

Nebraska Seat Belt Use Survey 2019 Data Collection Methodology Report

January 13, 2020

Revised January 28, 2020

Prepared by JM Larson, JR Fox, E Berg Iowa State University Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY Ames, Iowa

Nebraska Seat Belt Use Survey

Table of Contents

Introduction	3	,
Preparation	3	,
Data Collection Staff Training	4	
Observation Protocols and Procedures	5	,
Results	7	ŗ
Weighted State-Wide Use and Standard Error	8	í
Recommendations	8	í
Tables and Appendices	9	1
Estimation and Variance Estimation	20)

Nebraska Seat Belt Use Survey 2019 Data Collection Methodology Report January 13, 2020

Introduction

In an effort to achieve greater consistency and comparability in state-wide seat belt use reporting, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) issued new requirements in 2011 for observing and reporting future seat belt use. The requirements include the involvement of a qualified statistician in the sampling of specific road segments to be observed and in the data weighting process. A variety of specified operational details are also required. Each state prepares a plan that is approved by NHTSA and collects seat belt use data annually based on their approved plan. Every five years the sample of road segments must be redrawn based on updated information and approved by NHTSA.

In 2019, the Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology (CSSM) at Iowa State University was requested to collaborate with the Bureau of Sociological Research (BOSR) at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln to conduct the annual seat belt use survey for the State of Nebraska. CSSM has prepared the Iowa Seat Belt Use Plan and conducted observations for the State of Iowa since 2012. Because of its experience, CSSM prepared materials, conducted training, tabulated data, and prepared deliverable files for the Nebraska project. BOSR provided staffing for conducting and supervising the data collection process.

Primary contacts at each organization are listed below.

Simera Reynolds, Traffic Safety Specialist, Nebraska Department of Transportation

- Lindsey Witt-Swanson, Associate Director, Bureau of Sociological Research, University of Nebraska -Lincoln
- Janice Larson, Survey Research Unit Manager, Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology, Iowa State University
- Jody Fox, Project Manager, Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology, Iowa State University Emily Berg, PhD, Assistant Professor of Statistics, Iowa State University

This report describes the data collection process for obtaining 2019 Nebraska seat belt use data as stipulated by the approved study design. It also includes tables with overall results showing seat belt use in Nebraska.

Preparation

The Nebraska DOT provided CSSM with available materials from past seat belt data collection processes. This included Nebraska's original Seat Belt Use Survey Design from 2012, Note on Seat Belt Use Survey Reselection for 2017, the Nebraska Safety Belt Use 2018 Report, and a list of 72 sampled road segments. There were no specific project materials available from past Nebraska seat belt use data collection processes. CSSM planned and prepared materials for Nebraska's data collection in accordance with the Nebraska 2012 & 2017 plans approved by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Preparation involved several components: verifying the usability of the sampled sites, preparing general and site-specific materials for Data Collectors, and notifying appropriate local personnel prior to data collection.

Site Verification.

The Nebraska Seat Belt Survey Plan includes 72 road segments or sites sampled for annual observation, spread among 9 counties. Douglas County (Omaha) has 18 sampled segments, Lancaster (Lincoln) has 12. The remaining 7 counties each have 6 sampled road segments. The CSSM Project Manager examined the 72 sites for accessibility, safety, and practicality using Google Earth and other online sources. CSSM also checked the Nebraska Department of Transportation website to look for scheduled construction that could impact traffic patterns. No significant issues were discovered.

Materials Preparation.

After the 72 sites were verified, CSSM staff used online maps and Google Earth to identify and recommend observation points that would be safe and still provide the visibility necessary to observe seat belt use. CSSM staff prepared maps for Data Collectors to use as references when traveling to and locating sites. Equipment was prepared for use by Data Collectors, including vests, signs, stop watches, and clickers. Data collection forms were printed. Data collection schedules were prepared for each site and administrative procedures were documented.

Notification.

CSSM prepared a list of appropriate city/county law enforcement personnel to be notified about the project. This list was forwarded to BOSR for use once the observation schedule was finalized. CSSM understood that BOSR would notify appropriate municipal law enforcement and Nebraska DOT personnel would notify state highway patrol and other applicable DOT personnel. The purpose was to ensure that appropriate officials in each site area would be aware of the project and the days and times that Data Collectors would be at work in their area. However, this policy was inconsistently followed. CSSM was informed that no municipal law enforcement agencies were notified, and highway patrol in one county (Sarpy) was not notified prior to data collection. As a result, one Data Collector working on an interstate overpass in Sarpy County was stopped by a state trooper and told to leave. The Data Collector showed the trooper his letter of identification and explained the project and its purpose, but the trooper still insisted the Data Collector stop his work and leave the area. This incident emphasizes the importance of prenotification of law enforcement in the future.

Data Collection Staff Training

Nebraska utilized four primary data collectors in 2019, responsible for 18 sites each. Quality Control functions were filled by BOSR staff members.

CSSM conducted a two-day project training which was held at BOSR in Lincoln on August 8 & 9, 2019, with field data collection beginning on August 12, 2019. (See the agenda in Figure 1.) The training included a combination of lecture, classroom and field exercises. Training sessions covered data collection protocols, including how to find the observation sites, choosing an observation location, how to properly collect data, defining seat belt "use," "nonuse," and "use unknown," what to do if data cannot be collected at a site due to road construction, weather, or other circumstances, and the appropriate management and submission of collected data. Roadside safety training was provided by a safety representative from the Nebraska DOT.

Responsibilities of Quality Control monitors were also reviewed at the training. QC duties include conducting unannounced site visits to a minimum of two sites for each Data Collector (11% of the total sites) and reviewing the Data Collector's field protocol. The QC Monitors met with the Data Collectors in the field to answer questions and offer assistance as needed.

Data Collectors were provided with bright yellow vests to wear for safety. Data Collectors were instructed to use their car's flashing lights as needed for safety, and a clicker counter was made available to use as needed. Personal phones would provide a stopwatch function. Each Data Collector was provided with two "Survey Crew Ahead" signs and sandbag weights for use in high speed areas and other sites as appropriate.

Observation Protocols and Procedures

All passenger vehicles, including commercial vehicles weighing less than 10,000 pounds, were eligible for observation. Data Collectors completed two forms in the field, the Observation Site Form and the Observation Tally Form, which are shown in Appendix A and B. The Observation Site Form documented descriptive information about each site. Data Collectors recorded information including observation date, site location and number, alternative site data, traffic directions and lanes available and observed, start and end times for observations, and weather conditions.

The Observation Tally Form was used to mark seat belt

Figure 1. Seat Belt Data Collectors 2019 Training Agenda

Thursday, August 8, 2019

Seat Belt Survey Overview Study Design **NHTSA Requirements Data Collection Requirements** Definitions of terms **Data Collection Procedures** Assignments & Rescheduling Site Locations Low/High volume roadways Locating assigned sites Site assignment sheets & maps Data Collection Data Collection & Observation forms Recording observations Recording alternate site information **Traffic Counts** Site Review on Google Earth

Friday, August 9, 2019

Safety Training (NDOT representative) Signage and visibility Roadway safety Quality Control and QC monitoring Field Practice Setting up road work signs Practice observations

use/non-use/unknown use for drivers and right front passengers.

