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Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Planning

A Guide for States

Traffic Safety Information Systems in the 21st Century

Over the past fifty years states and local governments have built a wide range of information systems to support their information needs relating to traffic safety. These systems include, but are far from limited to:

- Traffic Crash Systems
- Roadway Inventory Systems
- Traffic Citation & Adjudication Systems
- Injury Surveillance Systems
- Driver Licensing & Driver History Systems
- Vehicle Registration Systems

The information systems within each state and local agency have traditionally been designed and operated to support the specific needs of one or more business processes within the owner agency. Since these systems began to appear in the 1960s they have become “mission critical” to their owner agencies. Many have gone through one or more major overhauls during their life as technology and needs changed. Today, as we look toward the traffic safety information needs of the 21st century, and the demands for all public agencies to have data driven, performance based safety programs, the traffic safety data community is faced with the challenge of re-visiting the design and operation of these systems.

As legislation indicates, federal and state traffic safety programs will need timely, accurate and accessible data covering all aspects of the traffic safety arena in order to properly identify problems, select countermeasures, monitor countermeasure programs and to ultimately evaluate the effectiveness of those programs. State and federal safety program funding will be tied to the ability of the traffic safety community to:

1. Prove what, and where the problems are.
2. Identify, using data on likely costs and impact, those countermeasures that are most likely to have the greatest return on investment of scale funding and staff resources.
3. Prioritize problems and countermeasures based upon hard data.
4. Monitor the implementation of countermeasures.
5. Ultimately document the effectiveness of the safety improvement programs.

In addition, as part of the re-authorization of US-DOT there is a new funding area: State Safety Data Improvement Programs. This significant commitment by Congress to the improvement of state safety information systems, and in turn the improvement of data available to US-DOT, calls for the development of comprehensive safety information system plans in each state. This planning process, if undertaken properly, is intended to assure that state safety information systems move in a direction that will support the need for a comprehensive state-wide traffic safety plan encompassing all jurisdictions and roads within the state.

Another incentive for the development of this guide rises from the recommendations from a collaborative planning effort that was undertaken within US-DOT. In 2003 and 2004 representatives of the various agencies within US-DOT met to address the data needs of US-DOT. A key recommendation of the Integrated Planning Team (IPT) Data Report relates to the development and implementation of State Traffic Records Strategic Plans:

(State) Traffic Records Coordinating Committees (TRCCs) should be organized and functioning in each State to build, strengthen, and provide the leadership needed to ensure that State resources for traffic safety data are coordinated. The State TRCC should include the State’s Department of Transportation, the State Highway Safety Organization (SHSO) and Regional and State data providers and data users, in addition to the owners/managers of the State traffic safety data. An effective membership would include persons with both decision-making authority and expertise in traffic safety data and whose tasks related to the TRCC would be included among their regular duties. Each State TRCC should:

1. **Develop and implement a multi-year strategic plan that establishes priorities for improving traffic safety data.** The plan should address the State’s traffic safety data and processing deficiencies, integrate State data needs and goals with the State’s highway safety plan, identify performance-based measures for measuring progress, indicate how funds will be used, and what progress the State has made to date. (Characteristics of a successful State TRCC are listed elsewhere.) A collaborative approach to developing the plan will be necessary to jointly identify the gaps in existing resources, negotiate the various authorities to perform each task, and assign who should be responsible, in terms of people and agencies, for completing each task. A time-line should be established and a plan of action completed per the uniform performance guidelines to be established, using a MMUCC-like process, for State TRCCs.

2. **Assess progress regularly.** The State TRCC should assess the status of its traffic records capabilities every 5 to 6 years to determine the status of its traffic safety data capabilities. Key performance measures should be implemented to identify deficiencies. At a minimum, needed improvements, identified during the assessment process, should be given priority for implementation when the traffic safety data strategic plan is updated.

3. **Implement proven traffic safety technology, methods and software.** State TRCCs should discourage reinventing the wheel, which would only waste resources and time. Instead a high priority should be assigned to using proven technology, methods and software that will enhance uniformity and integration, statewide and nationally. If States use in-house programming staff to develop a State-specific system, the system should comply with national guidelines for uniformity and integration.

Finally, inquiries from State TRCCs have indicated that there is a need for guidance from the Federal level and that States would benefit from receiving direction on the process they should undertake to develop a State Traffic Safety Data Improvement Strategic Plan. Preliminary work began on the development of a State Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Planning Guide in Federal Fiscal Year 2003. This was about the time that the initial language was developed for the Section 408 State Safety Data Improvement Program.* In calendar year 2005 this document was revised as the final language became available for the US-DOT Reauthorization bill.
This report provides an overview of a proposed Statewide Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Planning process. The proposed process and “checklists” contained in this document are intended to provide state safety data system planners and, in particular, the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee in each state with a road map to guide them through the planning process. It is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather a suggested method for producing a strategic plan that will not only meet the planning requirements of the State Safety Data Improvement Program but will also serve to provide the state with a well documented plan that has a maximum potential for improving the state and local safety information systems.

*Please note that Section 408 has now become Section 405 (b): State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements of the Section 405 National Priority Safety Program.


Purpose of the Document

As noted above, this document is intended to provide guidance and suggestions about how to achieve the goal of developing a workable, viable Statewide Traffic Safety Information Systems Plan. It is addressed to State Traffic Records Coordinating Committees, State Highway Safety Offices (Governor’s Highway Safety Representatives), and data systems policy managers. Those who choose to use this document are encouraged to modify the suggestions contained in the document to meet local conditions. It is recognized that an undertaking of this magnitude will be somewhat different in each state due to organizational structure, current state of each safety information system component, and the priorities of the state as influenced by budget, staffing and external forces.

In general, users are encouraged to read through the entire document at least once, and then a second time noting aspects of the suggested steps that might need modification within their individual state. Once you have had the opportunity to formulate how you might implement the planning process within your state, you are encouraged to contact your NHTSA Region staff to discuss the planning approach that you have identified, any technical support that might be required, and any areas where you feel that you need guidance or clarification.

   Remember, this document is a guide or a starting point for discussion, not a formal policy or rule.

Updates, Comments and Suggestions

Recognizing that the final legislation, and the associated administrative rules which drive state highway safety programs, may change over time a web site has been created which will contain the latest version of this document and various supporting documents. The web site will contain downloadable versions of this document as well as other resources.

Resources website: http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/resources.html

Those who use this document are encouraged to provide feedback and suggestions on how to improve the Guide. NHTSA is also interested in receiving comments from those who use the document on how the process has been modified within each state to meet local needs.
Prior to addressing the suggested planning process it is appropriate to provide some basic guidance on terminology and to provide some context. Several underlying concepts, various terms and abbreviations and some context information are at the core of the suggested planning process. This section is intended to provide that background and foundation information.

**SAFETEA – The Driving Force**

The re-authorization legislation has within it a requirement for a comprehensive Statewide Traffic Safety Plan which will require accurate, timely, consistent data – which must be made available to the state and local safety planners. In order to assure that the required data is available, Congress has established a major funding program. Title 23, Section 408 within the SAFETEA version of the legislation calls for funding of state safety data improvement projects at levels that have never been seen before.

As the re-authorization of US-DOT took shape, Congress specified that every state shall develop a data-driven, comprehensive, statewide highway safety plan as a precursor to receiving federal safety program funds. In most, if not all states, this will require significant improvements and expansion of state safety data systems. Without significantly improved safety data systems, most states will be challenged to develop a consistent methodology for problem identification and project selection across all roadways within the state. One of the key safety planning requirements is that this state-wide safety plan include projects from Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), county and municipal safety partners. The underlying assumption is that consistent methods be used to prioritize and evaluate projects, irrespective of jurisdiction. With increased emphasis on data-driven decision making, most data systems will be challenged to meet the significant increase in demand for data. In some cases, such as roadway inventory information systems, the systems may need to be expanded significantly. Without some exchange of timely, accurate and complete safety information between safety entities within the State it will be difficult to assess the safety problems and identify countermeasure programs that will cross traditional agency boundaries.

