



State of Texas

Traffic Records Assessment Roadway Module June 6, 2025

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Technical Assessment Team





Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Assessment Results	3
Assessment Ratings by Submodule	4
Recommendations & Considerations	4
Roadway Recommendations	4
Considerations for implementing your Roadway recommendations.....	4
Summary.....	5
Methodology and Background	7
Appendix A: Question Details, Ratings, and Assessor Conclusions	10
Questions, Ratings, and Assessor Conclusions.....	10
Appendix B – Assessment Participants.....	27
Appendix C	28
National Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	28
State-Specific Acronyms and Abbreviations	30

Table of Tables

Table 1. Assessment Ratings by Submodule.....	4
Table 2. Sample Traffic Records Assessment Timetable	8
Table 3. Texas Schedule for the 2025 Traffic Records Assessment for the Roadway System.....	9





Introduction

This Traffic Records Program Assessment uses the online State Traffic Records Assessment Program tool. This review is built upon the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory* (DOT HS 812 601).

The Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT) Traffic Safety Division requested an assessment of the Roadway data system. NHTSA commends the Traffic Safety Division for assessing their Roadway 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 34 assessment questions for the Roadway module, Texas met the Advisory ideal for 7 questions (21%), partially met the Advisory ideal for 14 questions (41%), and did not meet the Advisory ideal for 13 questions (38%).

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 Roadway 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
Roadway Data System			
Description and Contents of the Roadway Data System	2	1	2
Applicable Guidelines for the Roadway Data System		2	
Data Dictionary for the Roadway Data System		3	1
Procedures and Process Flows for the Roadway Data System	2	4	
Intrastate Roadway System Interface	2	1	2
Data Quality Control Programs for the Roadway Data System	1	3	8
<i>Total</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>13</i>

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 their 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, RDIPs (Roadway Data Improvement Program), and MMUCC Mappings are available for targeted technical assistance and training.

Roadway Recommendations

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

Considerations for implementing your Roadway recommendations

- Evaluate and possibly expand the current ETL processes to support interfaces that automatically move data from discrete databases to the GRID database.
- Develop a comprehensive data quality management program that supports establishing performance measures for the data quality attributes of timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility.





- Evaluate and expand the current county data collection and GRID submission/acceptance process to other local, municipal, or tribal sources of roadway data that are included in the statewide roadway database.
- Update the GRID Data Dictionary to specify which data elements are MIRE FDEs and any data elements collected by the State that might meet the MIRE description/standard.
- Automate manual data and GRID data edits and consider including them in the criteria for appropriate performance measures.

Summary

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) is the custodial agency responsible for collecting and maintaining the enterprise roadway information system for the State. According to Highway Statistics 2022 (Federal Highway Administration), TxDOT maintains 80,997 miles of State-owned highways and ramps. This mileage represents roughly 25% of the 323,364 miles of total roadway miles in Texas. The remaining 242,367 miles (75%) of roads are maintained by the 254 counties and over 1,200 municipalities.

TxDOT is doing an excellent job maintaining an enterprise roadway system inventory for its State-owned roadways, as evidenced by its complete and annual reporting to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS). However, it is not clear about its progress in collecting and managing sufficient data to support a comprehensive enterprise roadway system for all public roads. The Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory, 2018 Edition, describes “the ideal statewide system incorporates sufficient information on all public roads to support valid, system-wide network screening and countermeasure development, deployment, and evaluation”.

It is recognized that collecting and managing statewide roadway data for a system as large as Texas (242,367 local roadway miles, maintained by 254 counties and over 1,200 municipalities) is a formidable task. TxDOT has developed an excellent foundation for their enterprise roadway data information system that has undergone continual improvement and positions them well to make significant improvements to what is already in place.

TxDOT has demonstrated that both roadway features and traffic data elements are located using a compatible location referencing system. The system is built on Distance from Origin (DFO), which is applied to all public roadways. While multiple location referencing methods may exist for various state-maintained road applications (e.g., maintenance or construction), DFO serves as the core system to which all others are linked via common latitude/longitude coordinates. This compatibility is reinforced by the use of shared identifiers, such as traffic station IDs, that allow seamless data integration between the traffic data and roadway inventory systems.

TxDOT has established the Geospatial Roadway Inventory Database (GRID) as the central system for maintaining roadway data. GRID not only manages core roadway data, but it also connects to other roadway-related data systems such as traffic volume (via STARS II), bridge data (via comparisons with point features from the Bridge Division), and pavement data (through vendor-provided data and analysis). While this shows that data systems can be linked functionally, it also makes it clear that these systems





remain somewhat separate. Texas is encouraged to develop more complete documentation, such as a system overview, data architecture diagrams, or a user manual that demonstrates GRID's capability to serve as an enterprise roadway information system. Developing ongoing status reports as new non-State roads are added to the system would also be valuable and could serve as a data completeness performance measure.

Lastly, the State is encouraged to consider developing a comprehensive quality data management program for their roadway data. Responses have indicated that current priorities are directed toward getting data into the system rather than focusing on assessing data quality. That priority is commendable, especially when considering total state roadway mileage, local system size, and the effort involved to process the information. However, monitoring quality management, when well developed, provides valuable information regarding not only data quality but also the health and performance of the related data systems. The following information is available to assist in this effort: NHTSA's [Traffic Records Data Quality Management Guide](#) (DOT HS 813 544) and FHWA's [Performance Measures for Roadway Inventory Data](#) (FHWA-SA-12-036). This report also includes a list of considerations that, along with the question responses, include suggestions for improvement. The assessors hope all the information provided will be helpful as you move forward in the challenging task of developing a complete and accurate enterprise roadway system for Texas. If there are questions about our findings, we remain available to provide information that we hope will clarify our responses.





