estimating the risk associated with using mobile phones" and even the best studies may not control adequately for other factors that may influence the results. From the best studies – those discussed above – he concluded that crash risk is about three times greater when using a cell phone.

Aggregate data studies. Several recent studies take a broad look at cell phone or text messaging influences on crashes overall, using aggregate data rather than cell phone and crash data from individual drivers. The challenge of these studies is to isolate the effects of cell phones or texting from the many other factors that affect crashes and crash rates.

Farmer et al. (2010) combined the fourfold increase in crash risk while using a cell phone from the McEvoy et al. and Redelmeier and Tibshirani studies with the 7% cell phone use rate while driving obtained in a telephone survey to conclude that cell phone use caused 1.3 million crashes in 2008, or about 22% of all crashes, 19% of all fatal crashes, and 23% of all injury crashes. The National Safety Council (NSC) (2010a, 2010b) used similar methods to produce a similar estimate: 25% of all crashes are caused by cell phones.

Flanagan and Sayer (2010) critiqued the National Safety Council's study. They noted that NHTSA (2010a) estimates that 18-22% of all crashes are associated with (but not necessarily caused by) all forms of distraction while NSC estimates that 25% are caused by cell phone use alone. Using different values than NSC for the risk of cell phone use, the frequency of use while driving, the presence of multiple causes for many crashes, and the extent to which drivers reduce their cell phone use in more risky driving situations, Flanagan and Sayer concluded that cell phones may be associated with 3% to 4% of crashes.

Wilson and Stimpson (2010) compared trends in distracted driving fatalities recorded in FARS with trends in cell phone subscriptions and text message volume. They observed that distracted driving fatalities and text messaging both increased substantially from 2005 to 2008. Their multivariate regression analysis estimated that increased texting since 2001 produced over 16,000 additional traffic fatalities.

Fowles et al. (2010) studied the effects of cell phones on fatality rates from a "classical econometric" and quite technical point of view. They considered the effects of broad social and economic variables such as beer consumption, proportion of young males, seat belt laws, and the number of cell phone subscribers on annual fatality rates from 1980 to 2004. They concluded that fatality rates increased as cell phones first began to be used, then decreased as cell phone use rose, and finally increased again more recently. They attributed the positive effect of cell phones in the middle period to their use to call for emergency assistance at a crash. Now that cell phones are almost universal, their negative effects in distracting drivers overcome these positive effects. "The bottom line is that cell phones now have an adverse effect on motor vehicle fatality rates."

Collision insurance claim study. As part of a study of the effect of cell phone laws on insurance claim frequencies, HLDI (2009) tracked collision claim frequencies for several states in the period 2000-2009 (different years for different states). During this period of rapid growth in cell phone use in the general population and by drivers, collision claim rates either were flat or decreased slightly, both in states with and without cell phone laws. Collision claims differ from crashes: some crashes may not produce a collision claim because the damage was slight or because a vehicle was not insured, and minor events that produce collision claims may not be reported to the police as crashes. So collision claim rates may differ from crash rates.

Drivers frequently are distracted, perhaps as much as half the time while driving.

Summary and discussion //

Distraction effects on crash risk. What does this all mean? A few things are certain, while others are more a matter of opinion.

What's certain:

- Distractions affect driving performance.
- Drivers frequently are distracted, perhaps as much as half the time while driving.

Distractions are estimated to be associated with 15% to 25% of crashes

- Drivers adapt to some extent: they pay more attention to driving and reduce their distracting activities (such as using cell phones) in more risky driving situations. The 100-car data provides some documentation: secondary task frequency was 54% in random situations but 23% in situations similar to those that produced a crash or near-crash.
- Distractions are estimated to be associated with 15% to 25% of crashes at all levels from minor property damage to fatal injury. The true role of distractions in crashes may be greater because some distractions may not be reported accurately.
- Distractions cause some unknown number of individual crashes: many officers who regularly write crash reports can cite specific examples.

What's far from certain is how much various distractions affect crash risk. While the crash risk varies for different driving situations, the first question to ask is how a specific distraction affects overall crash risk.

The cell phone studies provide the best evidence. The studies estimate that cell phone use increases crash risk by:

- About 4 times, in the two classic studies that used cell phone records (Redelmeier and Tibshirani, 1997; McEvoy et al., 2005);
- About 3 times, in a meta-analysis of all crash data and naturalistic studies (Elvik, 2011);
- 2 to 3 times, for crashes and near-crashes in the 100-car study, using random controls (Klauer et al., 2006);
- 1.3 to 2.1 times, for crashes and near-crashes in the 100-car study, using drivers in similar situations as controls (Klauer et al., 2010);
- Not enough to be detected, for collision claims (HLDI, 2009).

The truth probably lies somewhere in this range. Cell phone use cannot increase crash risk by a factor of four in all situations: if it did, then cell phones would have caused about one-quarter of all crashes (Farmer et al., 2010; NSC, 2010a and 2010b), while all forms of distraction are estimated to be involved in 15% to 25% of crashes. But cell phone use – certainly hand-held, and perhaps also hands-free – does increase crash risk in some situations for some drivers. The only definite conclusion is that hand-held cell phone use increases crash risk to some extent.

