State of Utah
Traffic Records Strategic Plan for FFY2027

April 30, 2026

State Traffic Safety Information System Improvement

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary 6
2. Mission & Vision Statements 7
2.1 Mission Statement 7
2.2 Vision Statement 7
3. Traffic Records Coordinating Committee 8
3.1 Traffic Records Improvement Program Coordinator 8
3.2 UTRCC Committee Members 8
3.3 Past UTRCC Meetings 11
3.4 Future UTRCC Meeting Schedule 11
3.5 NHTSA Traffic Records Assessment 11
4. Traffic Records Strategic Plan 12
4.1 Utah Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (UTRCC) 12
4.1.1 UTRCC Overview 12
4.1.2 Recommendations for Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management from the NHTSA Assessment 13
4.1.3 Goals for UTRCC 13
4.1.4 Strategic Planning Overview 14
4.1.5 Recommendations for Strategic Planning from the NHTSA Assessment 14
4.1.6 Goals for Strategic Planning 14
4.2 Utah Traffic Records Data Systems Overview 16
4.2.1 Data Use & Integration Overview 17
4.2.2 Recommendations for Data Use & Integration from the NHTSA Assessment 17
4.2.3 Goals for Data Use & Integration 17
4.3 Crash Data System Plan 19
4.3.1 System Overview 19
4.3.2 Crash Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment 20
4.3.3 Crash Goals 21
4.4 Vehicle Data System Plan 25
4.4.1 System Overview 25
4.4.2 Vehicle Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment 26

4.4.3 Vehicle Goals 26
4.5 Driver Data System Plan 29
4.5.1 System Overview 29
4.5.2 Driver Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment 30
4.5.3 Driver Goals 30
4.6 Roadway Data System Plan 32
4.6.1 System Overview 32
4.6.2 Roadway Recommendations from NHTSA Assessment 33
4.6.3 Roadway Goals 33
4.7 Citation/Adjudication Data System Plan 36
4.7.1 System Overview 36
4.7.2 Citation/Adjudication Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment 37
4.7.3 Citation/Adjudication Goals 37
4.8 Injury Surveillance Data System Plan 40
4.8.1 System Overview 40
Pre-Hospital Data System 40
Statewide Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge Data Systems 40
Statewide Trauma Data System 41
Vital Records Data System 41
4.8.2 Injury Surveillance Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment 41
4.8.3 EMS/Injury Surveillance Goals 42
5. Progress 44
5.1 Traffic Records Performance Measures 44
5.1.1 Crash Timeliness – Received within 30 days 44
5.1.2 Crash Timeliness – FARS 46
5.1.3 Crash Timeliness – MCMIS 48
5.1.4 Crash Timeliness – Crash Geolocation 49
5.1.5 Crash Timeliness – Alcohol/Drug Test Results 52
5.1.6 Citation Timeliness – Citations within 5 days 53
5.1.7 Trauma Registry Timeliness – Median Days 56
5.1.8 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Pre-Hospital 57

5.1.9 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Trauma Registry 58
5.1.10 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Emergency Room 59
5.1.11 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Hospital Discharge 60
5.1.12 Crash Completeness – First Harmful Event (Unknown/Blanks) 61
5.1.13 Crash Completeness – Crash Severity (Unknown/Blanks) 63
5.1.14 Crash Completeness – Manner of Collision (Unknown/Blanks) 65
5.1.15 Roadway Completeness – Missing Route/Milepost data 66
5.1.16 Injury Surveillance Uniformity –Pre-Hospital (NEMSIS) 67
5.1.17 Crash Uniformity – MMUCC 5 68
5.1.18 Driver Integration – Driver/Crash 70
5.1.19 Citation Integration – Citation/Crash 71
5.1.20 Roadway Integration – Roadway/Crash 72
5.1.21 Injury Surveillance Integration –Pre-Hospital/Trauma Registry 74
5.1.22 Crash/Citation Accessibility –DDACTS Mapping Tool 75
5.1.23 Crash Accessibility –UDOT Data Requests 76
6. Traffic Records Data Standards Compliance 77
6.1 Model Inventory of Roadway Elements (MIRE) Compliance 77
6.1.1 MIRE Data Collection Status 77
6.1.2 Data Collection Methodology 80
6.1.3 Coordination with Other Agencies 81
6.1.4 Prioritization of MIRE Fundamental Data Elements Collection 81
6.1.5 Costs and Resources for MIRE FDE Data Collection 82
6.2 Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) Compliance 82
6.3 National Emergency Medical Services Information System (NEMSIS) Compliance 82
6.4 National Trauma Data Standard (NTDS) Compliance 82
6.5 National Information Exchange Model (MIEM) Compliance 82
7. Technical Assistance and Data System Training 83
7.1 Data System Training 83
7.1.1 Roadway 83
7.1.2 Driver 83
7.1.3 EMS 83

7.1.4 Crash 84
7.1.5 Citation 84
7.1.6 Vehicle 84
7.2 Technical Assistance 84
7.2.1 Crash Data Improvement Program (CDIP) 84
7.2.2 NHTSA MMUCC Mapping 84

Utah Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (UTRCC) Strategic Plan Endorsement

Representatives of the Utah Traffic Records Coordinating Committee have reviewed the Utah Traffic Information Systems Strategic Plan and endorse the plan.

Barbra Freeman **04/30/2026**

Barbra Freeman, State Traffic Records Coordinator Date

Traffic Records Program Manager

Utah Department of Public Safety, Highway Safety Office

Utah Traffic Records Strategic Plan

1. Executive Summary

The Utah Traffic Records Information Systems Strategic Plan serves as a guiding document for Utah's Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (UTRCC). This strategic plan provides a guide for Utah's traffic records information community to work towards increasing the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, integration, accessibility, and uniformity of Utah's traffic records data systems.

Utah's traffic records data systems include crash, citation/adjudication, vehicle, driver, roadway, and injury surveillance. Utah's traffic safety community uses data from these systems to provide the insight and analysis required to reduce motor vehicle crashes, injuries, and deaths.

The Utah traffic records strategic goals and related performance measures contained in this document are based upon the recommendations and findings from the NHTSA-sponsored traffic records assessment completed in January 2024.

Using the assessment results to drive discussions, the Utah TRCC held workshops to develop goals, strategies, and the expected improvement outcomes for each traffic records data system (see Section 4 of this document). The UTRCC reviewed and responded to each assessment recommendation and will use the strategic goals to plan improvements to the traffic records data systems over the course of the next five plan years. During this process, the UTRCC members provided direction and feedback on the focus of the goals and objectives using their diverse expertise and experience in each of the traffic safety-related areas.

Progress during this plan year includes a substantial increase in crash data analysis capabilities. This increase was achieved by revising the State's crash report form and increasing its compliance to national crash data guidelines (e.g. Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC)).

The Utah TRCC's plans for next year include increasing the integration of Utah's crash data with citation, adjudication, EMS, and vehicle data via the Utah Transportation and Public Safety Crash Data Initiative (UTAPS-CDI) system. UTAPS-CDI currently integrates crash and roadway data. With the addition of citation, adjudication EMS and Vehicle data, the UTAPS-CDI will provide increased highway safety analysis capabilities to the Utah Highway Safety Office, the Utah Department of Transportation, and other highway safety analysts.

As with prior strategic plans, this plan will be reviewed by the UTRCC on an annual basis. Reviewing the plan annually provides an opportunity for committee members to revise project plans to better meet changes in organizational priorities, as well as any changes at the state or federal level.

Performance measures within this plan will be reviewed and updated annually to track performance of Utah's traffic records data systems. By doing so, the committee can ensure that data improvement projects are moving forward in a timely manner as prescribed by the State.

Any grant funds awarded under BIL, Section 405c shall be used to make quantifiable, measurable progress improvements in the accuracy, completeness, timeliness, uniformity, accessibility, or integration of data in a core highway safety database.

2. Mission & Vision Statements

2.1 Mission Statement

The Utah Traffic Records Coordinating Committee's mission is to bring together State agencies and highway safety stakeholders to encourage and coordinate improvements to the State's traffic records data systems.

These improvements will provide highway safety professionals the analysis they require to fulfill their mission to create awareness that inspires safe roadway behavior, ultimately reducing serious injuries and fatalities on Utah roads.

2.2 Vision Statement

The Utah Traffic Records Coordinating Committee's vision is to provide the highway safety community with advanced traffic records data systems that provide timely, accurate, and integrated analysis capabilities. The resulting analysis will enable the implementation of effective safety countermeasures that improve the safety of Utah's roadways.

3. Traffic Records Coordinating Committee

3.1 Traffic Records Improvement Program Coordinator

Name: Ms. Barbra Freeman
Title: Traffic Records Program Manager
Agency: Utah Highway Safety Office
Calvin Rampton Public Safety Complex
Address: 4499 South 2700 West, Building #3, 2nd Floor
City, Zip: Taylorsville, UT 84129
Phone: 801-783-7250
Email: bafreeman@utah.gov

3.2 UTRCC Committee Members

Name / Title	Agency	System Represented
Felicia Alvarez *EMS Data Manager*	Utah Department of Public Safety, EMS	EMS
Tucker Samuelsen *Director of Judicial Data & Research*	Administrative Office of the Courts	Citation
Sarah Ulrich *FARS Analyst*	Utah Department of Public Safety, Highway Safety Office	Crash
David Blauer *Program Manager*	Federal Motor Carrier Administration	Vehicle
Chelsey Burns *IT Manager*	DTS, Public Safety	All
Jimmy Higgs *Director*	Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division	Driver
Barbra Freeman *Traffic Records – Program Manager* *UTRCC Coordinator*	Utah Department of Public Safety, Highway Safety Office	All
Chad Thompson *IT Director*	DTS Public Safety	All
Tara Zamora *Bureau Chief*	Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division	Driver

Name / Title	Agency	System Represented
Diliya Berrett *IT Manager II*	DTS, Utah Tax Commission	Vehicle
Imer Desena *Data Architect/Program Manager*	University of Utah, College of Engineering	Crash, Driver, Roadway, Vehicle
David Garcia Division Administrator	Federal Motor Carrier Administration	Vehicle
Chris Whipple *Safety Programs Engineer*	Utah Department of Transportation	Crash, Roadway
Elise Tanner *Safety Data Analytics Manager*	Utah Department of Transportation	Crash, Roadway
Juan Medina *Research Analyst Professor*	University of Utah, College of Engineering	Crash, Driver, Roadway Vehicle
Patrick Cowley *Director*	Utah Department of Transportation	Roadway
Gary Mower *Assistant Program Manager*	Utah Department of Health and Human Services, Violence & Injury Prevention Program	Driver, Injury
Laura Ault *GIS Director*	DTS, UGRC/GIS	Crash, Roadway
Chad Sheppick *Director*	Utah Department of Transportation, Motor Carrier Division	Roadway, Vehicle
Robyn LaLumia *Director*	Utah Department of Public Safety, Highway Safety Office	All
Matt Slawson *Regional Toxicology Liaison*	NHTSA	Toxicology
Dave Cox *Safety & Operations Program Manager*	Federal Highway Administration	Roadway
Matt Spillman *Captain*	Utah Department of Public Safety, Utah Highway Patrol	Crash, Citation, Driver, Vehicle
Kathy Wilcox *Manager*	Utah Department of Public Safety, BCI	Crash, Citation, Driver Vehicle

Name / Title	Agency	System Represented
Marcus Yockey *Bureau Chief*	Utah Department of Public Safety, BCI	Crash, Citation, Driver, Vehicle
Lauralee Blue Supervisor	Utah Department of Public Safety, BCI	Crash, Citation, Driver, Vehicle
TBD *EMS Data Analyst*	Utah Department of Public Safety, EMS	EMS
Lana Moser Trama Regional Coordinator	University of Utah, School of Medicine	EMS, Injury
Monte Roberts Division Director	Motor Vehicle Division of the Utah State Tax Commission	Vehicle

3.3 Past UTRCC Meetings

Utah held UTRCC meetings on the following dates:

July 17, 2025

October 16, 2025

January 14, 2026

April 9, 2026

3.4 Future UTRCC Meeting Schedule

Future UTRCC meetings are scheduled for the first Thursday of the month on a quarterly basis. The following dates are:

July 9, 2026

October 8, 2026

January 14, 2026

3.5 NHTSA Traffic Records Assessment

The State completed a NHTSA Traffic Records Assessment on January 19, 2024. The State's responses to the recommendations are listed in Section 4. The related performance measures. and goals are also listed in Section 4.

