The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety is an independent, nonprofit scientific and educational organization. The mission of IIHS is to reduce the losses — deaths, injuries and property damage — from crashes on the nation’s roads.

The Highway Loss Data Institute shares and supports this mission through scientific studies of insurance data representing the human and economic losses resulting from the ownership and operation of motor vehicles and by publishing insurance loss results by vehicle make and model.
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A message from Adrian Lund, President of IIHS and HLDI

At IIHS and HLDI, we are always in motion. In 2014, we sent 87 brand-new vehicles hurtling to violent ends, pushed the limits of autonomous braking systems on 43 new models, scrutinized 41 booster seats for children and published our first-ever list of recommended used vehicles for teenage drivers.

In the following pages we share a sampling of our accomplishments during the past year and take a look ahead at some of the work we’re planning for 2015.

Images of the vehicles we’ve put through our newest crash test continued to draw media attention in 2014 as we entered the third year of evaluating models for occupant protection in a small overlap front crash. For the 2015 model year, we saw significant improvements in performance among redesigned models from a number of manufacturers. The Kia Soul and the Toyota Prius v, for instance, jumped from a poor rating to a good rating. Another standout was the Honda CR-V, which improved from marginal to good.

Since we began rating vehicles for front crash prevention in 2013, we’ve seen swift progress. More and more vehicles are available with technology that warns of an impending frontal collision and/or initiates autonomous braking. Volkswagen, for example, rolled out an optional forward collision warning system on the 2015 Jetta, helping the midsize car secure a 2015 TOP SAFETY PICK+ award. Chrysler is another manufacturer taking note. The 2015 Chrysler 200 earns a superior rating for front crash prevention when the midsize car is equipped with its optional forward collision warning system with autobrake.

Safety improvements weren’t limited to passenger vehicles. In September, we crashed a Chevrolet Malibu into the back of a trailer from Vanguard to test the trailer’s rear underride guard in a 50 percent overlap test. The car ended up behind the trailer — not crushed beneath
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it — because the Vanguard’s underride guard held up after two prior models had failed. That’s the kind of improvement that inspires us to continue our research into preventing deadly underride crashes.

Keeping children safe in crashes is another important focus. In 2014, 27 booster seats earned our top rating of BEST BET, more than in any prior year. In 2015, we are working on a new ratings program evaluating LATCH setups in cars, minivans, pickups and SUVs to help parents find vehicles that will easily accommodate child restraints.

LATCH ratings are among the many developments on tap for 2015. By year’s end, we anticipate the completion of a new covered test track, which will be the base for our expanding crash avoidance research and test programs. The enormous all-weather domed facility opens up exciting research opportunities, even as our longstanding behavioral and vehicle research programs continue to yield benefits.

This year we will once again toughen the criteria needed to qualify for our TOP SAFETY PICK+ and TOP SAFETY PICK awards. Winners of the 2016 awards will be announced in December.

Already in 2015 we have published an analysis of driver death rates by vehicle type and model, research on the errors older drivers make that lead to crashes, studies showing how voice-command systems can help reduce driver distraction, an overview of graduated driver licensing laws, and a study on bicycle crashes that could help manufacturers adapt front crash prevention systems to detect cyclists. HLDI is looking at the effects of legalizing marijuana on collision claims, as well as losses associated with aluminum-body vehicles.

I am proud of our talented staff and their dedication to a broad research and communications program. This report is more than an accounting of our work. It is a tribute to the member company supporters who make our research and communications efforts possible. We thank them for their continued commitment to IIHS and HLDI.

Adrian Lund | President
At IIHS and HLDI, our research and communications programs help to:

- Protect people in crashes
- Prevent crashes from occurring in the first place
- Recognize manufacturers, vehicles and children’s booster seats that lead the way in safety
- Educate consumers and policymakers
- Communicate our research findings to the media and public
Much of our work at IIHS centers on crashworthiness, that is, how well a vehicle’s structure and restraint systems protect occupants in a crash. IIHS rates vehicles good, acceptable, marginal or poor, based on performance in five tests: moderate overlap front, small overlap front, side, roof strength and head restraints.
Small overlap front test raises safety bar

Our crashworthiness ratings program has helped consumers make informed choices when shopping for a new family vehicle and encouraged automakers to design safer vehicles that protect people in a range of common crash configurations.

