



TRCC Strategic Planning Workshop

December 2, 2021
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM, Via Zoom

1



Strategic Planning Workshop Agenda

1. Overall Vision for the Plan
2. Data System Section Review:
 - a. Crash
 - b. Vehicle
 - c. Driver
 - d. Citation/Adjudication
 - e. Roadway
 - f. EMS/Injury Surveillance
3. Plan Gaps:
 - a. Completing the Data System Sections
 - b. Prioritization
4. Action Plan for Completion

2

1. Overall Vision for the Plan

- a. Work with Data Systems to complete the data system sections in the Plan.
- b. Develop a project prioritization process that is utilized by the TRCC to select TRCC projects.
- c. Share plan draft for review and revisions and conduct a review workshop with the TRCC EC.
- d. Finalize the plan and conduct a sign-off session.
- e. Use the Plan!!

3

2. Data System Review

Each Data System Section has the following items:

1. Strategic Goal
2. Recommendations (based on the 2021 Self-Assessment)
3. System Statistics
4. System Attribute Status
5. Goals and Objectives
6. Performance Measures
7. Traffic Records Improvement Projects
8. Accomplishments
9. Coordinators

4

| Crash System Section | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Item | Status | Action Items |
| Strategic Goal | ✓Complete | |
| Recommendations | ✓Complete | |
| System Statistics | Provided | Coordinator will format this into the Plan. |
| System Attribute Status | Draft provided, being revised | The Crash team will revise |
| Goals and Objectives | Being revised | The Crash team will update |
| Performance Measures | Measures provided for Timeliness, Completeness, and Accuracy | Work with crash system to determine if other measures are relevant. |
| Traffic Records Improvement Projects | ✓Complete | |
| Accomplishments | Completed for 2020 | Will update for 2021 |
| Coordinators | ✓Complete | |

| Vehicle System Section | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Item | Status | Action Items |
| Strategic Goal | ✓Complete | |
| Recommendations | ✓Complete | |
| System Statistics | ✓Complete | |
| System Attribute Status | ✓Complete | |
| Goals and Objectives | ✓Complete | |
| Performance Measures | None provided | OMV will determine if measures possible with the modernization of the vehicle registration system |
| Traffic Records Improvement Projects | Projects are listed and section is complete. | Review/revise if needed in 2022 |
| Accomplishments | Completed for 2020 | Will update for 2021 |

| Driver System Section | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Item | Status | Action Items |
| Strategic Goal | ✓Complete | |
| Recommendations | ✓Complete | |
| System Statistics | ✓Complete | |
| System Attribute Status | ✓Complete | |
| Goals and Objectives | ✓Complete | |
| Performance Measures | None provided | OMV will determine measures possible with the modernization of the driver system. |
| Traffic Records Improvement Projects | Projects are listed and section is complete. | Review/revise if needed in 2022 |
| Accomplishments | Completed for 2020 | Will update for 2021 |
| Coordinators | ✓Complete | |

| Citation/Adjudication System Section | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Item | Status | Action Items |
| Strategic Goal | ✓Complete | |
| Recommendations | ✓Complete | Data System will review/finalize |
| System Statistics | Not developed | Coordinator will work with data system to complete. |
| System Attribute Status | Not provided | Coordinator will work with data system to complete. |
| Goals and Objectives | ✓Complete | |
| Performance Measures | Timeliness, Completeness, and Performance Target Provided | Work with citation system to determine if other measures are relevant. |
| Traffic Records Improvement Projects | Projects are listed and section is complete. | Review/revise if needed in 2022 |
| Accomplishments | Completed for 2020 | Will update for 2021 |
| Coordinators | ✓Complete | |

| Roadway System Section | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Item | Status | Action Items |
| Strategic Goal | ✓ Complete | |
| Recommendations | Under Review | Roadway Team will review and revise as needed. |
| System Statistics | Developing | Team will create relevant Roadway System Stats. |
| System Attribute Status | Developing | Team is completing. |
| Goals and Objectives | ✓ Complete | |
| Performance Measures | Developing Baselines for 3 measures | Team provided language for measures and is developing baselines |
| Traffic Records Improvement Projects | None noted | Work with Roadway Team to develop. |
| Accomplishments | Completed for 2020 | Will update for 2021 |
| Coordinators | ✓ Complete | Review and Revise for 2020 |