4. Traffic Records Strategic Plan

4.1 Utah Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (UTRCC)

4.1.1 UTRCC Overview

The Utah Department of Public Safety, Highway Safety Office sponsors the Utah Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (UTRCC). The UTRCC is a multidisciplinary, interagency committee with membership from all six core traffic records data systems—crash, driver, vehicle, roadway, citation and adjudication, and injury surveillance.

The UTRCC is organized into three levels that include executive, technical, and working group members. The UTRCC has workgroups that are staffed by subject matter experts organized to address specific technical issues or lead traffic records improvement projects.

The UTRCC Technical Committee Chair and Coordinator is a representative of the Highway Safety Office. The committee is empowered to prepare and implement the Utah Traffic Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan. UTRCC meetings include open and candid discussions between the custodial agencies and State safety stakeholders.

The UTRCC's mission is to provide more timely, accurate, complete, uniform, integrated, and accessible data to the Utah traffic safety community. The UTRCC members represent stakeholders from the following areas:

- Highway safety
- Highway infrastructure
- State and Local Law enforcement
- Courts
- Public health and injury control
- Motor carrier agencies and organizations
- Drivers License
- Motor Vehicle
- Research organizations

The role and function of the UTRCC is:

- The UTRCC provides coordination amongst the various state agencies and stakeholders to develop, implement, and monitor improvements to the State's traffic records data systems.
- Review and approve the Utah Traffic Records Safety Information Systems Strategic Plan.
- Consider and coordinate the views of organizations in Utah that are involved in the administration, collection, and use of the highway safety data and traffic records system.

- Represent the interests of the agencies and organizations within the traffic records system to outside organizations.
- Review and evaluate new technologies to keep Utah's traffic records systems up to date.
- Promote the importance of technical assistance and training of traffic records data systems.

The UTRCC has been successful in supporting the development, monitoring, and reporting of performance measures for the crash, roadway, driver, vehicle, citation and adjudication, and injury surveillance systems. The UTRCC encourages individual data system managers to implement performance measures for their respective systems and report those measures to the UTRCC.

4.1.2 Recommendations for Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management from the NHTSA Assessment

There were no Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management recommendations from Utah's Traffic Records Assessment that was conducted on January 19, 2024.

4.1.3 Goals for UTRCC

UTRCC Goal 1. Develop performance measures to improve the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the State's traffic records data.

Strategy: Develop performance measures for each traffic records data system that identifies areas where timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility can be improved.

Outcome: By tracking system performance using NHTSA-defined performance measures, data system managers can track the data quality and performance of their data systems.

Activity: Ongoing- Progress has been made in increasing the number of performance measures.

UTRCC Goal 2: Conduct a technical assistance and training needs assessment for traffic records data system users.

Strategy: At least once per year, the UTRCC will include an agenda item and host a discussion on traffic records data system training needs. This discussion will identify training and technical assistance needs. Additionally, a Technical Assistance and Training section will be added to the Traffic Records Strategic Plan.

Outcome: A better understanding of existing training resources can be used to develop improvements to training and technical assistance. These improvements will result in increased quality of highway safety analysis source data.

Activity: Ongoing.

UTRCC Goal 3: The UTRCC will investigate the requirements for a Data Quality Control program for traffic records data systems.

Strategy: The UTRCC will provide a framework for discussions on implementing data quality control programs for each data system with the objective of improving data across quantitative and qualitative dimensions. The UTRCC will investigate requesting a NHTSA Go Team to assist in developing a Data Quality Control Program for the State's traffic records data systems.

Outcome: Improved timeliness, accuracy, uniformity, accessibility, integration, and completeness of the traffic records data systems.

Activity: Ongoing.

4.1.4 Strategic Planning Overview

The Utah UTRCC prioritizes its projects and works with other federal agencies to increase data sharing. The State works with State and local agencies to improve traffic records systems and training of staff on those systems.

4.1.5 Recommendations for Strategic Planning from the NHTSA Assessment

There were no Strategic Planning recommendations from the Utah's Traffic Records Assessment that was conducted on January 19, 2024.

4.1.6 Goals for Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning Goal 1: The UTRCC will solicit lifecycle costs and plans as part of the project submission process.

Strategy: The UTRCC will consider lifecycle costs during the project selection and prioritization process, and these costs within the traffic records strategic plan.

Outcome: The costs of data improvement projects' lifecycle maintenance will be accounted for to ensure the traffic records system continues to function even in the absence of Federal grant funds.

Activity: Planned

Strategic Planning Goal 2: Include the project selection and prioritization methodology within the traffic records strategic plan.

Strategy: The UTRCC will document the project selection and prioritization method used within the traffic records strategic plan.

Outcome: The project selection and prioritization methodology will be formalized and documented within the traffic records strategic plan.

Activity: Planned.

4.2 Utah Traffic Records Data Systems Overview

The Utah Traffic Records Data system is comprised of various discrete data systems. These individual data systems span the driver, vehicle, citation/adjudication, crash, roadway, and several injury surveillance data sets (Pre-Hospital, Emergency Department, Hospital Discharge, Trauma Registry, and Vital Records).

Additionally, Utah has a traffic records data warehouse that draws from several of these data systems to centrally house and integrate various data sets into a combined traffic records data set that provides enhanced analysis capabilities to highway safety analysts.

The following table details each system along with any applicable comments

Data System	System Name	Host Agency	Remarks
Traffic Records Warehouse	UTAPS	University of Utah	Includes Crash, Citation/Adjudication, Roadway, EMS/Injury, Vehicle
Driver	Driver License Database	Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division	
Vehicle	Vehicle and Dealers Registration System (VADRS)	State Tax Commission and Department of Technology Services	
Citation	Traffic	Department of Public Safety	Law Enforcement System
Citation (Adjudication)	Courts Information System (CORIS)	Administrative Office of the Courts	Courts System
Crash	Traffic	Department of Public Safety	Law Enforcement System
Roadway	UTRANS/ARNOLD	Department of Transportation	
Pre-Hospital Data System (EMS)	Elite	Department of Public Safety, Bureau of EMS and Preparedness	NEMSIS 3.4 compliant
Statewide Emergency	Emergency Department Encounter Database	Utah Department of Health, Office of Health Care Statistics	

Data System	System Name	Host Agency	Remarks
Department Data System			
Statewide Hospital Discharge Data System	Healthcare Facility Database	Office of Health Care Statistics, Utah Department of Health	
Trauma Registry	Utah Trauma Registry	Department of Public Safety, Bureau of EMS and Preparedness	National Trauma Data Standard (NTDS) compliant
Vital Records	SILVER	Department of Health, Office of Vital Records and Statistics	

4.2.1 Data Use & Integration Overview

Utah decision-makers have access to data and personnel to help them use the data from the individual data systems. The Utah Department of Public Safety, Highway Safety Office hosts online workbooks with crash statistics and dashboards that are available to highway safety stakeholders and the public. If additional information is needed, a request may be sent to the Traffic Records Program Manager.

The Traffic Records Strategic Plan includes details on data integration with the inclusion of performance measures and status updates. The UTAPS system integrates efforts to manage the crash data in the State for safety improvement purposes. The system integrates crash, roadway, citation, adjudication, GIS datasets, vehicle and EMS/injury data. UTAPS primary users are direct stakeholders (i.e. UHP, DPS, UDOT) and third-party users approved by the State.

The University of Utah has run a premier Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System (CODES) project for many years. Those analysts and statisticians are available to decision-makers and the public to fill applicable data sets.

There are interfaces between the crash-driver and crash-vehicle systems that allow for dynamic exchange of information through UCJIS. Crash and roadway data sets are linked at the Department of Transportation and in UTAPS. EMS, Vehicle, and Adjudication data are in the initial stages of linking with crash data through the UTAPS interface.

4.2.2 Recommendations for Data Use & Integration from the NHTSA Assessment

There were no Data Use & Integration recommendations from the Utah's Traffic Records Assessment that was conducted on January 19, 2024

4.2.3 Goals for Data Use & Integration

Data Use & Integration Goal 1: The UTRCC will encourage and facilitate discussions on improving Traffic Records data access, data security, and data integration.

Strategy: Add a section to the UTRCC agendas to provide a discussion platform for data access, data security, and data integration efforts. The agencies responsible for each data system will provide updates on any related activities.

Outcome: The UTRCC discussions will identify areas of improvement as it relates to data access, data security, and data integration.

Activity: The UTRCC has experienced greater participation from traffic records stakeholders that has resulted in increased cooperation and discussions amongst the various data systems.

4.3 Crash Data System Plan

4.3.1 System Overview

The Utah Department of Public Safety has responsibility for the statewide law enforcement crash repository. This system collects crash reports statewide that are then transmitted to an analysis system at the University of Utah.

The Utah Transportation and Public Safety Crash Data Initiative (UTAPS-CDI) is a statewide crash analysis system managed by the University of Utah, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering. UTAPS-CDI receives 100 percent of the State's crash reports nightly from the Department of Public Safety's crash system but does not receive Native American (i.e. Navajo Nation, Shiprock, and various other tribes) crash reports.

The Department of Public Safety's crash data collection system has a robust system of edit checks and/or validation specifications that help to ensure that the data coming into the system from the field are correct and complete. There are approximately 200 edit/validation checks that ensure accurate and complete entry of crash reports by officers in the field. The statewide crash repository includes further auditing features that provide cross-field validations. Data analysts have the ability to run agency-specific reports.

In FY2024, Utah updated the State crash report to increase MMUCC 6 compliance. Utah updated and combined both the crash data dictionary and the instruction manual into one document the new document is now labeled as (Utah Crash Report Data Dictionary and DI-9 Instruction Manual) and is available on the Utah Highway Safety Office website.

The Utah Highway Safety Office and the Utah Highway Patrol are responsible for crash report training in the State. The Highway Safety Office's Traffic Records Program Manager and the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Data Analyst provide onsite and virtual training sessions to law enforcement agencies. These sessions are part of the data quality control and assurance process and instruct officers on the proper methods of completing a crash report. Additionally, the Utah Highway Patrol provides Intermediate and Advanced training to municipal, county, and state law enforcement.

Utah Department of Public Safety's Highway Safety Office (HSO) has a section of their website dedicated to Utah Crash Data and Statistics dashboards that provide help to visualize and share crash data with shareholders and the public. Each of these dashboards focuses on specific traffic safety factors and provides users with detailed, filterable information regarding each emphasis area.

The combination of UTAPS-CDI and the HSO Crash Data and Statistics dashboards provide highway safety stakeholders with the information they require to focus engineering and enforcement efforts in areas with the greatest crash risk.

4.3.2 Crash Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment

The following crash recommendations are from Utah's Traffic Records Assessment conducted on January 19, 2024.

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

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   See related Performance Measures:

   - Section 5.1.11 Crash Completeness – First Harmful Event (Unknown/Blanks)
   - Section 5.1.12 Crash Completeness – Crash Severity (Unknown/Blanks)
   - Section 5.1.13 Crash Completeness – Manner of Collision (Unknown/Blanks)

   See related Crash Goal 15 in Section 4.3.3.

2. *Improve the interfaces with the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   See related Performance Measure:

   See related Crash Goal 9 in Section 4.3.3 and Data Use & Integration Goal 1 in Section 4.2.3.

4.3.3 Crash Goals

Crash Goal 1: Update the Crash data dictionary and the DI-9 instruction manual to be compliant with the latest Utah crash form.

Strategy: The Utah DPS, in coordination with the University of Utah, will develop a Crash data dictionary and DI-9 instruction manual into one document for the UTAPS-CDI crash statewide repository. This effort will use the MMUCC 6 based crash form as a reference for the development of the crash data dictionary.

Outcome: Create/Update the Crash Report Data Dictionary and DI-9 Instruction Manual for the crash system that includes the variable names and definitions including characteristics, values, limitations, and exceptions. The manual will provide detailed information about the contents of the crash dataset. This will provide a document that is consistently formatted and contains what is needed for others to understand and analyze the crash data.

Activity: Accomplished.

Crash Goal 2: Incorporate system edit checks and validation rules into the Crash data dictionary.

Strategy: The Utah DPS will incorporate system edit checks and validation rules into the Crash Report Data Dictionary and DI-9 Instruction Manual for the crash statewide repository. This effort will document the existing edit checks and validation rules currently being used in the law enforcement data collection systems.