Congress has recognized the need for data systems support and has included funding for a State Safety Data Improvement Program in all current versions of the bill. This program is founded upon the basic fact that NHTSA, and all of US-DOT, are dependent upon good state data in order to make decisions at the national level. It is also founded on the fact that the current level of accuracy, timeliness, consistency and accessibility of state safety data files is far from what the traffic safety community needs – at both the state and the federal level.

Historically Traffic Records has been approached as something to “deal with”. That is, state and local safety data systems have been treated as a necessary part of problem identification and evaluation activities, but not really a “core” program area. The legislation, and in turn the NHTSA administrative rules for the implementation of the State Safety Data Improvement Program, calls for several key conditions to be met by the States in order to receive funding. This document is intended to suggest an approach to the data systems planning process that will meet the key components of the legislation and current “straw model” of the administrative rules. The key components are defined as:

- Single point of contact in the State at the operational level for all safety data issues (facilitate, coordinate policy, provide leadership)
- A viable, empowered, State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) to guide the data program
- Assessment of the state traffic safety information systems, performed within the past five years
Why Develop a Strategic Plan?

It can be argued that normal good business practices within a state dictate the existence of a comprehensive plan for the enhancement and improvement of the state’s safety data systems, and that there should be a process in place to manage the implementation of that plan. Unfortunately, the safety data systems in most states are components of various agency-specific business processes and are seldom considered on an enterprise level as a system in themselves. With the growing emphasis upon performance-based safety plans and comprehensive statewide safety planning, in combination with growing pressure on data systems to be efficient and cost effective, there now exists a need to view the various safety data sub-systems as a whole.

NHTSA is driven by a number of federal initiatives to promote the concept of a formalized Statewide Traffic Records Strategic Planning Process. One of the major motivations is that the Government Accounting Office (GAO) has published a report that calls for additional oversight and performance measurement for all NHTSA Programs. A key element of the safety program has been that the safety projects be data driven. Unfortunately, there exists an acknowledged weakness in terms of timeliness, completeness, reliability and accessibility for most state data systems, which calls to question the data available to NHTSA and the other US-DOT agencies to make sound decisions.

In response to the GAO request, and requests from Congress, NHTSA has taken a leadership role in the improvement of state safety data systems and in turn the data systems at US-DOT. This planning guide has
been put together with the intent of suggesting some processes that will respond to NHTSA’s need to be more accountable for safety funds, and in particular those related to State Safety Data Improvements. By providing guidance to the States it is hoped that the Regions will obtain the information they need to compile Regional plans.

The basic goals of this guide, in response to these GAO requirements are:

- Bring everyone (Region and state staff) up to speed on current Traffic Safety Information Systems issues
- Provide some benchmarks for States and Regions to use in developing their Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plans
- Set the planning expectations for implementation of the data components of SAFETEA

In addition to the GAO request for more oversight, Congress, within the language of the re-authorization bills, has charged NHTSA with assuring that the state and federal safety data systems are improved to meet the new requirements for data-driven and performance based safety programs. The Administrator has set the charge for NHTSA’s efforts to facilitate the improvement to state safety data systems as:

- To improve -
  - Timeliness
  - Accuracy
  - Completeness
  - Uniformity
  - Integration
  - Accessibility
  
  … of all of the components of the State Safety Information Systems, thus improving the data the NHTSA uses for their planning, problem identification and evaluation activities.

- To establish a basis for evaluation of how funds are to be spent, and their impact
- To define likely criteria for the award of State Safety Data Improvement Grants
- To set a foundation for the development of future Highway Safety Plans

### NHTSA's Safety Data Program Model

The foundation of safety data systems design, and this planning guide, is built upon a few basic assumptions and concepts. These basics set the direction and scope of the planning effort.

#### The Haddon Matrix

The Haddon Matrix was proposed as a method of organizing how we look at traffic safety issues. It presumes that all traffic crashes can, and should be interpreted as a combination of influences, circumstances and actions. We need to be aware that no one element will solve our problems in highway safety. Any real solution will be drawn from an understanding of the inter-relationship of factors and our ability to define and document a combination of human, vehicle and environment, pre-crash, crash and post-crash attributes and to address countermeasures to impact that combination of attributes.
The Haddon Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Crash Factors</th>
<th>Crash Event Factors</th>
<th>Post-Crash Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Factors</strong></td>
<td>Alcohol / Drugs</td>
<td>Restraint Use</td>
<td>Acute care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive driving</td>
<td>Helmet use</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Factors</strong></td>
<td>Crash avoidance</td>
<td>Crash Worthiness</td>
<td>Fire propensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antilock Brakes</td>
<td>Airbags</td>
<td>Enhanced 911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Factors</strong></td>
<td>Roadway Geometry</td>
<td>Breakaway Devices</td>
<td>Emergency Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sight Distance</td>
<td>Guard Rail / Attenuator</td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Roadside Obstacles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Haddon Matrix allows us to organize our thoughts as we interpret exactly what happened in a crash or some group of crashes, and it helps us identify those countermeasures that might best prevent a crash or mitigate the severity of the outcome. However, in order for us to attempt to use this approach to crash causation study, problem identification and countermeasure selection, we need information systems that will give us the details we need to fill in the matrix.

- We need the DATA to establish what happened, what needs to be done, and if things work
- We need to know Who – What – When - Where – Why

If and when we have the information, use of the Haddon Matrix helps us…

- Identify what went wrong
- Identify countermeasures that are likely to impact future events
- Monitor countermeasures
- Measure impact

The Haddon Matrix provides a structure for assuring that we have data for all the key components of a traffic crash study. It also helps us assure that our data contains all the elements that will allow us to do proper problem identification, program management and evaluation.

What is A Traffic Safety Information System?

A viable Traffic Safety Information System is more than just data files. It is a collection of data files, data collection tools, data analysis tools, policies, procedures, staffing and training that allows us to address traffic safety problems efficiently and effectively. It should contain information on the following primary areas of traffic safety:

- Crash
- Citation / Adjudication
- Driver Licensing
- Vehicle Registration
- Injury Surveillance
- Roadway

It should also provide supporting data that can be used to normalize information from these files. Examples of the supporting data are census / demographic information and travel information. The Traffic Safety Information System should also include components to assist in interpreting and presenting the data such as analytical tools, geographic information systems, etc. Finally, the information system should provide access to the data by the entire traffic safety community in a timely and intuitive manner.
Traffic Crash is often considered the most important element of a Traffic Safety Information System. However, without the additional data systems and the systems infrastructure to link and merge data from the other primary systems, the results of our efforts to understand and reduce traffic crashes, deaths and injuries are often hampered or ill-directed.

Unfortunately, all of this data is prone to:

- Inefficiency of data collection, storage and retrieval
- Conflict of data from multiple sources
- Inaccessibility to data caused by privacy or data sharing issues
- A wide range of other problems that reduce our ability to make sound decisions

States should approach the design and operation of our safety data systems with a much broader “system” view than has been used in the past. They should try to overcome the tendency to build single-function “stove pipe” systems and start to consider the value of the data to the traffic safety community beyond the business process that results in the initial collection of the data.

As states attempt to take this system view toward data we need to address challenges such as:

- How can we link data files to establish inter-relationships?
- How can we share files to eliminate duplicate or conflicting data?
- How can we provide other players in the traffic safety community with access to our data?
- How can we plan for a system that will truly support the needs of the traffic safety community as a whole?

State Traffic Records Systems

The entire traffic safety community, in the local, state, federal and private sectors all depend heavily upon state Traffic Safety Information Systems. US-DOT relies upon data from States as a basis for identifying program issues, countermeasure programs, etc. A review of the status of state data systems reveals that the general quality and timeliness of the data available to US-DOT from the states is lacking. This also implies that even within a state the data is likely to have problems meeting the needs of the traffic safety community.

SAFETEA promises to provide the resources and focus to make a difference through the State Safety Data Improvement Program. However, Congress is offering these funds with the prequisite that they be expended in an efficient and effective manner. The safety data community, including NHTSA, must take the lead in assuring that there are measurable improvements in the state data systems and in turn to data available to NHTSA. The purpose of this guide, and the administrative rules that will drive the SAFETEA effort, is it to provide some structure for assuring that the funds are expended in an efficient and effective manner.