There is no conclusive evidence on whether hands-free cell phone use is less risky than hand-held use. The 100-car study analyses found that complex tasks such as dialing a cell phone were more risky than simpler tasks such as talking on a phone (Klauer et al., 2006 and 2010). Analyses of the two commercial vehicle naturalistic studies found that dialing a cell phone increased the risk of safety-critical events, talking on or listening to a hand-held cell phone had no effect, and using a hands-free phone reduced the risk (Olson et al., 2009). Dialing a cell phone requires only a few seconds and involves both eyes and hands while a cell phone conversation may last

5 // How does distraction affect crash risk?

Texting probably increases crash risk more than cell phone use because texting requires both visual and manual distraction for a longer period of time than dialing a cell phone.

for many minutes and either involves one hand or is hands-free. The 100-car results imply that dialing a cell phone increases crash risk more for a short time while a cell phone conversation increases crash risk less for a longer time. The commercial vehicle studies suggest that cell phone effects on crash risk are produced by looking at or holding the phone, not by talking or listening. But the crash studies found no difference between crash risks for hand-held and hands-free phones (Redelmeier and Tibshirani, McEvoy).

Texting probably increases crash risk more than cell phone use because texting requires both visual and manual distraction for a longer period of time than dialing a cell phone. The only data on the risk of texting come from analyses of the two commercial vehicle naturalistic studies. They found that texting increased the risk of safety-critical events substantially, with an odds ratio of 23.2 (Olson et al., 2009; no texting was observed in 100-car study because data were collected in 2003 and 2004, before texting became common). These results are based on a small sample of 31 safety-critical events involving texting by commercial vehicle drivers, so the results may not be accurate and may not apply to passenger vehicle drivers.

No other distraction has even this much evidence for its effect on crash risk.

6 // Are there effective countermeasures for distracted driving?

Distracted driving countermeasures attempt to do one of three things:

- Eliminate the distraction, for example by prohibiting or preventing cell phone use or convincing drivers not to use cell phones;
- Reduce the driver's attention needed for a distracting task, for example by requiring or convincing drivers to use hands-free instead of hand-held cell phones;
- Warn distracted drivers of an impending risky situation, for example by a lane departure warning in the vehicle or a rumble strip in the roadway.

Distracted driving countermeasures can address the driving environment (the roadway and other things outside the vehicle), the vehicle, the driver, or some combination of these.

Roadway environment countermeasures. Many things outside the vehicle – people, animals, scenery, buildings, objects, signs, other road users, and the like – can attract a driver's eyes and attention. Regulations or standards for road signs and commercial signs provide a potential opportunity to eliminate or reduce distraction. But, as discussed in Chapter 4, there is not enough research evidence on how much distraction from a sign is safe. Distracted driving considerations do not suggest any changes to the guidelines or standards for road and commercial roadside signage in place in most jurisdictions.

Some types of rumble strips are an effective and widely-used strategy to warn drivers as they are leaving their travel lane.

Several roadway countermeasures are directed at drivers who are fatigued, impaired, or inattentive in addition to those who are distracted. For example, some types of rumble strips are an effective and widely-used strategy to warn drivers as they are leaving their travel lane. Persaud et al. (2004) studied centerline rumble strips on rural two-lane roads in seven states and concluded that they reduced all injury crashes by 14% and frontal and sideswipe crashes by 25%. In a British Columbia study, Sayed et al. (2010) found that roads with both edgeline and centerline rumble strips reduced off-road and head-on crashes a combined 21%. For other effective roadway strategies, such as shoulder width and design, see the AASHTO guides #4, for head-on collisions, and #6, for run-off-road collisions (NCHRP, 2003a and 2003b).

6 // Are there effective countermeasures for distracted driving?

Vehicle countermeasures. Measures to reduce the distracting effects that the vehicle imposes on driving, for example by managing the way vehicle-based information is presented to the driver, or to warn the driver of risky situations through forward collision or lane departure alerts, have been studied extensively. This report does not review these measures because states have little role in improving or regulating them. See Donmetz et al. (2009), Engström and Victor (2009), Regan, Victor et al. (2009), Smith et al. (2009), and Zhang et al. (2009) for summaries.

Driver countermeasures. States can attempt to reduce driver distraction by laws prohibiting certain distracting activities, with appropriate publicity and enforcement, or by communications persuading drivers to reduce or eliminate these activities. Both strategies have been debated and used extensively in recent years, especially for the distractions produced by cell phone use and texting.

General distracted driving laws. All states have provisions in their traffic laws requiring drivers to be competent and in control of their vehicles. These may be applicable to distracted driving: for example, some blatant forms of distraction may be considered reckless driving. Many states also prohibit specific distracting activities such as watching television while driving, which was illegal in 38 states as of 2005 (Kelderman, 2005). At least four states – Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma – and the District of Columbia now have laws specifically directed at distracted driving (AAA, 2010). For example, Maine's 2009 law (Sec. 1. 29-A MRSA §2117) prohibits "operation of a motor vehicle while distracted" which in turn is defined as "an activity that is not necessary to the operation of the vehicle and that actually impairs, or would reasonably be expected to impair, the ability of the person to safety operate the vehicle." None of these distracted driving laws has been evaluated (Regan, Young et al., 2009b).

Cell phone and texting laws. As of June 2011, 9 states and the District of Columbia prohibited talking on a hand-held cell phone while driving, 30 states and the District of Columbia prohibited the use of all cell phones by novice drivers (states use different definitions of novice driver), 34 states and the District of Columbia prohibited texting while driving, and 7 additional states prohibited texting by novice drivers (GHSA, 2011a).