Methodology and Background

In 2018, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration updated the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory* (DOT HS 812 601). 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	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	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 2025 Traffic Records Assessment for the Roadway System

Kickoff	February 25, 2025
Begin the first Q&A Round	February 25, 2025
End the first Q&A Round	March 28, 2025
Begin Review Period	March 29, 2025
Check-in Meeting	April 22, 2025
Begin the second Q&A Round	April 22, 2025
End the second Q&A Round	May 9, 2025
Assessors' Final Results Complete	May 25, 2025
Final Report Due	June 6, 2025
Debrief	June 11, 2025





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 156-183 focus on the Roadway system and are the basis of this assessment.

Questions, Ratings, and Assessor Conclusions

Description and Contents of the Roadway Data System

153. *Are all public roadways within the State located using a compatible location referencing system?*

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State of Texas provides a comprehensive and clear explanation of its location referencing approach for all public roadways. The use of Distance From Origin (DFO) as a standardized location referencing method applied to all roadways, including non-State-owned roads, establishes a compatible statewide system. The response confirms that while multiple LRMs exist for State-owned roads to support agency-specific applications (e.g., maintenance, construction), these are all derived from and interoperable with the base DFO system. The foundation of all data in latitude/longitude coordinates ensures cross-system compatibility, which satisfies the criterion of using a compatible location referencing system. Additionally, the newly attached screenshot from the Statewide Planning Map (SPM.png) visually demonstrates statewide roadway coverage, reinforcing the narrative and confirming the map's utility in applying the LRS to all roadways. The State also provides a clear percentage of State-maintained roads (25%), which helps contextualize the coverage of different LRSs. The integration and interoperability described, supported by the eLRS tool, indicate that users can retrieve any LRM for any point along a roadway, affirming systemwide compatibility. The response meets the advisory ideal by establishing that a consistent, compatible location referencing system is in use across all public roads in the State.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

154. *Are the collected roadway and traffic data elements located using a compatible location referencing system (e.g., LRS, GIS)?*

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State of Texas demonstrates that both roadway features and traffic data elements are located using a compatible location referencing system. The system is built on Distance From Origin (DFO), which is applied to all public roadways, including non-State routes. While multiple location referencing methods may exist for various State-level applications (e.g., maintenance or construction), DFO serves as the core system to which all others are linked via common latitude/longitude coordinates. This compatibility is reinforced by the use of shared identifiers, such as traffic station IDs, that allow seamless data integration between the traffic data shop and roadway inventory systems via GRID. The attached sample maps (SPM_AADT.png and Q154_Traffic_Stations.png) clearly illustrate the presence of traffic volume data (e.g., AADT) distributed across the statewide network, including visible station locations across multiple





counties. These visual examples, combined with the detailed narrative, confirm that the State's approach ensures a unified framework for locating both traffic and roadway data elements. The evidence meets the intent of the advisory ideal by showing that the State has both (1) a foundational location referencing system applied across all roads and (2) operational methods for data integration using shared identifiers, ensuring compatibility and functional alignment across datasets.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

155. *Is there an enterprise roadway information system containing roadway and traffic data elements for all public roads?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has provided a narrative describing the role of the Geospatial Roadway Inventory Database (GRID) as the central system for maintaining roadway data. The response outlines that GRID connects to other roadway-related data systems such as traffic volume (via STARS II), bridge data (via comparisons with point features from the Bridge Division), and pavement data (through network files provided for vendor analysis and subsequent reintegration). While these descriptions show that data systems are being linked functionally, the narrative also makes it clear that these systems remain somewhat separate, and that integration occurs through indirect processes or shared identifiers rather than through a unified, fully integrated enterprise system. Texas is encouraged to develop documentation such as a system overview, architecture diagram, or user manual that demonstrates GRID's capability to serve as an enterprise roadway information system. The documentation should show how data from the various subsystems—roadway, traffic, location reference, bridge, and pavement—are integrated and linked within or through GRID. Developing ongoing status reports clarifying the extent to which non-State roads are included in this system would also be valuable.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From 'Meets Advisory Ideal' to 'Partially Meets Advisory Ideal'.

156. *Does the State have the ability to identify crash locations using a referencing system compatible with the one(s) used for roadways?*

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

The State explains that its roadway inventory data is shared annually with the Crash Data System and includes several linear referencing methods: Route/Roadbed with Distance From Origin (DFO), Control-Section Milepoint, Reference Marker with Displacement (limited to State-owned roads), and latitude/longitude. These methods suggest that crash locations could be identified using referencing systems compatible with those used for roadway data. However, the response lacks confirmation from the crash data system owners regarding how crash locations are actually identified or operationalized using these referencing systems. Without direct input from those responsible for the Crash Data System, the compatibility between crash and roadway location systems cannot be verified. Additionally, the State did not provide a sample map or documentation showing crash locations geolocated on public roads using a compatible referencing system. The absence of this documentation leaves it unclear whether compatibility is applied consistently statewide, particularly on non-State-owned roadways. It is important to note that the "Does Not Meet" rating may reflect the limited data available to the assessors, rather than a definitive deficiency in system compatibility. Nonetheless, the assessors must base the rating on the





information and evidence submitted to ensure consistency across assessments. To support a “Meets” rating, the State should include documentation or a narrative from the crash data system owners confirming how crash locations are identified using one or more of the referencing systems provided by the roadway inventory. A sample map demonstrating statewide geolocation of crash data on public roads would provide strong supporting evidence. Clarifying how these referencing methods are applied consistently across both State and non-State roads would further strengthen the response.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From ‘Meets Advisory Ideal’ to ‘Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal’.

