State of Texas

Traffic Records Assessment
Crash Module

August 1, 2024

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Technical Assessment Team

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Introduction

This Traffic Records Program Assessment is the second assessment using the online State Traffic Records Assessment Program tool. This review is built upon the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory* (Report No. DOT HS 811 644).

The Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT) Traffic Safety Division requested an assessment of the Crash data system. NHTSA commends the Traffic Safety Division for assessing their Crash data system and identifying possible improvements and planning considerations.

Assessment Results

A traffic records system consists of data about a State's roadway transportation network and the people and vehicles that use it. The six primary components of a State traffic records system are: Crash, Driver, Vehicle, Roadway, Citation/Adjudication, and Injury Surveillance. Quality traffic records data exhibiting the six primary data quality attributes—timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility—is necessary to improve traffic safety and effectively manage the motor vehicle transportation network, at the Federal, State, and local levels. Such data enables problem identification, countermeasure development and application, and outcome evaluation. Continued application of data-driven, science-based management practices can decrease the frequency of traffic crashes and mitigate their substantial negative effects on individuals and society.

State traffic records systems are the culmination of the combined efforts of collectors, managers, and users of data. Collaboration and cooperation between these groups can improve data and ensure that the data is used in ways that provide the greatest benefit to traffic safety efforts. Thoughtful, comprehensive, and uniform data use and governance policies can improve service delivery, link business processes, maximize return on investments, and improve risk management.

NHTSA has recognized the benefit of independent peer reviews for State traffic records data systems. These assessments help States identify areas of high performance and areas in need of improvement in addition to fostering greater collaboration among data systems. To encourage States to undertake such reviews regularly, NHTSA is now offering the ability for states to build their own traffic records program assessments based on their needs. The full traffic records assessment includes nine modules: the six data systems (Crash, Driver, Vehicle, Roadway, Citation & Adjudication, and Injury), and three data management modules (TRCC Management, Strategic Planning, and Data Use and Integration). States can select which areas of the traffic records assessment to request and may choose a single module or any combination of modules. There is no five-year waiting period from the last assessment. States may request this assistance at any time.

Out of 48 assessment questions for the Crash module, Texas met the Advisory ideal for 36 questions (75%), partially met the Advisory ideal for 5 questions (10%), and did not meet the Advisory ideal for 7 questions (15%).

States are encouraged to use the recommendations, considerations, and conclusions of this report as a basis for the State data improvement program strategic planning process and are encouraged to review the report at least annually to gauge how the State is addressing the items outlined.

Assessment Ratings by Submodule

The Crash data system module contains questions grouped by submodules. Table 1 shows the rating by the individual submodules.

Table 1. Assessment Ratings by Submodule

	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
Crash Data System			
Description and Contents of the Crash Data System	11	0	0
Applicable Guidelines for the Crash Data System	2	0	0
Data Dictionary for the Crash Data System	4	0	0
Procedures and Process Flows for Crash Data Systems	8	0	0
Crash Data Systems Interface with Other Components	1	2	2
Data Quality Control Programs for the Crash System	10	3	5
Total	*36*	*5*	*7*

States are encouraged to use the recommendations, considerations, and conclusions of this report as a basis for the State data improvement program strategic planning process and are encouraged to review the report at least annually to gauge how the State is addressing the items outlined.

Recommendations & Considerations

The following section provides Texas with the traffic records assessment recommendations and associated considerations detailed by the assessors. The broad recommendations provide Texas flexibility in addressing them in an appropriate manner for your State goals and constraints. Considerations are more detailed, actionable suggestions from the assessment team that the State may wish to employ in addressing their recommendations. GO Teams, CDIPs (Crash Data Improvement Program), and MMUCC Mappings are available for targeted technical assistance and training.