McCartt et al. (2010) summarized several studies of the immediate and long-term effects of hand-held cell phone laws on cell phone use in New York, the District of Columbia, and Connecticut. All studies used roadside observers to record cell phone use. In each jurisdiction, cell phone use decreased substantially immediately after the laws became effective: by 47% in New York, 41% in the District of Columbia, and 76% in Connecticut. Use then increased, by different amounts in the three jurisdictions, but remained lower than might have been expected based on the experience of other nearby states without the laws. None of the jurisdictions enforced its law vigorously. The observers could not determine accurately whether drivers were using

As of June 2011, 9 states and the District of Columbia prohibited talking on a hand-held cell phone while driving, 30 states and the District of Columbia prohibited the use of all cell phones by novice drivers, 34 states and the District of Columbia prohibited texting while driving, and 7 additional states prohibited texting by novice drivers.

6 // Are there effective countermeasures for distracted driving?

hands-free cell phones so could not measure combined hand-held and hands-free cell phone use.

Foss et al. (2009) studied the effects of North Carolina's 2006 law banning all cell phone use by drivers younger than 18. Cell phone use by teenage drivers at high schools did not change from one to two months before the law to five months after the law. Two-thirds of teenagers interviewed post-law were aware of the law but fewer than one-quarter believed that the law was being enforced. About half of those who had driven on the day before the interview used their cell phones while driving.

Braitman and McCartt (2010) included questions on cell phone laws in their telephone survey of driver cell phone use. By comparing responses from states with and without laws, they concluded that "laws banning hand-held phone use seem to discourage some drivers from talking on any type of phone and motivate some drivers to talk hands-free. Laws banning texting while driving have little effect on the reported frequency of texting while driving in any age group."

Three studies have attempted to estimate the effects of hand-held cell phone laws on crashes. As discussed in Chapter 5, HLDI (2009) used data from insurance collision claims. They examined whether collision claims dropped when states implemented cell phone laws compared to claims in adjoining states without cell phone laws. HLDI found that cell phone laws had no effect on collision claims: claim rates either were flat or decreased slightly, both in states with and without cell phone laws.

Nikolaev et al. (2010) used county-level fatal and injury crash rates per licensed driver from 1997 to 2007 to study the effects of New York's 2001 hand-held cell phone law. After the law, injury crash rates were lower in all 62 New York counties and significantly lower in 46; fatal crash rates were lower in 46 counties and significantly lower in 10. The analysis did not control for other influences on crash rates over this time period, and both fatal and injury crash rates were decreasing in the pre-law period.

Kolko (2009) studied cell phone law effects using FARS data from 1997 to 2005. Cell phone laws during this period were in effect for more than 4 years in New York, 18 months in New Jersey and the District of Columbia, and 2 months in Connecticut. This limited experience suggested that the laws reduced traffic fatalities, but only in bad weather or wet road conditions, and the laws had no statistically significant effect on overall traffic fatalities.

In the only study of texting bans, HLDI (2010) studied their effect on collision claims using the same methods as their 2009 study of cell phone laws. They concluded that texting bans did not reduce collision claims. In fact, there appears to have been a small increase in claims in the states enacting texting bans compared to neighboring states. HLDI suggested two possible reasons for the increase. Texters may realize that texting bans are difficult to enforce,

6 // Are there effective countermeasures for distracted driving?

so they may have little incentive to reduce texting for fear of being detected and fined. Alternatively, texters may have responded to the ban by hiding their phones from view, potentially increasing their distracting effects by requiring longer glances away from the road.

After the texting ban become effective in one of the states studied by HLDI, crashes decreased at the same time that collision claims increased (Marti, 2011).

Distracted driving law enforcement. Only one study has evaluated the effect of law enforcement directed specifically at distracted driving laws. Hartford, Connecticut, and Syracuse, New York, participated in a NHTSA demonstration program of cell phone and texting law enforcement. Three waves of high-visibility enforcement and publicity activities were conducted in 2010 and a fourth was conducted in spring 2011. Immediately after the second wave, observed cell phone use dropped 56% in Hartford and 38% in Syracuse; observed texting while driving dropped 68% in Hartford and 42% in Syracuse (Cosgrove et al., 2010). Experience with similar short-term high-visibility enforcement campaigns directed at impaired driving and seat belt use suggests that the effects often diminish over time unless the campaign is repeated periodically. Results from the full study are scheduled to be released in July 2011.

All 27 European Union member states except Sweden ban hand-held cell phone use.

Cell phone laws and enforcement in other countries. Janitzek et al. (2010) report on laws, enforcement, and behavior regarding cell phones and other portable electronic devices in Europe. All 27 European Union member states except Sweden ban hand-held cell phone use, as do Iceland and Switzerland. Enforcement strategies and levels vary. About half the European countries target cell phones in special enforcement activities such as one-day campaigns or special motorbike enforcement units. The number of citations issued for cell phone law violations varies considerably, but in some countries "they outnumbered in recent years some other traditional offences such as non use of seat belts or impaired driving" (ibid, p. 62).