157. *Is crash data incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system for safety analysis and management use?*

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

The State clearly states that crash data is not incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system. Instead, the roadway data is shared with the crash data system for the purpose of safety analysis. While this integration supports crash analysis workflows, it does not satisfy the intent of this question, which specifically asks whether crash data is brought into the roadway system for safety analysis and management purposes. As such, the State does not meet the advisory ideal for this item. To improve the rating, the State would need to provide examples demonstrating that crash data is incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system, such as through a data layer or shared database that enables spatial analysis and integration with roadway and traffic features. Providing documentation or examples of how crash data is used within the roadway system to support safety-related decision-making or analysis would help move this item toward a “Meets” rating in future assessments.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From ‘Partially Meets Advisory Ideal’ to ‘Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal’.

Applicable Guidelines for the Roadway Data System

158. *Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements collected for all public roads?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State collects all required MIRE Fundamental Data Elements (FDEs) for non-local paved roads and has recently expanded its data collection to include intersection-related FDEs through a new intersection inventory. This suggests progress toward meeting the advisory ideal. For local paved and unpaved roads, the State indicates that it collects the required FDEs; however, there is some uncertainty regarding the accuracy of the road surface type classification (paved versus unpaved). This uncertainty suggests potential data quality limitations for these road types, which prevents the State from fully meeting the ideal. Additionally, no documentation was provided to validate which FDEs are collected or to clarify the completeness of the data across all public road types. To support a “Meets” rating in future assessments, the State should provide documentation identifying the specific MIRE FDEs it collects for each public road type (non-local paved, local paved, and unpaved), including the intersection-related elements. It would also be beneficial to clarify how the State verifies roadway surface type classification and to describe any efforts in place to improve the accuracy of this information. A data dictionary, schema, or summary table





aligned with MIRE FDEs would be particularly helpful as supporting evidence.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

159. *Do all additional collected data elements for any public roads conform to the data elements included in MIRE?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has provided a list of important roadway data elements it collects but are not classified as MIRE Fundamental Data Elements (FDEs). These include features such as shoulder types and widths, rumble strip presence, pavement condition, and speed limit. However, the submission lacks key information necessary to determine whether these elements conform to the definitions established in the MIRE guidelines. Specifically, the State did not provide definitions for the data elements or indicate whether the data are collected on all public roads or limited to State-maintained roads. The State's response also requests clarification on the meaning of "conform" as used in the assessment question. This question is asking whether the additional elements collected by the State match MIRE definitions in terms of naming, structure, and implementation. Because this alignment is neither confirmed in the narrative nor supported by documentation, the State cannot be rated as fully meeting the advisory ideal. To improve the rating in future assessments, the State should provide a mapping or crosswalk between the additional roadway elements it collects and the corresponding MIRE definitions. This should identify how closely the State's formats and coding schemes match those in MIRE. In addition, the State should clarify the extent of roadway coverage (e.g., State-maintained roads only or all public roads). Submission of a data dictionary or schema file would further support an evaluation of conformity.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

Data Dictionary for the Roadway Data System

160. *Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements for all public roads documented in the enterprise system's data dictionary?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State states that all MIRE Fundamental Data Elements (FDEs), with the exception of geometric elements related to intersections and interchanges, are documented in the GRID Data Dictionary. The attached data dictionary confirms extensive documentation of roadway-related data elements. However, the response does not confirm whether the dictionary includes FDEs for all public roads, nor does it identify or cite specific MIRE FDEs within the dictionary to establish a clear mapping to MIRE requirements. Additionally, the lack of documentation for intersection and interchange geometry indicates that the system's FDE coverage is incomplete relative to the advisory ideal. It is suggested, the State develop an annotated index or other documentation corresponding to the GRID Data Dictionary that identifies each MIRE FDE and where it is located in the document. This would help demonstrate that MIRE FDEs are documented and conform to MIRE standards. Clarification should also be provided on whether the data dictionary applies to all public roads or only State-maintained roads. If documentation of intersection-related elements is available outside GRID, that should be submitted as well to demonstrate completeness.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.





161. *Are all additional (non-Fundamental Data Element) MIRE data elements for all public roads documented in the data dictionary?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State affirms that all non-Fundamental MIRE data elements it collects are documented in the GRID data dictionary. However, it also clarifies that these data elements are collected only for State-owned roads. While the GRID data dictionary is extensive and appears to include a broad range of roadway attributes, the State did not identify which documented elements correspond specifically to non-FDE MIRE data elements. Without a clear mapping between these data elements and the MIRE model, it is not possible to confirm the level of conformity or completeness with respect to MIRE standards. Furthermore, since the coverage is limited to State-owned roadways, the advisory ideal—which refers to all public roads—is not fully met. To support a “Meets” rating in future assessments, the State should provide a list that identifies the additional MIRE data elements (beyond the FDEs) found in the GRID data dictionary and cite their specific location within the document. The State should also clarify whether any of these data elements are collected for local or non-State public roads. Expanding collection and documentation beyond State-owned roads would further improve alignment with the advisory ideal.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

162. *Does local, municipal, or tribal (where applicable) roadway data comply with the data dictionary?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