Using the Observation Tally Form, seat belt use observations were made of all passenger vehicle drivers and right front seat occupants in the selected lane. The only passenger vehicle right front seat occupants excluded from the study were child passengers traveling in child seats with harness straps. If there was no passenger in the right front seat of an observed vehicle, that information was also noted on the Observation Tally Form.

Seat Belt use categories - Data Collectors recorded belt use for the driver and right front seat passenger using the definitions shown in Figure 2 below, which were provided in the federal regulations.

Figure 2.		
Code	Meaning	Definition
Y	Yes, belted	The shoulder belt is in front of the person's shoulder.
Ν	No, unbelted	The shoulder belt is not in front of the person's shoulder.
U	Unknown	It cannot reasonably be determined whether the driver or right front passenger is belted.
NP	No passenger	There is no right front passenger present.

Scheduling.

Data collectors were generally assigned six sites in one county per work day. One data collector was assigned 12 of the Douglas County sites and the remaining 6 were assigned to another data collector. The 12 Lancaster county sites were divided between two data collectors. A daily schedule of sites with observation start times was provided by CSSM in order to ensure a representative sampling of times of day for the data collection, but BOSR assigned the days of the week and data collector for each group of 6 sites. Observations were to start at the assigned times, as much as possible, and to continue for exactly 45 minutes.

Observations.

Data Collectors were instructed to observe one lane and one direction of travel per observation site. The direction of travel was randomly assigned by the office; however, Data Collectors were allowed to observe the other direction if safety or windshield glare dictated. Deviations from the randomly assigned direction were noted on the Observation Site Form. In a few cases, traffic on the assigned segment was so minimal that both directions of travel were observed. If an assigned road segment included an intersection, Data Collectors were instructed to observe traffic traveling on the assigned road segment, not the cross-street.

Lower volume roadways such as county roads and streets were observed from a field drive or other location where Data Collectors could safely move their vehicles from the roadway. In some situations, data collectors observed from their vehicle while, in most cases, observing from outside of the vehicle was more effective.

Whenever possible, observations for high-volume, limited access roadways were made from an overpass. Observing from an overpass allowed for comparatively easy viewing of seatbelt use for both the driver and the passenger. Gravel road overpasses were preferred because of the low traffic volume, reducing safety hazards to the data collector. In some instances, observing from an overpass required moving the observation point from the specific road segment by a couple of miles; however, because of the limited exit and entrance to these roadways, there were no significant changes to the observed vehicles between the assigned road segment and the observation point.

If a low volume overpass is not available, Data Collectors are allowed to observe traffic at an exit ramp or rest stop. In these cases, because the exit ramp/rest stop only samples a portion of the traffic passing on the main highway, an additional traffic volume count is required in order to adjust for the reduced numbers. Only one rest stop site was used in 2019. The Data Collector completed a 45-minute observation period at a rest stop exit ramp. Then the Data Collector counted passing cars in one direction and in one lane of the assigned interstate road segment, timing the number of minutes to reach a count of 100 cars. This traffic count information was recorded on the Observation Site Form and was used to adjust the seat belt usage observation data.

Alternate Sites.

If unexpected construction or difficulty in locating a useable and safe place to observe required the Data Collector to deviate farther than 2 miles (or more than one block in city situations) from the selected road segment, he/she was instructed to call the office before proceeding and to note the location as an alternate site on the Observation Site form. For the 2019 data collection, no unanticipated alternate sites were needed.

Rescheduling.

If an assigned road segment was temporarily unavailable due to a traffic accident or inclement weather, data collection was to be rescheduled another week for the same time and day of the week. In 2019 there were three days with a little light rain, but no rescheduling was needed due to either weather or accidents.

Results

Data collection for 2019 occurred from Monday, August 12 through Friday, August 30, 2019. The 2019 seat belt use data collection resulted in the observation of 8,380 passenger vehicles, with a right front seat passenger in 2,175 of those vehicles, for a total of 10,555 potential observations of belt use. Of these 10,555 potential observations, there were 6,639 drivers and 1,701 right front passengers who were observed to be wearing seat belts (total 8,340 seat belt users). Seat belts were not worn by 1,491 drivers and 408 right front passengers (total 1,899 unbelted). Data collectors were unable to observe the seat belt use of 250 drivers and 66 passengers (total 316 unknown use).

The unknown use, or "nonresponse rate," for the August data collection was .0299 or 2.99%. This was well within the range allowed by federal regulations (1340.9f), which require the nonresponse rate to be below 10%.

Quality control checks were completed with each of the four primary Data Collectors to ensure compliance with project protocols. Three Data Collectors were observed by a QC monitor throughout an entire day of observations, and one Data Collector was observed at two sites. This comprises 28% of the sites (20 out of 72), which far exceeds the minimum of 5% required by federal regulations. However, the regulations (1340.8a) stipulate that QC visits should be "unannounced," which was not the case here. Future data collection should include unannounced quality control checks. No data collection problems were identified through these quality control checks.

Federal regulations require the calculation of seat belt use to be conducted with weighted data as described in the approved survey plan. Data weighting was completed by Dr. Emily Berg, Assistant Professor of Statistics at Iowa State University.

Results from the August data collection indicated that Nebraska's overall weighted seat belt use rate for 2019 was 76.0%, with an estimated standard error of .038, or 3.8%. This was higher than the maximum allowable standard error of 2.5 percentage points (1340.9g). In addition, the 2019 weighted safety belt use rate of 76% was approximately 9 percentage points lower than the 2018 weighted estimate of 85.5%.

CSSM examined the status of the August data collection and Dr. Berg recalculated weights and standard error following several different procedures but with no significant change in the results. CSSM identified possible reasons for the decrease in weighted seat belt use. First, it is not known with certainty which road segments were observed in 2018. A list of sampled road segments provided by the Nebraska DOT was used for 2019 observations, but they may or may not be the same as those used in 2018. The CSSM statistician was able to match the selection probability of most of the 2018 and 2019 road segments, but that also does not mean the same road segments were visited. Second, it was speculated that the decline could be a function of a change in data collection procedures. All data in past years was collected by one observer. The 2019 data was collected by four newly trained observers. It is possible that the visual interpretation of what appears to be belted or unbelted was understood differently. For example, in 2018 there were 16 vehicle occupants observed with unknown belt use, while in 2019 there were 316 occupants observed with unknown belt use, while in observer staff could have made a significant impact on belt use identification as well.