Drivers in Italy, Poland, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom were surveyed on their use of cell phones and other electronic devices while driving. About 25% to 45% of the drivers in the first four countries reported they used a hand-held or hands-free phone at least "sometimes" and about 10% used one "often" – use rates generally lower than those reported in the United States (Chapter 3). Seventy percent of United Kingdom drivers reported never using their phones while driving, and of those who do, 40% said they always used a hands-free phone (ibid, p. 81).

Australia and seven Canadian provinces also ban hand-held cell phone use and Japan bans all cell phone use while driving (ibid, Sec. 4.3). Harbluk et al. (2010) document Canadian distracted driving laws as of spring 2010. WHO (2011) provides a broad overview of how various countries are addressing cell phone use when driving.

FILE
12-017595

Several manufacturers provide systems that attempt to block or filter a driver's cell phone while the vehicle is in motion.

Technology. Several manufacturers provide systems that attempt to block or filter a driver's cell phone while the vehicle is in motion. Some consist of software applications ("apps") loaded onto the cell phone. They are triggered when the phone's motion exceeds some threshold, so they work only on GPS-equipped "smartphones." Other systems are integrated into the vehicle and affect all cell phones in the vehicle through a small transmitter.

Different systems have different features to block or allow calls. Blocked incoming calls can be stored as voice or text messages; auto-reply responses can be sent. All systems allow emergency calls to 911. Some allow calls to a few other numbers set in advance. Some block all incoming calls, texts, and emails. Some allow calls when the vehicle is briefly stopped at a red light; others block calls for several minutes after stopping. Some allow geographic areas to be specified within which all calls are blocked. Some allow the user to allow or block calls from specified phone numbers. Each system has a different strategy for addressing the "passenger problem" – whether and how to allow calls by someone in motion who is not a driver, such as a passenger in a car or a rider on a bus or train.

This technology is developing very rapidly. Pogue (2010) provides a recent overview. The University of Michigan's Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI) is conducting a study in 2011 to evaluate these systems (GHSA, 2011b).

Distracted driving communications and education. Most states conduct distracted driving education and communication activities (GHSA, 2010).

- For beginning drivers: Twenty-three states have created special materials on distraction for teen drivers. Information on distracted driving is a required component of driver education in 18 states and the District of Columbia. There are distracted driving questions on the driver's license test in 17 states and the District of Columbia. Thirty-two states and the District of Columbia have distinct sections on distracted driving in their driver license manuals.
- For others: Thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia conducted a recent public communication or education campaign on distracted driving. Eight states provided training or technical assistance to the judiciary on distracted driving.

None of these communication and education activities has been evaluated to see whether they increased drivers' knowledge, changed their behavior, or reduced crashes.

U.S. Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood has made distracted driving a top safety priority. The Department of Transportation has produced a variety of communication and education materials (see distraction.gov). Many other persons and organizations have publicized distracted driving or conducted specifically targeted campaigns, including Oprah Winfrey's *No Phone Zone* (www.oprah.com/packages/no-phone-zone.html), FocusDriven and the National Safety Council's *On the Road, Off the Phone* (www.focusdriven.org),

6 // Are there effective countermeasures for distracted driving?

Many companies around the world have established and implemented policies for their employees regarding cell phone use.

and the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons' *Decide to Drive* (www.decidetodrive.org). Some physicians are including distracted driving in their discussions with patients (Ship, 2010). While these activities undoubtedly have reached many drivers, their effects on driver knowledge, driver behavior, or crashes have not been evaluated.

Company policies and programs. Many companies around the world have established and implemented policies for their employees regarding cell phone use and other distractions (Regan, Young et al., 2009b). Speakers at the 2010 Department of Transportation Distracted Driving Summit provided examples (distraction.gov). The Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (NETS) reports that, of the 4,690 public and private organizations that downloaded the 2010 NETS Drive Safety at Work Week campaign materials, 3,067 have a cell phone policy in place, with 1,152 banning the use of all cell phones and another 1,915 prohibiting hand-held cell phones. Another 1,062 organizations plan to implement a policy in 2011 (trafficsafety.org).

Thirty-five states have worked with other state agencies and private employers to address distracted driving. Sixteen states and the District of Columbia have partnered with other state agencies or private companies to develop distracted driving policies (GHSA, 2010). Company policies can be a powerful influence on their employees' driving because companies can monitor their drivers' behavior and enforce their policies. However, no information on the effects of these policies is available.

Summary and discussion //

Distracted driving countermeasures. There are no roadway countermeasures directed specifically at distracted drivers. Many effective roadway design and operation practices that improve traffic safety in general, such as edgeline and centerline rumble strips, can warn distracted drivers or can mitigate the consequences if they leave their travel lane.

Vehicle countermeasures to manage driver workload, warn drivers of risky situations, or monitor driver performance have the potential to improve safety for all drivers, not just drivers who may become distracted. These are key focus areas of research by vehicle manufacturers and NHTSA (distraction.gov). While some systems are beginning to be implemented in new vehicles, others are still in development. Their ultimate impact on distracted driving cannot be predicted.

Countermeasures directed to the driver offer an opportunity to reduce distracted driving incidence and crashes in the next few years. They have concentrated on cell phones and texting through laws, communications campaigns, and company policies and programs. Technological systems to block or limit a driver's cell phone calls are developing rapidly but have not yet been evaluated.

6 // Are there effective countermeasures for distracted driving?

There is no evidence that cell phone or texting laws have reduced crashes.