Functions of a State Traffic Safety Information Systems (TSIS)

The type of State Traffic Safety Information System that we want to promote will address all the key issues that we identified earlier:

- Timeliness
- Accuracy
- Completeness
- Uniformity
- Integration
- Accessibility

It will encompass all the components that we have identified in the Traffic Safety Information Systems Guidelines.
It will be driven by a sound Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan as developed and monitored by a viable Traffic Records Coordinating Committee.

The main purpose of the Strategic Plan is to function as a management tool. It should assist a State in focusing its energy to achieve state-level goals and it should help ensure the efforts of the various agencies within the state are coordinated toward the same goals. The Plan should identify the resources needed to reach each goal and provide for a process to continuously assess the environment and adjusts the State’s direction in response to changes (legislative, organizational and budgetary).

As stated in the Data IPT Report, starting on Page 35:

“Better quality and availability of data will allow federal, State and other stakeholders to use timely, accurate data to make prudent traffic safety policy and resource allocation decisions, particularly in the areas of law enforcement (including impaired driving), crash prevention (including defects investigations and roadway improvements) and prevention of non-crash motor vehicle injuries and fatalities.”

“(B) developed a multiyear highway safety data and traffic records system strategic plan that addresses existing deficiencies in the State’s highway safety data and traffic records system and is approved by the highway safety data and traffic records coordinating committee and—

“(i) specifies how existing deficiencies in the State’s highway safety data and traffic records system were identified;

“(ii) prioritizes, based on the identified highway safety data and traffic records system deficiencies, the highway safety data and traffic records system needs and goals of the State, including the activities under subsection (a)(1);

“(iii) identifies performance-based measures by which progress toward those goals will be determined;

“(iv) specifies how the grant funds and any other funds of the State will be used to address needs and goals identified in the multiyear plan; and

“(v) includes a current report on the progress in implementing the multiyear plan that documents progress toward the specified goals.

The Data IPT Report defines a number of issues that should be addressed by the State Safety Data Strategic Plan. Examples relating to data accessibility are as follow:

1. States should implement online access to State data.
2. States should provide training to data providers on proper data collection procedures and to data users on how to use the data effectively.

- *A “Systems” approach rather than a “Component” approach*

The State, through its Strategic Plan, as implemented by the TRCC, should approach the planning and implementation of safety data systems improvements on a system basis, not on a component basis such as improving just the crash data or just the EMS data sub-system.

As the SAFETEA provisions are implemented, and the State Safety Data Improvement Program gets under way, the NHTSA staff will be attempting to help the states identify additional funding sources that might leverage the Section 405(b) monies. Possible additional funding might be available from DOJ, NIH, Homeland Security, etc.
The Regional Strategic Planning Process

In addition to the planning at the State level, NHTSA is required to develop and maintain a Regional and National Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan. As States develop their strategic plans, NHTSA region offices will be incorporating their assessment and problem identification information into the Regional Strategic Plans. At the national level, NHTSA Headquarters will be maintaining information that will comprise a National Strategic Plan and Status Report. The cooperation of the States in sharing information with NHTSA Regions as they go through the planning process will aid NHTSA in identifying areas where NHTSA might be able to provide programs or resources to assist the States. In addition, it will help NHTSA Headquarters as they assure that Congress is aware of how the funds are being used, what the needs are at the state level, and why the program should receive full funding in future appropriations bills.

Alternative Funding Choices

Although the planned State Safety Data Improvement Program offers the potential for significant support for the proposed Strategic Plans, it is recognized that in the larger picture, these NHTSA funds are likely to be a small portion of the total cost of improving state safety data systems. There are discussions of possible data systems funding at the national level within legislation that addresses impaired driving, and there are no doubt programs within other national sources such as the Department of Justice, the Center for Disease Control and the Homeland Security Administration. However, the states currently expend millions of dollars each year to operate and improve their existing data systems. Local agencies are expending significant local funds for automation of police cruisers, implementation of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology, and a wide range of other programs that can, and will, improve the overall safety data environment.

As the Traffic Records planning process is undertaken, these initiatives that are being funded from sources other than the State Safety Data Systems Improvement grants must be accounted for and coordinated with the NHTSA grant process. Obviously, NHTSA hopes that states will elect to follow the process outlines within this document even if they do not elect to apply for Section 405 (b) grants. At the same time, it is intended that each state will investigate multiple sources of funding beyond the 405 (b) program. The funding page on the Traffic Records Team website, http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/funding/funding.html offers links to possible alternative funding choices. With the significant number of initiatives that are likely to be identified through the planning process, it will require a number of funding sources to truly make the improvements that need to be made within any state.

Planning Tools

There are several online tools that can help states compile and track Strategic Planning information. The first is TRIPRS, which is the Traffic Records Improvement Program Reporting System (TRIPRS). It is an online reporting system developed to support the Section 405 (b) program as well as provide a repository for state Strategic Plans and related materials. States have the ability to use this system to enter information on their TRCC, projects, progress reports, and produce reports. For a full history of TRIPRS and further details on how it can be used, please visit the Resources & Publications page: http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/resources.html and look for the What is TRIPRS document.

Throughout this document, tips on maintaining information using TRIPRS will be included where applicable.

Another tool that can be used is the Traffic Records Inventory (TRI). (http://portal.nhtsa-tsis.net/triprs/f?p=103:12) It has a public side which gives a view of the basic information about the traffic records systems within each state and contact information for each state system. States may also update this information to provide information to others in their state as well as to prepare for the traffic records assessment process. The questions in the TRI are set to be updated in 2013.

Finally, states have access to the State Data Improvement Projects Clearinghouse. (http://portal.nhtsa-tsis.net/triprs/f?p=120:400) It contains a public view of the project data contained in TRIPRS and is searchable by state, keywords or a combination of both. This clearinghouse is intended as a resource to the states so that they will be able to identify where similar projects are being undertaken and to hopefully share information on what
works, and what does not work. NHTSA hopes that by publishing the various projects and the respective project leader / contact information state will be better able to share information on common problems, solutions and lessons learned.
Chapter 3

Overview of the Planning Process

It is recommended that each state review their current operating policies, existing management committees, and existing Information Technology (IT) planning documents in relation to the Section 405(b) requirements and in terms of the demands of SAFETEA-LU on state safety programs. If the state data improvement programs show measurable progress as required for subsequent year funding, and the state has made a good effort to address each of the following, they should have little difficulty meeting the requirements for Section 405(b) funding.

This section will provide a general overview of the proposed strategic planning process. The following sections in this guide will provide more specific detail on each of the planning and implementation steps.

The Strategic Planning Model

Each state will approach the overall process of developing and maintaining a Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan. The steps and components described in this guide are intended as a suggestion of how the process might be approached. It is NOT a requirement or specification to be followed by all states.

The steps in the overall process, as depicted below, are broken into three phases.

The first phase is the start-up or re-start of the process within a state. This phase includes the creation of the Executive TRCC as well as such working or Technical TRCCs as the state may wish to form, the establishment of policy statements and Memorandum of Agreement documents that define the roles and authorities of the TRCC and establish the working relationship between the various stakeholders, and the performance of a baseline Traffic Records Assessment.

The second phase is the creation / update of the TSIS Strategic Plan. This starts with the TRCC taking the findings from the Traffic Records Assessment and any other sources of deficiencies, setting goals for addressing those deficiencies, and establishing a vision for the direction the state will take to improve the systems. A set of projects are then defined which would address those deficiencies and move the state toward the defined goals. A step of project prioritization then takes place, resulting in the selection of projects that will be supported by the strategic plan. The project details are then tied down, performance measures are defined that will help document status and progress toward improving the systems, and baseline data is collected for those performance measures.

The third phase is the maintenance phase. This is the process of reviewing the progress from the past year, updating the strategic plan, documenting areas of progress, and submitting the updated plan to NHTSA. As noted in the flow diagram, this does entail revisiting all the steps of the plan development phase to assure the strategic plan is current and reflects the current priorities and directions for the state.

The rest of this guide describes these various steps and provides some ideas to consider in the planning process for your state.
The State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee

Each state is to have a policy-level group that oversees the State Safety Data Systems Strategic Plan and state safety data improvement program. This may be an existing IT Coordinating Committee, but in terms of the legislation, this group can also serve as the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC).