All roadway data, including data for local and municipal roads, is collected and maintained solely by TxDOT staff and not provided directly by local, municipal, or tribal agencies. While this approach centralizes control over data quality and consistency, the response does not explain how local system data—especially for roads not under State jurisdiction—is gathered, verified, or updated. Given that locally managed roads constitute a significant portion of the public roadway network in Texas, further detail is needed to understand how TxDOT ensures the accuracy and completeness of this information and whether it complies with the State’s roadway data dictionary. Additionally, the response does not address a potential inconsistency with information from question 167, where it was noted that some counties may be participating in the data submission process. The mention of Wiki pages documenting the update process suggests that there may be established procedures involving local coordination or at least a framework for such engagement. However, these Wiki pages were not provided, and it remains unclear whether the data collection processes used by TxDOT—especially when applied to local roads—align with the standards defined in the data dictionary. To support a “Meets” rating in future assessments, the State should provide a narrative or documentation explaining the methodology used by TxDOT staff to collect and maintain data for local roads. It would also be helpful to clarify whether local agencies contribute data directly or indirectly and whether the procedures used to gather local roadway data comply with the State’s data dictionary standards. Including the Wiki documentation referenced in Q167 would help understand the process of accepting county-provided data and whether the process might be applied to other local jurisdictions.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From ‘Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal’ to ‘Partially Meets Advisory Ideal’.





163. *Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?*

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

Updates to the data dictionary are made as part of the GRID system’s modification process. Specifically, whenever roadway elements are added or modified within GRID, corresponding updates are made to the data dictionary. This suggests that there is a general understanding or informal practice for maintaining alignment between the system and its documentation. However, the response does not describe or provide any formal guidance, documentation, or procedures that govern how and when these updates should occur. There is no mention of review processes, quality control measures, responsible parties, or version tracking mechanisms that would ensure updates are applied consistently and accurately. In the absence of written policies, a change management protocol, or even a detailed narrative describing the steps taken to maintain the data dictionary, the State does not demonstrate adherence to the advisory ideal. To support a “Meets” rating in a future assessment, the State should provide documentation that outlines the procedures used to manage updates to the data dictionary. This may include internal guidance documents, a change log showing historical updates, or a description of the roles and responsibilities involved in this process. If no formal documentation exists, a more detailed narrative outlining the workflow, controls, and verification steps would strengthen the response and provide the necessary assurance of consistency and oversight.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

Procedures and Process Flows for the Roadway Data System

164. *Are the steps for incorporating new elements into the roadway information system (e.g., a new MIRE element) documented to show the flow of information?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State describes a general process for incorporating new data elements into the GRID system using Microsoft VSTS (Azure DevOps) to document and track changes. A dedicated IT development team supports GRID, and new elements are added through a structured workflow involving requirements gathering and progress tracking. Data entry is a manual process involving ground truthing, consistent with existing data workflows. While this suggests that robust steps are in place to manage changes, the State does not provide documentation showing the full flow of information or clearly identifying who is responsible for each step. The absence of a visual process diagram, a detailed narrative, or a roles-and-responsibilities chart limits the ability to confirm that the process is documented. To support a “Meets” rating in future assessments, the State could provide documentation or a more detailed narrative outlining the steps involved in incorporating new data elements, from initial request through validation and integration into GRID. Including a flowchart or description of the roles responsible for each phase (e.g., data stewards, IT staff, program managers) would help demonstrate a documented and repeatable process.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

165. *Are the steps for updating roadway information documented to show the flow of information?*

Meets Advisory Ideal





The State has documented the process for updating roadway information in the GRID system and provided a clear flowchart that outlines the steps and decision points involved. The process includes initial linework updates by TPP, simultaneous review by TPP-DM and district staff, and a final verification step before making attribute updates in GRID. This workflow demonstrates a structured and collaborative review process with built-in checks to ensure accuracy before updates are finalized. Additionally, the State explains that recent improvements have streamlined this process by integrating geometry updates directly into GRID, eliminating the need for external editing and ETL into separate environments. This enhancement, along with in-system validation checks, reduces the potential for data errors and supports a more efficient update process. While no further action is required to support the current rating, the State could consider adding role-specific responsibilities or a brief narrative explaining who is involved at each step in the update process. This would help further clarify the flow of information and accountability within the system.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

166. *Are the steps for archiving and accessing historical roadway inventory documented?*

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State has provided a clear and complete description of its process for archiving and accessing historical roadway inventory data. It maintains annual snapshots of its databases and also produces end-of-year products, such as the Annual Roadway Inventory File. These products are archived both internally on a network drive and externally on the TxDOT.gov website, ensuring accessibility. The response also specifies roles: the IT division is responsible for maintaining the database snapshots, while the Roadway Inventory Branch prepares the archival products and coordinates with IT for public posting. This division of responsibilities and dual-location archival approach demonstrates a structured and reliable method for maintaining and accessing historical data.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

167. *Are the procedures used to collect, manage, and submit local agency roadway data (e.g., county, MPO, municipality, tribal) to the statewide inventory documented?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State reports that procedures for collecting and managing roadway data from local agencies are documented for counties, which are the only local entities currently participating in roadway data updates. These procedures, including the use of a new submission application, are maintained in internal wiki pages. However, the response does not describe how data for "non-county" local roadways, which may be maintained by municipalities, MPOs, or tribal agencies, is collected, managed, or submitted to the statewide inventory. If TxDOT collects other local data directly, as stated in the response to a previous question, more information is needed to clarify whether the same application and procedures are used. Since the advisory ideal encompasses procedures for all local agency roadway data, the absence of documentation or description for these other sources limits the response. The State should clarify how data for non-county local roads is gathered—particularly if TxDOT staff are responsible for collecting and managing any of this information—and whether these processes are documented. If counties are the only local entities responsible for all local roadway data, this should be stated explicitly. Including samples or summaries from the documented county submission process would also help confirm conformance to the advisory ideal.





Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

168. *Are procedures for collecting and managing the local agency (to include tribal, where applicable) roadway data compatible with the State's enterprise roadway inventory?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

A process is in place for engaging counties in the roadway data submission process. Counties can submit data updates via a platform provided by the State, which is based on the enterprise roadway inventory database. This approach helps promote structural and technical compatibility between local and State data by modeling local inputs on the State's established system. This demonstrates a meaningful step toward integration and data compatibility, especially at the county level. However, the response lacks documentation that outlines specific procedures, standards, or quality control mechanisms to guide local participation. There is no evidence that the platform's use is consistent across all local jurisdictions or that it extends to municipal or tribal entities. Additionally, the State has not described how it ensures ongoing conformance with data standards or how it supports local agencies in aligning with the system. The State should expand on how the platform enforces data standards and describe any automated data editing or validation features that support quality control. For example, the system could flag entries that fall outside expected value ranges (e.g., implausible lane widths) or automatically check for required fields before submission. Clarifying who manages and reviews incoming data would also strengthen the response. Finally, describing any outreach, training, or support efforts—especially to municipal and tribal agencies—would demonstrate a more comprehensive and coordinated approach to achieving statewide data compatibility.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From 'Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal' to 'Partially Meets Advisory Ideal'

169. *Are there guidelines for collection of data elements as they are described in the State roadway inventory data dictionary?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State maintains wiki-based documentation for data update procedures and notes that additional documentation exists for certain critical assets undergoing statewide review. There are also formal processes for updating specific data elements, such as speed limits, which require TxDOT Commission approval. While this demonstrates some structured guidance, the documentation appears to be decentralized and varies by data type. The response clarifies that only a limited set of data elements—such as reference markers, traffic counts, and pavement condition—are actively "collected," while most other attributes are derived from plans or imagery. For the data elements that are collected, the State provides a thorough explanation of collection methods and technologies used. Furthermore, the upcoming statewide imagery and LiDAR project, scheduled to begin with the 2025 data year, will significantly expand and formalize the collection of roadway attributes. However, at this stage, no single, comprehensive set of guidelines appears to be in place that covers the collection of all data elements as they are defined in the data dictionary. The State should provide excerpts from its wiki-based documentation or other formal materials that align specific data elements with their collection methods as defined in the data dictionary. A comprehensive guide or standardized reference showing how each type of roadway attribute is to be collected or derived—especially those linked to MIRE FDEs—would demonstrate clearer alignment to the advisory ideal. Once the LiDAR and imagery-based collection program is





implemented, documentation related to that effort should also be included to support future assessments.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

Intrastate Roadway System Interface

170. *Are the location coding methodologies for all State roadway information systems compatible?*

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State confirms that all roadway inventory data is stored in the GRID system, which supports four compatible location referencing methods: Route Coordinate (RC), Distance from Origin (DFO), Control Section Milepoint (CSM), and Texas Reference Marker (TRM). The screenshot provided clearly shows these options integrated into the system's data entry interface, demonstrating that multiple location coding methodologies are available and standardized within GRID. The State also notes that related systems—such as those managing pavement, traffic, and bridge data—either use compatible keys or reference these same location methods, supporting full interoperability. This unified framework meets the advisory ideal for maintaining compatibility across all State roadway information systems.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

171. *Are there interface linkages connecting the State's discrete roadway information systems?*

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There are no interface linkages between TxDOT's discrete roadway information systems. While a department-wide GIS Data Warehouse exists, it functions through monthly data copies rather than automated connections to production systems. The State makes a useful distinction between integration, which involves linking administrative databases for analysis at specific intervals, and interface, which is implied to entail real-time or standing system interoperability that supports business processes and direct data validation during operations. Due to a lack of interface capabilities that enable direct, system-to-system interaction, Texas does not meet the advisory ideal, which envisions a dynamic and seamless exchange of information among roadway data systems. The State's cautious approach to protecting live production systems is reasonable. However, establishing a staged or batched interface that draws from backups or scheduled snapshots may provide an improved middle ground between real-time interface functionality and current manual integration processes. It is important to note that there may be a mismatch between the technical definitions used by the assessor and the State that would potentially support a "partially meets" or "meets" rating. However, the current response does not provide enough detail to justify such a rating. To improve, the State could better describe its current integration workflows, clarify how data are shared among systems (e.g., GRID, STARS II, bridge or pavement systems), and document any movement toward interface linkages. Including a system diagram or outlining steps toward future interface development would help demonstrate progress toward the advisory ideal.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.





172. *Are the location coding methodologies for all regional, local, and tribal roadway systems compatible?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State refers to its earlier response in Question 153, which describes the use of the Distance From Origin (DFO) system and other referencing methods that are applied across the State’s roadway inventory. This suggests a level of compatibility that likely extends to regional, local, and tribal roadways, particularly since TxDOT collects and maintains data on all public roads. However, the response does not clarify whether all of the location coding methodologies described are used consistently for these local systems, or whether only a subset—such as DFO or lat/long—is applied. It is unclear whether location coding across all local, regional, and tribal roadway systems is fully compatible with the State’s enterprise system.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From ‘Meets Advisory Ideal’ to ‘Partially Meets Advisory Ideal’

173. *Do roadway data systems maintained by regional and local custodians (e.g., MPOs, municipalities, and federally recognized Indian Tribes) interface with the State enterprise roadway information system?*

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

TxDOT does not maintain any interface connections with roadway data systems operated by regional or local custodians, such as MPOs, municipalities, or tribal entities. While the State collects and maintains roadway data for all public roads, this is done independently of any direct system-to-system interaction with local custodians. The advisory ideal envisions active, functional interfaces that allow for dynamic data exchange between local systems and the State’s enterprise roadway information system. In the absence of such linkages, the State does not meet the criteria for this item. Since the Texas local roadway mileage is so large, the State should begin to explore or document any plans to establish interfaces or data-sharing protocols with local and regional entities. Even a pilot project, possibly similar to the county submission process, could serve as a foundation for future system integration. A description of long-term goals or barriers to developing these interfaces would also help contextualize the State’s current position.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