The limited research suggests that hand-held cell phone laws covering all drivers reduced cell phone use by about half when they were implemented, even though they were not vigorously enforced. Cell phone use then increased subsequently, but the laws appear to have had some long-term effect. The one study of high-visibility and heavily-publicized cell phone law enforcement suggests that it can reduce cell phone use at least temporarily.

There is no evidence that cell phone or texting laws have reduced crashes. Two studies found no effects of these laws on collision insurance claims. The only study of a complete cell phone and texting ban for beginning drivers, who use text messages and cell phones more frequently than older drivers, found no effect on their texting.

Publicity and campaigns directed at cell phone use and texting while driving undoubtedly have reached many drivers but their effects have not been evaluated. Many companies have cell phone use policies and programs but these also have not been evaluated.

FILE
12-077595



7 // Conclusions and recommendations

Distracted driving research thoroughly documents the frequency of distractions on the road and the effects of distraction in experimental settings. But there is little evidence on the two most important issues: the effect of distractions on crash risk (Chapter 5) and the effects of countermeasures on reducing distracted driving (Chapter 6). Research on cell phone use and texting, the distractions that have received the most attention, concludes that:

- Cell phone use increases crash risk to some extent but there is no consensus on the size of the increase.
- There is no conclusive evidence on whether hands-free cell phone use is less risky than hand-held use.
- The influence of texting on crash risk in passenger vehicles has not been studied.
- Laws banning hand-held cell phone use reduced use by about half when they were first implemented. Hand-held cell phone use increased subsequently but the laws appear to have had some long-term effect.
- A high-visibility cell phone and texting law enforcement campaign reduced cell phone use immediately after the campaign. Longer-term effects are not yet known.
- There is no evidence that cell phone or texting bans have reduced crashes.
- Distracted driving communications campaigns and company policies and programs have not been evaluated.

Distraction while driving cannot be eliminated; rather, it's part of who we are, as humans and as drivers. The actions outlined below may help manage it.

States should consider the following activities to address distracted driving. While each has been implemented in some states, there is no solid evidence that any is effective in reducing crashes, injuries, or fatalities.

- **Enact cell phone and texting bans for novice drivers.**
 - **Pro:** Novices are the highest-risk drivers. Their attention should be focused on driving, not on cell phone conversations or other distractions. A ban reinforces this

7 // Conclusions and recommendations

message and supports other novice driver restrictions included in state graduated licensing programs and helps parents manage their teenage drivers. As of June 2011, 30 states and the District of Columbia prohibited the use of all cell phones by novice drivers and 41 states and the District of Columbia prohibited texting by novice drivers (states use different definitions of novice driver).

- o **Con:** There is no evidence that novice driver cell phone or texting bans are effective.

● Enact texting bans.

- o **Pro:** Texting is more obviously distracting and counter to good driving practice than cell phone use. As of June 2011, 34 states and the District of Columbia had enacted texting bans for all drivers.
- o **Con:** Texting laws are difficult to enforce.

● Enact hand-held cell phone laws.

- o **Pro:** Hand-held cell phone use increases crash risk, probably more than hands-free. Laws reduce but will not eliminate hand-held cell phone use. Laws send a message that hand-held cell phone use while driving is unacceptable.
- o **Con:** Hand-held cell phone laws often are ignored. Hand-held cell phone laws send a message that hands-free cell phone use while driving is safe, which it may not be.

● Enforce hand-held cell phone and texting laws.

- o **Pro:** Enforcement will increase any law's effect. Enforcement can be targeted to specific high-risk locations or can be conducted in short high-visibility campaigns similar to those that have increased belt use and reduced impaired driving. Failing to enforce a law sends a message that the law is not important.
- o **Con:** Enforcing cell phone or texting laws will divert resources from other traffic law enforcement activities.

● Implement distracted driving communication programs.

- o **Pro:** Cell phone and texting laws should be publicized broadly to increase their effects. Other communication and education activities can address the broader issues of avoiding distractions while driving. Thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia conducted a recent distracted driving communications campaign.
- o **Con:** Distracted driving communication programs have not been evaluated. They will divert resources from other traffic safety communications activities.

7 // Conclusions and recommendations

● Help employers develop and implement distracted driving policies and programs.

- **Pro:** Many companies have established and implemented cell phone policies for their employees. Company policies can be a powerful influence on employees' driving.
- **Con:** Employer distracted driving programs have not been evaluated.

States can and should take three steps that will help reduce distracted driving immediately and in the future.

- Continue to implement effective low-cost roadway distracted driving countermeasures such as edgeline and centerline rumble strips.
- Record distracted driving in crash reports to the extent possible, to assist in evaluating distracted driving laws and programs. The 4th Edition Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) guidelines for state crash data systems, to be published in 2012, will address distracted driver coding (www.mmucc.us).
- Evaluate distracted driving laws and programs. Evaluation will provide the information states need on which countermeasures are effective and which are not.

Distracted driving is an important priority for employers, the automobile industry, and the federal government as well as for states. Key activities for each include:

Employers.

- Consider distracted driving policies and programs for their employees.
- Evaluate the effects of their distracted driving policies and programs on employee knowledge, behavior, crashes, and economic costs (injuries, lost time, etc.).

Automobile industry.

- Continue to develop, test, and implement measures to manage driver workload and to warn drivers of risky situations. These activities ultimately should lead to vehicles that work with drivers to prevent crashes.

Federal government.