The State TRCC membership is expected to include policy level representatives of the key safety data systems within the state. Membership should include the data managers, data collectors, and major data users for each of the following system components:

- Traffic Crash
- Roadway Inventory
- Citation / Adjudication
- EMS / Injury Control
- Driver License / Driver History
- Vehicle Registration

In addition to the TRCC, states may create working or technical committees as they deem appropriate to address specific planning and implementation efforts; however, the State TRCC should have the authority of overseeing the planning and improvement of the key safety data systems within the state. The State TRCC will be expected to approve the strategic plan and implementation plan on an annual basis.

Traffic Records Assessment

The second key element of the traffic safety data systems planning process in a state is the performance of a Traffic Records Assessment. This is an in-depth formal review of a State’s highway safety data and traffic records system that, at a minimum, addresses the issues identified in NHTSA’s Traffic Records Advisory. The resulting report should help guide the state in their strategic planning process. The assessment process and Advisory have recently been revised with the new assessment process being piloted in the Fall of 2012 and implemented in 2013. The updated Advisory can be found at:

http://www.nhtsa-htis.net/stateAssessments/stateAssessments.html

This page will be updated with new information as it becomes available.

Benchmarking & Setting Goals

Based upon the Assessment, the next task that most states should undertake is an active dialogue at the TRCC level to benchmark the state safety data systems in terms of where each currently stands in terms of timeliness, accuracy, completeness, integration, uniformity, and accessibility and general ability to answer basic safety data needs of the federal, state, and local safety programs. This benchmarking process should also address how well the various systems adhere to accepted data system standards such as MMUCC and ANSI D.20 for crash data and NEMSIS for EMS run data. As this benchmarking process is performed, the state should set specific performance goals for each system or process and should document the current status of each component in terms of those goals. In subsequent years the TRCC can then compare how each system has progressed toward meeting the locally established goals.
Developing the Strategic Plan

Once a state TRCC has set goals for each safety data system and has documented the current status of each system in terms of those goals, the next step is the actual development of a Strategic Plan. This document should be able to serve as a comprehensive map for the various initiatives that the TRCC believes should be undertaken, both short term and long term, to advance the state traffic safety information systems environment. In most cases the Strategic Plan will identify areas where there is a need for action and identifies programs that will address shortfalls in the various systems that will not be supported directly with Section 405(b) funding. However, all traffic safety data initiatives that are undertaken within the state, irrespective of their funding source(s) are interrelated, and should appear within the strategic plan. In many cases, projects funded by Section 405 and those not funded by other sources are likely to depend on each other.

The Strategic Plan should be an active document, being updated at least annually to reflect new issues and the changing environment within highway safety. New state legislation, changes to federal legislation, changing priorities, and opportunities will dictate that the Strategic Plan be reviewed and updated regularly.

Project Implementation—Putting It In Motion

Upon development of the Strategic Plan, the State TRCC should then develop an implementation plan. This provides a basic overview of each project that is identified in support of the Strategic Plan. A basic process is suggested for rating possible improvement projects, but the ultimate responsibility for a coordinated, effective implementation plan lies with the State TRCC. Each project plan should contain information such as: Project Director, responsible agency, goal/purpose of the project, anticipated results of the project (how will its success or failure be measured), any inter-relationships or dependencies on other projects, estimated timeline, and resource requirements. Finally, each project plan should identify funding source(s).

Monitoring and Updating

The final key component of the strategic planning process is one of monitoring progress of each of the projects that have been defined within the Plan and how these projects contribute toward the Strategic Goals. As projects are completed and new initiatives are identified the TRCC should update the system goals, strategic plan and implementation plans accordingly. As part of this on-going monitoring and updating process the Traffic Records Assessment should be redone every five years, the strategic plan should be updated at least annually, and regular progress reporting should be built into each of the projects within the implementation plan.

Conclusions and Making the Process Work for You

This outline of the suggested traffic safety information system strategic planning process is described and discussed in greater detail within the following sections of this Guide. The Guide is intended as just that, a guide - not a specific, mandatory process. Each state will need to modify the process that is described within the Guide to meet their local environment, organizational structure, and working limitations. There may be an existing IT planning and coordinating process already in operation within a state that fully meets the process described in the Guide. Each state is encouraged to work with their NHTSA Regional office to develop a variation of the process contained within the Guide that will meet the requirements of the legislation and develop criteria addressing local issues.
Chapter 4: Organizational Issues – The TRCC

The first step in the proposed planning process addresses the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC). Although this function may be implemented somewhat differently from state to state, its function and composition is critical to the ability of the State to develop and implement the desired Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan. This chapter discusses the issues related to the TRCC, its composition, and its role in the planning and implementation of the safety data systems improvement program.

State Safety Data Systems Coordinator

The legislation and administrative rules call for the designation of a single point of contact for all issues and funding related to the State Safety Data Improvement Program. Much like the safety planning requirements of SAFETEA which call for a single state-wide traffic safety plan, Section 405(b) calls for a single Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan, and a single person who will be the State’s liaison with the federal agencies for issues and communications related to that plan. Thus, each state will be expected to designate a State Safety Data Systems Coordinator which will allow the State and the federal agencies to work through a single person, rather than having to interface with multiple agency-level contacts.

This State Safety Data Systems Coordinator may, or may not serve as the Chair of the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee, but will certainly be a key member of that Committee. As such, the Coordinator will be expected to be familiar with all aspects of the Strategic Plan, and will be expected to provide the federal sponsors with regular progress reports on the implementation of the Plan. It is anticipated, but not required that this position will likely exist within the State Highway Safety Office and that this person will act as the champion for the safety data initiatives around the state.

Function and Composition of the TRCC

The Traffic Records Coordinating Committee is intended to be the group that guides the development and implementation of the Statewide Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan. For practical reasons most states are likely to break the TRCC into an Executive Committee and one or more Technical Committees. However, within whatever structure is chosen there must be representatives of the major stakeholders that can make policy, staffing and budgetary commitments related to the various projects that will be identified through the strategic planning process. At the managerial level there should be memorandums of understanding between the stewards of the major data components. These memorandums of understanding should establish the mission and authority of the committee to coordinate and manage the safety data systems within the State.

As mentioned previously, representation on the TRCC may be prescribed in the final administrative rules but as a minimum the TRCC should have representation from data collectors, managers and users for each of the key Traffic Safety Information System components. The TRCC need not necessarily be a new, stand-alone group. In many states there exist information systems coordinating groups or safety program coordinating groups that could easily serve as the State TRCC with minimal changes to their charters.
The TRCC may be focused upon implementation of projects in only a few of the key component areas, but the representation on the TRCC must cover those agencies that operate and manage each of the core sub-systems:

- Traffic Crash Systems
- Roadway Inventory Systems
- Traffic Citation & Adjudication Systems
- Injury Surveillance Systems
- Driver Licensing & History Systems
- Vehicle Registration Systems

The TRCC should also contain representation from the major functional or constituency groups including:

- FARS
- Geographic Information Systems
- State Highway Safety Office
- State Safety Planning Committee
- Federal Agency Representatives (NHTSA, FHWA, FMCSA)
- County, City and Regional Planning Organization safety data collectors and users

The TRCC should be configured to include, at some level, those people within the State that have responsibility for the collection, management, and provision of data from the key component systems. These people will be expected to agree on what the safety data issues are within the state, what projects should be undertaken to address those problems, and how those problems and projects are to be prioritized. The scope of this review and project identification process will go beyond those projects that might be funded by Section 405(b) monies. The TRCC’s mission and charge should include those major initiatives that are under way using state funds and funds from other federal programs.

The purview of this management level component of the TRCC, as established within the memorandum of understanding between the members, should include addressing issues that impact upon how local government will collect, share and access data with the state. It should also assure that the needs of data users are met within federal, state and local government as well as private sector traffic safety constituencies. This management level component of the TRCC has the charge and burden of assuring that the State Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan addresses the needs of the full range of traffic safety agencies and traffic safety data users while balancing those needs with the practicalities of trying to manage and coordinate complex systems within multiple agencies.