Many new cars, minivans, pickups and SUVs earn good ratings in IIHS and government crash tests. Still, some models need improvement when it comes to protecting people in rollovers, rear crashes and certain types of front crashes.

Our newest crash test is the small overlap front test, which we introduced in 2012. Automakers have steadily increased the number of good or acceptable small overlap ratings, but the small overlap front test continues to challenge many vehicles. The crash test replicates what happens when the front corner of a vehicle collides with another vehicle or an object such as a tree or a utility pole. In 2014, IIHS released small overlap ratings for small cars, minicars, midsize SUVs and minivans. Results were mixed.

Minicars were first up in 2014. Only 1 out of 11 tested achieved an acceptable rating, and none were good, making minicars the worst performing group of any evaluated. Midsize SUVs also struggled, with 2 of 9 evaluated earning a good rating.

When a dozen small cars were put to the test, one achieved a good rating, five earned acceptable, two earned marginal and four earned poor. Results for minivans rounded out the year. Only 1 of 5 minivans earned a good rating and one an acceptable rating. The rest earned a poor rating for protection in a small overlap front crash.

The IIHS small overlap front test is drawing the attention of new car assessment programs worldwide. Two vehicle research institutes in China – CATARC and CAERI – are doing research on small overlap crashes and have consulted with IIHS about test protocols. IIHS was on hand in 2014 when CATARC ran a small overlap car-to-car crash test.

The IIHS small overlap front test is a model for research in China.
Large truck underride guards improve

In 2014, IIHS continued a series of research tests evaluating the designs of rear underride guards, the steel bars that hang from the backs of trailers to prevent the front of a passenger vehicle from moving underneath the trailer during a crash. The program aims to spur better underride guards that won’t buckle or break away when a trailer gets rear-ended by another vehicle. IIHS crash tests have demonstrated that rear underride guards need to be stronger than current U.S. safety standards in order to prevent underride in the kinds of crashes that happen on North American highways.

Vanguard National Trailer Corp. is among the manufacturers taking the findings to heart. In 2014, a redesigned Vanguard trailer earned a passing score in a 50
percent overlap test that two earlier underride guard designs from Vanguard had failed.

In the test, a 2010 Chevrolet Malibu hurtled toward the trailer at 35 mph, smashing into the outer half of the trailer’s rear underride guard. The Vanguard’s underride guard stopped the oncoming Malibu, preserving survival space for the test dummy in the driver’s seat of the car and preventing the dummy’s head from contacting the rear of the trailer itself.

Motorcycle ABS works
Riding a motorcycle is inherently riskier than driving a car. Maintaining control is harder on two wheels than on four, and when crashes occur, motorcyclists are at greater risk of serious injury or death because they don’t have an enclosed vehicle to protect them. One

crash avoidance feature helping to prevent motorcycle crashes is known as ABS, or antilock braking systems. ABS prevents wheels from locking up, and that’s crucial on a motorcycle. The rate of fatal crashes is 31 percent lower for motorcycles equipped with optional antilock brakes than for the same models without them.

HLDI tracks the claims experience of motorcycles equipped with anti-lock brakes and in 2014, reported that ABS can benefit both high-risk motorcyclists and those with lower risk on the road. What’s more, high-risk riders are no less likely to opt for a bike equipped with the technology than those who appear less risky based on their auto-claims record.
Assessing crash avoidance systems

IIHS began a front crash prevention ratings program in 2013 to help consumers sort through a maze of technologies and zero in on the most effective systems. HLDI research indicates that forward collision warning and autobrake systems that work at low and at moderate speeds help drivers avoid front-to-rear crashes.

Auto manufacturers are making strides in adopting the most beneficial systems with autobrake capabilities and are offering the features on a variety of models. In 2014, IIHS conducted 43 ratings tests for autobrake systems. We have rated 192 2015 models, assigning ratings of basic, advanced or superior.

