

MINUTES OF THE
TRAFFIC RECORDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TRCC)
MEETING

206 South 17th Avenue, Phoenix, AZ
Department of Transportation (ADOT), Director's Board Room
1:00 P.M., Tuesday, February 12, 2008

The regular scheduled meeting of the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) Meeting was held on February 12, 2008, at 1:00 PM.

TRCC MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Jami Garrison, ADOT-TPD*
George Delgado, ADOT-MVD*
Jennifer Brown, FHWA
Doanh Bui, ADOT-ITG
Reed Henry, ADOT-HES
Rick Turner, ADOT-MVD
Jeff King, DPS
Alan Vitcavage, FMCSA
Sarath Joshua, MAG
Jim Williams, GOHS
Michael Hegarty, GOHS
Ester Corbett, ITCA**
Bryan Hill, Glendale PD**
Don Bischoff, Mohave Co. Sheriff**
Pat McGrath, AOC**

OTHERS ATTENDING

Teri Oliveira, ADOT-ITG
Haleh Farhadi, ADOT-ITG
David Harden, ADHS
Kiran Guntupalli, MAG

TRCC COORDINATOR:

Larry Talley, ADOT-TPD

* Co-Chairperson

** By Phone

1. Call to Order
Co-Chairperson, Jami Garrison called the meeting to order at 1:12 PM, asked attendees to introduce themselves, and reviewed the proposed agenda.
2. Approval of November 6, 2007 Meeting Minutes
The Minutes were reviewed and a motion was made by George Delgado and seconded by Jennifer Brown to accept the minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously to accept the minutes of the November 6, 2007 meeting.
3. Projects Update – Larry Talley
 - a) TraCS: Licensing and Training. Larry is the action officer for this task. The Project Investment Justification (PIJ) has been completed and submitted to the AZ Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) for review and approval. We are waiting for feedback and once approved we can move forward with the documentation to secure our license and request SDK training.
 - b) ALISS. Teri Oliveira is the ITG project manager for this project. Larry advised the committee that a consulting developer is on board and has started work. Sarath asked who the developer was. Teri responded that it is Klod Gjinopulli. Clarification was provided that Klod is an ADOT ITG contractor. Doanh elaborated on the process and movement of the data to the new database. Sarath asked if there would be major changes to the data structure. Doanh responded that there would not be any major changes.
 - c) Crash Data Collection. Teri is the ITG project manager for this project also. Larry explained that this is the project that will provide the input needed to develop the data collection screens in TraCS for the law enforcement agencies. He advised the committee that the advisory team has had one meeting to date and was comprised of primarily law enforcement personnel and law enforcement IT personnel. The next session is scheduled for February 21st; however, this project is dependent on the approval of the PIJ.
 - d) Analytical Tools. Haleh is the ITG project manager for this project. Larry briefed the committee that this advisory team has two sessions and is primarily comprised of traffic safety and engineering analysts – State, MPO and Local. The team is determining which analytical tools will be needed to analyze the crash data utilizing the web portal. This project also includes the movement of the data from the ALISS database to the AIDW (warehouse). ITG is hoping to have a shell together by June for basic analysis tools for GOHS and local agencies for reporting purposes. Haleh stated that they were still gathering requirements. She went on to explain that different agencies had different requirements, so ITG is still trying to sort out. Jami asked if there were two different types of tools. Haleh responded no. Larry explained that some agencies were looking for complex modeling and forecasting tools while others simply wanted intersection diagramming and rate based analysis. A discussion followed on duplication of projects and Larry stated that the team wanted to make sure that there was not a