Results from the August data collection were submitted to NHTSA by the Nebraska DOT, however in late December they were informed that the 2019 data was unacceptable since the standard error exceeded 2.5%. After consultation with Dr. Berg, the Nebraska DOT completed observations of an additional 3,329 cars with

800 right front passengers on December 26-31, 2019. The observations completed in December were added to the August observations for analysis and reporting.

The additional December observations increased the total number of occupants observed to 14,684, including 11,709 drivers and 2,975 right front passengers. When weighted by Dr. Berg, **Nebraska's overall weighted seat belt use rate for 2019 is 79.7%**, with an **estimated standard error of .023, or 2.3%**. This meets NHTSA's requirement that the standard error should be less than 2.5 percentage points.

Factoring in the December observations, the final **unknown use, or "nonresponse rate," is .0268 or 2.68%.** Federal regulations (1340.9f) require the nonresponse rate to be below 10%.

Figure 3 below shows Nebraska's final 2019 weighted average seat belt use for drivers, passengers, and total occupants as well as the estimated standard error.

	Ν	2019 Belted Estimate (S.E. in Parentheses)	95% Cl Lower	95% Cl Upper
Total Sample	14,684	0.797	0.754	0.842
		(0.023)		
Drivers	11,709	0.800	0.756	0.844
		(0.022)		
Passengers	2,975	0.785	0.726	0.843
		(0.030)		

Figure 3. 2019 Nebraska Safety Belt Use, weighted

Estimation and variance estimation procedures followed by Dr. Berg are appended to the end of this report.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future seat belt use observations include both minor operational components and sampling issues with major implications for future weighting and estimation.

- Any available information regarding past seat belt observation procedures and weighting should be obtained.
- The identification of sampled road segments should be clarified.
- Road segments with no or minimal traffic observed in 2019 should be replaced with alternate sampled road segments.
- Observers should be instructed to follow all documented procedures, including those that apply to exit ramps or rest areas.
- More practice sessions should be completed by observers, including 10-15 minute observation periods conducted independently by 2 or more observers and compared for reliability.
- Observers should be instructed to contact the Project Manager for instructions when unusual circumstances arise.
- Observation results should be reviewed as soon as possible by the Project Manager so that additional or replacement observations can be obtained if needed.
- Quality Control visits should be unannounced, as described in the regulations.

- Observation periods should be increased from 45 minutes to a minimum of 60 minutes. Whether observations longer than 60 minutes are advisable depends upon other potential adjustments to the sampling plan (see the item below).
- From a sampling perspective, Dr. Berg recommends increasing the number of primary sampling units. This can be accomplished in two ways. One way is to select more than 7 non-certainty counties. Alternatively, the number of road segments selected within the two certainty counties, Douglas and Lancaster, could be increased. It appears that Sarpy county is considered urban but is not included with certainty. Including Sarpy with certainty and increasing the number of road segments selected in Sarpy county would increase the number of primary sampling units in the sample.

Tables and Appendices

Table 1 shows state-wide weighted Nebraska Safety Belt Use for 2019 and 2018.

Table 2 lists the 72 observation sites with selected characteristics and the number of belted drivers and right front passengers for each site. This data is unweighted.

Tables 3 and 4 show the seat belt use of drivers and passengers by county. Table 3 contains the number or count of each category of belt use by drivers, passengers, and total for each sampled county. Table 4 contains two types of unweighted percentages of belt use for drivers, passengers, and combined total for each county. The "% of Total Belted" is the percent of the total number of persons (both drivers and passengers) who were belted. The "% of Known Belted" removes the persons with unknown belt use from the base number. Note that these percentages are unweighted and the state-wide seat belt use percentage is slightly different than the weighted seat belt use percentage required by federal regulations for reporting. Nevertheless, the unweighted percentages in Table 4 enable legitimate comparisons between seat belt users/nonusers and between counties.

Tables 5 and 6 show the seat belt use of drivers and passengers by road type. Table 4 contains the number in each category and Table 5 contains unweighted percentages. Federal regulations required the new survey plan to classify road types as primary (including interstates), secondary, and local.

Table 7 contains seat belt use of drivers and passengers by day of the week. The percentages included in the table are unweighted.

Table 8 contains seat belt use of drivers and passengers by time of day. The percentages included in the table are unweighted.

Table 9 contains sample weights for each observation site as well as seat belt use for drivers and passengers (number or count). This information is used for Part B reporting purposes. It is also provided in an Excel file accompanying this report.

Appendix A. Observation Site Form

Appendix B. Observation Count Form

Estimation and variance estimation procedures are appended to the end of this report.

	2019 N	2019 Belted Estimate	2019 Standard Error	2018 N	2018 Belted Estimate	2018 Standard Error
Total Sample	14,684	0.797	(0.023)	13,704	0.855	(0.012)
Drivers	11,709	0.800.	(0.022)	10,171	0.849	(0.014)
Passengers	2,975	0.785	(0.030)	3,533	0.873	(0.023)