- Help states evaluate the effects of distracted driving programs, especially cell phone and texting laws, enforcement campaigns, and communications.
- Continue tracking driver cell phone use and texting in NOPUS.
- Work with states to improve data collection on driver distractions involved in crashes. In particular, use the 4th Edition of MMUCC to improve how distraction is coded in crash reports.
- Continue to develop and conduct national communications campaigns on distracted driving.

References

FILE
12-077595

AAAFTS (2010). *2010 Traffic Safety Culture Index*. Washington, DC: AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety.

Ascone, D., Lindsey, T., & Varghese, C. (2009). *An Examination of Driver Distraction as Recorded in NHTSA Databases*. DOT HS 811 216. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Atchley, P., Atwood, S., & Boulton, A. (2011). The choice to text and drive in younger drivers: Behavior may shape attitude. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 43(1), 134-142.

Bayly, M., Young, K.L., & Regan, M.A. (2009). Sources of distraction inside the vehicle and their effects on driving performance. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Bellinger, D.B., Budde, B.M., Machida, M., Richardson, G.B., & Berg, W.P. (2009). The effect of cellular telephone conversation and music listening on response time in braking. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 12(6), 441-451.

Bendak, S. & Al-Saleh, K. (2010). The role of roadside advertising signs in distracting drivers. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 40(3), 233-236.

Braitman, K.A. and McCartt, A.T. (2010). National reported patterns of driver cell phone use in the United States. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 11 (6), p. 543-548.

Braver, E. R., Lund, A. K., & McCartt, A. T. (2009). *Hands-free Embedded Cell Phones and Airbag-deployment Crash Rates*. Arlington, VA: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

Caird, J.K., Willness, C.R., Steel, P., & Scialfa, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of the effects of cell phones on driver performance. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 40(4), 1282-1293.

Chan M, Atchley P. (2010). Effects of cell phone conversations on driver performance while driving under highway monotony. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Driving Symposium on Human Factors in Driver Assessment, Training and Vehicle Design*, 140-146. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa.

Cosgrove, L, Chaudhary, N., & Roberts, S. (2010). *High Visibility Enforcement Demonstration Programs in Connecticut and New York Reduce Hand-Held Phone Use*. DOT HS 811 376. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

FILE
12-077595

References

Craft, R.H. & Preslopsky, B. (2010). *Driver Distraction and Inattention in the United States Large Truck and National Motor Vehicle Crash Causation Studies*. Washington, DC: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Crisler, M. C., Brooks, J. O., Ogle, J. H., Guirl, C. D., Alluri, P., & Dixon, K. K. (2008). Effect of wireless communication and entertainment devices on simulated driving performance. *Transportation Research Record* 2069, 48-54.

CTIA (2010). *50 Wireless Quick Facts*. Washington, DC: CTIA-The Wireless Association. www.ctia.org/advocacy/research/index.cfm/AID/10377, updated October 2010.

Dingus, T.A., Klauer, S.G., Neale, V.L., Peterson, A., Lee, S.A., et al. (2006). *The 100-car Naturalistic Driving Study, Phase II - Results of the 100-Car Field Experiment*. DOT HS 810 593. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Donmetz, B., Boyle, L., & Lee, J.D. (2009) Designing feedback to mitigate distraction. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Drews, F.A. & Strayer, D.L. (2009). Cellular phones and driver distraction. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Dula, C.S., Martin, B.A., Fox, R.T. & Leonard, R.L. (2010). Differing types of cellular phone conversations and dangerous driving. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 43 (1), 187-193.

Edquist J, Horberry T, Hosking S, Johnston I. (2011). Effects of advertising billboards during simulated driving. *Applied Ergonomics* 42(4), 619-626.

Elvik, R. (2011). The effects on accident risk of using mobile phones: problems of meta-analysis when studies are few and bad. *Transportation Research Board 2011 Annual Meeting*, paper 11-0134. amonline.trb.org.

Engström, J. & Victor, T.W. (2009). Real-time distraction countermeasures. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Farmer, C.M., Braitman, K.A., & Lund, A.K. (2010). Cell phone use while driving and attributable crash risk. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 11(5), 466-470.

Flannagan, C. and Sayer, J. (2010). *An Assessment of Research on Cell Phone Risk while Driving*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute.