duplication of projects. Brian asked how local law enforcement makes use of the analytical tools. Larry explained that these tools are primarily for traffic engineering analysis and that a second working group will be formed to establish the analytical needs for law enforcement agencies. Brian asked if these tools were only for state agency use or if they will be available for local agencies. Larry confirmed that they would be available for all agencies – not just state and are expressly designed for the smaller agencies that do not have full time analysts or dedicated software programs for crash data analysis. He went on to explain that each agency will be able to log on through the web portal to view and analyze their data. A separate project will determine the level of security required for customers to view the data and what data will be available to which customer. George asked if any thought had been given to communicating to law enforcement agencies that TraCS has been agreed upon as the State standard for crash data collection, if there is any benefit to doing that at this time, and that agencies could continue to use 3rd party software. Larry stated he had not sent anything out and that he was hoping to get the TRCC website up and the information available then. A discussion followed concerning licensing of local agencies and how they can obtain the TraCS software to use. Sarath asked when TraCS will be available for review. Michael stated that the July law enforcement summit would be a good opportunity to introduce it when we talk about the new crash form. Teri stated that she did not want to make any commitments until the requirements are established. Larry stated that we might be able to use Phoenix's form as a demonstration. Brian stated that a possible forum might be at a quarterly meeting of the Arizona Association of Crime Analysts and that this would probably be a good topic. Brian stated that he could assist with arranging the invitation. Brian asked when we should schedule the briefing. A discussion followed. The decision was to place the recommendation on-hold until a later date. Alan asked how many other states were currently using TraCS. Larry stated 18 and a discussion followed on the data development screens.

- e) Crash Form. Jim Williams is the project manager. Jim advised the committee members that we had just had a meeting before this one to discuss proposed changes to the form. Jim stated that he needs to make sure the paper form is on the “same page” as the electronic form. Doanh stated that a meeting was necessary to insure the paper form is MMUCC compliant. Rick commented that the ALISS database needs to be MMUCC compliant but that the form does not need to contain all of the elements and attributes. A discussion followed. Teri agreed to schedule a meeting with Jim and Klod to discuss the requirements.

- f) EMS Data Repository. David Harden is the project manager. David began by stating that the Bureau of EMS is still working with GOHS to get a contract in place. GOHS is requiring budget line items be established which is a new process to EMS and had not been planned on. To date EMS has provided a purpose statement and a problem statement and has established a premier EMS agency - system program which includes four priority emergency categories (PECs). The PECs are trauma, stroke, cardiac arrest and STEMI, (lack of blood flow going

through the heart muscle). We believe these four areas are most beneficial to increasing the chance of survival for the patient and identifying servicing facilities for the EMS and trauma system. EMS will continue to work with GOHS to get the contract in place.

- g) CODES. Jami is the Chairperson for this evaluation team. Jami stated that she is scheduling a committee meeting within the next couple of weeks. The team will be looking at a more economical means of linking crash data sources together so that the costs associated with crashes can be determined and also looking at the necessity of CODES as it exists today. The TRCC has funded a project for the linking of 2006 data elements and hope to receive a report, but has not heard anything. George stated that in the minutes of the last TRCC meeting, Item 4, CODES, the question of where should it be housed is raised. He stated that he hoped the team would really consider that question in their deliberations. Jami agreed and stated that is why they wanted to look at other alternatives.

4. GTSAC Meeting Update – *Larry Talley* (Erroneously shown on Agenda as GOHS Meeting Update)

Larry began by stating that the GTSAC met last Tuesday and that the meeting agenda was mostly comprised of an update of the six Action Teams. The TRCC is the Data Improvement Action Team. Since the majority of the teams are just forming and have not met or only met only once, there was not a lot of information to share. Larry stated that he presented the four projects that we currently have underway.

5. TRCC Strategic Plan Update & 6. Annual Report Funding Status – *Larry Talley*
Larry provided two spreadsheets outlining the previously approved 2006 and 2007 Project List (combined). Larry explained how the projects were identified, which projects were funded and underway, and which projects had funds reserved, but had had no activity identified. He advised the committee that he had concern that projects totaling \$205,000 have had no reported progress on obligation of those funds. Larry asked about the validity of the projects and the need for the funds. He asked that everyone review the tasks listed and see if other projects should be funded. George asked if all of the funds had been moved from GOHS to ADOT. Larry stated that only the 2006 funds had been moved and that the letter still needed to be sent to GOHS requesting release of the 2007 funds. Jennifer asked if the projects shown were only the 408 funded projects. Larry answered in the affirmative. Jennifer stated that something that might be useful to everyone is to put what the funding source is. Larry agreed. Jennifer continued by asking if what was being asked of the committee was to confirm that the last four projects were valid and if the Action Person was going to spend the money. Jami responded that maybe the members could review the list and be prepared at the next meeting to decide which projects should have continued funding and where it can be used best. George stated that on the status of #19 and #32, he should have an answer by next Wednesday from MVD Customer Service personnel. After a discussion, Jami ask that the members take the documents, get back to Larry with which projects should be funded, and identify additional projects that are required and get them to Larry to be included. Brian suggested a

project may be a training video for officers for common mistakes for the crash form. A discussion followed. Jennifer stated that the biggest complaint she hears in other meetings is #5 (Location Reference – Standard procedure for identifying street names). Because this issue is something that generates complaints and she recommended the TRCC consider funding it. A discussion followed. Rick explained that he thought it was streets with multiple names - Item #40 that was the problem. Jennifer stated that her goal would be to fix the number one complaint – crash records backlog and then street names. She concluded by stating that customer satisfaction is her recommendation. George stated that MVD does not have a funding source for the backlog yet and that he and Rick are still working on the RFP. A discussion followed. Esther stated that #5 & #40 (road naming) are reasonable from the local and tribal perspective. She also emphasized that the size of the data fields containing the street names need to be the same. A discussion followed.

Jeff asked if anyone from AOC was on the phone and if projects #38 and #39 were not already underway or complete. Pat stated that he was on, but did not have a copy of the handout. Jeff asked about the establishment of the protocol for electronic citations (#39) and wasn't that complete or almost complete. Pat stated that right now there are quite a few overlapping electronic citation projects going on. He gave the example of the state-wide DPS governor mandated photo enforcement program where we have two courts live and two courts in test. Pat further stated that Apache Junction Justice Court is live with the DPS project and is getting ready to go live with hand-held devices along with others. AOC is proceeding with the ability to accept electronic citation data into our Case Management System. There are still some issues outstanding that need to be worked out.

6. FMCSA SaDIP Submittal – *Larry Talley*

Larry provided a brief history of the \$129,000 FMCS SaDIP application that, if approved, would fund an additional ITG programmer to develop the truck/bus crash supplement form and to modify the electronic data transfer from the new ALISS database to DPS/FMCSA. Alan stated that the submittal was currently under review at national. Larry thanked everyone for the support in getting the submittal in on time.

7. Traffic Records Update – *Rick Turner*

Rick stated that 2006 crash data was completed last month and that they have started working on the 2006 Crash Facts document. The first draft is currently out for review. Depending on how fast the reviews are completed, Traffic Records should have something on-line in the next few weeks or a month. Data analysts have started entering 2007 crash data into ALISS. As of last Friday they have 83.5% of January's data entered. As George reported, we are working on the RFP to get costs to move ahead with catching up the backlog using an outside company. It will be a pilot program where our staff does nothing but coding of 306,000 to 310,000 reports. The expectation is that 34,000 reports per month will be entered by a company. Management is concerned that our staff would have to code 212 reports a day. We are trying to determine if it is feasible.

We also have a grant position that is being monitored by GOHS for BAC entry. She is making good headway with police agencies and they are coming through with the data. We are still looking for BAC results from 2007 for 330 fatal crashes. The coroners are still having problems figuring out if some fatals are homicides. FMCSA provided a grant for two temporary people to come on board to do truck and bus supplements. Brian stated that the BAC specialist is working well from the law enforcement end.

Michael asked about an update on the scanner process. Rick stated that he was working with David Hunt, but there were some problems getting the scanner to identify some of the forms. The problem revolves around agencies making copies of the forms and submitting them. The copied forms are not standard in all cases which cause the problem. We think we have a solution. However, we still need to make sure we have the correct software identified.

Jennifer asked if the issue of the crash records archiving had been resolved. Rick stated that permission had to be obtained in order to change from microfilming to digital imaging and that he is working on it. Rick further stated that the State won't allow digital imaging for anything over five years. He is in the process of determining records retention timelines and has run it by Mike Manthey and Reed. Rick stated that Mike had told him that he needed 3 to 5 years of records for their process. Reed stated that they need 3 years before and 3 years after a project for their studies. Rick stated that he still needed to work on the issue, but that he is currently storing records on microfilm for 20 years and if the records are stored for over five years, they have to be microfilm.

8. Other Items – *Jami Garrison*

Call to the public.

9. Next Meeting – *Jami Garrison*

The next meeting is scheduled for May 20th in the same location – ADOT Director's Board Room, 1:00 – 3:00.

10. Adjournment

Co-Chairperson Jami Garrison adjourned the meeting at 2:35 PM.