 Table 1. 2019 and 2018 Nebraska Safety Belt Use, weighted estimates

Table 2. 2019 Seat Belt Usage

				Days of	Vehicle	Drivers	Passenger	Passenger
Site #	County	Location	Road Type	the Week	Count	Belted	Count	Belted
1001	Buffalo	US Hwy 183	Secondary	Fri	40	30	12	10
1002	Buffalo	US Hwy 183	Secondary	Fri	25	17	6	6
1003	Buffalo	I- 80	Primary	Fri	435	392	247	199
1004	Buffalo	E 25th St	Secondary	Fri	420	228	114	64
1005	Buffalo	I- 80	Primary	Fri	435	339	226	157
1006	Buffalo	State Hwy 10	Secondary	Fri	213	158	45	34
2001	Cheyenne	US Hwy 385	Secondary	Thurs	91	68	18	15
2002	Cheyenne	I- 80	Primary	Thurs	88	79	34	29
2003	Cheyenne	US Hwy 30	Secondary	Thurs	40	23	8	7
2004	Cheyenne	Upland Pkwy	Secondary	Thurs	119	69	36	21
2005	Cheyenne	I- 80	Primary	Thurs	126	120	68	52
2006	Cheyenne	I- 80	Primary	Thurs	120	95	74	57
3001	Dodge	US Hwy 275	Secondary	Wed/Fri	213	156	53	38
3002	Dodge	US Hwy 275	Secondary	Wed/Fri	157	122	45	34
3003	Dodge	US Hwy 275	Secondary	Wed/Fri	197	152	66	49
3004	Dodge	State Hwy 91	Secondary	Wed/Fri	121	89	30	22
3005	Dodge	State Hwy 79	Secondary	Wed/Fri	33	24	0	0
3006	Dodge	N Broad St	Secondary	Wed/Fri	239	182	52	37
4001	Douglas	NHWS Cleveland Blvd	Local	Tues/Sun	48	43	12	12
4002	Douglas	Blair High Rd	Secondary	Tues/Fri	418	358	65	54
4003	Douglas	Blair High Rd	Secondary	Tues/Fri	482	398	63	53
4004	Douglas	N 79th St	Local	Tues/Sat	6	6	2	2
4005	Douglas	Caldwell St	Local	Tues/Sun	6	6	0	0
4006	Douglas	N 12th St	Local	Tues/Sat	204	174	17	13
4007	Douglas	240th St	Secondary	Thurs/Sun	432	357	164	147
4008	Douglas	S 234th St	Local	Thurs	2	1	0	0
4009	Douglas	Adams St	Local	Thurs	6	4	1	1
4010	Douglas	S 156th Avenue Cir	Local	Thurs	4	3	1	1
4011	Douglas	S 118th St	Local	Thurs/Sun	19	16	6	4
4012	Douglas	I- 680	Primary	Thurs	867	725	91	72
4013	Douglas	I- 80	Primary	Wed	452	330	9	9
4014	Douglas	Arbor St	Local	Wed/Sat	24	18	6	2
4015	Douglas	S 4th St	Local	Wed/Sat	5	4	0	0
4016	Douglas	I- 480	Primary	Wed	442	318	25	18
4017	Douglas	S 67th St	Local	Wed/Sun	372	307	96	79
4018	Douglas	S 89th Ct	Local	Wed	4	2	0	0
5001	Holt	US Hwy 20	Secondary	Sat	25	18	6	5
5002	Holt	US Hwy 20	Secondary	Sat	48	42	26	23
5003	Holt	US Hwy 20	Secondary	Sat	94	64	35	31
5004	Holt	US Hwy 20	Secondary	Sat	87	44	30	22
5005	Holt	State Hwy L-45B	Secondary	Sat	6	4	2	1
5006	Holt	State Hwy L-45B	Secondary	Sat	6	4	1	1
6001	Lancaster	W Wittstruck Rd	Local	Mon/Mon	15	12	6	2
6002	Lancaster	SW 100th St	Local	Mon/Mon	42	33	8	7
6003	Lancaster	SW 100th St	Local	Mon/Mon	4	3	1	1
6004	Lancaster	S 12th St	Secondary	Mon/Tues	404	348	81	64
6005	Lancaster	S 35th St	Local	Mon/Thurs	48	39	6	6
6006	Lancaster	Aspen Canyon Rd	Local	Mon/Thurs	12	11	0	0
6007	Lancaster	NW 48th St	Local	Sun/Sun	92	71	20	16
6008	Lancaster	W Harvest Dr	Local	Sun	8	5	3	2
6009	Lancaster	I- 80	Primary	Sun	227	203	90	82
6010	Lancaster	I- 80	Primary	Sun	333	296	145	133
6011	Lancaster	David Dr	Local	Sun/Thurs	9	7	2	2
6012	Lancaster	O St	Secondary	Sun/Thurs	660	602	195	170
7001	Otoe	N 58th Rd	Secondary	Mon/Fri	250	202	43	33
7002	Otoe	Sterling Morton Btwy	Secondary	Mon/Fri	298	206	61	47

				Days of	Vehicle	Drivers	Passenger	Passenger
Site #	County	Location	Road Type	the Week	Count	Belted	Count	Belted
7003	Otoe	S 48th Rd	Secondary	Mon/Fri	98	64	27	21
7004	Otoe	Spr 66F	Secondary	Mon/Fri	29	18	11	8
7005	Otoe	S 30th Rd	Secondary	Mon/Fri	221	156	51	31
7006	Otoe	State Hwy 2	Secondary	Mon/Fri	349	244	84	60
8001	Sarpy	I- 80	Primary	Mon	219	210	66	63
8002	Sarpy	Shamrock Rd	Local	Fri/Fri	22	17	7	6
8003	Sarpy	State Hwy 370	Secondary	Fri/Sun	361	314	82	65
8004	Sarpy	Barksdale Dr	Local	Fri	19	17	2	2
8005	Sarpy	Eagle Crest Dr	Local	Fri/Sat	28	25	6	6
8006	Sarpy	S 93rd St	Local	Fri/Sat	18	16	7	6
9001	Seward	I- 80	Primary	Tues	169	147	87	77
9002	Seward	5th St	Secondary	Tues/Sun	105	68	24	15
9003	Seward	I- 80	Primary	Tues	13	12	2	2
9004	Seward	McKelvie Rd/Hwy 34	Secondary	Tues/Sun	209	167	32	26
9005	Seward	Alvo Rd/Hwy 34	Secondary	Tues/Sun	185	143	20	15
9006	Seward	154th	Secondary	Tues	91	68	14	11
					11,709	9,313	2,975	2,360

		Dri	vers		Right Front Passengers			TOTAL				
County	Total	Belted	Not Belted	Un- known	Total	Belted	Not Belted	Un- known	Total	Belted	Not Belted	Un- known
Buffalo	1,568	1,164	396	8	650	470	174	6	2,218	1,634	570	14
Cheyenne	584	454	124	6	238	181	54	3	822	635	178	9
Dodge	960	725	183	52	246	180	38	28	1,206	905	221	80
Douglas	3,793	3,070	567	156	558	467	75	16	4,351	3,537	642	172
Holt	266	176	86	4	100	83	17	0	366	259	103	4
Lancaster	1,854	1,630	200	24	557	485	68	4	2,411	2,115	268	28
Otoe	1,245	890	343	12	277	200	70	7	1,522	1,090	413	19
Sarpy	667	599	61	7	170	148	20	2	837	747	81	9
Seward	772	605	117	50	179	146	24	9	951	751	141	59
Total	11,709	9,313	2,077	319	2,975	2,360	540	75	14,684	11,673	2617	394

Table 3. 2019 Driver and Passenger Seat Belt Use by County (n)

 Table 4. 2019 Driver and Passenger Seat Belt Use by County (unweighted percentages)

	Di	rivers	Right Fron	t Passengers	т	DTAL
County	% of Total Belted	% of Known Belted	% of Total Belted	% of Known Belted	% of Total Belted	% of Known Belted
Buffalo	74.2%	74.6%	72.3%	73.0%	73.7%	74.1%
Cheyenne	77.7%	78.5%	76.1%	77.0%	77.3%	78.1%
Dodge	75.5%	79.8%	73.2%	82.6%	75.0%	80.4%
Douglas	80.9%	84.4%	83.7%	86.2%	81.3%	84.6%
Holt	66.2%	67.2%	83.0%	83.0%	70.8%	71.5%
Lancaster	87.9%	89.1%	87.1%	87.7%	87.7%	88.8%
Otoe	71.5%	72.2%	72.2%	74.1%	71.6%	72.5%
Sarpy	89.8%	90.8%	87.1%	88.1%	89.2%	90.2%
Seward	78.4%	83.8%	81.6%	85.9%	79.0%	84.2%
Total	79.5%	81.8%	79.3%	81.4%	79.5%	81.7%