Outcome: Utah Crash Report Data Dictionary and DI-9 Instruction Manual for the crash system that includes all the business rules required for complete, uniform, and accurate crash data. This update to the data dictionary can be used as an authoritative source for system development, analysis, and training efforts.

Activity: Accomplished.

Crash Goal 3: Convene an annual UTRCC Crash Form Working Group comprised of crash data system stakeholders to review crash form updates and identify other crash related improvements.

Strategy: In order to accommodate evolving crash analysis requirements, the UTRCC will form a Crash Form Working group that will meet annually to review the current crash form and investigate crash form and system improvement opportunities.

Outcome: A crash form and data system that is compliant with the latest standards and is satisfying the analysis needs of the highway safety community.

Activity: Continued.

Crash Goal 4: Update the State of Utah Fatality Analysis Reporting System Procedure Manual.

Strategy: The Highway Safety Office will perform a review and update the State of Utah Fatality Analysis Reporting System Procedure Manual every year in October.

Outcome: By performing periodic reviews and updates to the manual, the State will ensure that the procedures manual is kept consistent with evolving collection and reporting requirements.

Activity: Continued.

Crash Goal 5: Encourage Native American agencies to submit electronic crash data to the statewide crash repository.

Strategy: The DPS Task Force Native American liaison will discuss with Native American agencies regarding submission of crash report data to the statewide crash repository. UDOT will provide support in this effort and will assist in identifying limitations and constraints.

The UTRCC will encourage and assist Native American agencies in applying for federal funds to improve their crash data collection and submission process.

Outcome: A more complete and representative crash dataset that represents all statewide crashes.

Activity: Planned.

Crash Goal 6: Incorporate GIS layers or API endpoints within DPS Traffic and third-party vendor crash data collection modules.

Strategy: Highway Safety and UDOT will identify opportunities for incorporating State GIS layers (e.g. roadway layers) and/or endpoints (web service-based geolocation endpoints tied to the UDOT roadway network) within the DPS Traffic and third-party vendor crash modules.

Outcome: By incorporating location assignment using UDOT roadway data within the data collection modules, crash locations will be more accurate and complete.

Activity: Planned.

Crash Goal 7: The UTRCC will improve the linkage of crash, citation and adjudication data to enhance highway safety analysis.

Strategy: The UTRCC will look for crash, citation, and adjudication linkage opportunities and discuss desired approaches to achieving this linkage.

Outcome: Linkage of crash, citation, and adjudication data will provide enhanced analysis capabilities that can be used for targeted enforcement and roadway improvements.

Activity: Accomplished.

Crash Goal 8: Develop an accuracy performance measure and target for crash geolocation assignments.

Strategy: Create a crash location accuracy performance measure and related target for the assigned crash geolocation values using the *NHTSA Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems*.

Outcome: A better understanding of the accuracy of the crash geolocation assignment process. This will identify where improvements can be realized and track the performance of the geolocation process over time.

Activity: Continued.

Crash Goal 9: Develop a MMUCC uniformity performance measure and target for the crash data system.

Strategy: Using the NHTSA-sponsored Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) mapping results, create a performance measure that tracks the uniformity of the Utah crash form to the MMUCC national crash data standard. Create a related target for this performance measure.

Outcome: Tracking the compliance level of the State's crash form to the national crash data standard can be used during future form revisions to add uniform data elements that enable valid statistical analysis.

Activity: Continued.

Crash Goal 10: UTAPS to provide performance metrics to law enforcement agencies.

Strategy: UTAPS will provide crash data performance metric feedback (e.g. timeliness, completeness) to agencies that submit crash data to the statewide crash database.

Outcome: Improved feedback to law enforcement agencies will allow them to identify root causes of submission delays and data quality issues.

Activity: Planned.

Crash Goal 11: The Highway Safety Office to provide feedback to law enforcement agencies on crash data narratives.

Strategy: The Traffic Records Team will provide crash data feedback (completeness of crash narratives) to agencies that submit crash data to the statewide crash database.

Outcome: Improved feedback to law enforcement agencies will allow them to improve all crash report narratives that are submitted to the statewide crash database.

Activity: Continued.

Crash Goal 12: Implement sample-based audits of crash data.

Strategy: UDOT will continue to implement sample-based crash data audits using UTAPS as the data source. At a minimum, these audits should occur on an annual basis.

Outcome: Periodic, independent sample-based audits of crash data can be used to identify opportunities for system or procedural improvements. They can also be used to generate new training content, update manuals, update validation rules, and prompt form revisions.

Activity: Continued.

Crash Goal 13: Provide annual Crash system data quality reports to the UTRCC.

Strategy: UDOT and UTAPS will provide annual crash data system quality management updates to the UTRCC.

Outcome: The UTRCC and crash data stakeholders will be aware of data quality issues and can plan for improvements to address these issues.

Activity: Continued.

4.4 Vehicle Data System Plan

4.4.1 System Overview

The State of Utah Vehicle and Dealer Registration System (VADRS) is used to process vehicle titling and registration transactions and is administered by the Motor Vehicle Division of the Utah State Tax Commission.

The majority of vehicle titling and registration transactions are conducted by tax commission clerks. VADRS terminals are used by tax commission employees to process transactions in real time. Data entered into VADRS is validated through field and logical edits as well as using third party vendor software to confirm Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) information. Non-compliant VINs are manually entered and matched against the MSO (manufacturer statement of origin) or out of state title. VADRS data elements and structures are defined in the VADRS data dictionary. VADRS users are provided training manuals to assist them in processing vehicle title and registration transactions.

The VADRS vehicle data system is not linked to the Driver License Division's Driver License Database.

Utah participates in the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) through real time queries while conducting vehicle title transactions. Utah title information is sent to NMVTIS when the title is issued. Additionally, all vehicle title and registration transactions are run through NCIC every 15 minutes. Vehicle title brands and brand history from other states are retained as a part of the Utah vehicle record.

Utah participates in PRISM for vehicles in the International Registration Program (IRP) by sending IRP records. PRISM sends back a record set of all targeted VINs and carriers. Vehicle information is available to law enforcement personnel to complete crash forms, citations, and motor carrier vehicle inspection reports via queries from either in-car data terminals or police communications facilities. Additionally, vehicle registration documents contain AAMVA PDF417 barcoded information allowing for rapid data collection by law enforcement equipped with bar code reading technology.

The Utah Motor Vehicle Division maintains the VADRS Step by Step Manual User's Manual, the Motor Carrier Step by Step Manual, the IRP Self Plate Step by Step Manual, the MVP New Title/Registration Step by Step Manual, the DMV Policies and Procedures Manual and the Special Group Plate Guide.

These manuals document the collection, reporting, and posting procedures for registration, title, and title brand information.

VADRS incorporates functionality for receiving user feedback to identify problems and receive ideas for improvement, detecting high frequency errors to identify issues, and long-term trend analyses.

4.4.2 Vehicle Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment

The following Vehicle recommendations are from Utah's Traffic Records Assessment conducted on January 19, 2024.

1. *Improve the data quality control program for the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   Related Performance Measure: N/A

   See related Vehicle Goal 3 in Section 4.4.3.

2. *Improve the interfaces with the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   See related Performance Measure in Section 5.1.3 Crash Timeliness – MCMIS.

   See related Vehicle Goal 5 in Section 4.4.3.

4.4.3 Vehicle Goals

Vehicle Goal 1: Implement sample-based audits of all vehicle records.

Strategy: Currently, Utah Motor Vehicle Division audits a random sample of third-party transactions; however, internal transactions are not audited. The UTRCC recommends that all vehicle records are periodically audited.

Outcome: Data quality audits will ensure that procedures are being followed and that procedures cover all existing processes.

Activity: Planned.

Vehicle Goal 2: Provide annual Vehicle system data quality reports to the UTRCC.

Strategy: Motor Vehicle Division will provide annual vehicle data system quality management updates to the UTRCC.

Outcome: The UTRCC and vehicle data stakeholders will be aware of data quality issues and can plan for improvements to address these issues.

Activity: Continued.

Vehicle Goal 3: Develop a Vehicle Accuracy performance measure and target.

Strategy: Develop a Vehicle accuracy performance measure and related targets that track the accuracy of one or more of the following data elements: Vehicle Identification Number, Current registration status, Motor carrier name, Commercial or non-CMV Motor carrier ID, State of registration, Title brands, State of title.

Outcome: A better understanding of the accuracy of critical Vehicle data elements. This will identify where improvements can be realized and provide the ability to track performance of the Vehicle data system over time.

Activity: Planned.

Vehicle Goal 4: Develop a Vehicle Integration performance measure and target.

Strategy: Develop a Vehicle integration performance measure and related target that compares titled vehicles against the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS). Title data is synchronized with NMVTIS every five years. NMVTIS provides an export of every Utah title in their system. Then, DMV compares the NMVTIS titles against VADRS titles and the discrepancies are counted and tracked.

Outcome: A better understanding of the integration between VADRS and NMVTIS title data sets. This will identify where improvements can be realized and provide the ability to track performance of the Vehicle data system over time.

Activity: Continued.

Vehicle Goal 5: Incorporate system auditing functionality within VADRS.

Strategy: Currently, system auditing is tracked via Excel spreadsheets, this effort will incorporate system auditing functionality directly within the VADRS system.

Outcome: Including system auditing directly within the VADRS system will increase the accessibility and use of system auditing.

Activity: Completed.

4.5 Driver Data System Plan

4.5.1 System Overview

The Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division developed and currently maintains the State's Driver License Database that complies with federal guidelines and contains records of commercial licenses. Exchanges of records and photographs with eligible entities take place according to NHTSA standards, incorporating the record from a previous State of licensure into its own driver history. Within the past two years, the Driver License Division has implemented the State Pointer Exchange Services (SPEXS) program that allows for easier transmission of driver's license data between states and allows for one driver, one license.

The driver system maintains licensed driver data including driver's license type (including commercial licenses), endorsements, restrictions, issuance dates, status, conviction history, DUI and drug arrests, crash involvement limited to cited incidents and instances of no insurance, and driver training history.

An interface exists between the Driver License Database and SPEXS, Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS), Commercial Driver's License Information System (CDLIS), the Social Security Online Verification (SSOLV), and the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlement (SAVE) systems. The Court's system provides all convictions (including DUI) electronically to the Driver License Database. Access to the driver data is provided to law enforcement via Utah Criminal Justice Information System (UCJIS). Courts may also access the driver data via UCJIS or it may be provided manually if requested via a certified record.

Utah is able to track DUI offenders; all DUI arrests are sent to the Driver License Database to be entered into the driver record. When a person is arrested an Administrative action can be performed prior to a conviction from the court. If the person is found guilty, the conviction is sent via electronic transfer to the Driver License Database. Arrests and convictions within the Driver License Database are retained on the driver history for 55 years in compliance with federal statutes. Arrests and convictions on the driver record sent to insurance companies, employers, and the driver will be provided a ten-year history. Other traffic infractions are limited to a three-year history.

Utah has developed external fraud prevention policies and procedures. Utah checks for anomalies by running demographic checks to ensure a driver does not possess multiple licenses within the Driver License Database.

Internal fraud prevention procedures include running reports of office and staff activities. The driver system limits user's permissions based on the user's role. The system enforces least privileged access to system functionality and data. The State provides an option to enforcement of data access policy violations with a Class B Misdemeanor.

4.5.2 Driver Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment

The following Driver recommendations are from the Utah's Traffic Records Assessment conducted on January 19, 2024.

1. *Improve the data dictionary for the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

   State does not plan to implement. There is no driver system data dictionary in and of itself. However, the Utah Division user stories explains all the items that would be in a data dictionary. Also, there are specific validation rules in the driver system application process.

2. *Improve the data quality control program for the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory*.

   State accepts recommendation.

   Related Performance Measure: N/A

   See related Driver Goal 2 in Section 4.5.3.

4.5.3 Driver Goals

Driver Goal 1: Develop process flow diagrams outlining key data process flows within the Driver License Database.

Strategy: The Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division will further develop process flow diagrams to cover established database and primary user groups or downstream data systems (i.e. examiners, issuance staff, law enforcement, courts, or authorized trusted parties).

Outcome: Process flow diagrams will be used to understand the need for and understanding of existing processes and will promote continuous improvement. The process flows can also identify redundant or unnecessary steps.

Activity: Continued.