9

| EMS/Injury System Section | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Item | Status | Action Items |
| Strategic Goal | ✓ Complete | |
| Recommendations | ✓ Complete | Data System will review/finalize |
| System Statistics | Not developed | Coordinator will work with injury systems to complete. |
| System Attribute Status | ✓ Complete | |
| Goals and Objectives | ✓ Complete | |
| Performance Measures | Completeness, and a Performance Target from the EMS System are provided | Work with injury system to determine if other measures are relevant. |
| Traffic Records Improvement Projects | Projects are listed and section is complete. | Review/revise if needed in 2022 |
| Accomplishments | Completed for 2020 | Will update for 2021 |
| Coordinators | ✓ Complete | Review/revise for 2022 |

10

3. Plan Gaps

What is our plan missing?

- a. Completing Data System Sections, this includes performance measures.
- b. We have a robust Project Prioritization section in the Plan but is not being implemented.
- c. The overall plan lacks TRCC review, input, and revisions.

11

a. Data System Sections - Performance Measures

| DATA SYSTEM | PERFORMANCE ATTRIBUTE | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|------------|-------------|---------------|
| | TIMELINESS | ACCURACY | COMPLETENESS | UNIFORMITY | INTEGRATION | ACCESSIBILITY |
| CRASH | 4 | 2 | 9 | — | — | — |
| VEHICLE | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DRIVER | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ROADWAY | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CITATION/ ADJUDICATION* | 1 | — | 1 | — | — | — |
| EMS/INJURY* | — | — | 1 | — | — | — |

*We also have a performance target for this data system.

12

b. Prioritization – *What’s in our plan?*

- Projects must address one or more of the six data systems.
- Projects must address one or more of the six data attributes.
- A New Project Funding Proposal Request Form.
- A four-box analysis to determine the anticipated “payoff” while also considering the cost/effort of the project.

13

b. Prioritization – *What is NHTSA’s Guidance?*

- Project Funding Proposal Request Form (this is a template for our form).
- Guidance to conduct a “four-box” analysis to determine the anticipated “payoff” while also considering the cost/effort of the project.
- Explanation of the Modified Delphi Technique that guide a process of project presentations, first round discussions and ballots, second round discussions and ballots, and the final decision.
- A project prioritization template that considers goals, objectives, funding amounts, cost/difficulty, benefits, and sets priorities.

14

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Alabama:

- The TSIS, Traffic Safety Information System, created a plan to organize projects and set them to specifications or requirements for each category.
- Their plans are organized under the six data systems and will address the critical needs listed.
- The implementation of projects will be prioritized to the effect on measurable performance metrics.

15

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Colorado:

- There is a formal process which the State Traffic Records Advisory Committee, STRAC, annually undertakes to approve, conditionally approve, or reject projects and further provide rankings when projects exceed funding.
- The overall criteria are that proposed 405c projects must improve Colorado's traffic records systems.
- If they meet the afore mentioned criteria and meet the goals of this Strategic Plan, then the projects are usually accepted if funding is available.
- If the STRAC believes the project cost is too high an investment for the return, or it only helps the sponsoring agency internally, then the proposed project is rejected or sent back to the applicant with restrictions or request for clarifications.
- As a general rule, a four-box analysis is conducted for each proposal received

16

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Connecticut:

- The TRCC reviews each system’s deficiencies and developed goals, projects, and tasks to address the deficiencies as they relate to the goal of the state’s traffic records system.
- The TRCC considers the **Degree of Difficulty**: *How difficult is the project in terms of: Infrastructure, Inter-Agency, and Policy* and scoring each request: 5 –Not Difficult, 4 –Somewhat Difficult, 3 –Difficult, 2 –Very Difficult, and 1 – Unattainable.
- Then determines the **Impact**: *How significant will the project impact the Traffic Safety Information System if successful*: 5 –Very Significant Impact, 4 –Significant Impact, 3 –Somewhat Significant Impact, 2 –No Significant Impact, and 1 –No Impact.

