

Bureau of Transportation Safety, Division of State Patrol, Wisconsin DOT - Comments

New requirements for the Triennial Highway Safety Plan, Annual Application, and Annual Report should be limited to what is directed in federal law. Any new requirements added by NHTSA that could create unnecessary administrative burdens, discourage grant subrecipient participation, or duplicate content among the three submissions.

2. NHTSA can best support State programs by: adhering to legal requirements; providing clarity in regulations and guidance; continuing to provide high quality research, guidance, program best practices, and supporting materials; and, exercising its convening powers to promote interdisciplinary cooperation to tackle highway safety issues.

3. With few exceptions, the content among the Triennial Highway Safety Plan, the Annual Application, and the Annual Report should not significantly overlap. Congressional intent was clearly to differentiate between these submissions to reduce the administrative burden of applying for grants.

4. NHTSA should limit new requirements for the Annual Application. The Annual Application should not be an invitation for NHTSA to systematically and granularly review each State's individual projects on their own merits.

5. NHTSA should affirm its policy under the new rules for the type of substantive changes and funding thresholds which would trigger a requirement to submit an HSP Amendment.

6. Each State will face different experiences, partners, and resources to address two new Section 402 requirements regarding public participation and data-driven traffic safety enforcement programs fostering community collaboration and data collection requirements. States in particular will face significant challenges meeting a universal requirement for traffic stop data collection. NHTSA should set high-level, long-term, process-oriented goals and provide States the flexibility to pursue those goals according to their capabilities. Quiet simply the systems across the country are at varying levels of readiness to meet this requirement.

7. To reconcile the differing performance management periods between NHTSA submissions and the FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP), the three core performance measures that are required to be identical should be reported annually in the Triennial HSP and subsequent Annual Applications. The remaining required performance measures should be generated in the Triennial HSP with targets for the three-year period and be assessed in each year's Annual Report.

8. For the new requirement that performance targets must now "demonstrate constant or improved performance" and yet remain data-driven, NHTSA and FHWA should convene with GHSA and AASHTO to establish the State target-setting procedures and outcomes that the two agencies will consider compliant for regulatory purposes.

9. In order to align with the U.S. DOT National Roadway Safety Strategy, NHTSA should allow States more flexibility to align their programs with the Safe System approach. Some examples of possible actions are: removing barriers to funding non-traditional partners, allowing states to diversify the countermeasures they use, and avoiding penalizing states for setting aggressive performance targets.

10. NHTSA should increase the Planning and Administration (P&A) Cost Threshold for States from 15% to 18% to account for the additional work created by the increase in grant funding,

inflation costs, expense changes associated with remote work, and other current and anticipated technology developments.