HLDI studies the real-world claims experience of vehicles with crash avoidance features to see if the systems are living up to their promise. In 2014, HLDI examined insurance loss results for two Subaru systems: EyeSight and a rear-vision camera. The EyeSight front crash prevention system is associated with reductions in claim frequency for 3 of the 5 coverage types examined — property damage liability (11 percent),...
bodily injury liability (40 percent) and personal injury protection (10 percent). The reductions in property damage liability and bodily injury liability are statistically significant. The rear-vision camera shows reductions in property damage liability, collision and personal injury protection claim frequencies. The result for property damage liability is statistically significant.
IIHS safety awards recognize vehicles that earn top ratings in IIHS crashworthiness, crash avoidance and mitigation evaluations. IIHS also rates booster seats on how well they provide good safety belt fit in a range of vehicles.
IIHS awards recognize standouts in crash protection, prevention

The number of vehicles earning either of the Institute’s two awards jumped to 71 in 2015, up from 39 for 2014, giving consumers more choices for optimum protection in crashes. Winners of the top-tier TOP SAFETY PICK+ award increased by 11 for 2015, despite a tougher standard for front crash prevention. In all, there were 33 TOP SAFETY PICK+ winners and 38 TOP SAFETY PICK winners when the initial batch of 2015 winners was announced in December. Since then, IIHS has announced five additional winners.

To qualify for either of the 2015 awards, vehicles must earn either a good or acceptable rating in the small overlap front crash test, and good ratings in the other four crashworthiness evaluations — moderate overlap front, side, roof strength and head restraints. In addition, TOP SAFETY PICK+ winners must have an advanced or superior rating for front crash prevention.

Manufacturers will have to meet tougher criteria for the 2016 awards. Vehicles must earn a good rating in each of the Institute’s five crashworthiness evaluations, including the small overlap front test. Models that also earn an advanced or superior rating for front crash prevention will qualify for TOP SAFETY PICK+.

Advertising

486 ads approved to use TOP SAFETY PICK/TOP SAFETY PICK+ claims

- 204 online
- 125 print
- 70 other
- 56 TV
- 31 radio
- 91 for Canadian market
- 6 for other foreign markets

TOP SAFETY PICK was cited 3,639 times on major market TV stations in 2014. Subaru’s “They lived” commercial featuring the IIHS TOP SAFETY PICK logo was broadcast more than 900 times.
Booster seat ratings improve

The ranks of top-rated booster seats continue to grow as manufacturers design models to earn high marks in the annual IIHS booster seat evaluations. Among the 41 models new for 2014, there are 27 BEST BET seats — more than in any prior year — and three GOOD BETs. Eight boosters are in a category the Institute calls “Check Fit,” and there are three new models that the Institute doesn’t recommend using as boosters.

Boosters earn a rating of BEST BET, GOOD BET, Check Fit or Not Recommended, based on a protocol that involves measuring how three-point lap and shoulder belts fit a child-size dummy seated in the booster on a stationary test fixture. Measurements are taken under four conditions spanning the range of safety belt configurations in passenger vehicles. The evaluations focus on belt fit and don’t involve crash tests.

Ratings for newly introduced models and older boosters still on the market can be found at iihs.org/boosters. Altogether, IIHS has ratings for 69 BEST BET and eight GOOD BET boosters, 35 Check Fit boosters and five Not Recommended seats for 2014.

Some manufacturers ask IIHS to evaluate booster designs they are developing to see how they would rate for belt fit. In 2014, IIHS reviewed 12 prototype boosters from four different manufacturers for unofficial ratings.
Our work draws crowds. Guided tours and exhibit hall displays help our many visitors understand our research programs. Insurers and journalists are frequent guests.
Vehicle Research Center

The kind of hands-on research that we undertake at IIHS requires lots of room, both indoors and outdoors. Thanks to the insurers who support us, our central Virginia campus affords us the acreage and facilities we need to carry out our mission.

The Vehicle Research Center (VRC) is where we conduct crash tests, crush roofs, run cars into the backs of tractor-trailers, drive vehicles toward test rigs and pedestrian stand-ins and execute a myriad of other engineering evaluations.