Crash Recommendations

1. Improve the data quality control program for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
2. Improve the interfaces with the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

Considerations for implementing your Crash recommendations

- Document the policy for updating the data dictionary and associated training materials, to ensure that all new legislation, technology updates, national guidelines, procedures, and form changes are captured and that the review is part of a scheduled continuous improvement process.
- Review and update, if necessary, the current Data Performance Measures, ensuring that they provide meaningful information to managers relative to the status of the crash system data; set goals and measure each at pre-determined intervals.
- Continue to report progress on performance and performance measurement to the TRCC, as crash data is the central focus of traffic safety information.
- Audit a very small sample of crash reports to compare the narrative, diagram, and coding to ensure that there is no need for additional training or changes to current training or training manuals.

Summary

Texas's crash database is an excellent system that has grown and improved incrementally over the past several decades through some adversity but is currently operating very effectively. The system has several positive aspects, including one hundred percent electronic reporting, which allows for data to be processed through uniform business rules and edits.

Documentation, including the data dictionary, training documents, and coding manuals were provided and are up-to-date and thorough. The State's crash report has used both MMUCC and ANSI D16 as guidelines for its data elements and the data collected is used to identify crash risk factors and potential safety improvements.

The State has a data quality control program, with limited State-level correction authority for its entry clerks to correct obvious errors; its system has automated edit checks and validation rules that ensure incomplete data fields are returned to officers as errors; high error rates are reported to and discussed with

reporting departments; and data quality performance measures have been developed. Errors are monitored and reported back to individual agencies on a regular basis and error management processes are documented. Ten percent of all crash reports are audited for interpreted fields as are all fatal crash reports. TxDOT does not audit for a comparison of the narrative and diagram to the data entered.

During the course of this assessment, several of the measures have been upgraded, a sign that the State is committed to providing the most effective and efficient data system possible to its users, collectors, and managers. Additionally, the State began reporting crash data measures to its TRCC during this assessment at the most recent meeting.

The State has limited integration and interfaces between systems, largely due to concerns with data security issues and previous hacking of its systems. There is, however, a link that allows crashes to be located through the roadway system. There is also a linkage that has been developed through third-party vendors with the driver and vehicle systems. These links had previously been developed by the State, but a security issue had led to the links being deactivated [or severed] four years ago and the State is working to restore them.

Even the best systems have the potential for improvement, as does Texas's crash data system. While its size makes auditing a challenge, it would be beneficial to undertake a random audit of a small percentage of reports for comparison of narrative, diagram, and coded contents. Such a review would ensure that there are no additional training needs. Such a review would validate that the training materials are, in fact, complete, thorough, and up-to-date.

Finally, a review of the performance measures should be undertaken. During this assessment, a discussion of more effective measures has taken place, and measures that could be more helpful to the State might be developed. The real point of performance measures is to ensure that managers are fully informed as to any incremental changes in the quality of the data within the system at any time. Changes can occur due to new legislation, personnel turnover, system updates, or new trainers. Any of these issues can cause degradation of data quality that goes unnoticed until a major problem has developed – unless quality factors are regularly measured and compared. The State can set goals and determine how improvements could be made, as well.

The State is to be commended on its proactive approach to addressing issues noted in this assessment during its course. Management that meets challenges assertively and with positive effort and outcome are more than likely to succeed in whatever it is they strive to achieve.

Methodology and Background

In 2018, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration updated the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory* (Report No. DOT HS 811 644). This *Advisory* was drafted by a group of traffic safety experts from a variety of backgrounds and affiliations, primarily personnel actively working in the myriad State agencies responsible for managing the collection, management, and analysis of traffic safety data. The *Advisory* provides information on the contents, capabilities, and data quality of effective traffic records systems by describing an ideal that supports data-driven decisions and improves highway safety. Note that this ideal is used primarily as a uniform measurement tool; it is neither NHTSA's expectation nor desire that States pursue this ideal blindly without regard for their laws and unique circumstances. In addition, the *Advisory* describes in detail the importance of quality data in the identification of crash causes and outcomes, the development of effective interventions, the implementation of countermeasures that prevent crashes and improve crash outcomes, updating traffic safety programs, systems, and policies, and evaluating progress in reducing crash frequency and severity.