Driver Goal 2: Implement a formal data quality program that incorporates sample-based audits and comparative and trend analyses against Driver data.

Strategy: The Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division will expand upon and formalize their existing data quality processes. This effort will include documenting the roles, procedures, and periodicity related to the performance of sample-based audits and comparative and trend analyses of the Driver License Database.

Outcome: A formal data quality program will provide the information necessary to implement improvements to the collection, submission, processing, posting, and maintenance of driver data.

Activity: Continued.

Driver Goal 3: Implement the expansion of toxicology results, The Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division receives from the state toxicology lab.

Strategy: The State Toxicology Lab will send all DUI arrest toxicology results to the Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division.

Outcome: By receiving toxicology results, this will assist in having a better understanding of the types of drugs drivers are using and also what level of alcohol they had in their system at the time of the arrest. Collecting this data will assist in analyzing data and assist in public outreach projects.

Activity: Continued.

4.6 Roadway Data System Plan

4.6.1 System Overview

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) has a mature geospatial roadway data management system. The system supports the ability to map roadway data on all Utah public roads. In addition to the geospatial system, all public roads have a Linear Referencing System (LRS) using Federal Highway Administration's All Roads Network Of Linear-referenced Data (ARNOLD) that is maintained by UDOT. UDOT currently maintains a robust roadway data set for State maintained roadways and some critical data elements on non-State maintained federal-aid roads. The UDOT roadway system includes 5,899 miles (12%) of the 49,304 total centerline miles. 3,941 miles (8%) are non-State maintained federal-aid routes. The remaining 39,474 miles (80%) are non-federal aid routes without an LRS, with approximately one-half being unpaved roads.

Utah is compliant with the requirements of the most recent approved transportation bill, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) that provides funding for fiscal years 2022-2026. The 2012 Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) legislation called for improved and more robust safety data for better safety analysis to support the development of States' Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSPs) and Highway Safety Improvement Programs (HSIPs). The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), signed in 2015, continued the State safety data system requirements established in MAP-21. MAP-21 and the FAST Act also provide guidance on collecting a subset of the Model Inventory of Roadway Elements (MIRE). The data element subset identified by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is referred to as the Fundamental Data Elements (FDE). The FDEs are the basic roadway data elements recommended to be collected and linked with crash data for analysis to identify safety problems and to make more effective safety countermeasure decisions for the Highway Safety Improvement Program.

Utah supports the UDOT Data Portal; the portal allows access to roadway data on those State maintained roads and non-State federal-aid roads. Information for the available data layers can be viewed and downloaded. Portal data provides roadway inventory, planning, and maintenance data and is used primarily by State and local governments and MPOs (municipal planning organizations). Authenticated and authorized users also have access to crash data tied to the roadway network.

Through a partnership with local agencies, UDOT has collected all MIRE Fundamental Data Elements for all public roads. Regional and local custodians do not currently provide roadway data to the UDOT database.

The Utah Geospatial Resource Center (UGRC), in partnership with UDOT, collects and maintains a dataset that combines GIS data from local, county, and other State and Federal agencies. This contains GIS mapping data that represents the statewide roads centerline dataset for Utah and other road and highway related data such as milepost locations, exit numbers and names, highway linear referencing system (LRS) routes, and label lines for dynamic rendering of highway shields. UGRC pulls data from the UTRANS shared editing database into the Statewide Geographic Information Database (SGID) where it is made publicly available. State and local governments, academic institutions, municipal planning organizations, and the public use this data for engineering, safety, elections, 911, and other various uses.

4.6.2 Roadway Recommendations from NHTSA Assessment

The following Roadway recommendations are from the Utah's Traffic Records Assessment dated January 19, 2024.

1. *Improve the guidelines for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

   State Accepts Recommendation.

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

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   See related Performance Measure in Section 5.1.15 Roadway Completeness – Missing Route/Milepost Data.

   See related Roadway Goal 8 in Section 4.6.3.

3. *Improve the data dictionary for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   See related Performance Measure in Section 5.1.17 Crash Uniformity – MMUCC 6.

   See related Roadway Goal 5 in Section 4.6.3.

4.6.3 Roadway Goals

Roadway Goal 1: Collect and maintain Linear Referencing System (LRS) data within the roadway data system for all Utah public roads.

Strategy: UDOT and the UGRC will collect and maintain LRS data for all Utah public roads.

Outcome: Improve the completeness of the State's roadway data system and enhance highway safety analysis capabilities.

Activity: Continued.

Roadway Goal 2: Consolidate MIRE Fundamental Data Elements (FDE) to a single geodatabase.

Strategy: UDOT will merge data from the following sources in order to meet the FDE requirements and have all fields available in one location:

- UTRANS
- HPMS
- Roads & Highways - LRS
- UDOT Asset Layers
- UDOT Traffic Data
- usRAP data for federal aid roads

Outcome: Improve the completeness of the State's roadway data system and enhance highway safety analysis capabilities by consolidating the MIRE FDEs to one shared location.

Activity: In progress. UDOT has completed the collection of the FDEs from the various sources. UDOT has successfully migrated the data into a shared geodatabase and online web map for presentation.

Roadway Goal 3: Develop a timeliness performance measure and related target based on the NHTSA Model Performance Measures for a Roadway data system.

Strategy: UDOT will develop a timeliness performance measures and related target based on the NHTSA Model Performance Measures that will measure the average timeliness of Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) from date of collection to entry in the roadway data system.

Outcome: Improved understanding of the timeliness performance of the roadway data system and related processes.

Activity: The UDOT traffic data analytics group is completing an internal review of processes and has identified additional staff that will be hired. This will help the department establish and begin meeting timeliness goals for AADT data delivery.

Roadway Goal 4: Develop completeness and accuracy performance measures and related targets based on the NHTSA Model Performance Measures for a Roadway data system.

Strategy: UDOT has developed roadway completeness and accuracy performance measures and related targets based on the NHTSA Model Performance Measures. All roadway data records have errors in no more than 10% of data elements. At least 95% of all point assets (signs, intersections, etc.) are collected and included in the database. For continuous linear assets (medians, shoulders, lanes, etc.) all records are collected (100% completeness).

Outcome: Improved understanding of the completeness and accuracy of the roadway data system.

Activity: Continued

Roadway Goal 5: Provide annual roadway data quality management updates to the UTRCC.

Strategy: Annually, present the latest roadway data system performance measures and results to the UTRCC.

Outcome: Improved tracking and awareness of roadway data system performance.

Activity: Continued.

4.7 Citation/Adjudication Data System Plan

4.7.1 System Overview

The Courts Information System (CORIS) is the State of Utah's statewide citation and adjudication system for District and Justice Courts. CORIS is electronically connected to the Utah Department of Public Safety's Bureau of Criminal Identification (BCI) and Driver License Division (DLD). As represented in the ideal traffic records system, each agency assigns their own citation numbers.

Citation information is transmitted to CORIS, CORIS then posts final dispositions (up to and including the resolution of any appeals) to a shared database with the Department of Public Safety. DPS/BCI control how that information is shared with the Driver License Database (i.e. the driver data system) and Vehicle and Dealers Registration System (VADRS) (i.e. the vehicle database). The Utah Department of Public Safety receives a nightly update of cases dispositions from the Administrative Office of the Courts, providing real-time access to information on an individual's driving and criminal history. Citation and adjudication data are used for the prosecution of offenders and adjudication of cases, particularly where the history of the defendant would warrant an increase in the charge or sentence. Citation and adjudication data are utilized by the BCI for traffic safety program planning purposes.

The State of Utah's citation and adjudication system follows national data systems and guidelines to ensure compatibility and serve data management and exchange needs. DUI convictions and traffic-related felonies are reported according to Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. The system employs National Center for State Courts (NCSC) guidelines for court records. Data submitted via a web service from the Department of Public Safety to the courts for traffic citations filed electronically adheres to the NIEM Justice Domain guidelines.

The citation management web service data elements (utilized by all agencies in Utah and the court's case management system CORIS) are defined and documented by a data dictionary. The data dictionary is kept up to date with the most recent software release. The system's field data collection manuals, training materials, and corresponding reports are modified and updated in coordination with the data dictionary.

The State's court case management system, CORIS, is capable of distinguishing between the administrative handling of court payments in lieu of court appearances (non-mandatory appearances) and court appearances. Deferrals (e.g. pleas in abeyance and citations eligible for deferred traffic prosecution per Utah statute 77-2-4.2) and dismissals are tracked by the court's case management system and passed to the driver history record to ensure subsequent repeat offenses are not viewed as first offenses. CORIS has processes for retaining, archiving, and purging citation records as defined and documented by the courts in the Judicial Council Code of Judicial Administration's retention schedule. CORIS includes BAC and drug testing results for impaired driving data tracking. CORIS interfaces with Public Safety for posting of dispositions, so

that both the driver and vehicle systems will have dispositions posted to the driver and vehicle files for carrying out administrative sanctions.

4.7.2 Citation/Adjudication Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment

The following Citation/Adjudication recommendations are from Utah's Traffic Records Assessment conducted on January 19, 2024.

1. *Improve the data quality control for the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   See related Performance Measure in Section 5.1.6 Citation Timeliness – Citations within 5 days.

   See related UTRCC Goal 4 in Section 4.1.3.

2. *Improve the interfaces with Citation and Adjudication system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records program Assessment Advisory.*

   State Accepts Recommendation.

   See related Crash Goal 8 in Section 4.3.3.

4.7.3 Citation/Adjudication Goals

Citation/Adjudication Goal 1: Data Dictionary - Document eCitation data fields populated through interfaces.

Strategy: The Administrative Office of the Courts will update the CORIS data dictionary to indicate fields that are updated via external data systems.

Outcome: Documenting the data elements in the CORIS database with links to external systems will provide a more complete picture of the source of data within the citation and adjudication system.

Activity: Continued

Citation/Adjudication Goal 2: Implement a MIDRIS-compliant Utah DUI tracking system.

Strategy: The UTRCC will spearhead an effort to define the DUI tracking system requirements and work with Highway Safety to promote implementation of the system. The UTRCC will seek input from DUI stakeholders including the Driver License Division,

prosecutors, law enforcement, BCI, Highway Safety, courts, and the Utah Department of Corrections, Adult Probation & Parole (AP&P).

Outcome: Charge and sentence offenders appropriately, based on their driving histories; Manage impaired driving cases from arrest through completion of court and administrative sanctions; Identify populations, trends, and problematic components of the overall impaired driving control system; Adequately gauge DWI trends and the effectiveness of a range of education, information, enforcement, legislative, and other countermeasures; Provide stakeholders with adequate and timely information to fulfill their responsibilities; Provide key decision-makers (law enforcement, DMV, prosecutors, judges, etc.) with adequate and timely information to allow equitable imposition of charges and penalties; improve efficiency and reduce the administrative burden on system stakeholders.

Activity: Continued.

Citation/Adjudication Goal 3: Develop a timeliness performance measure and target for the CORIS citation data system.

Strategy: Create a timeliness performance measure for the CORIS citation data system and a related target using the *NHTSA Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems*.

Outcome: A better understanding of the timeliness of the CORIS citation data. This will identify where process bottlenecks occur so actions can be taken to improve the timeliness of citation data.

Activity: Continued.

Citation/Adjudication Goal 4: Develop a timeliness performance measure and target for the Department of Public Safety Traffic citation data.

Strategy: Create a timeliness performance measure for the law enforcement Traffic citation data system and a related target using the *NHTSA Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems*. Timeliness measure should report statewide averages and timeliness by reporting agency.

Outcome: A better understanding of the timeliness of the law enforcement Traffic citation data. This will identify where submission and process bottlenecks occur so actions can be taken to improve the timeliness of law enforcement citation data.

Activity: Continued.

Citation/Adjudication Goal 6: Implement geolocation functionality within the Traffic citation data system.

Strategy: Implement functionality with the Traffic citation data system to enable officers to geolocate citations using GPS and/or GIS technologies.

Outcome: Increased citation analysis capabilities allowing stakeholders to perform map-based and roadway-based queries of citation data.

Activity: Planned.

Citation/Adjudication Goal 7: Develop a geolocation completeness performance measure and target for the Traffic citation data system.

Strategy: Create a geolocation completeness performance measure for the law enforcement Traffic citation data system and a related target using the *NHTSA Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems*. The completeness measure should report geolocation completeness by the reporting agency.