At the technical or working committee level, the TRCC may have project-specific or sub-system specific sub-committees that perform the day-to-day implementation tasks related to projects or provide technical recommendations to the management level / decision-making function within the TRCC. In a typical state these working committees or sub-committees are likely to represent where the majority of the work is actually done in developing and implementing the Strategic Plan. Their charge might include the identification of problems within some specific sub-system or business process or making recommendations of possible system improvements, including the development of cost estimates and implementation plans.

No matter how the TRCC function is organized within a given State it is imperative that the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee be active in the strategic planning process as well as in the implementation process. The TRCC is ultimately accountable for how the federal (and state) funds are expended and are ultimately responsible for assuring that the projects that are undertaken truly improve the state traffic safety information system. The TRCC should be receiving regular progress reports on all safety data system initiatives and should undertake the role of overall safety data program management. Due to the expanded oversight requirements placed upon NHTSA, the TRCC, through the State Safety Data Coordinator will be expected to provide NHTSA with regular updates on the progress of all traffic safety information system improvement projects that are identified in the state strategic plan.
TRCC Roles and Responsibilities

In summary, the requirements of the re-authorization legislation, and the administrative guidelines from NHTSA for participation in the State Safety Data Improvement Program, suggest that the State should undertake the following:

1. The state should designate a State Safety Data Coordinator who shall act as primary contact on all safety data related issues for the State. This person shall be responsible for:
   a. Maintaining communications with NHTSA Region staff relative to the safety data strategic planning and program implementation activity within the State and act as primary point of communication between NHTSA and the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee.
   b. Provide the NHTSA Region with regular (at least annual, but possibly quarterly) updates on all planning activity and project implementation progress.
   c. Provide NHTSA with an annual report documenting progress toward meeting Safety Data Strategic Plan goals and the impact of specific projects, as they are implemented, toward achieving those goals.
   d. Act as facilitator, if not Chairman, of the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee and as facilitator / coordinator of all Working or Technical Committees.

2. The State should create, by written agreement of the parties involved, a State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. This committee, as established through the appropriate memorandums of understanding, is expected to manage the development and implementation of a comprehensive Statewide Safety Data Improvement Strategic Plan. Each year the State shall submit a roster of the Committee members showing representation from each of the major component systems.

3. The State should create such working committees, technical committees or project-specific committees as the State deems appropriate. As part of the Annual Report the State Safety Data Coordinator shall list all such committees, their membership, and their area of responsibility.

4. The state should develop, and maintain a comprehensive Statewide Safety Data Improvement Strategic Plan incorporating all aspects of the safety data systems within the state, irrespective of funding sources.

TRIPRS: The designated State Safety Data Coordinator and TRCC roster may be identified and listed inside TRIPRS. Certifications may also be uploaded to TRIPRS for future reference.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > State TRCC Information

| Select TR Improvement Program Coordinator: USER, DEMO - TSASS |
| Revision Date: 27-JAN-12 |
| Name: DEMO |
| USER |
| Office: IT |
| Agency: TSASS |
Program Accountability

The Traffic Records Coordinating Committee, through the State Safety Data Systems Coordinator, will be expected to provide the federal sponsors with annual reports on their progress. During the initial assessment and strategic planning phase, these reports will obviously focus upon progress toward adoption of a Strategic Plan. Once the Strategic Plan is in place and implementation begins, these reports will be expected to include information on how the various projects are progressing. The reports should also highlight any changes to the Strategic Plan that might have been identified as the projects progress. Finally, as projects are completed, these reports should contain evaluations of the impact of the projects. It is imperative that within the traffic safety data community we be able to document that we are indeed meeting (or exceeding) our goals of improving timeliness, accuracy and accessibility of our traffic safety data.

At this time there are no specific requirements for how this reporting is to be done, and in all likelihood the process will differ from state to state and from year to year based upon where a given state is within the process. Annual reports are to be requested by NHTSA with the intent that the NHTSA Region offices will combine the reports from their states into a Regional status and progress report. These reports will in turn be compiled by NHTSA Headquarters for purposes of informing NHTSA management and Congress of what is being done at the State level and what progress we are making with the SAFETEA funds.

TRIPRS: As noted later on in this document, project activity and performance measure progress may be recorded and tracked inside TRIPRS.

Reauthorization Legislation

The legislation within the SAFETEA-LU version of the transportation reauthorization bill (Section 2004) states:

… a State must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it has (1) established a highway safety data and traffic records coordinating committee with a multidisciplinary membership that includes among others, managers, collectors, and users of traffic records and public health and injury control data systems; and (2) developed a multiyear highway safety data and traffic records system strategic plan that addresses existing deficiencies in the State’s highway safety data and traffic records system and is approved by the highway safety data and traffic records coordinating committee and (i) specifies how existing deficiencies in the State’s highway safety data and traffic records system were identified; (ii) prioritizes, based on the identified highway safety data and traffic records system deficiencies, the highway safety data and traffic records system needs and goals of the State, including but not limited to the activities under subsection (a)(1); (iii) identifies
performance-based measures by which progress toward those goals will be determined; (iv) specifies how the grant funds and any other funds of the State will be used to address needs and goals identified in the multiyear plan; and (v) includes a current report on the progress in implementing the multiyear plan that documents progress toward the specified goals.

Other sections of the legislation specify a requirement that the State provide at least annual updates on all projects within the Strategic Plan as well as documentation of the results of the various projects in attaining their specified goals.
Once the State has a Traffic Records Coordinating Committee and State Safety Data Coordinator, the next step is to assess the current safety data environment. This process is composed of several steps as outlined below.

### Taking Inventory

Before having a formal Traffic Records Assessment, each state should first take inventory of their state safety data systems. This task entails documenting what systems the state has, their basic characteristics (size, annual growth, timeliness), ownership and current upgrade plans. NHTSA maintains the State Traffic Records System Inventory (TRI) online at the NHTSA Traffic Records web site (http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/default.html), or directly at: http://portal.nhtsa-tsis.net/triprs/f?p=103:12

By completing an update of this systems inventory the State will accomplish several things. First, they will assure that they know what systems are in existence, the basic "condition" of each system, who the data owners / managers are, and ultimately who should be involved in the strategic planning process. In addition, the TRCC will hopefully gain some understanding of areas that should be investigated further during the formal assessment process to follow.

View-only access to the TRI is open to the public but a login is required to make updates. To save time, the TRI may also be accessed from the main menu, once logged into TRIPRS. Also, TRI content may be viewed and downloaded as HTM, PDF, Word or Excel reports. This allows for the sharing of information with others in the state as well as an easy method of collecting updates. Finally, if needed, a blank Word version of the inventory questions is available, but the preferred method of updating is via the online system.

### Traffic Records Assessment

Most states participated in a NHTSA Traffic Records Assessment at least once in the past 5 years. This assessment process has typically involved a team of safety data systems experts drawn together by NHTSA who interview the data owners and users in the state about the various safety data systems components, processes and procedures. The assessment team would then use the NHTSA Traffic Records Advisories as a guide for rating the state’s responses to questions and publishing their assessment report.

The assessment process has recently been updated and will be piloted in the fall of 2012. The advisory has also been updated as of July 2012 and is available on the Assessments page:

http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/stateAssessments/stateAssessments.html

A slideshow summarizing the new assessment process can also be found on the same page. There have been several changes to the assessment process; the largest of them is that it is now an online process at no cost to the state. The pre-assessment questionnaire has been revised to match the Advisory. The state’s answers to these questions comprises the bulk of the assessment.

For a state to participate in successive years of the Section 405(b) State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements Program, the state is expected to have an assessment that is no more than five years old. This will assure that the states are starting with consistent information relative to how they measure up to the current Traffic Records Advisories. It also reflects the assumption that most states will have made at least some significant changes to their safety data systems within the past 3-5 years and that technology might change how one looks at some of the issues that had been identified in an older assessment.