The *Advisory* is based upon a uniform set of questions derived from the ideal model traffic records data system. This model and suite of questions is used by independent subject matter experts in their assessment of the systems and processes that govern the collection, management, and analysis of traffic records data in each State. The 2018 *Advisory* reduces the number of questions from the previous edition, eases the evidence requirements, and includes additional guidance to lessen the burden on State respondents.

As part of the 2018 update, the traffic records assessment process was altered as well. While it remains an iterative process that relies on the State Traffic Records Assessment Program (STRAP) for online data collection, the process has been reduced to two question-answer rounds. In each round, State respondents answer each question assigned to them before the assessors examine their answers and supporting evidence, at which point the assessors rate each response. At the behest of States who wanted increased face-to-face interaction, a check-in or midpoint meeting, which can be held onsite or through a virtual meeting will now be held between the first and second rounds. The facilitator will lead this discussion and any input from this meeting will be entered into STRAP for the State's review. The second and final question and answer round is used to clarify responses and provide the most accurate rating for each question following the onsite review. To assist the State in responding to each question, the *Advisory* also provides State respondents with suggested evidence that identifies the specific information appropriate to answer each assessment question.

The assessment facilitator works with the State assessment coordinator to prepare for the assessment and establish a schedule consistent with the example outlined in Table 2. Schedules can be adjusted to accommodate State-specific needs.

Independent assessors rate the responses and determine how closely a State's capabilities match those of the ideal system outlined in the *Advisory*. Each system component is evaluated independently by two assessors, who reach a consensus on the ratings. Specifically, the assessors rate each response and determine if a State (a) meets the description of the ideal traffic records system, (b) partially meets the ideal description, or (c) does not meet the ideal description. The assessors write a brief narrative to explain their rating for each question, as well as a summary for each section and any considerations—actionable suggestions for improvement—that will be included with the assessment's recommendations.

The assessment facilitator generates a final report based on the results of the assessment. The NHTSA

Traffic Records Team representative then provides the State coordinator with a digital copy of the final report and an accompanying cover letter via email. After the assessment has been completed and the final report delivered, the facilitator presents the final report and summarizes the assessment's recommendations and conclusions to the States' TRCC via a webinar

Table 2. Sample Traffic Records Assessment Timetable

Upon NHTSA TR Team receipt of request		Initial pre-assessment conference call
1 month prior to kickoff meeting		Facilitator introduction pre-assessment conference call
Between facilitator conference call and kickoff		State Coordinator assigns questions, enters contact information into STRAP, and builds initial document library
Assessment	Monday, Week 1	**Onsite Kickoff Meeting**
	Monday, Week 1 – 12pm EST, Friday, Week 3	**Round 1 Data Collection**: State answers standardized assessment questions
	Friday, Week 3 – Wednesday, Week 5	**Round 1 Analysis**: Assessors review State answers, rate all responses and complete all draft conclusions
	Thursday, Week 5 – Monday, Week 7	**Review Period**: State reviews the assessors' initial ratings in preparation for the onsite meeting.
	Tuesday, Week 7	**Onsite Review Meeting**: Facilitator and State respondents meet to discuss questions; clarifications entered into STRAP
	Wednesday, Week 7 – 12pm EST, Friday, Week 9	**Round 2 Data Collection**: State provides final response to the assessors' preliminary ratings and onsite clarifications
	Friday, Week 9 – Monday, Week 11	**Round 2 Analysis**: make final ratings
	Tuesday, Week 11 – Monday, Week 12	Facilitator prepares final report
Week 12		NHTSA delivers final report to State and Region
(After completion of assessment, date set by State)		NHTSA hosts webinar to debrief State participants
(After completion of assessment)		(OPTIONAL) State may request GO Team, CDIP or MMUCC Mapping, targeted technical assistance or training