174. *Does the State enterprise roadway information system allow MPOs and local transportation agencies (to include federally recognized Tribes, where applicable) on-demand access to data?*

Meets Advisory Ideal

The enterprise roadway information system is an internal application used for data editing and is not accessible on demand by external agencies. However, it does provide several other methods for accessing roadway data, including the Statewide Planning Map, annual year-end data files, ArcGIS Online services, and an Open Data Portal. These platforms offer public-facing access to roadway information, which likely meets many of the informational needs of MPOs and local transportation agencies. These tools demonstrate a commitment to data transparency, accessibility, and on-demand access to enterprise roadway data.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.





Data Quality Control Programs for the Roadway Data System

175. *Do Roadway system data managers regularly produce and analyze data quality reports?*

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

The State has implemented a robust framework of more than 100 business rules within the GRID system to promote data consistency and completeness at the point of entry. These rules, along with nightly SQL checks that validate relationships between data elements, reflect a strong foundational commitment to structural data integrity. These automated controls help ensure conformance with internal standards and prevent many common data entry errors. However, while these embedded checks are valuable, they do not substitute for the generation and review of formal data quality reports. The State acknowledges that its current approach does not address judgment-based errors, such as the misclassification of roadway attributes (e.g., functional class), which may pass structural checks but nonetheless degrade data quality. Periodic data quality reports are a recognized best practice for identifying such subtle errors and are essential for several reasons: they enable continuous system improvement, inform targeted training for system users, and provide transparency about data limitations to stakeholders. Judgment-based errors may be detected through analytic reviews that look for statistical anomalies or inconsistencies across datasets. For example, a report might highlight functional classifications that are inconsistent with roadway geometry, speed limits that fall outside typical ranges for a given facility type, or abrupt changes in classification patterns over time that suggest potential misentries. Comparing historical and current data or analyzing regional discrepancies in how certain fields are populated can also surface outliers worthy of review. These types of analyses provide critical insight into areas where training or system guidance may need reinforcement. Currently, there is no indication that roadway data managers regularly produce or analyze such reports. As a result, the State lacks a mechanism to assess the broader effectiveness of its data validation processes or to detect and address errors that emerge over time. Without these reports, opportunities for system refinement, user feedback, and stakeholder communication are missed. To move toward a “Meets” rating, the State could begin developing periodic quality reports focusing on human-entered or judgment-based fields, such as functional class, access control, or speed limits. Demonstrating how such reports inform corrective action or guide user training would reflect a more comprehensive, data-driven approach to quality management and elevate the State’s already-strong foundational controls.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

176. *Is there a formal program of error/edit checking for data entered into the statewide roadway data system?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State referred to its response to Question 175, which describes the use of business rules, SQL query reports, and drop-down choices. While this suggests that some form of error or edit checking exists, there is no specific documentation provided in the response to Question 176. The reference to Question 175 does not include a formal narrative or attachment that clearly outlines a structured program for error or edit checks across the statewide roadway data system. The response lacks detail about how these checks are applied, whether they are implemented consistently across all data sources, and who is responsible for maintaining or updating them. Without clear documentation or a narrative describing a formal process, the State does not fully demonstrate that it meets the advisory ideal. The State should provide documentation such as written procedures,





validation rule sets, system specifications, or other formal materials that explain the edit and error-checking processes. If these materials are referenced from the response to Question 175, they should also be cited directly or attached to Question 176 to make their applicability clear. The documentation should show that a formal, consistently applied process exists for error and edit checking in the statewide roadway data system.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From ‘Meets Advisory Ideal’ to ‘Partially Meets Advisory Ideal’

177. *Are there procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors?*

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State provides a helpful description of how error detection is managed within the GRID system, noting that validation rules prevent changes from being committed to the database until identified issues are resolved. This indicates that the system has built-in mechanisms to catch and address data entry issues in real time. Additionally, the State explains that known updates are tracked using a web map application, and that prioritization of edits is handled by two Roadway Inventory branch managers, with a focus on department-critical needs such as new roads or added capacity. These descriptions reflect a thoughtful and responsive approach to maintaining roadway data quality. However, while the narrative offers insight into current practices, it does not appear that there is formal documentation detailing how prioritization and error correction decisions are made or applied across the system. The prioritization process is described as being based on managerial discretion, which may be effective but is not formally defined in the materials provided. The mention of the StRAP effort to systematically review all state-owned roadways and attributes is a strong step toward improved data quality, though it is not fully framed as part of a documented procedure for addressing detected errors. The State could provide documentation that outlines the procedures for how detected errors are prioritized and addressed—both through automated systems like GRID and through manual processes. This might include internal guidance, process descriptions, or criteria used to assign priority. Additional context on how the web map application is used to manage edits, and how the StRAP effort fits into an ongoing data quality or correction process, would also be helpful. These additions would demonstrate a more formal and consistent approach to managing roadway data quality across the system.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From ‘Meets Advisory Ideal’ to ‘Partially Meets Advisory Ideal’

178. *Are there procedures for sharing quality control information with data collectors through individual and agency-level feedback and training?*