Any assessment will call upon the state staff to document how the state’s traffic records system components measure up to the Traffic Records Advisories. These advisories provide suggestions about how data should be
used within the safety program and call for a Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. A review of the Advisory
document, as referenced above, the pre-assessment questions and the assessment process guidelines will give
TRCC members an excellent understanding of what they should know before starting the development of a
strategic plan. If the assessment is performed properly, the TRCC will have the information that they need to
identify the weaknesses in their current safety data systems and procedures as well as a good picture of where
they need to identify countermeasure projects.

Interpreting the Assessment

The final element of the traffic records assessment is the interpretation of the findings, which must be performed
by the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. The TRCC members should take the time to understand the
findings of the assessment, take the time to discuss openly the potential impact of the various deficiencies that
may have been identified, and take the time to develop consensus about the significance of each deficiency.
Only then can the TRCC start to move toward the prioritization of possible system improvement projects.

When the TRCC reviews the assessment findings, they should pay particular attention to areas where there are
obvious, low-cost fixes that can be undertaken immediately, as well as those issues that are already scheduled to
be fixed. Once these issues are essentially eliminated from the mix, the next area of focus should be on
addressing each of the weaknesses in the system, looking for patterns, and trying to identify what it might take to
eliminate each of the deficiencies.

The assessment review should address specific deficiencies and opportunities for improvement within each of the
safety data system components:

- Traffic Crash Systems
- Roadway Inventory Systems
- Traffic Citation & Adjudication Systems
- Injury Surveillance Systems
- Driver Licensing & History Systems
- Vehicle Registration Systems

The result of this assessment review should be a listing of deficiencies and/or objectives. This listing should
include the area and system each is addressing. Deficiencies and/or Objectives identified through other means,
such as self-assessments or a citation tracking review, can also be included. In those cases, it is helpful to identify
the source of each deficiency and or objective.
TRIPRS: TRIPRS allows for the entry of deficiencies and/or objectives along with their source, area and system addressed and current status.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Deficiencies-Objectives

Deficiencies - Objectives

Deficiency Name: 180 days for convictions to appear in driver history
Deficiency-Objective Label: CIT_DEF12
Performance Area: Timeliness
System: Citation / Adjudication
Type: Deficiency
Status: Addressed - Some Progress
Source: Traffic Records Assessment
Last Updated: 18-MAY-2012
Revision Date:

Deficiency-Objective Description: Adjudications/convictions from courts may take 180 days to be reflected in the driver history.

Linked Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>CIT_PR_01</td>
<td>Citation Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>ZZTRA09001</td>
<td>Add bar coding technology for the vehicle registration document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

Setting Goals

The next step in the planning process calls for the TRCC to benchmark the existing systems and set goals for those systems. System benchmarking entails the comparison of the existing system’s performance to some level of desirable performance. The TRCC then needs to set goals for the performance of the improved system. The TRCC should review the findings from the assessment and evaluate where the system actually does, and does not provide the information and data support that the state needs and wants. One mechanism for accomplishing this is to spend some time reviewing the existing system as compared to the Traffic Safety Information System Guidelines, a document developed by the Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals (ATSIP). [http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/docs/TSISguidelines10_30_03.pdf](http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/docs/TSISguidelines10_30_03.pdf)

Establishing System Benchmarks

The TRCC should review their safety data systems to determine the current status of each system component in terms of its current performance, the desired level of performance, and the standard performance area measures in terms of timeliness, completeness, accessibility, etc. The systems should be benchmarked in terms of their ability to address safety data questions. These questions should be posed in the form of: “Can your system answer X question?” or “Can your system support the Y business function?” The process should also include a review of the current systems in terms of accepted “best practices standards” such as ANSI D.16, ANSI D.20, and MMUCC. Finally, the systems should be reviewed in terms of their ability to support the business processes described within the AASHTO Guidelines and other similar documents.

As the TRCC conducts the benchmarking process, they are encouraged to view the various components as part of an overall Traffic Safety Information System, and not just in terms of the individual component sub-systems. This “big picture” view will identify areas where the various component systems function well in support of the business process that prompted their development, as well as where the sub-systems fall short in terms of the overall safety information system perspective.

The TRCC should also benchmark the overall system and its components in terms of how they each address technology and current best practices. The TRCC should ask themselves the following questions:

- What is the most recent, accepted best practice?
- How well is the system integrated?
- Does the system embrace the latest / best technology?
- Does the system design follow developing XML standards?
- Does the system provide the functionality and flexibility that we want in the future?

There are various standards and guidelines for benchmarking your systems.

The benchmarking of the crash system should include a review of the data systems to establish how well it complies with the accepted standards and guides. The Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) provides guidance on the suggested content of state crash data systems. ANSI D.16 and D.20 standards provide guidance on traffic safety information system data dictionaries and classification systems.

Another document that can assist the states in benchmarking their systems include the AASHTO Guidelines for Linear Referencing Systems, which can provide a state with excellent standards for the evaluation of how traffic crashes, roadway elements, traffic citations and EMS runs are located to the roadway network. Obviously, one
would hope that all the safety data systems that contain location information would utilize the same location standards within a given state. The National Emergency Medical System Information Standards (NEMSIS) document provides detailed recommendations for pre-hospital data systems.

In applying the various guidelines, the TRCC may decide that a particular question is of little importance in their state, or possibly not a consideration at all since some major component doesn’t even exist in their state. However, these responses should be documented (along with ‘why not?’) for later reference. In most cases the descriptions of each system and the associated questions should help the TRCC gain a broader perspective on what their model safety information system should be able to do. These same guidelines should be used to ask questions about what the TRCC wants to be able to accomplish as their safety data systems are upgraded. What questions are really important to the state, and cannot currently be answered? These become the foundation for setting goals for the system that the state wants to achieve.

System benchmarking can allow the state to develop a summary of the state of each of the systems, which can be included as part of the strategic plan. This can assist anyone reading the strategic plan in understanding more about the current state of each data system.

### Setting Your Own Goals

Having reviewed the findings of the Traffic Records Assessment, using the Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems and the above possible criteria, the TRCC should agree on specific goals for their traffic safety information system. These goals should address the questions that the system should be able to answer, the performance levels that should be met, and the inter-relationships that should exist (data sharing, data linkage).

In setting these goals the TRCC may wish to set short term (1-2 year) and longer term (3+ years) thresholds for measuring the success of the Strategic Plan and its implementation. Goals should be set to challenge the process, but should also be reasonable. The TRCC should keep in mind that their progress and the performance of their Statewide Safety Data Improvement Program will be measured against these published goals.

### Establishing Performance-Based Measures

Throughout the various system guidelines and standards you will find generic references to “timely, accurate, complete, accessible, uniform and integrated”. These are known as performance areas and can be attributed to each of the six core traffic records data systems. (Crash, Citation/Adjudication, Driver, Vehicle, Injury Surveillance/EMS and Roadway.) Performance measures are used to demonstrate measurable progress within a state. As a starting point, the state may reference Appendix 3 of the Federal Register entry of January 2006, which contains basic definitions of performance-based measures.

http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/docs/Federal_Register.pdf

In early 2011, NHTSA released a paper identifying 61 model performance measures based on the six core data systems and performance areas.


The paper also contains definitions of each data system and performance attribute. States may use these model measures to monitor systems and projects but are not required to. States should also feel free to develop their own measurements.

Links to both the Federal Register and the Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems may be found on the Resources and Publications page: [http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/resources.html](http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/resources.html)
TRIPRS can be used to enter, track and report on performance-based measures as well as their goals. The system also allows users to select one of the 61 model measures by area and system, which are then auto-filled upon confirmation. A state-defined performance measure option is also available for creating unique measures.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Performance Measures

**Crash Timeliness**

**Label:** C-T-02  
**Status of Improvement:** Demonstrated Improvement  
**Active Status:** Proposed  
**Last Updated:** 08-MAY-2012  
**Revision Date:** 30-JUN-2011

This performance measure is based on the C-T-02 model.

Test State will improve the Timeliness of the Crash system as measured in terms of an increase of the percent of crash reports entered into the database within 30 days after the crash within a period determined by the State.

The state will show measurable progress using the following method: The time from the date of the crash to the date when the report is submitted to the database will be measured. The percent of those crashes being submitted within 30 days will then be calculated.