Table 3. Texas Schedule for the 2024 Traffic Records Assessment for the Crash System

Kickoff	April 29, 2024
Begin first Q&A Round	April 29, 2024
End first Q&A Round	June 01, 2024
Begin Review Period	June 17, 2024
Onsite Meeting	June 27, 2024
Begin second Q&A Round	June 27, 2024
End second Q&A Round	July 13, 2024
Assessors' Final Results Complete	July 30, 2024
Final Report Due	August 01, 2024
Debrief	August 06, 2024

Appendix A: Question Details, Ratings, and Assessor Conclusions

This section presents the assessment's results in more granular detail by providing the full text, rating, and assessor analysis for each question. This section can be useful to State personnel looking to understand why specific ratings were given and further identify areas to target for improvement. A full Traffic Records assessment contains 328 questions. Questions 28-75 focus on the Crash system and are the basis of this assessment.

Questions, Ratings, and Assessor Conclusions

Description and Contents of the Crash Data System

28. Is statewide crash data consolidated into one database?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State of Texas's crash database, known as the Crash Records Information System (CRIS) is a compilation of four relational databases, and all submitted crash reports are in this single database.

29. Is the statewide crash system's organizational custodian clearly defined?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The Custodian of the State's crash database is the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). Texas statutes outline required crash reporting guidelines in the Texas Transportation Code Section 550.062, including required reporting to TxDOT of any crash involving injury or death of a person, or property damage to the apparent extent of $1000 or more, no later than the 10th day after the date of the crash.

30. Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of fatal crashes to the statewide crash system?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has a special team that works with the fatal crash reports and uses FARS, MMUCC, and ANSI D16 as guidelines for the submission of fatal crashes.

31. Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of injury crashes to the statewide crash system?

Meets Advisory Ideal

State statute requires reporting of any crash that results in death or injury to any person, and the State reports it uses the KABCO injury severity scale, ANSI D16, and the Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria as bases for its crash injury guidelines.

32. Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of property damage only (PDO) crashes to the statewide crash system?

Meets Advisory Ideal

Texas requires all crashes with at least one motor vehicle with no injuries or fatalities and damage over $1,000 to be reported. Any crash that is reported with a lesser amount of damage and no injury is not included in the State repository but may be kept in the local repository of the agency that completed the report.

33. Does the State have statutes or other criteria specifying timeframes for crash report submission to the statewide crash database?

Meets Advisory Ideal

State Transportation Code Section 550.062(b) requires that crash reports be filed electronically not later than the 10th day after the date of the collision.

34. Does the statewide crash system record the crashes that occur in non-trafficway areas (e.g., parking lots, driveways)?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has provided the criteria for including the non-traffic way crashes. They are deemed non-reportable, but the data is still captured.

35. Is data from the crash system used to identify crash risk factors?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State provided samples of its use of data in identification of crash risk factors, both through the State's Highway Safety Plan and a demonstration of teen driving crash statistics.

36. Is data from the crash system used to guide engineering and construction projects?

Meets Advisory Ideal

Texas has created a template within AASHTOWare Safety for the districts to use for network screening. This uses the fatal and serious injuries to determine possible locations for projects. The State also uses a benefit cost ratio or Safety Improvement Index (SII) to prioritize their projects.

37. Is data from the crash system regularly used to prioritize law enforcement activity?

Meets Advisory Ideal

Texas has described how they provide information to law enforcement and utilize DDACTs. They also indicated that they are now using AASHTOWare Safety as another tool that law enforcement can use for planning enforcement activities.

38. Is data from the crash system used to evaluate safety countermeasure programs?

Meets Advisory Ideal

Analyses of the effectiveness of safety countermeasures have been provided for a number of entities for a variety of efforts, including whether intersection lighting impacts pedestrians' failure to yield right of way, new software, high-friction surface treatments and work-zone safety campaign timing. Slides identifying the effectiveness of these various countermeasures were

provided.