	Drivers				Right Front Passengers			Total				
Road Type	Total	Belted	Not Belted	Un- Known	Total	Belted	Not Belted	Un- Known	Total	Belted	Not Belted	Un- Known
Local	1,017	840	157	20	209	170	36	3	1,226	1,010	193	23
Primary	3,926	3,266	548	112	1,164	950	194	20	5,090	4,216	742	132
Secondary	6,766	5,207	1,372	187	1,602	1,240	310	52	8,368	6,447	1,682	239
TOTAL	11,709	9,313	2,077	319	2,975	2,360	540	75	14,684	11,673	2,617	394

Table 5. 2019 Seat Belt Use by Road Type (n)

Table 6. 2019 Seat Belt Use by Road Type (unweighted percentages)

	Dri	vers	Right Front	t Passengers	TOTAL		
Road Type	% of Total Belted	% of Known Belted	% of Total Belted	% of Known Belted	% of Total Belted	% of Known Belted	
Local	82.6%	84.3%	81.3%	82.5%	82.4%	84.0%	
Primary	83.2%	85.6%	81.6%	83.0%	82.8%	85.0%	
Secondary	77.0%	79.1%	77.4%	80.0%	77.0%	79.3%	
TOTAL	79.5%	81.8%	79.3%	81.4%	79.5%	81.7%	

	Drivers Belted	Total Drivers	Passengers Belted	Total Passengers	% Drivers Belted	% Passengers Belted
Sunday	1,630	1,861	605	679	87.6%	89.1%
Monday	805	1,004	220	284	80.2%	77.5%
Tuesday	1,344	1,590	218	265	84.5%	82.3%
Wednesday	1,089	1,502	109	167	72.5%	65.3%
Thursday	1,602	1,955	337	434	81.9%	77.6%
Friday	2,564	3,410	765	1,016	75.2%	75.3%
Saturday	279	387	106	130	72.1%	81.5%
Total	9,313	11,709	2,360	2,975	79.5%	79.3%

Table 7. 2019 Driver and Passenger Seat Belt Use by Day of Week (n & unweighted %)

Table 8. Driver and Passenger Seat Belt Use by Time of Day (n & unweighted %)

	Drivers Belted	Total Drivers	Passengers Belted	Total Passengers	% Drivers Belted	% Passengers Belted
7AM to 759AM	241	292	26	35	82.3%	74.9%
8AM to 859AM	198	271	44	58	73.0%	76.1%
9AM to 959AM	783	1,009	160	186	77.6%	86.2%
10AM to 1059AM	918	1,121	318	369	81.9%	86.2%
11AM to 1159AM	1,354	1,638	458	564	82.6%	81.2%
12PM to 1259PM	1,078	1,431	249	345	75.3%	72.1%
1PM to 159PM	1,131	1,453	281	366	77.8%	76.8%
2PM to 259PM	1,130	1,394	360	471	81.1%	76.4%
3PM to 359PM	814	997	235	273	81.6%	85.8%
4PM to 459PM	648	843	82	116	76.9%	70.8%
5PM to 559PM	1,018	1,259	147	191	80.8%	76.8%
Total	9,313	11,709	2,360	2,975	79.5%	79.3%

Site ID	Site Type	Dates Observed	Sample Weight	Number of Drivers	Number of Front Passengers	Number of Occupants Belted	Number of Occupants Unbelted	Number of Occupants Unknown Use
1001	Original	8/23/19	2.62	40	12	40	11	1
1002	Original	8/23/19	1.56	25	6	23	7	1
1003	Original	8/23/19	3.59	435	247	591	86	5
1004	Original	8/23/19	39.26	420	114	292	240	2
1005	Original	8/23/19	1.02	435	226	496	162	3
1006	Original	8/23/19	7.32	213	45	192	64	2
2001	Original	8/22/19	8.78	91	18	83	26	0
2002	Original	8/22/19	3.69	88	34	108	11	3
2003	Original	8/22/19	3.62	40	8	30	17	1
2004	Original	8/22/19	7.92	119	36	90	65	0
2005	Original	8/22/19	1.35	126	68	172	20	2
2006	Original	8/22/19	2.72	120	74	152	39	3
3001	Original	8/21 & 12/27/2019	4.86	213	53	194	45	27
3002	Original	8/21 & 12/27/2019	10.97	157	45	156	33	13
3003	Original	8/21 & 12/27/2019	5.32	197	66	201	49	13
3004	Original	8/21 & 12/27/2019	15.31	121	30	111	27	13
3005	Original	8/21 & 12/27/2019	11.52	33	0	24	5	4
3006	Original	8/21 & 12/27/2019	388.91	239	52	219	62	10
4001	Original	8/20 & 12/29/2019	134.31	48	12	55	5	0
4002	Original	8/20 & 12/27/2019	3.19	418	65	412	58	13
4003	Original	8/20 & 12/27/2019	25.70	482	63	451	71	23
4004	Original	8/20 & 12/28/2019	49.44	6	2	8	0	0
4005	Original	8/20 & 12/29/2019	96.21	6	0	6	0	0
4006	Original	8/20 & 12/28/2019	112.17	204	17	187	32	2
4007	Original	8/15 & 12/29/2019	3.82	432	164	504	74	18
4008	Original	8/15/19	67.28	2	0	1	1	0
4009	Original	8/15/19	84.55	6	1	5	2	0
4010	Original	8/15/19	98.43	4	1	4	1	0
4011	Original	8/15 & 12/29/2019	32.06	19	6	20	3	2
4012	Original	8/15/19	1.25	867	91	797	118	43
4013	Original	8/14/19	0.92	452	9	339	88	34
4014	Original	8/14 & 12/28/2019	96.92	24	6	20	10	0
4015	Original	8/14 & 12/28/2019	153.11	5	0	4	1	0
4016	Original	8/14/19	2.30	442	25	336	105	26
4017	Original	8/14 & 12/29/2019	72.34	372	96	386	71	11
4018	Original	8/14/19	158.17	4	0	2	2	0
5001	Original	8/17/19	6.02	25	6	23	8	0
5002	Original	8/17/19	20.94	48	26	65	9	0
5003	Original	8/17/19	18.00	94	35	95	32	2
5004	Original	8/17/19	79.91	87	30	66	49	2
5005	Original	8/17/19	11.93	6	2	5	3	0
5006	Original	8/17/19	20.42	6	1	5	2	0

Table 9. Sample Weights and Seat Belt Use by Observation Site: Part B Reporting Data (n)