Our crash hall is huge — 22,000 square feet with three runways for crash tests. Just outside, an 8-acre open-air track is where we evaluate vehicles equipped with technology to avoid or mitigate crashes. Soft-sided targets and breakaway test rigs minimize vehicle damage when there are impacts.

When we want to evaluate how dummies, restraint systems or booster seats would fare in a crash without destroying a vehicle, we use a sled rig that can simulate severe crash forces. In 2014, we built and installed a vehicle buck that can be mounted on the sled. We used this setup to examine the dynamic performance of boosters and to evaluate a new crash test dummy.

Our vehicle prep area resembles a high-end garage. It’s where technicians ready each car, minivan, SUV and pickup for testing. Every vehicle gets a turn in our photo studio, where photographers capture the images we use in our research and communications programs.

87 crash tests
- 53 small overlap
- 6 moderate overlap front (plus 2 for research)
- 6 side impact
- 19 roof crush
- 1 truck underride

Visitors/groups hosted
- 2,600 visitors
- 108 groups, including 46 insurer groups, 16 emergency services, 9 government/policy
As part of the $30 million expansion of the VRC, a new office and conference space was completed at the start of 2015. The 18,000-square-foot three-story building accommodates staff, as well as visitors and manufacturer representatives on hand for our vehicle evaluations. The conference center allows us to host groups of up to 150 people.

Work is slated to finish in 2015 on a 5-acre covered track for evaluating crash avoidance systems, including systems that can detect pedestrians and bicyclists. Research we conducted in 2014 is helping us target additional areas to explore to encourage the most promising technologies.
When it comes to selecting a vehicle for their newly licensed teenage driver, parents sometimes feel they need to make a trade-off between safety and affordability. To make the decision easier, IIHS compiled a list of recommended safe and affordable used vehicles for teens. See the list at iihs.org/teenvehicles.

There are two tiers of recommended vehicles: BEST CHOICES and GOOD CHOICES. Prices range from about $5,000 to nearly $20,000, so parents can buy the most safety for their money, whatever their budget.

The recommendations are guided by four main principles:

- Young drivers should stay away from high horsepower. More powerful engines can tempt them to test the limits.

- Bigger, heavier vehicles are safer. They protect better in a crash, and HLDI analyses of insurance data show that teens are less likely to crash them in the first place. There are no minicars or small cars on the recommended list. Small SUVs are included because their weight is similar to that of a midsize car.

- Electronic stability control is a must. This feature helps a driver maintain control of the vehicle on curves and slippery roads. It reduces risk on a level comparable to safety belts.

- Vehicles should have the best safety ratings possible. At a minimum, that means a good rating in the IIHS moderate overlap front test, an acceptable rating in the side test and four or five stars from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (safercar.gov).
Older drivers trim crashes

Older drivers have a much higher fatal crash risk than middle-age drivers. This is mostly because of their heightened fragility. Still, fatal crash rates have declined among older drivers at a much faster pace than among middle-age drivers. It’s a marked shift that began to take hold in the mid-1990s and indicates that the growing ranks of aging drivers aren’t making U.S. roads deadlier.

Early in 2015, IIHS shared results of a study shedding more light on what’s behind declines in older driver death rates. Two developments likely are helping: Older drivers are in fewer crashes per mile traveled, and they are surviving crashes, especially side impacts, more often than prior generations.

Safely navigating intersections continues to be a problem, a companion study published in 2015 found. IIHS researchers examined critical driver factors that led to crashes among drivers 70 and older, comparing them with those of drivers ages 35-54. The kinds of errors older drivers most often make differ from those of middle-age drivers. Older drivers were more likely to make inadequate surveillance errors involving looking but not seeing than middle-age drivers. In contrast, when middle-age drivers made surveillance errors they most often were a result of failing to look.
Examining distraction
Using a cellphone while driving increases crash risk. In 2014, IIHS released results of a study it did in conjunction with the Virginia Tech Transportation Research Institute looking at trips made by 105 drivers during one year. It found the risk of a crash or near crash was 17 percent higher when the driver was interacting with a cellphone. Much of the increase was attributable to reaching for, answering or dialing a cellphone. Those things tripled the risk, while talking on or listening to a cellphone wasn’t associated with an increased rate of crashes or near crashes.