Applicable Guidelines for the Crash Data System

39. Is there a process by which MMUCC is used to help identify what crash data elements and attributes the State collects?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The response explains TxDOT's process for determining its prioritization of adding various MMUCC data elements to its crash report.

40. Is there a process by which ANSI D.16 is used to help identify the definitions in the crash system data dictionary?

Meets Advisory Ideal

According to the response, Texas used the ANSI D16 Classification of Motor Vehicle Crashes to create its reporting instructions for police crash reports. The crash reporting instructions were attached as evidence.

Data Dictionary for the Crash Data System

41. Does the data dictionary provide a definition for each data element and define that data element's allowable values/attributes?

Meets Advisory Ideal

Texas' 2024 CR-100 Instructions to Police for Reporting Crashes v 27. Provides instructions that include definitions and allowable attributes for each field. They also provided documentation that shows allowable attributes for each field.

42. Does the data dictionary document the system edit checks and validation rules?

Meets Advisory Ideal

A document entitled "CRIS business rules" was provided that outlined edit checks and validation rules.

43. Is the data dictionary up-to-date and consistent with the field data collection manual, coding manual, crash report, database schema and any training materials?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The data dictionary provided is up-to-date, as of January 2024. It is updated at the time of any software update, and users and trainers are provided with release notes from said software update. Any form change drives software changes, business rules, and changes to training materials. It is

good policy to review and update all these items on a regularly scheduled basis, should the crash form and the system not change for a protracted time period, to ensure that all legislative changes have been captured, federal guideline updates have been reviewed for potential inclusion, and it is ensured that all system changes are part of training materials.

44. ***Does the crash system data dictionary indicate the data elements populated through links to other traffic records system components?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State is linked with the digital road network and information is auto-populated. They provided a document that demonstrated the required specifications.

Procedures and Process Flows for Crash Data Systems

45. ***Does the State collect an identical set of data elements and attributes from all reporting agencies, independent of collection method?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

All law enforcement agencies submit crash reports on the current CR-3 form, revised 4-1-2023. Although some older forms are currently supplemented on the form on which they were originally submitted, which may have been 2015 or 2018 versions, all reported elements and attributes on those forms must meet State standards.

46. ***Does the State reevaluate their crash form at regular intervals?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has an excellent process of continuous review of its crash form at monthly business rule meetings, at which error reviews and training needs discussions are conducted. A status update is also conducted with the Crash Data Section Director. The next major form revision is planned for 1/1/2026. This is a fortuitous time to update the form as the MMUCC guidelines and the ANSI D16 Manual on Crash Classification are currently being updated.

47. ***Does the State maintain accurate and up-to-date documentation detailing the policies and procedures for key processes governing the collection, reporting, and posting of crash data- including the submission of fatal crash data to the State FARS unit and commercial vehicle crash data to SafetyNet?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State thoroughly outlines its processes for collecting and submitting crash reports in a short narrative in its response. It would be helpful for the State to memorialize the entire process in a concise policy, including dates for periodic updates of all documentation, such as training materials and data dictionary, (whether at the close of each legislative session; upon completion of system updates; biennially; upon revision of or updates to MMUCC and ANSI D16 or some other specific timeframe or date) to ensure that processes and procedures remain timely and are part of a

continuous improvement process.

48. ***Are the quality assurance and quality control processes for managing errors and incomplete data documented?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has business rules that do not allow crash reports to be submitted without valid data. All fatal crash reports and ten percent of the other crash reports are audited. The State described their business rules and processes.

49. ***Do the document retention and archival storage policies meet the needs of safety engineers and other users with a legitimate need for long-term access to the crash data reports?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State notes that TxDOT retains the individual crash records for the current year plus ten years. The State found, under this assessment, that the current archive document only requires 5 years but is in the process of being updated as a result of that discovery.