Site ID	Site Type	Dates Observed	Sample Weight	Number of Drivers	Number of Front Passengers	Number of Occupants Belted	Number of Occupants Unbelted	Number of Occupants Unknown Use
6001	Original	8/12 & 12/30/2019	7.54	15	6	14	6	1
6002	Original	8/12 & 12/30/2019	29.32	42	8	40	9	1
6003	Original	8/12 & 12/30/2019	21.48	4	1	4	1	0
6004	Original	8/12 & 12/31/2019	2.44	404	81	412	65	8
6005	Original	8/12 & 12/26/2019	59.48	48	6	45	7	2
6006	Original	8/12 & 12/26/2019	37.16	12	0	11	1	0
6007	Original	8/18 & 12/29/2019	13.79	92	20	87	21	4
6008	Original	8/18/2019	151.93	8	3	7	4	0
6009	Original	8/18/2019	2.43	227	90	285	29	3
6010	Original	8/18/2019	0.64	333	145	429	47	2
6011	Original	8/18 & 12/26/2019	72.24	9	2	9	2	0
6012	Original	8/18 & 12/26/2019	30.15	660	195	772	76	7
7001	Original	8/12 & 12/27/2019	5.08	250	43	235	55	3
7002	Original	8/12 & 12/27/2019	6.73	298	61	253	104	2
7003	Original	8/12 & 12/27/2019	7.22	98	27	85	40	0
7004	Original	8/12 & 12/27/2019	19.36	29	11	26	14	0
7005	Original	8/12 & 12/27/2019	21.57	221	51	187	79	6
7006	Original	8/12 & 12/27/2019	3.31	349	84	304	121	8
8001	Alternate	8/30/2019	17.67	219	66	273	9	3
8002	Original	8/16 & 12/27/2019	108.16	22	7	23	6	0
8003	Original	8/16 & 12/29/2019	16.90	361	82	379	58	6
8004	Original	8/16/2019	55.02	19	2	19	2	0
8005	Original	8/16 & 12/28/2019	166.04	28	6	31	3	0
8006	Original	8/16 & 12/28/2019	136.22	18	7	22	3	0
9001	Original	8/20/2019	9.49	169	87	224	27	5
9002	Original	8/20 & 12/29/2019	21.08	105	24	83	40	6
9003	Original	8/20/2019	13.39	13	2	14	1	0
9004	Original	8/20 & 12/29/2019	4.06	209	32	193	27	21
9005	Original	8/20 & 12/29/2019	4.13	185	20	158	27	20
9006	Original	8/20/2019	20.37	91	14	79	19	7
			TOTALS	11,709	2,975	11,673	2,617	394

Appendix A. Observation Site Form 2019

Nebraska Seat B Site Form	elt Survey
Data Collector:	Date: / / 2019
Site Identification:	
County: «County»	ID:
Road Name: «Road_name911»	County Site #: «County_map_inset_ »
Site Start and End Time:	
Start time for observations:am	ı/pm
End time for observations: an	n/pm
(Total observation period MUST last exactly 45 minutes)	-
Selected traffic flow direction: North South Total number of lanes in selected direction: Weather Conditions: Clear Cloudy/PC	East West
Alternate Site Information:	Light og
Is this an alternate site (not including a recommended observation point)?	o Yes
If yes, why was an alternate site needed?	
Traffic Count:	
Is a traffic count required (exit ramp or rest stop)? No	o Yes
If yes, Number of Cars: Du	uration:

Appendix B. Observation Count Form 2019

Country	_										n	_			
County:										Pag	e	_ or			
County	site	#: _													
ID #:								Data Collect	tor II	D#					
		Res	pons	es: Y	′ = Ye	es, N	= No,	= Unknown, NP =	• No	Pass	enge	er			_
VEHICLE NUMBER	D SE/	RIVE ATBI USE	ELT	P, SE/	ASSI Atbi	ENGE ELT V	ER USE	VEHICLE NUMBER	Di SE/	RIVE ATBE USE	R	P/ SE/	ASSE Atbe	ENGI	ER US
1	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	41	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	
2	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	42	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	- 1
3	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	43	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	\mathbb{N}
4	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	44	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	N
5	· · ·Y· ·	1.N.1	°.U°.	Y	- N- 1	· . U · .	NP.	45	. ΥΥ. '	. N .	· . U · .	·	- N- 1	. U.	- N
5	Ϋ́	N		Y	N	0	NP	45	Y	N	U	Y	N	0	- P
- /	T V	N		1 V	N		NP	47	r V	N		T V	N	0	D N
0	V	N	II.	V	IN N	1	NP	40	V	N	U U	I V	N	11	- D
10	V	N	- U	V	N	- U	NP	50	V	N	11	V	N	U U	N
11	V	N	Ŭ	V	N	Ŭ	NP	51	V	N	Ŭ	V	N	U U	N
12	Ý	N	Ŭ	Ý	N	Ŭ	NP	52	Ý	N	Ŭ	Ý	N	Ŭ	- N
13	Y	N	Ū	Ý	N	Ū	NP	53	Y	N	Ū	Y	N	Ū	N
14	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	54	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	N
15	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	55	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	
16	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	56	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	\mathbb{N}
17	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	57	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	\mathbb{N}
18	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	58	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	N
19	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	59	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	N
20	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	60	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	- N
21	Y	N	U	Y	N	0	NP	61	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	- P
22	T V	N		1 V	IN N		NP	62	ľ V	N		T V	N	0	D N
23	Y	N	Ŭ	Y	N	Ŭ	NP	64	V	N	Ŭ	Y	N	Ŭ	- D
25	Y	N	Ŭ	Ý	N	Ŭ	NP	65	Y	N	Ŭ	Y	N	Ŭ	N
26	Y	N	U	Y	N	Ū	NP	66	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	N
27	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	67	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	
28	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	68	Y	Ν	U	Y	N	U	
29	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	69	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	\mathbb{N}
30	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	70	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	- IN
31	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	71	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	N
32	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	72	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	N
33	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	73	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	- IN
34	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	NP	/4	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	D N
35	Ĭ	N	0	Ϋ́	N	0	ND	75	Ý	N	0	ľ V	N	0	IN N
37	T V	N	0	ĩ V	N	0	ND	77	T V	N	11	T V	N	0	I\ N
3.8	V	M	11	V	N	11	ND	78	V	N	11	V	N	11	IN N
39	V	N	11	V	N	11	NP	79	V	N	11	V	N	11	- IN
40	Y	N	Ŭ	V	N	11	NP	80	V	N	11	V	N	II.	N

Estimation and Variance Estimation for the Nebraska 2019 Seat-Belt-Use Survey

This document summarizes estimation and variance estimation procedures for the 2019 seat belt survey in Nebraska. The main result is that the estimated seat-belt use rate for 2019 is approximately 10 percentage points lower than the 2018 estimate, and the estimated standard error for 2019 is approximately triple the 2018 standard error. The provided documentation for the 2017-2018 surveys is unclear about the procedures for Douglas and Lancaster counties. In this document, we explain our understanding of the procedures used for the 2017-2018 surveys, and we explain the methods that we use to construct estimation weights and variance estimates for the 2019 survey.

1 Summary of Nebraska Sample Design for 2017-2022 Surveys

The road segments to be included in the Nebraska samples for 2017-2022 are selected according to a stratified 2-stage design. The first stage sample of counties is selected using with replacement sampling, where the probability is related to the total vehicle miles traveled in the county. In the second stage, a sample of road segments is selected from each sampled county using stratified probability proportional to size with replacement sampling, where the strata are road types and the size measure is the road segment length. All counties except for Douglas and Lancaster counties have six sampled road segments. Douglas and Lancaster counties are over-sampled, as described below in more detail.