17

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Connecticut:

- Next, the TRCC considers **Cost**: *How expensive will the Project be (include life cycle cost in the estimate)*: 5 –Less than \$200K, 4 –More than \$200K, but less than \$500K, 3 –More than \$500K, 2 –More than \$500K, but less than \$1.0M, and 1 –Over \$1.0M.
- Last the TRCC determines **Measurable Progress**: *Will the Project show measurable progress during the 1st year of funding*: 5 –Significant Measurable Progress, 4 –Measurable Progress, 3 –Somewhat Measurable Progress, 2 –No Measurable Progress, and 1 –No Progress

18

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Maryland:

- Projects overseen by the TRCC, especially those receiving federal grant funding, will be prioritized using a points system and Four Box Analysis process.
- Points for each project are to be assigned using the following questions:
 1. How difficult is the project in terms of infrastructure, territorial, and policy issues?
 2. How significant will the project impact TSIS if successful?
 3. How expensive will the project be? (a weighted cost x reliability of estimate maybe appropriate)
 4. Are improvements to one system necessary in order to better another?

19

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Maryland:

Table 2: Four Box Analysis

| | |
|--|--|
| High Payoff- Low Risk or Cost Good Opportunity High Priority | High Payoff – High Risk or Cost Moderate Opportunity Middle Priority |
| Low Payoff – Low Risk or Cost Moderate Opportunity Middle Priority | Low Payoff – High Risk or Cost Poor Opportunity Low Priority |

20

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Montana:

- The methodology for prioritizing the projects is simple. Each project has a number of attributes that can impact their perceived priority: project status and health, traffic records systems involved, project dependencies, available funding, and lead agency priority.
- In order to keep the process simple and flexible, a three-tiered prioritization of projects was agreed upon with the following generic definitions followed:
 - High Priority** – Project is currently active, impacts multiple traffic records systems, has other projects dependent on its implementation, and/or the lead agency considers it a high priority.
 - Medium Priority** – Project is not currently active, the start date is in the near future, may affect multiple traffic records systems, may have other projects dependent on its implementation, and/or the lead agency considers it a medium priority.
 - Low Priority** – Project is not currently active, the start date is far in the future, influences very few other traffic records systems, does not have other projects dependent on its implementation, and/or the lead agency considers it a low priority.

21

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Montana:

- Each voting member of the TRCC is polled to determine their opinion of the priority for each project.
- The majority of votes for a particular priority is accepted.
- If any member believes the majority of votes do not provide the correct priority, the group can discuss the project, followed by a re-vote.
- Priorities will be reviewed and may change as projects begin, stall, end, gain other funding, loose funding, or as needed

22

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

Nevada:

The TRCC prioritized to ensure that there was documented progress towards implementation Nevada’s strategies. The following priority level was applied to each strategy:

Priority 1: Top priority and can have significant process in one year.

Priority 2: Top priority but is anticipated to take longer than one year.

Priority 3: Secondary priority and can have significant progress in one year.

Priority 4: Secondary priority and is anticipated to take longer than one year.

23

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

North Carolina:

— All strategies or projects included are considered important to both the short-term and long-term success of the NC TRCC, each agency and North Carolina.

— Each initiative will have measurable benefits.

— In addition to addressing data systems, data collection, the technical ability to link data or systems, or other technical components, some projects may focus on increasing the general knowledge, understanding, or marketability of the data

24

b. Prioritization – *Examples from other States?*

North Carolina:

- Projects demonstrating the results of a successful NC TRCC partnership should also be considered.
- The NC TRCC also recognizes that many projects or strategies will be easier to implement and may yield high payoff and have few obstacles to achieve relatively quick success.
- If resources become available to the NC TRCC, typically in the form of grants or possibly through the NC ECHS, a process should be in place to select these projects.

25

b. Prioritization

We have plenty of great ideas on prioritization but how do we put what is on paper into action?

- Establish a TRCC Project Review Committee
- The Project Review Committee can finalize, implement, and ensure adherence to the TRCC's prioritization process.
- The Committee will vet projects and make funding recommendations to the TRCC Executive Committee based on the merits of each funding request.
- The Committee can also eliminate funding requests that do not meet 405(c) funding criteria.

26

4. Action Plan for Completion

- Revise and share plan draft with the TRCC Following this meeting by January 7, 2022.
- Work with Data Systems to complete their input for the Data System Sections of the Plan. This may include additional data system meetings. Target completion date is February 15, 2022.
- Conduct Executive Committee Review of the Plan draft by March 30, 2022.

27

4. Action Plan for Completion

- Conduct TRCC Executive Committee final review and sign-off session by May 20, 2022.
- Prepare and submit finalized Plan to LHSC by May 30, 2022 (the Plan is due to NHTSA by the end of June each year).

28

Contact Information

Karla Houston, TRCC Coordinator

Email: karlahouston@lsu.edu



latrcc.lsu.edu
225.578.7057
225.933.1616