50. ***Do all law enforcement agencies collect crash data electronically?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

Since January of 2024, all crashes submitted to the Texas crash data system are electronic using one of two systems, (CRASH application, .xml submission, or via the 'CRASH Mobile' app) and are in the State Transportation as a requirement.

51. ***Do all law enforcement agencies submit their data to the statewide crash system electronically?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

All law enforcement agencies in the State of Texas submit crash reports electronically as of January 15, 2024.

52. ***Do all law enforcement agencies collecting crash data electronically in the field apply validation rules consistent with those in the statewide crash system prior to submission?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

All agencies in Texas use one of two electronic reporting systems that have business rules in place. This ensures all agencies are applying the same business rules before submitting crashes.

Crash Data Systems Interface with Other Components

53. ***Does the crash system have a real-time interface with the driver system?***

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State does not currently have an interface between its crash system and its driver database.

Work to develop this functionality is underway. Some third-party vendors have developed this functionality, but it is not available statewide.

54. ***Does the crash system have a real-time interface with the vehicle system?***

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State does not have an interface between the vehicle system and the crash system at this time, but reports it is working to develop this functionality. Some third-party vendors have developed this functionality, but it is not available statewide.

55. ***Does the crash system interface with the roadway system?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

Texas's crash and roadway system interface to auto-populate up to twelve fields when the law enforcement officer clicks the location of the crash on the map, including the latitude/longitude. Crashes are located on the digital road network by an algorithm within CRIS which links each crash to the corresponding segment automatically. When the algorithm is not able to automatically locate a crash, that crash is added to the 'Locate' queue, where it is manually located by the Crash Data Analysis team.

56. ***Does the crash system interface with the citation and adjudication systems?***

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There is no interface between citation and crash data, nor are there plans for such. The value of such an interface is that using similar location systems for enforcement activities (citations/countermeasures) as for crashes can allow for layering of enforcement and crashes to determine if enforcement efforts impact the incidence or severity of crashes over time. The State does note that there is a great deal of effort in the Law enforcement community to use crash data for analyses.

57. ***Does the crash system have an interface with EMS?***

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There is no interface between crash and EMS at this time. It would be helpful to have the EMS run number on the crash report, especially if auto-populated, to provide for tracking of injured crash victims throughout the injury surveillance system to determine the extent and cost of crash injuries in the State.

Data Quality Control Programs for the Crash System

58. ***Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

A list of hundreds of edit checks and validation rules was provided for the Crash Records

Information System for Texas.

59. ***Is limited State-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide crash database to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating officer?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State provides its employees and vendors with authority to amend obvious errors and omissions on crash reports.

60. ***Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected crash reports to the originating officer and tracking resubmission of the report in place?***

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has developed a process to return rejected crashes. There is, however, no way to track those resubmissions to ensure that they are properly addended to the original crash. The issue is that the processor may not be aware of whether the crash report s/he is working on is an original or a returned report.

61. ***Does the State track crash report changes after the original report is submitted by the law enforcement agency?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

Changes to reports are tracked by adding an extension to the original crash report number, such as .1, .2, etc. so that resubmissions can be identified and in the order in which they were submitted.

62. ***Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The timeliness measures provided are the percentage of crash reports available in the system within 30 days, and the average number of days between the crash date and the date of availability.

63. ***Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has one measure for accuracy of crash location. They have provided the information in the narrative and attached their strategic plan that has the performance measure listed.

64. ***Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?***

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

During the course of this assessment, the State has changed its completeness measure to the percentage of critical data fields that are complete. Goals and metrics have been established but

have not been measured due to the recent establishment of the measure. That measure with metrics and actual measurement reporting would result in a "Meets Advisory Ideal" rating.

65. ***Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?***

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

The response to this round indicates that Texas is 100% electronic, which means, based on the information provided, that all crashes submitted are subject to the same business rules and edit checks. That fact provides a uniformity measure (Percent of crash reports subject to the same business rules and edit checks). The State can adopt it for a "Meets" rating for this question.