**Performance Measure Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Best Value</th>
<th>Best Date</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>01-JUN-10</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>09-JUN-11</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31-JAN-12</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the baseline information about the current state traffic safety information system has been documented, the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee must begin identifying projects that will move the system components, and in turn the entire system toward the goals that they have set for their system.

Identifying Candidate Projects

There are numerous techniques that may be followed in identifying projects that will affect the performance of the state Traffic Safety Information System. As these projects are identified and documented, each project description should include information on the likely lead agency, likely budgetary and resource requirements, and the likely duration of the project. Each project description should identify exactly what deficiency it is intended to address, and the likely improvement in that performance measure. A key attribute of each project description should be some estimate of the risk of the project. This risk measurement should be expressed in terms of both the likelihood of success and the likely cost should the project fail. Finally, the project descriptions should address possible obstacles to implementation, particularly those that are institutional in nature.

Most of the initial project descriptions will be fairly general in nature, and most estimates of cost and benefit will be educated guesses at this stage. The intent of this initial project identification effort is largely one of brainstorming to obtain a fairly complete list of options. As projects are identified for serious consideration the estimates can be verified and the project information defined more completely. Likewise, as the projects are discussed within the TRCC, they will likely be modified. Hopefully, through the discussion process some of the roadblocks to implementation will be eliminated.

Prioritizing Candidate Projects

Once the TRCC feels that they have at least temporarily exhausted the list of candidate projects, they should be rated on several scales. The consensus building process to develop these ratings will be a major test of the sincerity of the TRCC and their commitment to the planning process. It is suggested that each project be assigned some point value on each of the following scales:

1. How difficult is the project in terms of infrastructure, territorial, and policy issues?
2. How significantly will the project impact the TSIS if successful?
3. How expensive will the project be – a weighted cost x reliability of the estimate may be appropriate?
4. Are improvements to one system necessary in order to better another? For example, if the crash data system is improved but you cannot locate good crash data on the roadway system, what is the real benefit?
Having completed these ratings, the projects should be placed in one of four categories as depicted below:

**Four Box Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH PAYOFF – LOW RISK OR COST</th>
<th>HIGH PAYOFF – HIGH RISK OR COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD OPPORTUNITY</td>
<td>MODERATE OPPORTUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– HIGH PRIORITY</td>
<td>– MIDDLE PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW PAYOFF – LOW RISK OR COST</td>
<td>LOW PAYOFF – HIGH RISK OR COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE OPPORTUNITY</td>
<td>POOR OPPORTUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– MIDDLE PRIORITY</td>
<td>– LOW PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As suggested by the diagram above, this first cut on the rating of the projects will allow the TRCC to pick those projects that the feel most confident will make a difference in the short term. These may often turn out to be projects with little or no cost, other than agreeing to work together better. Those projects in the High Payoff – Low Risk/Cost group are obviously the first ones that will undergo a review to assure that the assumptions are correct and that they are worthy of making it to the Strategic Plan. If they can be done immediately, keep them in the plan to show that the planning process itself resulted in some benefits to the system.

The next projects that the TRCC should investigate further are those in the Low Payoff – Low Risk/Cost and the High Payoff – High Risk/Cost groups. All of the projects in these two groups should be carefully reviewed to assure that assumptions and expectations are realistic, and to see if their value to the effort or cost might be different based upon the High Payoff – Low Risk/Cost projects already being done. Based upon the results of this detail review, projects should be placed into a short-term or long-term group and then the projects within each should be ranked based upon some consensus building tool.

**Creating the Project List**

The output from this phase of the planning effort should be a set of project plans that have enough detail to clearly define:

- What is the problem being addressed?
- What needs to be done?
- What are the roadblocks to implementation?
- What resources are required to implement the project (what are the costs)?
- What is the expected outcome of implementing the projects (what are the benefits)?

Each project should also be assigned a relative priority for implementation and a label as being a short-term effort or a long-term effort. This project listing will serve as the backbone of the Strategic Plan and the associated implementation plan.
TRIPRS: As projects are identified and basic details are defined, the information may be entered into TRIPRS. This will result in the ability to export projects reports and lists by priority, status, etc. A field is available on the projects screen in TRIPRS to enter the priority determined for each project. This can be a numbering system, or words such as low, medium or high priority.

**TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Project</th>
<th>CIT_PR_01 - Citation Tracking System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Citation Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Test State Administrator of Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Contact</td>
<td>DEMO USER, TSA33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision Date</td>
<td>09-FEB-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects > Project System / Area being addressed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System / Performance Area</th>
<th>Timeliness</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Completeness</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Uniformity</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crash</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRIPRS Home > Management Dashboard > Quick Look > Projects by Priority**
The next step in the strategic planning process is to expand each Project Description to include a plan for its implementation. This will provide key information on such items as:

- Why is the project being undertaken?
- How does it relate to the Strategic Plan?
- Who is responsible for project implementation?
- How will the project be financed?
- How long will the project take?

TRIPRS: This additional project information can be added to the projects already established within the system during the identifying and prioritizing process. The basis and expected impact should be included as part of the project description to help explain why the project is being undertaken. Strategic Plan relationships may be shown by linking recommendations, deficiencies/objectives, performance measures and projects.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects > Description
TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects > Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Budget Goal</th>
<th>Budget Allocation</th>
<th>Carry Over</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Revision Date</th>
<th>Award Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>05-FEB-09</td>
<td>No Award Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA Section 408 Funds</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>05-FEB-10</td>
<td>NHTSA - 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Grant</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>20-OCT-11</td>
<td>No Award Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects > Budgets (State Budget Sources)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edit Budget Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Agency</th>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Fund Description</th>
<th>Mod User</th>
<th>Mod Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>SDAI</td>
<td>NHTSA - SDAI - Safety Data Improvement Program</td>
<td>JONES.21</td>
<td>05-NOV-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA 103</td>
<td></td>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>NHTSA - Section 163</td>
<td>MULLE2</td>
<td>20-SEP-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA Section 408 Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>NHTSA - Section 408 State Safety Data Systems Improvement Program</td>
<td>JONES.21</td>
<td>23-SEP-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Response to Terrorism</td>
<td>No funding provided</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>Unknown/Undefined Funding Source</td>
<td>MULLE2</td>
<td>05-OCT-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>UNKNONW</td>
<td>State Funds - Undeclared</td>
<td>MULLE2</td>
<td>05-OCT-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td></td>
<td>USDHHS</td>
<td>UNKNONW</td>
<td>State Funds - Undeclared</td>
<td>MULLE2</td>
<td>05-OCT-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects > Linked Items

To add a linked item:
Select an item(s) from the select list, then click the "Add Linked Item" button. If an item is selected that you do not want to delete, you will be asked to confirm the deletion.

Link Type
- Project

Available Link Items
- Project: CIT_PR_01 - Citation Tracking System / Status: Active
- Project: CR_PR_01 - CEDEP and DEEP / Status: Active
- Project: EMS_PR_01 - EMS Run System / Status: Active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delete</th>
<th>Link Type</th>
<th>Link Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deficiency / Objective</td>
<td>CIT_DEF12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>CA_PM01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>RD_PR_01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>ZZTRA04001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>ZZTRA04005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Is Responsible?

Each Project Plan should contain information on the individual(s) that are considered Project Implementation Director(s). In most cases, the Project Directors listed in the Implementation Plan will be expected to communicate regular updates on the progress of their respective projects, through the State Safety Data Systems Coordinator to NHTSA and to the NHTSA Clearinghouse web site.

TRIPRS: Projects leads, lead and partner agencies can be entered for each project included in TRIPRS.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects

### Project Summary Report

- **Project Label - Name:** CIT_PR_01 - Citation Tracking System
- **Priority:** Highest
- **Revision Date:** 09-FEB-2009
- **Last Updated:** 17-JAN-2012
- **Status:** Active
- **Lead Agency:** Test State Administrator of Court
- **Partners:** AOC, DMV, State Police
- **Website:**

### Project Director

- **Name:** Mr. DEMO USER II
- **Agency:** TSA/SS, Oracle Programmer Analyst
- **Address:** 1213 Springfield Road
  Grove City, OH 43123
- **Phone:** (614) 539-4100
- **Email:** damo@ssss.com

What Must be Done?