A preliminary probability for each county i is calculated as

$$\pi_i = \frac{9V_i}{T_v},$$

where V_i is the 2014 vehicle miles traveled for county *i*. Table 2 of the Nebraska sampling document provides V_i for all counties except for Seward County. We obtain a value of $V_i = 384.36$ for Seward County from https://dot.nebraska.gov/media/6672/2014annualvehiclemiles.pdf.

Douglas County and Lancaster County have $\pi_i > 1$ and are included with certainty. Oversampling these two large counties is reasonable, but the particular way in which these counties are over-sampled seems somewhat odd. These two counties are included in the with-replacement scheme with a draw probability proportional to $\pi_i - k_i$, where k_i is the greatest integer smaller than π_i .

Define

$$S_i = \begin{cases} \pi_i \text{ if not Lancaster or Douglas County} \\ \pi_i - k_i \text{ if Lancaster or Douglas County.} \end{cases}$$

The with-replacement draw probability is then $S_i / \sum_{i \in U} S_i$, where U denotes the collection of counties included in the frame for selection. The number of draws is 9.

For all counties except for Douglas and Lancaster counties, six secondary road segments are selected. Douglas and Lancaster counties are over-sampled, and the ultimate sample size for these two counties depends on the number of times that they are selected in the with-replacement scheme. The number of road segments selected from a county is $6(Q_i + I[\text{Lancaster County}] + I[\text{Douglas County}])$, where Q_i is the number of times that the county is selected in the with-replacement selection scheme. For Douglas County, $Q_i = 2$, and for Lancaster County $Q_i = 1$. Therefore, the sample sizes for Douglas and Lancaster counties are 18 and 12, respectively.

Within each county, a stratified sample of road segments is selected using stratified systematic probability proportional to size sampling. The three road strata are primary, secondary, and local roads. Road segments are allocated to strata within each county using proportional allocation based on road segment length. The road segment length is also the size measure for probability proportional to size sampling. Let $\pi_{j|i}$ denote the conditional probability of selecting road segment j given that county i is selected.

2 Weights and Point Estimators of Seat Belt Use Rates

Using the 2018 Nebraska report, we were able to determine that the column labeled "Selection.Probability" in the provided spreadsheet contains the inverse of the estimation weights used for 2018 for road segments in the 2018 sample. Based on the documentation provided, we think that the column labeled "Selection.Probability" contains the quantities

$$\tilde{\pi}_{ij} = \pi_i \pi_{j|i},$$

where the π_i values for Douglas and Lancaster counties are greater than 1. We define an initial weight for all counties except for Douglas and Lancaster by

$$w_{ij}^{(0)} = \left(\frac{\pi_{ij}}{\pi_i}\right)^{-1} \tilde{\pi}_i^{-1},$$

where

$$\tilde{\pi}_i = \frac{7V_i}{T_v - V_{Douglas} - V_{Lancaster}}.$$

The initial weight for Douglas and Lancaster counties is defined

$$w_{ij}^{(0)} = \left(\frac{\pi_{ij}}{\pi_i}\right)^{-1}.$$

We ratio adjust the weights $w_{ij}^{(0)}$ to preserve the county level vehicle miles traveled. The ratio adjusted weight is defined as

$$w_{ij} = \frac{w_{ij}^{(0)}V_i}{\sum_{j \in A_i} w_{ij}^{(0)}(L_{ij}C_{ij})},$$

where L_{ij} is the length of road segment j in county i, C_{ij} is the vehicle count for the road segment. The vehicle count is defined

$$C_{ij} = \begin{cases} C_{ij,Aug19} \text{ if segment only observed in August 2019} \\ (C_{ij,Aug19} + C_{ij,Dec19})/2 \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases}$$
(1)

where $C_{ij,t}$ is the number of vehicles observed on the road segment during data collection at time period t.

Denote the estimates of the seat belt use rates for drivers, passengers, and total occupants by \hat{p}_d , \hat{p}_p , and \hat{p} , respectively. The estimates of the seat belt use rates are defined by

$$\hat{p}_{d} = \frac{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_{i}} w_{ij} b_{d,ij}}{\sum_{i \in A} w_{ij} (b_{d,ij} + u_{d,ij})}$$
$$\hat{p}_{p} = \frac{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_{i}} w_{ij} b_{p,ij}}{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_{i}} w_{ij} (b_{p,ij} + u_{p,ij})},$$

and

$$\hat{p} = \frac{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_i} w_{ij} b_{ij}}{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_i} w_{ij} (b_{ij} + u_{ij})},$$

where A denotes the sample of counties, A_i denotes the sample of road segments in county *i*, $b_{d,ij}$ denotes the number of belted drivers, $b_{p,ij}$ denotes the number of belted passengers, $u_{d,ij}$ denotes the number of unbelted drivers, and $u_{p,ij}$ denotes the number of unbelted passengers in vehicles observed for road segment *j* of county *i*. In the definition of \hat{p} , $b_{ij} = b_{d,ij} + b_{p,ij}$, and $u_{ij} = u_{d,ij} + u_{p,ij}$.

3 Variance Estimation

The main idea of the variance estimator is to estimate the conditional variance, given the number of times that Douglas and Lancaster counties are selected. This conditions on the (random) sample sizes for these counties. In the Appendix, we summarize a brief simulation study that supports this procedure.

We define a set of replicate weights for variance estimation. The sample has nine total counties, including Lancaster and Douglas counties. We label the seven counties that are not Lancaster or Douglas with the numbers 1-7. We label Douglas and Lancaster counties with the numbers 8 and 9, respectively. For k = 1, ..., 7, we define a replicate weight by

$$\tilde{r}_{ij}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = k \\ w_{ij} 7/6 & \text{if } i \neq k, i \le 7 \\ w_{ij} & \text{if } i > 7. \end{cases}$$

We define 18 replicates for Douglas County and 12 replicates for Lancaster county. Let n(ij) denote the number of road segments in the county *i* sample for the stratum h(ij) that contains road segment *j*. Label the 18 road segments in Douglas County by j = 1, ..., 18. For k = 8, ..., 25, define a replicate weight by

$$\tilde{r}_{ij}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 8, j = k - 7\\ w_{ij} \frac{n(ij)}{n(ij) - 1} & \text{if } i = 8, j \neq k - 7, h(ij) = h(i(k - 7))\\ w_{ij} & \text{if } i \neq 8 \text{ or } i = 8 \text{ and } h(ij) \neq h(i(k - 7)). \end{cases}$$

Label the 12 road segments in Lancaster county by j = 1, ..., 12. For k = 26, ..., 37, define

$$\tilde{r}_{ij}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 9, j = k - 25 \\ w_{ij} \frac{n(ij)}{n(ij) - 1} & \text{if } i = 9, j \neq k - 25, h(ij) = h(i(k - 25)) \\ w_{ij} & \text{if } i \neq 9 \text{ or } i = 9 \text{ and } h(ij) \neq h(i(k - 25)). \end{cases}$$

The final replicate weight $r_{ij}^{(k)}$ is defined by ratio adjusting the $\tilde{r}_{ij}^{(k)}$ to the county vehicle miles traveled. Specifically,

$$r_{ij}^{(k)} = \frac{\tilde{r}_{ij}^{(k)} V_i}{\sum_{j \in A_i} \tilde{r}_{ij}^{(k)} (L_{ij} C_{ij})}$$

The estimated standard error is defined as

$$SE(\hat{p}) = \sqrt{\hat{V}\{\hat{p}\}},$$

where $\hat{V}\{\hat{p}\} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\hat{p}^{(k)} - \hat{p})^2$, and

$$\hat{p}^{(k)} = \frac{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_i} r_{ij}^{(k)} b_{ij}}{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_i} r_{ij}^{(k)} (b_{ij} + u_{ij})}$$

For this definition of the replicates, $\hat{p} = 37^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{37} \hat{p}^{(k)}$.

4 Results

Below, we present the estimates for 2019 corresponding to the tables included in the 2018 report.

Table 1: Nebraska Safety Belt Use						
Sample Division	\mathbf{N}	2019 Belted Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper		
		(S.E. in Parentheses)				
Total Sample	14684	0.797	0.754	0.842		
		(0.023)				
Drivers	11709	0.800	0.756	0.844		
		(0.022)				
Passengers	2975	0.785	0.726	0.843		
		(0.030)				

Sample Division	2019 Belted Estimate				
	(S.E. in Parentheses)				
Total Sample	0.797				
	(0.023)				
Drivers	0.800				
	(0.022)				
Passengers	0.785				
	(0.030)				

Table 3: Weighted Belt Use By County – Percent Belted

	N (2019)	2019 Belted Estimate
Buffalo	2218	0.601
Cheyenne	822	0.726
Dodge	1206	0.781
Douglas	4351	0.848
Holt	366	0.643
Lancaster	2411	0.882
Otoe	1522	0.713
Sarpy	837	0.891
Seward	951	0.805

Table 4: 2019	Weighted and	l Unweight	ed Belt Use	Estimates by	Road Types
	Road Type	N (2019)	Weighted	Unweighted	
	Local	1226	0.85	0.84	
	Primary	5090	0.89	0.85	

8368

Secondary

0.77

0.79

4.1 Comparison of August 2019 Estimates and December 2019 Estimates

We compare the August 2019 estimates to the December 2019 estimates in Table 5. A tstatistic for the null hypothesis mean difference between December 2019 and August 2019 estimators is zero is -2.30. The estimators from the two time-points have significantly different means. The December 2019 data is more similar to the 2018 data, in terms of estimated belt use proportion.

	Estimate	SE
August	0.758	0.038
December	0.848	0.013
Difference	0.090	0.039

Table 5: Comparison of estimates based on August 2019 data to estimates based on December2019 data.

4.2 Alternative Parameter: Miles Belted

An alternative parameter is the proportion of belted miles driven, instead of the proportion of belted people. An estimator of the proportion of belted miles is

$$\hat{p}_{alt} = \frac{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_i} w_{ij} b_{ij} L_{ij} C_{ij}}{\sum_{i \in A} \sum_{j \in A_i} (b_{ij} + u_{ij}) w_{ij} L_{ij} C_{ij}}$$

The estimate and standard error of the proportion of belted miles is 82.5% and 2.0%, respectively.

Appendix: Simulation

We conduct a limited simulation study to validate the estimation and variance estimation procedures. We generate a population of 102 clusters, each with 100 population elements. We assign values to the 10200 population elements as independently generated standard normal random variables. We assign size measures to the first 100 clusters as independently generated $\chi^2_{(1)}$ random variables. We define a preliminary inclusion probability for clusters $1, \ldots, 100$ by

$$\pi_i = \frac{12S_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{100} S_i},$$

where S_i is the assigned size measure. We set $\pi_{101} = 1.6$ and $\pi_{102} = 2.8$. We then define draw probabilities for with-replacement sampling of clusters by $p_i = \pi_i / (\sum_{j=1}^{102} \pi_j)$ for i = $1, \ldots, 102$. We select a probability proportional to size sample of clusters with 12 draws. We select a simple random sample from each sampled cluster. The second-stage sample size is 10 for clusters 1-100, and the second stage sample size is $10 + 5Q_i$ for i = 101, 102, where Q_i is the number of times that cluster i is selected in the second stage. We define an estimation weight for element j in cluster i as

$$w_{ij} = \begin{cases} 100/10/(12p_i) \text{ if } i \le 100\\ \\ 100/(10+5Q_i) \text{ if } i > 100. \end{cases}$$

We consider two variance estimates. The first uses an analytical expression. The second is a replication variance estimator.

We let \hat{V}_A denote an estimate of the variance obtained using an analytical formula as the sum of the between-cluster variance for sampled clusters with i < 101 and the within-cluster variance for clusters 101 and 102. Let $1, \ldots, \tilde{m}$ denote draws on which clusters with labels less than 101 are selected. The analytic variance formula is defined as

$$\hat{V}_A = \hat{V}_{A1} + \hat{V}_{A2} + \hat{V}_{A3},$$

where

$$\hat{V}_{A1} = \frac{1}{\tilde{m}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} (Z_i - \bar{Z})^2,$$

$$\hat{V}_{A2} = 100^2 \left(1 - \frac{10 + 5Q_{101}}{100} \right)^2 s_{101}^2 / (10 + 5Q_{101})$$

$$\hat{V}_{A3} = 100^2 \left(1 - \frac{10 + 5Q_{102}}{100} \right)^2 s_{102}^2 / (10 + 5Q_{102}),$$

 $Z_i = 100\bar{y}_i/\tilde{p}_i, \ \bar{y}_i$ is the simple mean of the sampled observations for the cluster selected on draw i,

$$\tilde{p}_i = \frac{p_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{100} p_i},$$

 $\bar{Z} = \tilde{m}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} Z_i$, and s_i^2 is the sample variance of the observations sampled in cluster *i*.

For the jackknife variance estimator, we define $120 + 5 \sum_{i=101}^{102} Q_i$ replicates in a manner analogous to the procedure described for the Nebraska survey. The method of defining replicates for the simulation is identical to the procedure used for the Nebraska survey except that we do not need to account for strata within clusters. We denote the jackknife variance estimator by \hat{V}_{J1} .

We estimate the finite population total for 100,000 samples. A t-statistic for the bias of the point estimator is -0.56. The ratio of the MC mean of \hat{V}_A to the MC variance of the estimator is 1.053. The ratio of the MC mean of \hat{V}_{J1} to the MC variance of the estimator is 1.059.