66. ***Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?***

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There is currently no measure of integration for the crash data system. The response in round two indicates for purposes of system security, no interfaces are planned. Nonetheless, the State can still note a measure of integration for the traffic records system, by noting the number of traffic record component systems that are interfaced or integrated.

67. ***Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has provided data and numeric factors for its measure of accessibility of the crash system for users (both data entry and data users) and has provided downtime for the past year. It has also noted its metric goals.

68. ***Has the State established numeric goals-performance metrics-for each performance measure?***

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The Texas Strategic Plan for Traffic Records does show some numeric goals; for example, the accessibility goal is 99.67 percent, with actual results being 99.92 percent. However, the completeness measure has changed, and some goals are listed as pending in the plan. A reasonable goal should be set for each measure and effort should be made to see improvement, or at least to prevent degradation of services. Measurement is especially important when services are excellent, as they can tend to degrade slowly over time without notice and are difficult to return to standard when discovered.

69. ***Is there performance reporting that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each law enforcement agency?***

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State notes that it conducts business rule meetings monthly with individual law enforcement agencies when the error rate rises above 1 percent. In case of significant issues, contact with a

specific agency may occur immediately. This is an excellent practice, but there is no mention of a timeliness feedback.

70. Are detected high-frequency errors used to prompt revisions, update the validation rules, and generate updated training content and data collection manuals?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The errors that are noted are tending to help modify the current validation rules. It would be helpful to develop a report to ensure that the most often made errors are the subject of training, re-training, and are noted in the content of data collection manuals. The State reports that during this assessment, completeness measures have been updated to look at the percentage of reports with all recommended data and that there are multiple dashboards built that track the percentage of reports filed via CRASH and via Submission Services; the top errors by report, reports with more than one critical error, all by submission source and agency. These reports were first reported at the TRCC on July 10, 2024. This is an excellent example of the beneficial outcomes of taking measures, setting goals, and reporting those. The real value of a Traffic Records Coordinating Committee is collaboration and crash data are the central data useful for safety improvement within a State system. This is an opportunity to build on that collaboration throughout Texas's traffic safety community and to establish positive communication with the crash data system leading by example.

71. Are quality control reviews comparing the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the report considered part of the statewide crash database's data acceptance process?

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

Texas does not currently have quality control reviews for narrative, collision diagram, and coded content. They are in the process of developing some. Such reviews, if completed, can provide information useful for training content, and help ensure user needs are met.

72. Are sample-based audits periodically conducted for crash reports and related database content?

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

Sample-based audits are reportedly not conducted on the crash database contents currently, due to volume and the pre-screening conducted by the business edits.

73. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State reports several times a year on differences across years and jurisdictions. They currently also use AASHTOWare Safety where the district staff can review changes from year to year or SHSP Emphasis Area categories.

74. ***Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State receives feedback from local users and convenes a quarterly users' group to assist with issues or information related to crash data, including potential enhancement or requests for additional data elements. This group also provides training on unfamiliar data. It would provide a helpful resource for changes to legislation annually or to the crash report when it is revised periodically, including suggestions for revision.

75. ***Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?***

Meets Advisory Ideal

An excellent start of data quality reporting to the TRCC regarding the crash system has been demonstrated during this assessment. This can provide an example to other data component systems of types of useful data quality measures and their value in data improvement and oversight.

Appendix B – Assessment Participants

State Highway Safety Office Representative(s)

NHTSA Headquarters Coordinator

Tom Bragan
USDOT
Program Analyst

State Assessment Coordinator(s)

Larry Krantz
Texas Department of Transportation
Program Manager

Emily Martin
TTI TAMU
Assistant Research Scientist

Eva Shipp
TTI TAMU
Senior Research Scientist

NHTSA Regional Office Coordinator(s)

Rebecca R Walker
NHTSA
Regional Program Manager

Assessment Facilitator

Kathleen Haney
VHB
Senior Traffic Safety Analyst

Assessment Team Members

Kelly Campbell
Idaho Transportation Department
Research Analyst, Principal

Joan Vecchi
contractor
owner

State and Local Respondents

The following State and Local staff assisted in the Assessment by providing responses to the Advisory criteria and questions.