Outcome: A better understanding of the completeness of the geolocation data elements in the law enforcement Traffic citation data. This will identify missing or incomplete location data and provide the information necessary to track geolocation improvements in the Traffic citation data system.

Activity: Planned.

4.8 Injury Surveillance Data System Plan

4.8.1 System Overview

An ideal statewide Injury Surveillance System is minimally comprised of data from five core components: pre-hospital emergency medical services (EMS), trauma registry, emergency department, hospital discharge, and vital records. This data provides more detailed information on the nature and extent of injuries sustained in a motor vehicle crash than can be found in other components of the traffic records system. Consequently, this information is invaluable when determining the injury severity, costs, and clinical outcomes of the individuals involved.

Utah has all five major components of a traffic records injury surveillance system and the available data is accessible to both traffic safety stakeholders, as well as the public, through either aggregate summary tables or department-approved data use agreements.

Pre-Hospital Data System

The Utah Department of Public Safety Bureau of EMS (BEMS) manages the pre-hospital data collection system known as the ImageTrend-based Elite system. Paper reports are not accepted, per State rule, and the data collection is 100 percent electronic. The system is NEMSIS 3.5-compliant and the software system incorporates comprehensive edit checks and validations to ensure that the data falls within acceptable parameters. The State has developed performance measures and metrics for all six data quality categories and quality management reports are regularly shared with the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (UTRCC). There is a sound feedback loop between users and data collectors as well as performance reporting to submitting agencies from the State, and processes are clearly documented.

There are approximately five different software systems submitting data to the statewide repository. All agencies have submitted data electronically to the repository. Provider submission requirements are defined as “Emergency Medical Services Providers shall submit NEMSIS EMS incident data elements for each Patient Care Report in the format defined in the NEMSIS EMS DataSet, as follows: “Each EMS provider shall submit NEMSIS EMS incident data elements for each patient care report (PCR) in the format defined in the NEMSIS EMS data set within seven days of the incident occurring”. Most EMS providers report within the first week after the incident. BEMS is working to change the reporting requirement to seven days before once the new administrative rule is updated.

Statewide Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge Data Systems

The Utah Department of Health and Human Services Health Care Statistics Program in the Division of data, systems, and evaluation is the agency responsible for the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge data systems. These systems are managed by a third-party vendor, Mercer. All system-related documentation is available online for limited-use data files. For information related to the unlimited data files, authorization must be obtained by OHCS. Feedback with regards to training and error correction between Mercer and the submitting

hospitals is conducted to ensure that data is as accurate as possible. Aggregate data is available through the Utah Indicator-Based Information System for Public Health and the OHCS is hopes to begin publishing annual reports again soon. Requests for the unlimited data set may be filled upon approval by the Department of Health Institutional Review Board.

Statewide Trauma Data System

The statewide trauma registry data system is managed by the Utah Department of Public Safety Bureau of EMS and is housed on the Patient Registry by ImageTrend platform. Data is collected for trauma cases from 100 percent of the State's acute care hospitals. There are three methods of data collection; some facilities submit data directly to the Statewide Trauma Registry, others submit through a web-based process directly to the registry, and the remainder are entered via a manual abstraction at the state. The trauma data are available to the public through annual reports; to the hospital registrars through an OLAP Trauma Cube, and to other hospital audiences through a Trauma Tableau Dashboard. Data quality has been reviewed at the front-end by the ESO software provider and subsequently by the Utah Data Coordinating Center at the University of Utah. In July 2025, the trauma system moved to the ImageTrend software provider. This move has helped us integrate EMS with trauma data almost seamlessly, but the transition has not been without issues. The State has developed performance measures and metrics for all categories except completeness for the Strategic Plan. The State Trauma performance improvement and patient safety workgroup and the Trauma System Advisory Committee have built, reviewed, and approved Trauma System performance measures.

Feedback loops have been established between data managers and users and quarterly Trauma User Group meetings are used to discuss common issues and concerns.

Vital Records Data System

The Utah Department of Health and Human Services Office of Vital Records and Statistics (OVRS) is responsible for managing all vital statistics data including death certificates. Utah submits all data to the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) for quality review. Due to strict requirements from the NCHS, the State relies on that quality review to ensure that all State data conforms to standards. Therefore, all records are reviewed at the local health department, the OVRS, and the NCHS before being admitted to the State file. Aggregate data is available through the Utah Indicator-Based Information System for Public Health.

4.8.2 Injury Surveillance Recommendations from the NHTSA Assessment

The following Injury Surveillance recommendations are from Utah's Traffic Records Assessment dated January 19, 2024.

1. *Improve the data quality control program for the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

State Accepts Recommendation.

See related Performance Measures:

- Section 5.1.8 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Pre-Hospital
- Section 5.1.9 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Trauma Registry
- Section 5.1.10 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Emergency Room
- Section 5.1.11 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Hospital Discharge
- Section 5.1.16 Injury Surveillance Uniformity – Pre-Hospital (NEMSIS)
- Section 5.1.17 Crash Uniformity – MMUCC 6

See related EMS/Injury Surveillance Goal 2 Section 4.8.3.

2. *Improve the interfaces with the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.*

State Accepts Recommendation.

See related Performance Measure in Section 5.1.20 Injury Surveillance Integration – Pre-Hospital/Trauma Registry.

See related EMS/Injury Surveillance Goal 1 in Section 4.8.3.

4.8.3 EMS/Injury Surveillance Goals

EMS/Injury Surveillance Goal 1: Develop an Integration performance measure and related target that counts the number of records linked between the trauma data, and EMS data using an integrated data system.

Strategy: DPS-EMS Informatics will develop an integration performance measure based on the NHTSA Model Performance Measures.

Outcome: Improved understanding of the integration of the State's injury surveillance system and related processes.

Activity: Continue to improve integration performance

EMS/Injury Surveillance Goal 2: Annually, the Injury Surveillance data system managers (i.e. emergency department, hospital discharge, trauma registry, EMS) will present data system performance and quality reports to the UTRCC.

Strategy: The UTRCC will schedule an annual review of Injury Surveillance data systems performance. The Injury Surveillance data system managers will present data system performance metrics to the UTRCC.

Outcome: The UTRCC members will have an increased understanding of the performance of the Injury Surveillance data systems. This will allow identification of data system performance issues and provide opportunities for improvement.

Activity: Continued.

EMS/Injury Surveillance Goal 3: Capture alcohol and drug toxicology results for DUI cases.

Strategy: The Utah Public Health Laboratory, Toxicology section and the Utah Highway Safety Office will develop a plan to capture alcohol and drug toxicology results for all DUI cases.

Outcome: Increased understanding and analysis of DUI-involved crashes.

Activity: Continued.

EMS/Injury Surveillance Goal 4: EMS and trauma data shared with UTAPS

Strategy: The BEMS and Utah Highway Safety Office will develop a plan to share data regarding EMS, trauma and UTAPS data.

Outcome: By combining crash with EMS and trauma data this will help increased the understanding of the data and will assist in data analysis.

Activity: Continued.

5. Progress

5.1 Traffic Records Performance Measures

5.1.1 Crash Timeliness – Received within 30 days

Label: C-T-2
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated a Decrease in Improvement
Related Project/System: Crash

Narrative

Utah will improve the Timeliness of the Crash system as measured in terms of:

The percentage of crash reports entered into the database within 30 days after the crash.

The result is a decrease in timeliness of 9.7%. These outcomes were the result of a specific one-time event related to data capturing issues with a vendor supporting UHP. The target for the next period is unchanged at 90%.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	% Received within 30 days	Target (%)
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	96.35%	Not set
January 1, 2016	December 31, 2016	97.40%	Not set
January 1, 2017	December 31, 2017	97.40%	Not set
January 1, 2018	December 31, 2018	97.3%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	90.68%	98%
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	91.78%	98%
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	89.09%	98%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	97.00%	98%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	97.06%	98%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	98.52%	98%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	88.82%	90%
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

<u>Current</u>

```
use [Daily_Download]
select distinct (Ps_Case)
from [Daily_Download].dbo.udot_main um
```

```
WHERE Ps_Case IN (SELECT Ps_Case FROM Daily_Download.dbo.udot_main GROUP BY Ps_Case HAVING
um.Version_ID = 1)
and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date))>='2025-04-01' and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date)) <='2026-03-31'
and datediff(day,(cast(Date_of_Crash as date)),cast(Submitted as date)) <= 30
```

Calculation for 2025-2026:

- *Total records received: 65,975*
- *<=30 days to submit: 58,556 (88.82%)*

5.1.2 Crash Timeliness – FARS

Label: C-T-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated a Decrease in Improvement
Related Project/System: FARS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Timeliness of the Crash system as measured in terms of:

The mean number of days from the crash date to the date the fatal crash is initially entered into the FARS system.

The result is a decrease in timeliness by 5 days. The target for the next period is 10 days.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Mean Number of Days	Target (days)
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	9	Not set
January 1, 2016	December 31, 2016	11	Not set
January 1, 2017	December 31, 2017	7	Not set
January 1, 2018	December 31, 2018	8	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	15	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	9	7
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	9	7
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	7	6
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	5	4
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	8	5
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	13	10
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

Current

Early Notification Reports

Report

Early Notification Timeliness Summary Report - 04/01/2025 to 03/31/2026

State	Number of Fatal Cases	Days from Incident to Entry into FASTFARS				Within 14 days		Within 30 days	
		Mean	Median	90 Percentile	95 Percentile	Cases	%	Cases	%
Utah	298	13	3	44	70	241	81	258	87
National	34698	18	6	48	86	24914	72	29490	85

Report Output Format Excel File Export Report

Baseline

Early Notification Reports

Report

Early Notification Timeliness Summary Report - 04/01/2024 to 03/31/2025

State	Number of Fatal Cases	Days from Incident to Entry into FASTFARS				Within 14 days		Within 30 days	
		Mean	Median	90 Percentile	95 Percentile	Cases	%	Cases	%
Utah	269	8	3	23	35	222	83	251	93
National	36577	18	6	50	81	26251	72	30965	85

Report Output Format Excel File Export Report

5.1.3 Crash Timeliness – MCMIS

Label: C-T-1
Status of Improvement: TBD
Related Project/System: MCMIS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Timeliness of the FMCSA Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS) as measured in terms of:

> The median number of days from the commercial vehicle crash date to the date of entry into the MCMIS database.

The result is an increase in timeliness of 7.14 days. The target for the next period is 12 days.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Median Number of Days	Target (days)
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	15	Not set
January 1, 2016	December 31, 2016	20	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	20	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	20	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	15	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	1080.95	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	109.12	75
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	38.11	35
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	22.06	20
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	21.28	20
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	14.14	12
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	TBD	
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

5.1.4 Crash Timeliness – Crash Geolocation

Label: C-T-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated a Decrease in Improvement
Related Project/System: FARS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Timeliness of crash geolocation assignments as measured in terms of:

The median days from the crash date to the date the crash has been geolocated in the statewide crash repository.