References

FILE
12-097595

- Foss, R.D., Goodwin, A.H., McCartt, A.T., & Hellinga, L.A. (2009). Short-term effects of a teenage driver cell phone restriction. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 41(3), 419-424.
- Fowles, R., Loeb, P. D., & Clarke, W. A. (2010). The cell phone effect on motor vehicle fatality rates: A Bayesian and classical econometric evaluation. *Transportation Research: Part E*, 46(6), 1140-1147.
- GHSA (2010). *Curbing Distracted Driving: 2010 Survey of State Safety Programs*. Washington, DC: Governors Highway Safety Association.
- GHSA (2011a). *Cell Phone and Texting Laws, May 2011*. Washington, DC: Governors Highway Safety Association. www.ghsa.org/html/stateinfo/laws/cellphone_laws.html.
- GHSA (2011b). UMTRI study to compare technology to block cell phone use while driving. GHSA Washington Update 9(1), 4.
- Harbluk, J. L., Noy, Y. I., Trbovich, P. L., & Eizenman, M. (2007). An on-road assessment of cognitive distraction: Impacts on drivers' visual behavior and braking performance. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 39(2), 372-379.
- Harbluk, J.L., Provost, M., Boase, P. & Burns, P.C. (2010). Canadian Legislative Approaches to Discourage Distracted Driving. Proceedings of the 20th Canadian Multidisciplinary Road Safety Conference, Ontario, June 6-9, 2010.
- HLDI (2009). *Hand-held Cellphone Laws and Collision Claim Frequencies*. Highway Loss Data Institute Bulletin Vol. 26, No. 17. Arlington, VA: Highway Loss Data Institute.
- HLDI (2010). *Texting Laws and Collision Claim Frequencies*. Highway Loss Data Institute Bulletin Vol. 27, No. 11. Arlington, VA: Highway Loss Data Institute.
- Horberry, T. & Edquist, J. (2009). Distractions outside the vehicle. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Horrey, W. J., Lesch, M. F., & Garabet, A. (2008). Assessing the awareness of performance decrements in distracted drivers. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 40(2), 675-682.
- Horrey, W. J., & Wickens, C. D. (2006). Examining the impact of cell phone conversations on driving using meta-analytic techniques. *Human Factors* 48(1), 196-205.

References

FILE
12-077595

- Hosking, S., Young, K. & Regan, M. (2007). The effects of text messaging on young novice driver performance. In: I.J. Faulks, M. Regan, M. Stevenson, J. Brown, A. Porter & J.D. Irwin (Eds.). *Distracted driving*. Sydney, NSW: Australasian College of Road Safety. Pages 155-187.
- Hosking, S. G., Young, K. L., & Regan, M. A. (2009). The effects of text messaging on young drivers. *Human Factors* 51(4), 582-592.
- Janitzek, T., Jamson, S., Carsten, O., & Eksler, V. (2010). *Study on the Regulatory Situation in the Member States Regarding Brought-in (i.e. Nomadic) Devices and their Use in Vehicles*. Brussels: European Union.
- Kelderman, E. (2005). *State Laws Vary on Driving Distractions*. Stateline.org. Washington, DC: The Pew Center on the States. www.stateline.org/live/ViewPage.action?siteNodell=136&languageId=1&contentId=20069.
- Klauer, S.G., Dingus, T.A., Neale, V.L., Sudweeks, J.D., & Ramsey, D.J. (2006). *The Impact of Driver Inattention on Near-crash/Crash Risk: An Analysis Using the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study Data*. DOT HS 810 594. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Klauer, S.G., Guo, F., Sudweeks, J. & Dingus, T.A. (2010). *An Analysis of Driver Inattention Using a Case-Crossover Approach on 100-Car Data: Final Report*. DOT HS 811 334. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Kolko, J.D. (2009). The effects of mobile phones and hands-free laws on traffic fatalities. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 9(1), Article 10.
- Laberge-Nadeau, C., Maag, U., Bellavance, S., Lapierre, S.D., Desjardins, D., Messier, S., & Saïdi, A. (2003). Wireless telephones and the risk of road crashes. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 35(5), 649-660.
- Lee, S.E., Simons-Morton, B.G., Klauer, S.G., Ouimet, M.C., & Dingus, T.A. (2011). Naturalistic assessment of novice teenage crash experience. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 43(4), 1472-1479.
- Liang, Y., & Lee, J.D. (2010). Combining cognitive and visual distraction: Less than the sum of its parts. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 42(3), 881-890.
- Marti, C. (2011). Personal communication.
- McCart, A.T., Hellinga, L.A., & Bratiman, K.A. (2006). Cell phones and driving: Review of research. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 7(2), 89-106.

References

FILE
12-077595

McCartt, A.T., Hellinga, L.A., Strouse, L.M., & Farmer, C.M. (2010). Long-term effects of handheld cell phone laws on driver handheld cell phone use. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 11(2), 133-141.

McEvoy, S.P., Stevenson, M R., McCartt, A.T., Woodward, M., Haworth, C., Palamara, P., et al. (2005). Role of mobile phones in motor vehicle crashes resulting in hospital attendance: A case-crossover study. *British Medical Journal* 331(7514), 428-430.

NCHRP (2003a). Report 500, Vol. 4: *A Guide for Addressing Head-On Collisions*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board.

NCHRP (2003b). Report 500, Vol. 6: *A Guide for Addressing Run-Off-Road Collisions*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board.

NSC (2010a). *NSC Estimates 1.6 Million Crashes Caused by Cell Phone Use and Texting*. Press release 1/12/2010. Itaska, IL: National Safety Council.

NSC (2010b). *Attributable Risk Estimate Model*. Itaska, IL: National Safety Council. www.nsc.org/news_resources/Resources/Documents/Risk%20Estimate%20Model%20%28Full%20Study%29.pdf.

NHTSA (2010a). *Distracted Driving 2009*. DOT HS 811 379. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

NHTSA. (2010b). *Driver Electronic Device Use in 2009*. DOT HS 811 372. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Nikolaev, A. G., Robbins, M.J., & Jacobson, S.H. (2010). Evaluating the impact of legislation prohibiting hand-held cell phone use while driving. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy & Practice* 44(3), 182-193.

O'Brien, M.P., Goodwin, A.H., & Foss, R.D. (2010). Talking and texting among teenage drivers: a glass half empty or half full? *Traffic Injury Prevention* 11(6), 549-554.