Meets Advisory Ideal

The State provides a well-rounded and clear description of its approach to sharing quality control information with roadway data collectors. The response outlines three structured mechanisms for delivering feedback and training. First, the requirement for all GRID editors to complete a two-day hands-on training ensures that foundational knowledge and procedures are consistently delivered to every user. Second, the twice-weekly WebEx sessions conducted during the StRAP project offer a collaborative environment for reinforcing editing practices and maintaining data quality through real-time guidance and discussion. These sessions appear to function as both operational support and continuous learning opportunities. Third, the quarterly Teams meetings provide a broader platform for communication across all data editors and GIS users, helping to share updates and





reinforce coordination across the State’s 25 districts. The inclusion of SharePoint documentation to track attendance, leaders, and topics adds another layer of structure and accountability, which further supports the State’s approach to ongoing quality control and user engagement. Although documentation such as training materials or meeting agendas was not attached, the detailed narrative provides a strong indication that the State has formal, sustained processes in place for communicating quality standards and ensuring consistent data collection practices. This level of training, feedback, and coordination aligns well with the advisory ideal, and the State’s thoughtful approach to reaching its large and distributed user base is commendable.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

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

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

The State outlines internal expectations for updating roadway attributes within four to six months of project completion and describes efforts to finalize data within two to three months after the end of the calendar year to meet FHWA deadlines. This narrative reflects an operational understanding of timeliness and a commitment to maintaining current data. However, the response does not include any defined timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers or users. According to the advisory ideal, a performance measure should include a specific metric with a baseline value and actual tracked results. For instance, a valid measure might state that 90 percent of roadway changes are updated within 120 days and be supported by tracked data over time to assess progress and inform decisions. In this case, while the State describes its timeline goals, it does not present a measurable standard or evidence that performance against such a standard is tracked or evaluated. To achieve a “Meets” rating in a future assessment, the State would need to provide a documented performance measure that includes both the metric and corresponding performance data. This might take the form of an internal report, dashboard, or tracking tool that shows how timeliness is measured and monitored. Describing how these measures are used by data managers or stakeholders to evaluate the system’s responsiveness would further strengthen the response.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

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

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There are no formally established performance measures specific to the accuracy of its roadway data. While it references the need to pass HPMS validation rules and describes a robust internal set of over 60 validation checks—including expected values for roadway features such as lane, shoulder, and median widths—these checks function more as data validation rules than as performance measures. The advisory ideal calls for the use of at least one defined accuracy performance measure that includes a baseline and actual values over time, tailored to the specific needs of data managers and users. HPMS validation compliance and internal rule enforcement, while important, are not substitutes for such performance measures. Without a specific metric that is tracked and evaluated to monitor data accuracy systematically, the State does not currently meet this standard. The State should develop and document at least one accuracy performance measure relevant to its roadway data system. This could include, for example, a measure tracking the





estimated percentage of features with correct spatial placement or a measure of consistency between reported and field-verified asset attributes. Providing baseline values, current performance metrics, and examples of how this information is used to guide data quality improvement would help demonstrate that accuracy is actively monitored and managed in a way that aligns with the advisory ideal.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

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

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There are no internally developed completeness performance measures tailored specifically to the needs of its data managers or users. The mention of HPMS validation checks reflects a federal reporting requirement, not a State-defined measure. While passing HPMS checks may demonstrate a baseline level of data completeness, it does not fulfill the advisory ideal, which asks for State-specific metrics designed to monitor and improve the quality and coverage of roadway data based on local needs and system use. A completeness performance measure should identify how well the State is capturing the necessary data elements and should include a baseline and actual performance value. For example, a useful measure might track the percentage of required roadway attributes collected across all segments or the proportion of roads mapped with complete location referencing. The State should provide at least one completeness performance measure that includes a clear metric, a baseline value, and a current measured value. Ideally, the measure would reflect attributes relevant to the State's roadway inventory and be used internally to guide data quality improvement. Supporting documentation, such as performance dashboards, internal reports, or summaries that demonstrate how completeness is evaluated over time, would also help establish that the measure is meaningful and actively used by the State's data program.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

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

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

The State reports that it has established data attribution expectations based on roadway ownership, requiring both State-owned and non-State-owned roads to include defined sets of attributes. This demonstrates a thoughtful approach to consistent data collection and indicates an awareness of the importance of data uniformity. The use of a Wiki-based resource to document these standards suggests guidance is available to contributors. However, the State does not report any formal performance measures to assess or monitor data uniformity. While setting standards is an important first step, the advisory ideal calls for at least one measurable indicator that tracks how well those standards are being followed. Uniformity performance measures help ensure that data values are consistent in format, meaning, and structure across jurisdictions and systems. Examples of such measures might include calculating the percentage of records that use consistent date formats such as YYYY-MM-DD, tracking how often distance values appear in non-standard units like kilometers instead of miles, or evaluating how often contributors use non-approved codes or submit data in incorrect formats. For instance, measuring the number of schema mismatches or inconsistent use of controlled vocabularies (e.g., inconsistent abbreviations for states or roadway classifications) would help identify gaps in uniformity across different systems or jurisdictions.