Each project plan should also contain a list of major phases or deliverables, called milestones, that will be critical to the success of the project. These milestones should be selected as the major points on the critical path, or major decision points in the implementation process. The Project Plan need not contain a full work plan for the implementation process, but should contain enough information to allow the TRCC and the NHTSA Region and NHTSA Headquarters to monitor how the project is moving in terms of completing the major tasks.

On a Strategic Plan level, there should be a general set of milestones and tasks identified, including the timelines for implementation of each project in the Implementation Plan. These general milestones should be put into a Gantt chart and included within the Strategic Plan document. The intent of this Strategic Plan level list of milestones and the associated Gantt chart is to allow the TRCC and Region to have a general feel for how the implementation effort will progress and major milestone points will give a good indication of how the overall process is moving.
When Will it be Done?

For each of the milestones identified above, there should be some estimate of when the milestone will be completed. Those milestone dates that are particularly susceptible to outside influences should be identified with some note about the external influences and the likelihood of there being a problem. This will allow the TRCC and the Region to monitor these issues more closely.

TRIPRS: Milestones, along with a target date, actual completion date and status may be entered for each project in TRIPRS.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects > Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edit Milestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Will We Know if it Worked?

For each project there should be a plan for measuring and evaluating the success of the project. As each project is implemented, the TRCC will be expected to review its implementation and assess if it indeed made the differences in the performance measures that were identified at the planning phase. Each project should have some concrete measure identified as a goal for the effort. It is understood that some projects will be infrastructure or institutional in nature and may not have a direct impact upon a measure of timeliness, completeness, accuracy or accessibility; however, each project should have been identified in the beginning as an effort that will move the overall system closer to achieving those performance measures or being able to answer key questions. In the case where a project is an infrastructure, institutional or other form that has an indirect impact, the project should have some specific function or process that it facilitates, and the evaluation should then focus upon if the resulting changes appear to facilitate that area.

TRIPRS: Within TRIPRS, established projects and performance measures may be linked to show their relationship and demonstrate that the project is making quantifiable progress. This allows the state to link multiple projects to a single performance measure and vice versa. Projects may also be linked to deficiencies and recommendations to show which of those the state feels are being addressed in undertaking the selected project. Also, as mentioned below, activity reports may be created for each project to include any other progress made, issues encountered, plans and/or comments.
A sample project report outline has been included in the TRIPRS Help & Resources module.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Projects > Activity Reports and Linked Items

### Activity Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Start</th>
<th>Report End</th>
<th>Report Date</th>
<th>Provided By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-01-2010</td>
<td>03-01-2010</td>
<td>03-01-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress**
The contractor was hired ahead of schedule. This has allowed the project to move forward ahead of schedule.

**Problems**

**Plans**

**Comments**
The project director has changed but no delays have occurred.

### Linked Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>ZZTRA04005</td>
<td>Conduct an analysis of training needs and develop and implement a training plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>RD_PR_01</td>
<td>LRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>ZZTRA04001</td>
<td>Design and implement a centralized statewide citation tracking system which contains information about each citation from dissemination to law enforcement, its issuance to an offender, to its disposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency/Objective</td>
<td>CIT_DEF12</td>
<td>180 days for convictions to appear in driver history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>CA_PM01</td>
<td>Citation/Adjudication - Accessibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the Strategic Plan has been created and the implementation process started, the TRCC is responsible for monitoring the implementation process and reporting through the State Safety Data Coordinator.

**Program Monitoring**

The TRCC should meet on a regular basis and review progress reports from all of the Project Managers. This review should be focused upon assuring that the implementation is progressing as expected, identifying and addressing problems that may have developed in the implementation, and providing the project managers with any appropriate guidance or feedback. This monitoring process should also address any developing issues that may not have been identified in the Strategic Plan.

There will no doubt be developments during the life of the Strategic Plan that will result in the need to amend the Plan. These may be the result of new legislative actions, new technology, or changing budgetary constraints. The Strategic Plan is intended to be flexible and should be updated as required by local conditions.

**Project Evaluation**

As projects are implemented, the TRCC will be expected to evaluate each project in terms of its success or failure. This success will be measured in terms of the positive impact upon the goals behind the project and a measurable impact upon the criteria that were identified in the Project Plans.

**Reporting**

At least annually the TRCC should forward, through the State Safety Data Coordinator or a designee, a status report on the implementation process and any project evaluations. The report should address the range of safety data system improvement projects that are being undertaken. It should document the progress being made on each project, any problems or delays that have been encountered, and how the projects are progressing in terms of their projected milestones and timelines. As each project is completed, its impact upon the appropriate benchmark measures should be assessed and reported. Not all projects will be successes, but all projects should be evaluated so that the overall program impact can be understood.

TRIPRS: TRIPRS may be used to help in the plan monitoring process. The project section allows for the editing of budgets, milestones and their status as well as the inclusion of project activity reports. These reports contain space to update the project’s progress, any future plans, problems encountered and any other relevant comments. Project directors and/or contacts may be given editing access to update the information for their projects and TRCC members can be given access to view project reports. Each performance measure may also be turned into an Interim Progress Report for use in proving that quantifiable progress has been made. Finally, TRIPRS also includes a section called the Management Dashboard, which provides summarized views of the data within TRIPRS. Examples are maps showing system use, charts displaying TRCC membership and various budget tools.

TRIPRS Home > Edit Current Plan > Performance Measures
Section 408 Interim Progress Report

State: Test State  Report Date: __/__/__  Submitted by: __________________

Regional Reviewer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System to be Impacted</th>
<th>Crash</th>
<th>OTHER specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Area(s) to be Impacted</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>OTHER specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure used to track Improvement(s)</td>
<td>Crash_Timeliness - The average (arithmetic mean) number of days from (A) the crash date to (B) the date the crash report is entered into the database within a period determined by the State.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Relevant Project(s) in the State’s Strategic Plan | Title, number and strategic Plan page reference for each Traffic Records System Improvement project to which this performance measure relates:
RD_PR_01-LBRS |

TRIPRS Home > Management Dashboard

TRIPRS Usage

Click on a State for information.
AASHTO Bookstore: https://bookstore.transportation.org/category_browse.aspx

A library of free and priced AASHTO publications.


MIDRIS: http://www.tsass-tsis.com/MIDRIS/

MIRE: http://www.mireinfo.org/

MMUCC: http://www.mmucc.us/

NEMSIS: http://www.nemsis.org/

NHTSA: http://www.nhtsa.gov/

NHTSA Traffic Records Team: http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/default.html

The following sites can be accessed via the TR Team Website or directly at:

Resources and Publications: http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/sdImprovement/resources.html

State Data Information Resources (the Crash, Citation and EMS Catalogs): http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/stateCatalog/stateData.html


TRIPRS: http://portal.nhtsa-tsis.net/triprs/f?p=120:1

Section 405 National Priority Safety Program Information:

Traffic Records 101: http://www.trafficrecords101.net/

An online curriculum for use by State and local traffic safety professionals that provides the basics, as well as an understanding of specific data components and technologies included in a comprehensive traffic records system.

A more comprehensive list of links may also be found at: http://www.nhtsa-tsis.net/links/links.html
**Glossary**

**ATSIP**: Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals: A national organization composed of professionals that collect, manage and use traffic safety information.

**BTS**: Bureau of Transportation Statistics

**DOT-TRCC**: The US DOT Traffic Records Coordinating Committee: Group of agency representatives from US-DOT who are responsible for coordinating the DOT efforts to improve state and federal safety data systems.

**FHWA**: Federal Highway Administration

**FMCSA**: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

**NHTSA**: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

**Regional Program Manager (RPM)**: An individual at a NHTSA Regional office who is responsible for oversight of a state's highway safety program.

**TR Team**: NHTSA group that manages the traffic records (TR) program area for NHTSA.

**TRIPRS**: Traffic Records Improvement Program Reporting System: A set of software tools for the development and maintenance of the State Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan as required under Section 405(b) State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements, as well as the management of state traffic records improvement activities by states and US-DOT.

**TRCC**: Traffic Records Coordinating Committee: The group of safety data system owners who are responsible in a state for coordinating the planning and improvement of state safety data systems.