James Markham
Texas Department of Transportation
Section Director

Appendix C

National Acronyms and Abbreviations

AADT	Average Annual Daily Traffic
AAMVA	American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ACS	American College of Surgeons
AIS	Abbreviated Injury Score
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
ATSIP	Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals
BAC	Blood Alcohol Concentration
CDC	Center for Disease Control
CDIP	NHTSA's Crash Data Improvement Program
CDLIS	Commercial Driver License Information System
CODES	Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System
DDACTS	Data Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DMV	Department of Motor Vehicles
DPPA	Drivers Privacy Protection Act
DOH	Department of Health
DOJ	Department of Justice
DOT	Department of Transportation
DOT-TRCC	The US DOT Traffic Records Coordinating Committee
DRA	Deputy Regional Administrator (NHTSA)
DUI	Driving Under the Influence
DUID	Driving Under the Influence of Drugs
DWI	Driving While Intoxicated
ED	Emergency Department
EMS	Emergency Medical Service
FARS	Fatality Analysis Reporting System
FDEs	Fundamental Data Elements
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FMCSA	Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
GCS	Glasgow Coma Scale
GDL	Graduated Driver Licensing
GES	General Estimates System
GHSA	Governors Highway Safety Association
GIS	Geographic Information System
GJXDM	Global Justice XML Data Model
GPS	Global Positioning System
GRA	Government Reference Architecture
HIPAA	Health Information Privacy and Accountability Act
HPMS	Highway Performance Monitoring System
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Plan
HSP	Highway Safety Plan
ICD-10	International Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems
IRB	Institutional Review Board

ISS	Injury Severity Score
IT	Information Technology
JIEM	Justice Information Exchange Model
LEIN	Law Enforcement Information Network
MADD	Mothers Against Drunk Driving
MCMIS	Motor Carrier Management Information System
MIDRIS	Model Impaired Driving Records Information System
MIRE	Model Inventory of Roadway Elements
MMUCC	Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
NAPHSIS	National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems
NCHIP	National Criminal History Improvement Program
NCHS	National Center for Health Statistics
NCIC	National Crime Information Center
NCSC	National Center for State Courts
NDR	National Driver Register
NEMSIS	National Emergency Medical Service Information System
NGA	National Governor's Association
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NIBRS	National Incident-Based Reporting System
NIEM	National Information Exchange Model
NLETS	National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System
NMVTIS	National Motor Vehicle Title Information System
NTDS	National Trauma Data Standard
PAR	Police Accident Report
PDPS	Problem Driver Pointer System
PDO	Property Damage Only
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
RA	Regional Administrator (NHTSA)
RDIP	FHWA's Roadway Data Improvement Program
RPM	Regional Program Manager (NHTSA)
RTS	Revised Trauma Score
RMS	Records Management System
RPC	Regional Planning Commission
SaDIP	FMCSA's Safety Data Improvement Program
SAVE	Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements
SHSP	Strategic Highway Safety Plan
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SSOLV	Social Security Online Verification
STRAP	State Traffic Records Assessment Program
SWISS	Statewide Injury Surveillance System
TCD	Traffic Control Devices
TRA	Traffic Records Assessment
TRIPRS	Traffic Records Improvement Program Reporting System
TRCC	Traffic Records Coordinating Committee
TRS	Traffic Records System
UCR	Uniform Crime Reports

VIN	Vehicle Identification Number
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
XML	Extensible Markup Language

State-Specific Acronyms and Abbreviations

CDA	Crash Data Analysis
CRIS	Crash Records Information System
SII	Safety Improvement Index
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation