



State Traffic Records Advisory Committee (STRAC)

Quarterly Meeting

Thursday, March 20, 2014
9:00 AM to 2:30 PM
Colorado State Patrol Academy
15055 Golden Rd, Building 100
Golden, CO 80401

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Aurora PD, Lt. Jeff Turner	CDOT, BoYan Quinn	DRCOG, Mark Northrop
Aurora PD, Ofc. Kevin Deichsel	CDOT, David Swenka	FHWA, Dahir Egal
Cambridge Systematics, Lorrie Laing	CDPHE, Jan Hart	JeffCo, Scott Burton
CDOT, Alisa Babler	CDPS, Maj. Barry Bratt (<i>Chair</i>)	MSU, Susan Lowrance
CDOT, David Bourget (<i>Secretary</i>)	CU Denver, Carolyn McAndrews	MSU, Chelsea
CDOT, Carol Gould	DHS, Webster Hendricks	MSU, George
CDOT, Rahim Marandi	DOR, Cheri Urda (<i>Co-Chair</i>)	NHTSA, Leslie Nelson Taullie
CDOT, Charles Meyer	DOR, Theodore (Ted) Trujillo	WYDOT Consultant, Joe McCarty
CDOT, Tara Mundt (<i>Minutes</i>)	DPD, Sgt. Mike Farr	

Agenda: (action items in red)

1. Introductions
2. Review of past Meeting Minutes
 - a. Motion to approve last meeting minutes
 - i. Motion approved
3. Go-Team – report out & findings (Kara/Barry/Leslie)
 - a. Barry: #1 – We need to use STRAC Strategic Plan to build ourselves a roadmap of where to go – plan to have it updated by June incorporating the Statewide Strategic Plan and Charles Meyer’s Crash Database Team. Have steps and goals #2 – We need a Traffic Records Committee Coordinator (TRCC). Currently have three people that do that job, but mostly administrative duties: overseeing the grant management, paperwork, etc. However, we need someone who will take a lead on working towards goals in between meetings. Someone to stay focused on our Strategic Plan. A project manager.
 - b. Joe, TRCC for Wyoming - works with several departments as a consultant for Wyoming, trying to bring them all together. The challenges: understanding what each department wants and needs to do. Each of them has different systems, have to be able to bring them all together somehow.
 - i. Has found that using more “Pilots” helps with selling the ideas and getting projects started
 - ii. Another challenge is “selling projects” to all of the government officials
 - iii. Needs to link the data together or create a data warehouse
 1. Cheri – Would like to see something for all of the data to come together and also will hide the personal data.

- iv. Wyoming STRAC meets quarterly with a smaller attendance. They have formed many subcommittees, which meeting more frequently. Wyoming STRAC interacts with other state agencies (police departments, sheriff's offices, etc.) as well.
 - c. Leslie – Go Team Report – their original intent was to look at the EARS system. EARS is antiquated, Go-Team was supposed to look at how to keep EARS going with all of the changes (Denver, Aurora, Colorado Springs will be sending reports electronically). This didn't happen as planned due to Motor Vehicle's Registration & Vehicle System and Driver's License system is going to be updated using current technology – these systems will in turn effect other systems (EARS) as well as affect CDOT's data files
 - i. Leslie - DOR is custodian of the original report because it is a legal document. CDOT has the "user file" mirrored to DOR's database (access to the database). However, in the data of CDOTs actually pinpoints the crashes with GPS locations and corrects the side block's codes and number of vehicles, etc. Also, CDOT basically only pulls the side blocks off. This makes it more engineering data, which works for CDOT but not for other agencies and departments that needs the data as well. (Behavioral studies, etc.)
 - ii. Opportune time with DOR's system upgrades. Go-Teams recommendations: Create a user file that helps all departments, DR2447 is 8 years old and needs to be updated, and have a TRCC.
 - 1. Ted – these upgrades are still in the "request" phase, a \$92 million request which is at the legislature. Enhanced technology for all users (public and other departments). Will take about 3-4 years for implementation.
 - a. At the point that DOR is trying to figure out what they need, along with all of the users of the systems (data)
 - 2. DR2447 Update – It is a good time to do so.
 - 3. Barry – What can STRAC do to help?
 - a. **DOR needs a clear understanding of the needs from all departments/agencies and the links between them.**
 - 4. Current DOR systems are all fragmented and all isolated. The new system will be one system that links all data together.
 - a. Barry – should DOR bring someone that is really close to this project to STRAC?
 - i. Ted – once the vendor is determined – they will work with all departments for collaboration. Hoping to release the Request for Proposals (RFP) in September/October.
 - 1. Barry – we have time to get more information and work together.
 - 5. Leslie – we have partners (NHSTA, FHWA, and FMCSA, etc.) that can help with the funding of this project.
 - 6. **Barry – we all should go back to our own offices and look at our systems – will they all link together?** If we all submit to the Cabinet/ Legislature then they may have a better idea of our needs. We can add this into our new Strategic Plan.
 - 7. Dahir – everyone needs to be aware of this... and that we will NEED help. STRAC needs to support DOR.
 - iii. **Rahim will send an electronic copy of the Data Warehouse proposal to Barry**
4. Task Force on Statewide Crash Database – Update (Charles)
 - a. The meeting of this committee consisted of a few people: Ted (DOR), Jan (CDHPE), Glenn (CDOT), David B (CDOT), Charles M (CDOT)
 - b. Dynamic times: talked about all databases – merging them into one, Phones, Data, expectations, Map21 requirements (Health must be linked to crash data by 2020)
 - i. CDOT's data is user's data – however, it is more engineering based. CDOT pulls more data, as needed; this is very time consuming for the custom queries.
 - c. There is a NEED to link data bases or have a common data base.
 - d. SHSP should address the databases and how do we go forward.

- i. Need to take a step down from the old STRAC Strategic Plan. This was a good plan, but needs to be practical in regards to the goals and how to achieve them. The new SHSP needs to be rewritten and include detailed step by step process to achieve the major goals.
 - 1. At that point we can solicit projects that will ultimately benefit the goals of the SHSP.
 - ii. We all need to speak this vision and work towards them.
 - iii. TRCC person will overview all of these projects, funding, and where we are with the vision.
 - 1. 2009 Data Warehouse Report was a good report, but stopped at the implementation due to the complexity of the project and the costs.
 - a. We need to do small projects that move us forward.
 - iv. The SHSP should be developed with what every department needs, 1-2 year goals/plans, as well as a 5-year plan – where do we want to be?
 - 1. **EVERYONE: Send all of your department’s goals to Barry by April 25th. Every agency consult with their management or executive team as to their goals and expectations with crash data.**
 - a. Automated DUI Case files? – would this help the Police Officer’s jobs easier?
 - b. Think about users of the data? Public?
5. Higher Education Partnership Pilot Project Presentation (Susan Lowrance, MSU)
 - a. The purpose of this “Pilot Project” (proof of concept) was to showcase a way of data visualization and data sharing interactively in the form of a web based application. From the home screen, the user is able to choose what data to query. This data is displayed in several different ways: heat or density maps; “raw” data in a listing view; and reports consisting of graphs and charts. All of these can be exported if the project is continued.
 - i. This project can be broken down in stages: CDOT data first, then incorporate other agencies.
 - ii. Can build in user profiles protected with passwords, System Admin to create profiles in which it will allow limits be set for certain users. However, an application in which the public can also access.
 - 1. Example: Schools, community, and parents can use the data to find a safe route to school for their children.
 - iii. Now – if project is approved – MSU can do all of the “On-System” (State highways and interstates). However, will need the “Off-system” (local and county roads) geo coded.
 - 1. Not something CDOT currently does. CDOT will geo-code the “On-System” by using a mile point for a reference point
 - 2. MSU has submitted a proposal (separate project) to Geo-code the off-system and as a deliverable give CDOT the software to continue geo-coding future crash records.
 - b. This web based application could eventually replace the “Crash Rate Book”
6. FHWA State Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) –Crash Data Emphasis Area Team (Lorrie Laing, Cambridge Systematic)
 - a. All agencies and departments have their own Strategic Plan; the state wide brings all of them together.
 - b. We are currently working off of the 2006 Statewide Strategic Plan, which was a good document. However, there were too many plans that never were implemented. Most of the goals were unreachable.
 - c. Overall focus should be to reduce serious injury and fatal crashes
 - d. Required this year, funding is tied to it
 - e. A 5-year Road Map that will identify the top 5 strategies
 - i. **Need to have this completed by June 2014 (SHSP schedule)**
 - ii. **Establish a sub-committee by April 15th (need to deliver their emphasis area plan by schedule) (Done)**
 - 1. Subcommittee (from STRAC): Barry Bratt, Jan Hart, Charles Meyer, Ted Trujillo, (need someone from FMCSA)
 - iii. Needs to be data driven. Need to be able to track and evaluate progress
 - f. Lorrie informed that regional meetings with large regions: Pueblo, Aurora, Denver, Colorado Springs, etc. Anyone that is interested in the information and can put ideas into this.
 - g. Barry and Lorrie will get together and discuss possible dates in which to schedule a meeting (a lot can be done through webinars, phone calls, and e-mails)

7. FY2013-14 Project Status (Rahim)
 - a. Aurora, "E-Citation" – late start
 - b. Castle Rocke, "E-Citation" – late start
 - c. CDHPE, "EMS Registry" – end goal is data linkage, will not be able to complete all links
 - d. Denver, "E-Reporting" – at point of running test reports through, but not submitting yet
 - e. Elbert, "E-Citation" – Software ordered
 - f. Greenwood Village, "E-Reporting" – Project not started in first quarter, started the planning in second quarter, will be done by September 30th 2014.
 - g. Jefferson County, "Accident Reconstruction Software" (Correct title is "Crash Data Cleaning and Analysis Improvement Project") – moving along – this is a one-time-deal
 - h. Aurora, "E-Reporting" – as of yesterday fixed the bugs in the system, today will try to submit again (one report at a time, then try to "flood" the system). Goal is to go live by April 10th (IT personnel will be going on leave of absence on the 11th)
 - i. By the end of summer, should be 60-65% electronic reports. Overall goal is to be 100% electronic. However, smaller agencies will need to be web based, but the server is "no good".
 1. Can we get a new server?
 - ii. 85% is a good goal for now, since that is approximately the % of crash reports that are internally electronic.
 - iii. Rahim will send a list of top 15 agencies reporting (or will be able to) electronically.

8. Additional FY 14 Projects (Rahim)
 - a. #14-04-01-15 – CDOT, "Data Integration & Fox Pro Conversion" vendor: Plus Solutions (short form was updated from #14-04-01-10 to #14-04-01-15 that encompasses both projects)
 - i. NHSTA concurred this maybe a "Band-Aid"
 1. CDOT will develop a clear project objectives/ deliverables and will schedule a meeting with NHTSA to discuss – CDOT has scheduled for Monday March 31st. (Rahim will send a very detailed and understandable list of deliverables of this Project to the STRAC Voting Members.)
 - ii. Plus Solutions was paid for projects that were never completed.
 1. E-Reporting for Lakewood, Thornton, Loveland, Northglenn, Westminster, etc.
 2. Barry wants to see original grant proposals; was the project quoted by the hours or by the overall work?
 3. Need to resolve this issue before we can approve of more projects through this vendor
 4. This vendor is very familiar with current software and program, if CDOT has to find another vendor it would cost more due to learning curve.
 5. All project must have clear and attainable objectives – lesson learned
 - b. #14-04-41-16 – CDOT, "Geo-Coding Off-System Locations" vendor: Metro State University
 - i. Vote – Motion Approved Rahim will ensure that the "may" is changed to "will" in the last paragraph on the first page (Done 3/28/2014)

9. FY2014-15 Projects (Discussion & Approval) ***See attached updated project listing in email***
 - a. E-Citation projects – Judicial is still not ready yet. Judicial is the holdup at this point.
 - i. Will need to prioritize them. And they have to be able to test to verify that it will work once Judicial is ready... how can we do that? It has to match the state's schema
 - ii. Priority -E-citation:
 1. #15-04-01-01 Loveland – vote – Motion Approved
 2. #15-04-01-02 Baca County – this is just for their own system, would not go into municipal court, no vendor named – vote – Motion Not Approved

3. #15-04-01-04 Avon, Basalt, Eagle, Minturn, Vail Police Departments –Combines many agencies in Eagle County - vote – [Motion Approved](#)
 4. #15-04-01-08 Wheat Ridge – vote – [Motion Approved](#)
 5. #15-04-01-09 Pueblo (E-citation and E-Reporting) – [Tabled for now](#) – [More info. needed](#)
- b. #15-04-01-07 CDHPE “Improve EMS and Trauma Data Systems - \$90k per year? What is the deliverable? What is the end? Should we go to a 75-25% plan? Why is this important?
 - i. Data linkage – checking the injury levels from the crash report.
 - ii. Need to look at the performance measures from previous years
 - iii. [Tabled for now](#) – [More info needed \(end goal, data linkage, etc.\)](#)
 - c. #15-04-01-11 CDOT “Users Database/Strategic Plan” reserve some funds for consultant
 - i. [Tabled for now - CDOT \(Charles Meyer/Rahim\) will be finalizing a scope of work taking into consideration comments from the Go-Team, previous scope of work from the 2008 Virtual Data Warehouse Project, etc.](#)
 - d. #15-04-01-03 Lafayette PD “Speed Monitoring/Matrix Message Trailer”
 - i. Unallowable funds for 405C (might go to HSO)
 - ii. Vote – [Motion Not Approved](#)
 - e. #15-04-01-05 Aurora PD “3D laser Scanner & PC to map crash scenes”
 - i. Vote – [Motion Not Approved](#) – already bought one for Aurora
 - f. #15-04-01-06 Broomfield PD “RMS E. Reporting”
 - i. Condition = has to be full service; submit electronically to DOR
 - ii. Vote – [Motion Approved](#)
 - g. #15-04-01-10 Thornton PD “Improved Data Reported in Crash Reports”
 - i. Unallowable – how does this improve crash data?
 - ii. Vote – [Motion Not Approved](#)
 - h. #15-04-01-12 CDOT “Traffic Records Program Support”
 - i. N/A
 - i. #15-04-01-13 CDOT “FARS Program Support”
 - i. N/A
 - j. #15-04-01-14 CDOT “Higher Ed Partnership Program”
 - i. No amount – [Tabled for now](#) – [Rahim will work w/MSU to finalize the SOW and the budget to present to STRAC for approval.](#)

Need to add to the 405C application requirements:

All equipment purchased with 405C Funds must be Made in America

Tabled items/next meeting’s agenda:

1. Revised crash report discussion (Barry)
2. New federal requirements for safety performance measures (short e-mail sent 3/24)
3. Traffic Records Assessment – [Rahim to send questions to appropriate agencies.](#)
4. Traffic Record Forum (October 26-29) – who is going? New people are best (Ted, Barry?) If interested, please write in.
5. Colorado’s Traffic Records Conference – this year?