Bans on hand-held phone use and texting are common, but there is mixed evidence about whether they reduce crashes. This is the case even though IIHS research has documented that bans on hand-held phone use reduce overall phone use. Even with strong enforcement, bans on hand-held phone use and texting aren’t reducing crashes reported to insurers, HLDI found in a 2013 analysis.

Voice-command systems are seen as one way to reduce the distraction of using in-vehicle infotainment and communications features. Voice systems do help drivers keep their eyes on the road when compared with manual interfaces, a 2015 study by researchers from IIHS and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s AgeLab shows. But they don’t eliminate visual distraction altogether.
HLDI mines claims data

HLDI collects data from companies representing about 85 percent of the market for private passenger auto insurance. HLDI’s database of loss information for nearly 410 million automobiles — the largest repository of its kind — enables analysts to identify patterns of losses by vehicle make and model. HLDI also analyzes motorcycle losses with information on more than 8 million bikes.

Analyzing this wealth of claims data helps HLDI determine if crash avoidance and other safety features are making a difference. Consumers can use HLDI’s findings to help home in on cars, minivans, pickups, SUVs and motorcycles with the lowest insurance losses and proven safety features.

- VIN decodes
  - 3,505,683 passenger vehicles
  - 985,232 motorcycles

- iihs-hldi.org website
  - 1,708,989 views

- HLDI reports
  - 47

HLDI’s data analysis provided the underpinnings of IIHS ratings for front crash prevention systems spreading through the fleet. Another trend is the growing use of aluminum in vehicles. HLDI has studied several models’ use of aluminum to see how this material is affecting insurance claims. Tallying losses from collisions with animals and losses from vehicle thefts are additional areas of focus.
A multipronged communications program puts IIHS and HLDI in a strong position to secure media coverage of our research. Our experts are favorite contacts for transportation journalists, who rely on us to provide objective insights.

### Facts & figures

**TRADITIONAL MEDIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1,064</th>
<th>79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interviews with print or online media</td>
<td>interviews for radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Video news release audiences**

- Small overlap minicars
  - January 22
  - 121.9 million
- Small overlap midsize SUVs
  - April 9
  - 146.2 million
- Front crash prevention ratings
  - May 29
  - 78.7 million

---

**A new look for IIHS and HLDI**

With a new office building and research facilities coming online as 2015 dawned, we seized the opportunity to rebrand with a new logo. Our bold new look visually connects IIHS and HLDI, and the distinctive yellow road stripe through the letter H references our highway safety mission. Created in-house, the new logo replaces ones introduced during 1998.
**NEW MEDIA**

6,430 Twitter followers, up 62 percent from 2013
- 34 percent originate outside the U.S.
- 194,000 audience impressions per month

28.4 million Views of IIHS uploads, up 33 percent from 2013
- 50,620 new subscribers, up 51 percent from 2013
- 100,000 total subscribers reached on Jan. 8, 2015
- 87 uploads; 5 uploads with more than 1 million views each
- 65.9 million total lifetime views

Small overlap small cars
- July 30
- 165.5 million

Booster ratings
- November 6
- 53 million

Small overlap minivans
- November 20
- 129.2 million

TOP SAFETY PICK awards
- December 23
- 76.7 million

2014 total
- **771.2 million**

Audience per video news release and overall total for year:
- 771.2 million viewers of 14,793 broadcasts vs. 368.5 million viewers of 5,313 broadcasts in 2013
- Average per release: 110 million viewers of 2,113 broadcasts vs. 61.4 million viewers of 885 broadcasts in 2013
Media highlights


2. Anne McCartt, senior vice president for research, discusses the first-ever IIHS list of recommended used vehicles for teenage drivers.

3. Jessica Jermakian, senior research scientist, explains how we rate booster seats.

4. Joe Nolan, senior vice president for vehicle research, is interviewed by CBS This Morning.

5. SUV ratings drew strong coverage.

6. ABC’s Diane Sawyer covers 2015 TOP SAFETY PICK winners.

7. David Zuby, executive vice president, is interviewed by CBS on small overlap ratings for minivans.
6.2 million sessions

Top referring websites in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>forbes.com</td>
<td>74,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babycenter.com</td>
<td>49,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobile01.com</td>
<td>49,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nbcnews.com</td>
<td>45,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allstategoodhandsnews</td>
<td>36,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.facebook.com</td>
<td>34,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autos.msn.com</td>
<td>32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.iihs.org</td>
<td>32,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents.com</td>
<td>32,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kia.com</td>
<td>26,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youtube.com</td>
<td>21,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cbsnews.com</td>
<td>18,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumerreports.com</td>
<td>15,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnbc.com</td>
<td>15,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facebook.com</td>
<td>14,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Web traffic by country

- **72%** U.S.
- **7%** Canada
- **21%** outside of North America

Top 10 countries by traffic outside North America

- Taiwan
- South Korea
- China
- Japan
- Russia
- Germany
- United Kingdom
- Turkey
- Mexico
- Australia

2014 site total 6.2 million sessions
IIHS bibliography, 2014-15

Airbags

Automated enforcement
Survey about pedestrian safety and attitudes toward automated traffic enforcement in Washington, D.C. Cicchino, Jessica B.; Wells, JoAnn K.; McCartt, Anne T. Traffic Injury Prevention  |  May 2014

Bicyclists
Cyclist crash scenarios and factors relevant to the design of cyclist detection systems. MacAlister, Anna; Zuby, David S. Arlington, Va.: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  March 2015

Child safety
Vehicle characteristics associated with LATCH use and correct use in real-world child restraint installations. Cicchino, Jessica B.; Jermakian, Jessica S. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  April 2014
Use of top tethers with forward-facing child restraints: observations and driver interviews. Eichelberger, Angela H.; Decina, Lawrence E.; Jermakian, Jessica S.; McCartt, Anne T. Journal of Safety Research  |  February 2014

Crash avoidance technologies
Experiences of model year 2011 Dodge and Jeep owners with collision avoidance and related technologies. Cicchino, Jessica B.; McCartt, Anne T. Traffic Injury Prevention  |  April 2015
Differences in glance behavior between drivers using a rearview camera, parking sensor system, both technologies, or no technology while backing. Kidd, David G.; McCartt, Anne T. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  October 2014
Toyota drivers’ experiences with Dynamic Radar Cruise Control, the Pre-Collision System, and Lane-Keeping Assist. Eichelberger, Angela H.; McCartt, Anne T. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  March 2014
Volvo drivers’ experiences with advanced crash avoidance and related technologies. Eichelberger, Angela H.; McCartt, Anne T. Traffic Injury Prevention  |  February 2014

Crash testing and crashworthiness

Distracted driving
Multi-modal assessment of on-road demand of voice and manual phone calling and voice navigation entry across two embedded vehicle systems. Mehler, Bruce; Kidd, David G.; Reimer, Bryan; Reagan, Ian J.; Dobres, Jonathan; McCartt, Anne T. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  March 2015
Multi-modal demands of a smartphone used to place calls and enter addresses during highway driving relative to two embedded systems. Reimer, Bryan; Mehler, Bruce; Reagan, Ian J.; Kidd, David G.; Dobres, Jonathan. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  March 2015
The influence of roadway situation, other contextual factors, and driver characteristics on the prevalence of driver secondary behaviors. Kidd, David G.; Tison, Julie; Chaudhary, Neil K.; McCartt, Anne T.; Cassanova-Powell, Tara D. Arlington, Va.: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  March 2015
Relationship of near-crash/crash risk to time spent on a cell phone while driving. Farmer, Charles M.; Klauer, Sheila G.; McClafferty, Julie A.; Guo, Feng. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety  |  October 2014

Special considerations in distracted driving with teens. Durbin, Dennis R.; McGehee, Daniel V.; Fisher, Donald; McCartt, Anne T. *Annals of Advances in Automotive Medicine* | March 2014

**General and miscellaneous**


**Older drivers**

Why have fatality rates among older drivers declined? The relative contributions of changes in survivability and crash involvement. Cicchino, Jessica B. Arlington, Va.: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety | March 2015


**Roundabouts**


**Safety belt technology**

Drivers’ attitudes toward front or rear child passenger belt use and seat belt reminders at these seating positions. Kidd, David G.; McCartt, Anne T. *Traffic Injury Prevention* | April 2014

Attitudes toward seat belt use and in-vehicle technologies for encouraging belt use. Kidd, David G.; McCartt, Anne T.; Oesch, Nathan J. *Traffic Injury Prevention* | January 2014

**Teenagers**

History and current status of state graduated driver licensing (GDL) laws in the United States. Williams, Allan F.; McCartt, Anne T.; Sims, Laurel B. Arlington, Va.: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety | March 2015


Tracking progress in teenage crash risk in the United States since the advent of graduated driver licensing programs. McCartt, Anne T.; Teoh, Eric R. *Journal of Safety Research* | June 2015

Views of New Jersey teenagers about their state’s policies for beginning drivers. Williams, Allan F.; McCartt, Anne T. *Journal of Safety Research* | February 2014

**Vehicle headlights**

On-road experiment to assess drivers’ detection of roadside targets as a function of headlight system, target placement, and target reflectance. Reagan, Ian J.; Brumbelow, Matthew L.; Frischmann, Tim. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* | March 2015

Test track evaluation of headlight glare associated with adaptive HID, fixed HID, and fixed halogen low beam headlights. Reagan, Ian J.; Frischmann, Tim; Brumbelow, Matthew L. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety | October 2014

**Vehicle size and weight**

The effects of vehicle redesign on the risk of driver death. Farmer, Charles M.; Lund, Adrian K. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety | September 2014
## HLDI reports, 2014

### Advisories

- Insurer advisory: Marijuana use and crash risk; April
- Claim advisory: 2013-14 noncrash fire-related recalls; April

### Special topics

- Animal strike losses, hybrids versus their conventional counterparts; 31(26), December
- Bodily injury liability exposure by driver and vehicle age; 31(9), April
- Collision and property damage liability losses in multiple-vehicle crashes; 31(5), April
- Collision claim frequencies and NFL games; 31(25), December
- Collision claim severity for aluminum intensive vehicles; 31(7), April
- Collision insurance losses - 2014 models; 31(10), August
- Effect of 2013–14 polar vortex on collision losses; 31(21), December
- Electronic stability control and the vehicle fleet; 31(13), September
- Evaluation of motorcycle antilock braking systems; 31(11), September
- Honda Accord collision avoidance features: initial results; 31(2), April
- Honda Accord collision avoidance features: an update; 31(16), September
- Injury odds of animal strike claims compared to collision claims; 31(18), December
- Injury rate factors; 31(12), September
- Insurance losses by rated driver age and gender; 31(6), April
- Losses due to animal strikes; 31(3), April
- Motorcycle collision losses for three-wheelers: an update; 31(19), September
- Pickup size, cab configuration and injury losses; 31(27), December
- Point of impact and claim size distribution for collision claims by rated driver age; 31(23), December
- Point of impact distribution for animal strike claims; 31(14), September
- Predicted availability of safety features on registered vehicles – an update; 31(15), September
- Subaru collision avoidance features: initial results; 31(24), December

### Vehicle descriptions

- 2015 Motorcycle models preview; (MD-14P), December
- Collision avoidance features – 2015 models; (VIC-14), December
- HLDI facts and figures, 1981-2015 vehicle fleet; (VIF-14), December
- Specifications and basic features – 2015 models; (VIS-14), December

### Standard reports

- Animal strike losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (AS-13), September
- Bodily injury liability losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (B-13), September
- Collision losses: 2010-14 motorcycles; (MR-14), Dec.
- Collision losses: 2012-14 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (R-14), December
- Comprehensive losses: 2009-13 motorcycles (MC-13), April
- Comprehensive losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (C-13), April
- Glass losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (G-13), April
- Liability and first party medical losses: 2009-13 motorcycles; (ML-13), September
- Medical payment losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (M-13), September
- Personal injury protection losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (I-13), September
- Property damage liability losses: 2012-14 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (P-14), December
- Rated driver age: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (AG-13), September
- Theft losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (T-13), April
- Whole vehicle theft losses: 2011-13 passenger cars, pickups, SUVs, and vans; (WT-13), April

### Summary of animal strike research; (A-89), December
- Theft losses of 1993–2012 passenger cars, pickups, and SUVs; 31(1), April
- Theft losses of 1993–2012 passenger cars, pickups, and SUVs Appendix; 31(1A), April
- Total losses under collision coverage; 31(20), December
- Turbocharged engines – insurance losses under collision coverage; 31(8), April
- Young teen crash risk by vehicle type; 31(4), April

### Theft losses of 1993–2012 passenger cars, pickups, and SUVs Appendix; 31(1A), April

### Total losses under collision coverage; 31(20), December

### Turbocharged engines – insurance losses under collision coverage; 31(8), April

### Young teen crash risk by vehicle type; 31(4), April
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MEMBER GROUPS
Acceptance Insurance
ACE Private Risk Services
Affirmative Insurance
Alfa Alliance Insurance Corporation
Alfa Insurance
Allstate Insurance Group
American Family Mutual Insurance Company
American National
Ameriprise Auto & Home
Amica Mutual Insurance Company
Auto Club Enterprises
Auto Club Group
Auto-Owners Insurance
Avala Insurance
Bankers Insurance Group
Bitco Insurance Companies
California Casualty Group
Capital Insurance Group
Censtat Casualty Company
Chubb & Son
Colorado Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company
Concord Group Insurance Companies
Cotton States Insurance
COUNTRY Financial
CSAA Insurance Group
CSE Insurance Group
Direct General Corporation
Erie Insurance Group
Esurance
Farm Bureau Financial Services
Farm Bureau Insurance of Michigan
Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company of Idaho
Farmers Insurance Group
Farmers Mutual Hail Insurance Company of Iowa
Farmers Mutual of Nebraska
Florida Farm Bureau Insurance Companies
Frankenmuth Insurance
Gainso Insurance
GECO Corporation
The General Insurance
Georgia Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company
Goodville Mutual Casualty Company
Grange Insurance
Halmark Insurance Company
Hanover Insurance Group
The Hartford
Haulers Insurance Company, Inc.
Horace Mann Insurance Companies
ICW Group
Imperial Fire & Casualty Insurance Company
Indiana Farmers Mutual Insurance Company
Infinity Property & Casualty
Kemper Corporation
Kentucky Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Companies
Liberty Mutual Insurance Company
Louisiana Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company
Main Street America Insurance Group
Mercury Insurance Group
MetLife Auto & Home
Michigan Millers Mutual Insurance Company
MiddleOak
Mississippi Farm Bureau Casualty Insurance Company
MMG Insurance
Munich Reinsurance America, Inc.
Mutual of Enumclaw Insurance Company
Nationwide
New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Group
Nodak Mutual Insurance Company
Norfolk & Dedham Group
North Carolina Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company
Northern Neck Insurance Company
Ohio Mutual Insurance Group
Old American County Mutual Fire Insurance
Oregon Mutual Insurance
Pekin Insurance
PEMCO Insurance
Plymouth Rock Assurance
Progressive Corporation
The Responsive Auto Insurance Company
Rockingham Group
Safe Auto Insurance Company
Safeeco Insurance Companies
Samsung Fire & Marine Insurance Company
SECURA Insurance
Sentry Insurance
Shelter Insurance Companies
Sampo Japan Insurance Company of America
South Carolina Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company
Southern Farm Bureau Casualty Insurance Company
State Auto Insurance Companies
State Farm Insurance Companies
Tennessee Farmers Mutual Insurance Company
Texas Farm Bureau Insurance Companies
Tower Group Companies
The Travelers Companies
United Educators
USAA
Utica National Insurance Group
Virginia Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance
West Bend Mutual Insurance Company
Western National Insurance Group
Westfield Insurance
XL Group plc

FUNDING ASSOCIATIONS
American Insurance Association
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Property Casualty Insurers Association of America