Olson, R.L., Hanowski, R.J., Hickman, J.S. & Bocanegra J. (2009). *Driver Distraction in Commercial Vehicle Operations*. FMCSA-RRR-09-042. Washington, DC: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Owens, J.M., McLaughlin, S.B., & Sudweeks, J. (2011). Driver performance while text messaging using handheld and in-vehicle systems. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 43(3), 939-947.

Persaud, B.N., Retting, R.A., & Lyon, C.A. (2004). Crash reduction following installation of centerline rumble strips on rural two-lane roads. *Accident analysis & Prevention* 36(6), 1073-1079.

References

- Pogue, D. (2010). *Your Phone Is Locked. Just Drive*. New York Times, April 29, 2010. www.nytimes.com/2010/04/29/technology/personaltech/29pogue.html.
- Ranney, T.A. (2008). *Driver Distraction: A Review of the Current State-of-Knowledge*. DOT HS 810 787. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Redelmeier, D. A., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1997). Association between cellular-telephone calls and motor vehicle collisions. *New England Journal of Medicine* 336(7), 453-458.
- Regan, M.A., Lee, J.D., & Young, K.L. eds. (2009). *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Regan, M.A., Victor, T.W., Lee, J.D., & Young, K.L. (2009). Driver distraction injury prevention countermeasures – Part 3: vehicle, technology, and road design. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Regan, M.A., Young, K.L., & Lee, J.D. (2009a). Introduction. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Regan, M.A., Young, K.L., & Lee, J.D. (2009b). Driver distraction injury prevention countermeasures – Part 1: Data collection, legislation and enforcement, vehicle fleet management, and driver licensing. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Robertson, R. (2011). *Distracted Driving: So What's the Big Picture?* Ottawa, ON: Traffic Safety Research Foundation.
- Royal, D. (2003). *National Survey of Distracted and Drowsy Driving Attitudes and Behavior: 2002; Volume I: Findings*. DOT HS 809 566. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Sayed, T., deLeur, P., & Pump, J. (2010). Impact of rumble strips on collision reduction on highways in British Columbia, Canada. *Transportation Research Record* 2148, 9-15.
- Ship, A. (2010). The Most Primary of Care – Talking about Driving and Distraction. *New England Journal of Medicine* 362, 2145-2147.
- Smiley, A., Persaud, B., Bahar, G., Mollett, C., Lyon, C., Smahel, T., et al. (2005). Traffic safety evaluation of video advertising signs. *Transportation Research Record* 1937, 105-112.

FILE
12-077595

References

- Smith, M.R.H., Witt, G.J., Bakowski, D.L., Leblanc, D., & Lee, J.D. (2009). Adapting collision warnings to real-time estimates of driver distraction. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Vanlaar, W., Mayhew, D., Simpson, H., & Robertson, R. (2007). *The Road Safety Monitor 2006: Distracted Driving*. Ottawa, ON: Traffic Injury Research Foundation.
- Violanti, J.M. & Marshall, J.R. (1996). Cellular phones and traffic accidents: An epidemiological approach. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 28(2), 265-270.
- Vivoda, J. M., Eby, D. W., St Louis, R.,M., & Kostyniuk, L. P. (2008). Cellular phone use while driving at night. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 9(1), 37-41.
- VTTI (2010). *100-Car Naturalistic Study Fact Sheet*. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech Transportation Institute. www.vtti.vt.edu/PDF/100-Car_Fact-Sheet.pdf.
- WHO (2011). *Mobile Phone Use: A Growing Problem of Driver Distraction*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization. www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/publications/road_traffic/en/index.html.
- Wilson, F. A., & Stimpson, J. P. (2010). Trends in fatalities from distracted driving in the United States, 1999 to 2008. *American Journal of Public Health* 100(11), 2213-2219.
- Young, M. S., Mahfoud, J. M., Stanton, N. A., Salmon, P. M., Jenkins, D. P., & Walker, G. H. (2009). Conflicts of interest: The implications of roadside advertising for driver attention. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behavior* 12(5), 381-388.
- Young, R. A., & Schreiner, C. (2009). Real-world personal conversations using a hands-free embedded wireless device while driving: Effect on airbag-deployment crash rates. *Risk Analysis* 29(2), 187-204.
- Zhang, H., Smith, M.R.H., & Witt, G.J. (2009). Driving task demand-based distraction mitigation. In *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*, M.A. Regan, J.D. Lee, & K.L. Young eds., Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

FILE

12-077595



State Farm insures more cars and homes than any other insurer in the U.S., is the leading insurer of watercraft and is also a leading insurer in Canada. Our 17,800 agents and more than 68,000 employees serve 81 million policies and accounts — more than 79 million auto, fire, life and health policies in the United States and Canada, and nearly 2 million bank accounts. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company is the parent of the State Farm family of companies. State Farm is ranked No. 34 on the Fortune 500 list of largest companies. For more information, please visit www.statefarm.com® or in Canada www.statefarm.ca®.



The Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) is a nonprofit association representing the highway safety offices of states, territories, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. GHSA provides leadership and representation for the states and territories to improve traffic safety, influence national policy and enhance program management. Its members are appointed by their Governors to administer federal and state highway safety funds and implement state highway safety plans. For more information, please visit www.ghsa.org®.

444 N. Capitol Street, NW
Suite 722
Washington, DC 20001-1534

TEL 202.789.0942

www.ghsa.org