The result is a decrease in timeliness of 5.3 days. The target for the next period is 10 days.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Median Number of Days	Target (days)
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	9	Not set
January 1, 2016	December 31, 2016	11	Not set
January 1, 2017	December 31, 2017	7	Not set
January 1, 2018	December 31, 2018	8	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	16.2	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	4.6	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	10.6	7.5
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	6.9	6
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	6.8	6
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	8.5	6
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	13.8	10
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

Current

Report

Early Notification Timeliness by Jurisdiction - 04/01/2025 to 03/31/2026

			Days from Incident to Entry into Early Notification					Within 14 Days		Within 30 Days	
State	Jurisdiction	Number of Fatal Cases	Max	Mean	Median	90 Percentile	95 Percentile	Cases	%	Cases	%
49	American Fork PD	2	40	20	21	40	40	1	50	1	50
49	Bluffdale PD	1	5	5	5	5	5	1	100	1	100
49	Box Elder County SO	1	44	44	44	44	44	0	0	0	0
49	Brigham City PD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100	1	100
49	Cache County SO	3	6	3	2	6	6	3	100	3	100
49	Cedar City PD	3	7	4	4	7	7	3	100	3	100
49	Cottonwood Heights PD	2	9	6	7	9	9	2	100	2	100
49	Daggett County SO	1	9	9	9	9	9	1	100	1	100
49	Davis County SO	2	19	10	10	19	19	1	50	2	100
49	DNR	5	143	78	102	143	143	2	40	2	40
49	Duchesne County SO	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	100	2	100
49	Farmington PD	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	100	1	100
49	Grand County SO	1	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	1	100
49	Grantsville PD	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	100
49	Gunnison Valley PD	1	5	5	5	5	5	1	100	1	100
49	Heber PD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100	1	100
49	Herriman PD	1	70	70	70	70	70	0	0	0	0
49	Iron County SO	3	33	19	21	33	33	1	33	2	67
49	Juab County SO	3	66	30	23	66	66	1	33	2	67
49	Kane County SO	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100	1	100
49	LaVerkin PD	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	100	1	100
49	Layton PD	4	12	6	6	12	12	4	100	4	100
49	Lehi PD	2	10	5	6	10	10	2	100	2	100
49	Lindon PD	2	177	91	92	177	177	1	50	1	50
49	Logan PD	3	48	23	12	48	48	2	67	2	67
49	Millard County SO	2	20	14	14	20	20	1	50	2	100
49	Murray PD	10	98	20	5	56	98	7	70	8	80
49	Navajo PD	2	12	12	12	12	12	2	100	2	100
49	Ogden PD	5	56	32	45	56	56	2	40	2	40
49	Orem PD	3	90	32	3	90	90	2	67	2	67
49	Pleasant Grove PD	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	100	2	100

Baseline

Report

Early Notification Timeliness by Jurisdiction - 04/01/2024 to 03/31/2025

			Days from Incident to Entry into Early Notification					Within 14 Days		Within 30 Days	
State	Jurisdiction	Number of Fatal Cases	Max	Mean	Median	90 Percentile	95 Percentile	Cases	%	Cases	%
49	American Fork PD	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	100	1	100
49	Beaver County SO	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100	1	100
49	Cache County SO	2	23	12	12	23	23	1	50	2	100
49	Carbon County SO	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	100	1	100
49	Cedar City PD	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	100	1	100
49	Centerville PD	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	100	1	100
49	Clearfield PD	2	3	1	2	3	3	2	100	2	100
49	Cottonwood Heights PD	2	3	1	2	3	3	2	100	2	100
49	Davis County SO	1	10	10	10	10	10	1	100	1	100
49	DNR	2	45	23	23	45	45	1	50	1	50
49	Draper PD	2	4	2	3	4	4	2	100	2	100
49	Emery County SO	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	100	2	100
49	Grand County SO	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	100	2	100
49	Harrisville PD	2	21	15	16	21	21	1	50	2	100
49	Hurricane PD	2	10	5	6	10	10	2	100	2	100
49	Layton PD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100	1	100
49	Lehi PD	1	37	37	37	37	37	0	0	0	0
49	Logan PD	2	8	4	5	8	8	2	100	2	100
49	Murray PD	2	18	15	15	18	18	1	50	2	100
49	Navajo PD	2	9	7	8	9	9	2	100	2	100
49	Ogden PD	12	58	11	4	32	32	8	67	10	83
49	Orem PD	1	32	32	32	32	32	0	0	0	0
49	Park City PD	1	11	11	11	11	11	1	100	1	100
49	Provo PD	4	84	27	14	84	84	2	50	3	75
49	Rich County SO	1	10	10	10	10	10	1	100	1	100
49	Riverdale PD	1	23	23	23	23	23	0	0	1	100
49	Riverton PD	2	1	0	1	1	1	2	100	2	100
49	Roosevelt PD	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	100	1	100
49	Roy PD	5	33	14	7	33	33	3	60	4	80
49	Salem PD	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	100	1	100
49	Salt Lake City PD	9	35	12	7	27	35	6	67	8	89
49	San Juan County SO	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	100	1	100
49	Sandy PD	2	22	11	12	22	22	1	50	2	100
49	Sanpete County SO	1	13	13	13	13	13	1	100	1	100
49	Sevier County SO	1	42	42	42	42	42	0	0	0	0
49	Smithfield PD	1	9	9	9	9	9	1	100	1	100
49	South Ogden PD	1	17	17	17	17	17	0	0	1	100
49	South Salt Lake PD	5	37	9	4	37	37	4	80	4	80
49	Spanish Fork PD	2	24	12	12	24	24	1	50	2	100
49	Springville PD	1	6	6	6	6	6	1	100	1	100

5.1.5 Crash Timeliness – Alcohol/Drug Test Results

Label: C-T-1
Status of Improvement: Maintained Improvement
Related Project/System: Crash

Narrative

Utah will improve the Timeliness of the Crash system as measured in terms of:

The mean number of days from the date of sample arrival at the Utah Public Health Laboratory until a report is issued to law enforcement.

The result maintained its timeliness at 31 days. The target for the next period is 28 days.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Mean Number of Days	Target (days)
January 1, 2014	December 31, 2014	14	14
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	24	14
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	25	14
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	26	14
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	28	14
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	28	14
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	30	25
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	28	25
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	22	21
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	23	22
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	31	28
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	31	28

5.1.6 Citation Timeliness – Citations within 5 days

Label: C/A-T-2
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated a Decrease in Improvement
Related Project/System: CORIS

Narrative

Utah will strive to improve the Timeliness of the Citation system as measured in terms of:

The percentage of electronically filed citations filed with CORIS within 5 days of the date of violation.

The result is a decrease in timeliness of 1.15%. The target for the next period is 94%.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	% Received within 5 days	Target (%)
July 1, 2013	June 30, 2014	90.4%	Not set
July 1, 2014	June 30, 2015	90.5%	Not set
July 1, 2015	June 30, 2016	91.1%	Not set
July 1, 2016	June 30, 2017	92.75%	Not set
July 1, 2017	June 30, 2018	92.55%	Not set
July 1, 2018	June 30, 2019	92.27%	Not set
July 1, 2019	June 30, 2020	93.11%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	93.43%	Not Set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	93.77%	93.80%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	92.16%	93%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	92.92%	93%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	95.03%	96%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	93.88%	94%

Supporting Materials (Backup)

Current

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	Citation Filing Statistics April 1, 2024 to March 31, 2025										
2	DISTRICT						JUSTICE				
3	year	month	delayed >5 days	total filed i	% late		year	month	delayed >5 days	total filed i	% late
4	2024	4	123	**1,533**	8.02%		2024	4	1,403	**33,159**	4.23%
5	2024	5	111	**1,531**	7.25%		2024	5	1,895	**34,069**	5.56%
6	2024	6	112	**1,564**	7.16%		2024	6	1,801	**32,764**	5.50%
7	2024	7	102	**1,332**	7.66%		2024	7	1,888	**33,918**	5.57%
8	2024	8	78	**1,240**	6.29%		2024	8	1,659	**33,574**	4.94%
9	2024	9	100	**1,054**	9.49%		2024	9	1,686	**32,491**	5.19%
10	2024	10	76	**1,229**	6.18%		2024	10	1,594	**31,901**	5.00%
11	2024	11	57	**1,138**	5.01%		2024	11	1,253	**30,458**	4.11%
12	2024	12	70	**1,135**	6.17%		2024	12	1,770	**30,172**	5.87%
13	2025	1	66	**1,337**	4.94%		2025	1	1,482	**32,908**	4.50%
14	2025	2	49	**1,145**	4.28%		2025	2	1,255	**30,071**	4.17%
15	2025	3	72	**1,312**	5.49%		2025	3	1,424	**34,055**	4.18%
16											
17	total:		1016	15550	6.53%		total:		19110	389540	4.91%
18											
19											
20	GRAND TOTAL		20126	405090	4.97%						
21	DIST& JUST										
22				On Time:	95.03%						

Baseline

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	Citation Filing Statistics April 1, 2023 to March 31, 2024										
2	DISTRICT						JUSTICE				
3	year	month	delayed >5 days	total filed	% late		year	month	delayed >5 days	total filed	% late
4	2023	4	122	**1,534**	7.95%		2021	4	1,917	**31,215**	6.14%
5	2023	5	142	**1,513**	9.39%		2021	5	2,653	**35,971**	7.38%
6	2023	6	102	**1,570**	6.50%		2021	6	2,538	**33,682**	7.54%
7	2023	7	112	**1,510**	7.42%		2021	7	4,202	**33,575**	12.52%
8	2023	8	106	**1,560**	6.79%		2021	8	3,062	**33,684**	9.09%
9	2023	9	101	**1,528**	6.61%		2021	9	2,100	**31,553**	6.66%
10	2023	10	99	**1,539**	6.43%		2021	10	2,136	**29,839**	7.16%
11	2023	11	135	**1,527**	8.84%		2021	11	2,446	**32,144**	7.61%
12	2023	12	99	**1,623**	6.10%		2021	12	1,476	**29,739**	4.96%
13	2024	1	123	**1,567**	7.85%		2022	1	1,646	**31,665**	5.20%
14	2024	2	91	**1,461**	6.23%		2022	2	1,744	**32,231**	5.41%
15	2023	3	135	**1,836**	7.35%		2022	3	1,697	**35,205**	4.82%
16											
17	total:		1367	18768	7.28%		total:		27617	390503	7.07%
18											
19											
20	GRAND TOTAL		28984	409271	7.08%						
21	DIST& JUST										
22				On Time:	92.92%						

5.1.7 Crash Accuracy – Crash Records QCed in UTAPS

Label: C-T-2
Status of Improvement: Maintained Improvement
Related Project/System: Crash

Narrative

Utah will improve the Accuracy of QCing all Crash Reports in UTAPS system as measured in terms of:

> The percentage of crash reports QCed in UTAPS with no errors found in the database within the calendar year.

The result is a Satisfactory score from the Quality Assurance process, equivalent to >96% accuracy of records reviewed. The target for the next period is to maintain such a level of accuracy >96%.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	% Accuracy Records QCd	Target (%)
January 1, 2024	December 31, 2024	96%	96%
January 1, 2025	December 31, 2025	96%	96%

Notes (2025-2026): All quality assurance reviews of the crash data performed in 2025 provided a satisfactory outcome, where satisfactory is given when accuracy is equal or above 96%.

Supporting Materials (Backup)

The Quality Assurance (QA) process is based on standard practices based on acceptance sampling. Current reporting is based on partial measurements from 2023 conducted through an independent review of record's QC'd by UDOT. The process is still in early stages but it is producing satisfactory levels of accuracy above 96%.

5.1.8 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Pre-Hospital

Label: I-A-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated Improvement
Related Project/System: Elite

Narrative

Utah will improve the Accuracy of the Pre-Hospital system as measured in terms of:

The percentage of pre-hospital records with no errors in critical fields.

The Result is an increase in accuracy of 2.01 percent. The target for the next period is 99.5 percent. Ongoing work continues with each vendor and agency to ensure accuracy of records submitted.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Accuracy	Target (Percent)
January 1, 2017	December 31, 2017	97.48%	Not set
January 1, 2018	December 31, 2018	97.48%	Not set
January 1, 2019	December 31, 2019	98.72%	Not set
January 1, 2020	December 31, 2020	98.73%	Not set
January 1, 2021	December 31, 2021	98.52%	99%
January 1, 2022	December 31, 2022	97.56%	98%
January 1, 2023	December 31, 2023	98.91%	98%*
January 1, 2024	December 31, 2024	97.42%	98%*
January 1, 2025	December 31, 2025	99.38%	99.5%
January 1, 2026	December 31, 2026		

*lowered due to data system switch to new national standard and some vendors are still unable to get their data in correctly.

5.1.9 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Trauma Registry

Label: I-A-1
Status of Improvement: Maintained Improvement
Related Project/System: Utah Trauma Registry

Narrative

Utah will improve the Accuracy of the Trauma Registry as measured in terms of:

The percentage of Trauma Registry records with errors in critical fields.

The result is an 0% increase in accuracy of percent. The target for the next period is 90 percent due to a change in software applications. Utah went to ImageTrend's trauma system after years on another vendor. It has been extremely challenging to get data to the correct accuracy since that move. We work weekly with the vendor to address issues.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Accuracy	Target (Percent)
January 1, 2017	December 31, 2017	85%	Not set
January 1, 2018	December 31, 2018	86%	Not set
January 1, 2019	December 31, 2019	86%	Not set
January 1, 2020	December 31, 2020	87%	88%
January 1, 2021	December 31, 2021	98%	99%
January 1, 2022	December 31, 2022	99%	99.5%
January 1, 2023	December 31, 2023	99%	99.5%
January 1, 2024	December 31, 2024	99%	99.5%
January 1, 2025	December 31, 2025	95%	95%*

*2025 data is incomplete due to software vendor changes. Target was decreased due to Vendor changes

5.1.10 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Emergency Room

Label: I-A-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated Decrease Improvement
Related Project/System: Emergency Department Encounter Database

Narrative

Utah will improve the Accuracy of the Emergency Room as measured in terms of:

The percentage of Emergency Room records with no errors in critical fields.