The State should implement and document a performance measure that tracks one of these issues, provide baseline and current values, and explain how the results are used to guide data quality improvements. Clarifying how the Wiki-based standards are enforced or audited would also show that the guidance is actively applied, not just passively available. Without evidence of an active performance measure, the rating remains Does Not Meet the Advisory Ideal. This finding is intended to help the State identify actionable next steps toward meeting that standard.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

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

Partially Meets Advisory Ideal

The State maintains a "standard products" list, which includes timelines for when various roadway data products should be completed. This suggests a degree of structure supporting data availability and timeliness—both important components of accessibility. This approach shows that the State is aware of the need to make data available to users in a predictable and timely manner. However, while the product list outlines delivery expectations, the response does not identify any formal performance measures related to accessibility. Accessibility in a data quality context includes not only the timely availability of data but also how easily users can locate, retrieve, and use it. A meaningful performance measure would typically include a specific metric (such as the percentage of products delivered on time or within a defined timeframe), a baseline value, and actual values tracked over time. These elements are necessary to determine whether the State is achieving its accessibility goals. Moreover, the response does not address whether data products are made available in user-friendly formats, whether relevant documentation or metadata is provided, or how easily users can retrieve the data without technical or administrative obstacles. These are all core dimensions of data accessibility, and without information on these aspects, it is not clear how accessible the State's roadway data products truly are to analysts, decision-makers, or other authorized users. To meet the advisory ideal, the State should implement and report on one or more formal performance measures tailored to accessibility. These might include the percentage of standard products delivered by their scheduled release date, average time to fulfill data requests, or user-reported satisfaction with the data access process. Each measure should include a baseline, actual performance values, and evidence that results are reviewed and used for improvement. Demonstrating how these metrics are monitored, such as through dashboards or internal performance reviews, would further support a "Meets" rating in future assessments. As it stands, the absence of documented accessibility performance measures or evidence of systematic evaluation results in a Does Not Meet rating for this item.

Change Notes: Rating Changed.

From 'Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal' to 'Partially Meets Advisory Ideal'

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

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There are no integration performance measures in place for its roadway information system. While the response is candid, the absence of any defined metric, documentation, or even informal tracking indicates that the State does not meet the advisory ideal for this item. Integration performance measures are critical for evaluating how effectively data is combined across





systems—such as linking roadway data with crash, vehicle, or asset management systems. High-quality data integration involves more than just transferring information; it requires maintaining consistency in formats and definitions, using common identifiers to link records accurately, and ensuring that data can be meaningfully analyzed across platforms. Performance measures help monitor whether these goals are being achieved and identify where integration processes may be falling short. Without any measures in place, there is no way to determine how well roadway data flows between systems, whether those connections are reliable, or how integrated information is used to support cross-system analysis and decision-making. The lack of even preliminary metrics or examples of system linkages indicates that the State is not actively evaluating or managing its integration practices. To achieve a “Meets” rating, the State should develop and document at least one integration performance measure. Examples might include the percentage of roadway records successfully linked to crash records, the number of active data exchanges between roadway and other core systems, or the frequency with which integration processes are executed (e.g., through automated ETL jobs or scheduled API pulls). These measures should include a defined baseline, current values, and a description of how the results are used by data managers to improve the integration process. Providing clear documentation of integration workflows, use of common identifiers, or performance dashboards that monitor linkage success would further strengthen the State’s alignment with the advisory ideal. In the absence of any of these elements, the rating remains Does Not Meet.

Change Notes: Rating Unchanged.

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

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

There are no performance measures for its enterprise roadway information system, and, as a result, have not defined any numeric goals or performance metrics. This absence means the State cannot meet the advisory ideal for this item. Numeric goals are a foundational component of performance management. They provide concrete targets—such as percentages, counts, or time thresholds—that allow data managers and users to assess whether performance measures are being met and to track improvements over time. The advisory ideal expects that for each defined performance measure, the State would establish a corresponding numeric goal that reflects expectations for data quality, system responsiveness, or integration effectiveness. Since no performance measures have yet been developed across areas such as timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, accessibility, or integration, the State cannot demonstrate the use of numeric targets to evaluate progress or performance. To move toward meeting the advisory ideal, the State should begin by defining performance measures in one or more of these areas and then assign clear, numeric goals to guide performance monitoring and continuous improvement.

Change Notes: New Question.

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

Does Not Meet Advisory Ideal

TxDOT does not currently provide data quality management reports to the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) for regular review. While some data recipients are informed when products are complete and available, this communication is informal and does not constitute structured reporting focused on data quality oversight. The advisory ideal calls for routine, formal





reporting to the TRCC on data quality issues and performance measures across the enterprise roadway information system. Regularly providing data quality management reports to the TRCC supports coordinated system oversight, strategic decision-making, and alignment of agency efforts to improve data quality. These reports should ideally address performance in areas such as timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, accessibility, and integration. The absence of any such reporting to the TRCC reflects a missed opportunity for institutional accountability and cross-agency collaboration. To achieve a “Meets” rating, the State should establish a process for creating and sharing data quality management reports with the TRCC at defined intervals (e.g., quarterly or annually). These reports should include relevant metrics or performance information and demonstrate how the TRCC is engaged in reviewing and responding to the findings.

Change Notes: New Question.





Appendix B – Assessment Participants

State Highway Safety Office Representative(s)

Letty Von Rossum
Texas Department of Transportation
BTS Section Director

NHTSA Headquarters Coordinator

Beau Burdett
USDOT
Program Analyst

State Assessment Coordinator(s)

Larry Krantz
Texas Department of Transportation
Program Manager

NHTSA Regional Office Coordinator(s)

Rebecca R Walker
NHTSA
Regional Program Manager

Jeremy Rogers
Texas Department of Transportation
Roadway Inventory Manager

Assessment Facilitator

Kathleen Haney
VHB
Senior Traffic Safety Analyst

Assessment Team Members

Jack Benac
Jack D. Benac LLC.
Traffic Safety Specialist

David Whitchurch
LSU Center for Analytics and Research in Transportation
Safety
Business Analytics Manager

State and Local Respondents

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

Jeremy Rogers
Texas Department of Transportation
Roadway Inventory Manager





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
NEMESIS	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

DFO Distance from origin
GRID Geospatial Roadway Inventory Database
IRI International Roughness Index
StRAP STatewide Review of Assets Project
TxDOT Texas Department of Transportation
VSTS Now Microsoft Azure DevOps