The result is a decrease in accuracy of 0.10% percent. The target for the next period is 99 percent.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Accuracy	Target (Percent)
January 1, 2014	December 31, 2014	24%	Not set
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	35%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	66%	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	90%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	93%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	97.25%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	98.7%	99%
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	99%	99.2%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	98.8	100%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	98.5	99%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	98.4	99%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026		
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

<u>Current:</u>

WITH combined_data AS (SELECT record_id, | Enter a SQL expression to filter results (use Ctrl+Space)

	fiscal_year	encounter_type	total_unique_records	valid_address_count	pct_not_missing_address
1	2024-04-01 to 2025-03-31	E	873,147	859,506	98.44
2	2024-04-01 to 2025-03-31	I	301,005	297,956	98.99

<u>Baseline</u>

Encounter_Type	Admission_Year	Admission_Quarter	Nonempty_Street_Address_Cnt	Total_Record_Cnt	Percent_of_Total_Records_with_Nonempty_Street_Address
E	2019	1	179930	181790	99.0%
E	2019	2	178172	180232	98.9%
E	2019	3	184772	187023	98.8%
E	2019	4	179479	181473	98.9%
I	2019	1	71922	72473	99.2%
I	2019	2	71431	72006	99.2%
I	2019	3	72157	72833	99.1%
I	2019	4	70709	71258	99.2%

5.1.11 Injury Surveillance Accuracy – Hospital Discharge

Label: I-A-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated Decrease Improvement
Related Project/System: Healthcare Facility Database

Narrative

Utah will improve the Accuracy of the Hospital Discharge records as measured in terms of:

The percentage of Hospital Discharge records with no errors in critical fields.

The result is a decrease in accuracy of 0.21 percent. The target for the next period is 99.5 percent.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Accuracy	Target (Percent)
January 1, 2014	December 31, 2014	36%	Not set
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	43%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	63%	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	86%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	97.25%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	92.93%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	99.1%	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	99.9%	99.3%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	99.1%	99.5%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	99.2%	99.5%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	98.99%	99%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026		
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

WITH combined_data AS (SELECT record_id, Enter a SQL expression to filter results (use Ctrl+Space)

	fiscal_year	encounter_type	total_unique_records	valid_address_count	pct_not_missing_address
1	2024-04-01 to 2025-03-31	E	873,147	859,506	98.44
2	2024-04-01 to 2025-03-31	I	301,005	297,956	98.99

<u>Baseline</u>

Encounter_Type	Admission_Year	Admission_Quarter	Nonempty_Street_Address_Cnt	Total_Record_Cnt	Percent_of_Total_Records_with_Nonempty_Street_Address
E	2019	1	179930	181790	99.0%
E	2019	2	178172	180232	98.9%
E	2019	3	184772	187023	98.8%
E	2019	4	179479	181473	98.9%
I	2019	1	71922	72473	99.2%
I	2019	2	71431	72006	99.2%
I	2019	3	72157	72833	99.1%
I	2019	4	70709	71258	99.2%

5.1.12 Crash Completeness – First Harmful Event (Unknown/Blanks)

Label: C-C-3
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated a Decrease in Improvement
Related Project/System: Traffic/UTAPS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Completeness of crash records as measured in terms of:

> The percentage of unknowns or blanks in critical data elements for which unknown is not an acceptable value.

The result for First Harmful Event is a decrease in completeness of 0.07 percent. The target for the next period is 0.00 percent.

Measurements for First Harmful Event

Start Date	End Date	Percent Unknown/Blank	Target (Percent)
April 1, 2014	March 31, 2015	0.59%	Not set
April 1, 2015	March 31, 2016	0.21%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	0.00%	0.00%
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	0.01%	0.00%
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	0.00%	0.00%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	0.00%	0.00%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	0.00%	0.00%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	0.00%	0.00%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	0.07%	0.00%
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

Current (2025-2026)

```
use [Daily_Download]
select Ps_Case, Submitted, Date_of_Crash, First_Harmful_Event
from [Daily_Download].dbo.udot_main um
WHERE Ps_Case IN (SELECT Ps_Case FROM Daily_Download.dbo.udot_main GROUP BY Ps_Case HAVING
um.Version_ID = MAX(Version_ID))
and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date))>='2025-04-01' and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date)) <='2026-03-31'
and First_Harmful_Event in ('89',NULL,'')
```

Total records (2025-2026): 65,975
Records with crash severity missing (value of '89', NULL, or ' '): 45
% of records with missing crash severity: 0.07%

Baseline

```
2023-2024
SELECT * FROM TRAFFIC.CRASH
WHERE VERSION = '1'
and REPORT_COMPLETED_DTTIME < '01-APRIL-2023'
AND REPORT_COMPLETED_DTTIME > '31-MARCH-2022'
AND FIRST_HARMFUL_EVENT_CODE ='89'
```

=1 out of 68,849

5.1.13 Crash Completeness – Crash Severity (Unknown/Blanks)

Label: C-C-3
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated a Decrease in Improvement
Related Project/System: Traffic/UTAPS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Completeness of crash records as measured in terms of:

> The percentage of unknowns or blanks in critical data elements for which unknown is not an acceptable value.

The result for Crash Severity is a decrease in completeness of 0.11 percent. The target for the next period is 0.05 percent.

Measurements for Crash Severity

Start Date	End Date	Percent Unknown/Blank	Target (Percent)

April 1, 2014	March 31, 2015	0.08%	Not set
April 1, 2015	March 31, 2016	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	0.00%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	0.01%	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	0.00%	0.00%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	0.06%	0.00%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	0.03%	0.00%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	0.02%	0.01%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	0.11%	0.05%
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

Current (2025-2026)

```
use [Daily_Download]
select Ps_Case, Submitted, Date_of_Crash, Crash_Severity
from [Daily_Download].dbo.udot_main um
WHERE Ps_Case IN (SELECT Ps_Case FROM Daily_Download.dbo.udot_main GROUP BY Ps_Case HAVING
um.Version_ID = MAX(Version_ID))
and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date))>='2025-04-01' and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date)) <='2026-03-31'
and Crash_Severity in ('89',NULL,'')
```

Total records (2025-2026): 65,975
Records with crash severity missing (value of ‘89’, NULL, or ‘ ’): 72
% of records with missing crash severity: 0.11%

Baseline

```
2023-2024
SELECT count(distinct activity_idx) FROM TRAFFIC.CRASH
WHERE VERSION = '1'
and REPORT_COMPLETED_DTTIME < '01-APRIL-2023'
AND REPORT_COMPLETED_DTTIME > '31-MARCH-2022'
AND SEVERITY_CODE = '89'
= 40 of 68,849 = 0.06%
```

5.1.14 Crash Completeness – Manner of Collision (Unknown/Blanks)

Label: C-C-3
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated Improvement
Related Project/System: Traffic/UTAPS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Completeness of crash records as measured in terms of:

> The percentage of unknowns or blanks in critical data elements for which unknown is not an acceptable value.

The result for Manner of Collision has increased in completeness by 0.23 percent. The target for the next period is 0.50% percent.

Measurements for Manner of Collision

Start Date	End Date	Percent Unknown/Blank	Target (Percent)
April 1, 2014	March 31, 2015	0.24%	Not set
April 1, 2015	March 31, 2016	0.08%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	0.06%	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	0.06%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	0.05%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	12.26%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	56.05%	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	69%	58%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	12.67%	11%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	0.98%	0.60
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	0.92%	0.50%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	0.69%	0.50%
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

<u>Current 2025-2026</u>

```
use [Daily_Download]
select Ps_Case, Submitted, Date_of_Crash, Manner_Of_Collision
from [Daily_Download].dbo.udot_main um
```

WHERE Ps_Case IN (SELECT Ps_Case FROM Daily_Download.dbo.udot_main GROUP BY Ps_Case HAVING
um.Version_ID = MAX(Version_ID))
and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date))>='2025-04-01' and (cast(Date_of_Crash as date)) <='2026-03-31'
and Manner_Of_Collision in ('89','99',NULL,'')

Total records (2025-2026): 65,975
Records with manner of collision missing (value of '89', '99', NULL, or ' '): 458
% of records with missing manner of collision: 0.69%

Baseline

```
2023-2024
SELECT count(DISTINCT ACTIVITY_IDX) FROM TRAFFIC.CRASH
WHERE VERSION = '1'
and REPORT_COMPLETED_DTTIME < '01-APRIL-2023'
AND REPORT_COMPLETED_DTTIME > '31-MARCH-2022'
AND (MANNER_OF_COLLISION_CODE ='89' OR MANNER_OF_COLLISION_CODE='99')
=8,724 out of 68,849 =12.67%
```

5.1.15 Roadway Completeness – Missing Route/Milepost data

Label: R-C-1
Status of Improvement: Maintained Improvement
Related Project/System: ARNOLD

Narrative

Utah will improve the Completeness of roadway records as measured in terms of:

The percentage of public roadways with complete route and milepost (LRS) data.

The result has maintained 100% in completeness. The target for the next period is 100%

Start Date	End Date	Percent Complete	Target (Percent)
January 1, 2016	December 31, 2016	100%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	100%	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	100%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	100%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	100%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	100%	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	100%	100%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	100%	100%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	100%	100%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	100%	100%

April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026		
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

5.1.16 Injury Surveillance Uniformity –Pre-Hospital (NEMSIS)

Label: I-U-1
Status of Improvement: Maintained Improvement
Related Project/System: Elite

Narrative

Utah will improve the Uniformity of the Pre-Hospital data as measured in terms of:

> The percentage of records in the State Pre-Hospital system (Elite) that are National Emergency Medical Service Information System (NEMSIS) 3.5 compliant.

The result is maintaining complete uniformity with NEMSIS 3.5 at 100 percent. The target for the next period is 100 percent.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Uniform	Target (percent)
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	100%	Not set
April 1, 2015	March 31, 2016	100%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	100%	Not set
April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	100%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	100%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	100%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	100%	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	100%	100%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	100%	100%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	100%	100%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	100%	100%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	100%	100%
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

5.1.17 Crash Uniformity – MMUCC 6

Label: C-U-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated Improvement

Related Project/System: Traffic/UTAPS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Uniformity of crash data as measured in terms of:

> The percentage of MMUCC 6 compliant data elements entered into the crash database or obtained via linkage to other databases. The measurement is limited to crash data elements as designated in the MMUCC 6 data standard.

The result is an increase in Improvement of 5.92% in completeness. The target for the next period is 76% percent.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Uniform	Target (percent)
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	69.48%	70%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	75.4%	76%

Supporting Materials (Backup)

Current

Total Uniformity and Completeness Alignment for All Elements

Data Structure Name	Data Level	Uniformity Alignment (%)	Completeness Recommendations
UT Documentation for SEDC 2nd MMUCC 6 Mapping Report (see Document Library)	Overall Alignment	75.4 %	42
UT Documentation for SEDC 2nd MMUCC 6 Mapping Report (see Document Library)	System-Populated	100 %	
UT Documentation for SEDC 2nd MMUCC 6 Mapping Report (see Document Library)	Crash	81.22 %	6
UT Documentation for SEDC 2nd MMUCC 6 Mapping Report (see Document Library)	Vehicle	69.57 %	16
UT Documentation for SEDC 2nd MMUCC 6 Mapping Report (see Document Library)	Driver	82.14 %	8
UT Documentation for SEDC 2nd MMUCC 6 Mapping Report (see Document Library)	Person	80.99 %	2
UT Documentation for SEDC 2nd MMUCC 6 Mapping Report (see Document Library)	Non-Motorist	78.95 %	10

Baseline

Total Uniformity and Completeness Alignment for All Elements

Data Structure Name	Data Level	Uniformity Alignment (%)	Completeness Recommendations
UT State Documentation For Final MMUCC 6 Mapping (see Document Library)	Overall Alignment	69.48 %	68
UT State Documentation For Final MMUCC 6 Mapping (see Document Library)	System-Populated	66.67 %	
UT State Documentation For Final MMUCC 6 Mapping (see Document Library)	Crash	74.59 %	14
UT State Documentation For Final MMUCC 6 Mapping (see Document Library)	Vehicle	61.81 %	20
UT State Documentation For Final MMUCC 6 Mapping (see Document Library)	Driver	84.82 %	12
UT State Documentation For Final MMUCC 6 Mapping (see Document Library)	Person	71.83 %	9
UT State Documentation For Final MMUCC 6 Mapping (see Document Library)	Non-Motorist	81.05 %	13

5.1.18 Citation Integration – Citation/Crash

Label: C/A-I-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated Improvement
Related Project/System: UTAPS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Integration of the crash data integrated with citation records as measured in terms of:

The percentage of records in the UTAPS database that are linked to citation data.

The result is an increase by 40% in integration. The target for the next period is 100%.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Integrated	Target (percent)
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	0%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	0%	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	0%	10%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	40%	75%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	80%	95%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	100%	100%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	100%	100%
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Notes Current (applicable to 2025-2026):
In the reporting period, the system is processing 100% of traffic-related citations and adjudication data, as identified at the central state repository (i.e., DTS). Both citations and adjudicated data have their own ETL process to store new data, extract it to a front-end database, and then push it to tables accessible via dashboards. The dashboards are currently under development.

Supporting Notes 2023-2024
The UTAPS system continues receiving and processing 100% of citation records on a daily basis on the back-end databases and on the front-end dashboards. Historical data was expanded to include all traffic-related citations since 2018. This is a significant increase in coverage compared to data available last year (last year database was expanded to include 2021 and 2022). The UTAPS team can now respond to data requests with a more complete database including over 5 years of historical records. Additional integration related to adjudicated data is in planning stages, as well as additional interfaces for approved users to directly filter and manage data through a query builder.

Supporting Notes Baseline:

% integrated - 40% (estimated based on the data availability and the resources at hand).
Target (percent) - 75% (deployment of data via dashboards is expected within the next few months)

This is not a direct integration of crashes to citation records, so the goal of the integration is not to identify matching events. Instead, the goal of the integration is to analyze both crashes and citations to support enhanced safety by improving resources available for planning and decision making. This data will be available to the Highway Safety Office, the Highway Patrol, and local law enforcement agencies.

5.1.19 Roadway Integration – Roadway/Crash

Label: R -I-1
Status of Improvement: Demonstrated Improvement
Related Project/System: UTAPS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Integration of the crash data integrated with roadway records as measured in terms of:

The percentage of records in the UTAPS database that are linked to roadway data.

The result is an increase in integration by one new element. The long-term target is to gradually incorporate the full list of elements described below.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Number of Elements	Target
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	0	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	10 elements	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	10 elements	13 elements
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	13 elements	16 elements
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	13 elements	16 elements
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	13 elements	16 elements
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	14 elements	24 elements
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Supporting Materials (Backup)

Notes 2025-2026:
The UTAPS staff commenced integration of GIS layers using UDOT asset layers. This information is guiding quality reviews, specifically when performing quality assurance and end-of-year checks. The first field being used actively is intersections, increasing the integration metrics by one, but with the expectation of similar expansions.

Notes 2024-2025:

The UTAPS system continues to integrate the same number of elements from the roadway system. Additional elements are still on the planning stage and will be incorporated in coordination with UDOT and HSO. Potential new fields include those listed below:

- Rumble strip (type)
- Right shoulder width
- Left shoulder width
- Median condition
- Number of Travel Lanes
- Number of Left Turn Lanes
- Number of Right Turn Lanes
- Bicycle Lane
- Barrier
- Sidewalk
- Intersection

Baseline

The three new elements added in Spring 2023 include the roadway speed limit, the number of lanes, and a value for the city name from a geospatial service.

Elements already existing in the baseline data include the following:

1. Route
2. Direction
3. Segment type
4. MIlepost
5. Ramp ID
6. Exit Number
7. Road Functional Class
8. MPO
9. Rural/Urban Area Type
10. Urban cluster designation
11. Road segment county
12. Road segment region
13. FIPS census code

5.1.20 Injury Surveillance Integration –Pre-Hospital/Trauma Registry

Label: I-I-1
Status of Improvement: Maintained Improvement
Related Project/System: Elite/Utah Trauma Registry

Narrative

Utah will improve the Integration of the Trauma Registry data integrated with Pre-Hospital records as measured in terms of:

The percentage of records in the Pre-Hospital database that are linked to Trauma Registry data.

The result has maintained linkage between trauma and pre-hospital data. The target for the next period is 95 percent.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Percent Integrated	Target (percent)
January 1, 2015	December 31, 2015	19%	Not set
April 1, 2016	March 31, 2017	17%	Not set

April 1, 2017	March 31, 2018	15%	Not set
April 1, 2018	March 31, 2019	64%	Not set
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	90%	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	90%	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	94%	95%
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	94%	95%
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	92%*	95%
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	92%*	95%
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	TBD	
April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

5.1.21 Crash/Citation Accessibility –DDACTS Mapping Tool

Label: C-X-1, C/A-X-1
Status of Improvement: Maintained Improvement
Related Project/System: DDACTS

Narrative

Utah will improve the Accessibility of the crash and citation data as measured in terms of:

The number of users accessing and using the official DDACTS Mapping Tool.

The result is an increase in accessibility compared to the previous year. The target for the next period is 14 UHP and Multiple agency users.

Measurements

Start Date	End Date	Number of Users from L.E. Agencies	Target
April 1, 2019	March 31, 2020	0	Not set
April 1, 2020	March 31, 2021	46 (UHP)	Not set
April 1, 2021	March 31, 2022	46 (UHP)	55 (UHP)
April 1, 2022	March 31, 2023	8 (UHP)	10 UHP & Multiple agencies
April 1, 2023	March 31, 2024	8 (UHP)	10 UHP & Multiple agencies
April 1, 2024	March 31, 2025	8 (UHP)	10 UHP & Multiple agencies
April 1, 2025	March 31, 2026	10 (UHP + Local Agencies)	14 UHP & Multiple agencies

April 1, 2026	March 31, 2027		

Notes 04/13/26: the DDACTS dashboard has undergone significant improvements by integrating crash, citation, and speed data to produce metrics relating these three elements. There are two UHP dashboards to date: one directed to UHP and one directed to all other agencies. UTAPS will continue inviting agencies to test the interfaces throughout 2026.

Notes 05/05/25: The state is conducting initial internal rounds of reviews of dashboards containing both crash and citation data. It is expected for these dashboards to be further tested by a limited number of agencies before moving to a wider release. Data integration between citations, adjudication, and crashes is one of three main integration efforts being conducted as part of the SEDC grant with NHTSA. Progress on this area will be reported as soon as the dashboards are opened for agencies to test and use on a regular basis.

Notes 04/30/24: The pilot study to include new law enforcement agencies is still in planning stages. No concrete progress on this item, but the future goal remains unchanged. Specific plans are being drafted as part of expanded integration efforts for the next reporting period.

6. Traffic Records Data Standards Compliance

6.1 Model Inventory of Roadway Elements (MIRE) Compliance

In this section, Utah has incorporated specific quantifiable and measurable anticipated improvements for the collection of MIRE fundamental data elements.

6.1.1 MIRE Data Collection Status

Which MIRE fundamental data elements are currently being collected and which MIRE fundamental data elements are not being collected? On which functional classes of roads are not being collected?

The following table summarizes which data are currently collected, how, where they are stored, and what data gaps (orange cells) still need to be addressed.

		Non-Local						Local (B&C Roads)		
MIRE 2.0 Number	Element	State Roads Source	State Roads Source Detail	Percent Complete	Federal Aid Roads Source	FA Source Detail	Percent Complete	Local Roads Source	Local Source Detail	Percent Complete
4.1	Type of Governmen	HPMS	ownership in R&H	100	HPMS	ownership in R&H	100	HPMS	ownership in R&H	100
4.2	Type of Governmen	HPMS	ownership in R&H	100	HPMS	ownership in R&H	100			
8	Route Number	UDOT LRS	UDOT Routes	100	UDOT LRS	UDOT Routes	100			
9	Route/Street Name	R&H	agrc_alias	100	R&H	agrc_alias	100			
10	Begin Point Segmer	UDOT LRS	In R&H	100	UDOT LRS	In R&H	100	UDOT LRS	In R&H for ARNOLD	100
11	End point Segment	UDOT LRS	In R&H	100	UDOT LRS	In R&H	100	UDOT LRS	In R&H for ARNOLD	100
12	Segment Identifier	Multiple	LRS route number, UTRANS id's, or derived	100	Multiple	LRS route number, UTRANS id's, or derived	100	Multiple	LRS route number, UTRANS id's, or derived	
13	Segment Length	UDOT LRS	Stored in the M feature	100	UDOT LRS	Stored in the M feature	100			
18	Direction of Inventor	UDOT LRS	P or N direction	100	UDOT LRS	P or N direction	100			
19.1	Functional Class	R&H Public	functional_class	100	R&H	functional_class	100	R&H	functional_class	100
19.2	Functional Class (In	R&H Public	functional_class	100	R&H	functional_class	100			
20	Rural/Urban Design	R&H	alrs_urban_code	100	R&H	alrs_urban_code	100	R&H	alrs_urban_code	
21	Federal Aid	R&H	NHS and numbering	100	R&H	NHS and numbering	100			
22	Route Type	R&H	strawnet layer	100	R&H	strawnet layer	100			
23	Access Control	R&H	hpms_access_control	100	R&H	hpms_access_control	100			
24	Surface Type	R&H	hpms_surface_type	100	R&H	hpms_surface_type	100	UTRANS	dot_surf_type	25
32	Number of Through	R&H	hpms_total_lanes	100	R&H	hpms_total_lanes	100	UTRANS	dot_thru_lanes	25
55	Median Type	Median asset layer	median_type	100	usRAP	item 27 or 24	100			
81	AADT	UDOT Traffic		100	UDOT Traffic		100	UTRANS	aadt	0
82	AADT Year	UDOT Traffic		100	UDOT Traffic		100	UTRANS	dot_aadt_year	0
93	One/Two-Way Oper	R&H	hpms_facility_type	100	R&H	hpms_facility_type	100			
110	Unique Junction Ide	Intersections Asset	pending asset_id	100	usRAP	pending asset_id	100			
112	Location Identifier fc	Intersections Asset	same as centerpoint	100	usRAP	same as centerpoint	100			
113	Location Identifier fc	Intersections Asset	same as centerpoint	100	usRAP	same as centerpoint	100			
116	Intersection/Junctior	Intersections Asset	int_type	100	usRAP	intersection_geometry, intersection_type	100			
121	Intersection/Junctior	Intersections Asset	traffic_co	100	usRAP	intersection/junction_traffic_control	100			
129	Unique Approach Id	Intersections Asset	int_rt_n	100	usRAP	We probably don't have this	25			
130	Approach AADT	UDOT Traffic		100	UDOT Traffic		100			
131	Approach AADT Yea	UDOT Traffic		100	UDOT Traffic		100			
168	Unique Interchange	Intersections Asset	pending asset_id	100	N/A	Not available, but all interchanges are on state roads	100			
172	Interchange Type	Intersections Asset	int_type	100	N/A	Not available, but all interchanges are on state roads	100			
177	Ramp Length	UDOT LRS	Stored in the M feature	100	UDOT LRS	Stored in the M feature	100			
181	Ramp AADT	UDOT Traffic		100	UDOT Traffic		100			
182	Year of Ramp AADT	UDOT Traffic		100	UDOT Traffic		100			
185	Roadway Type at Be	UDOT LRS		100	UDOT LRS		100			
187	Location Identifier fc	UDOT LRS		100	UDOT LRS		100			
189	Roadway Type at En	Derived		100	Derived		100			
191	Location Identifier fc	UDOT LRS		100	UDOT LRS		100			

Which business office(s) in the State DOT collect, receive, and maintain the MIRE fundamental data elements? How are the data stored and managed?

The Asset Management group collects and maintains the asset data in coordination with the Maintenance, Pavement, HPMS, GIS, and Traffic & Safety groups. Data is stored on state servers and managed by internal data scientists and IT staff.

Who can access the MIRE fundamental data elements for safety analyses, and what steps are necessary to access the data? Are systems planned or already implemented to facilitate access to the data (e.g. online portals)?

All MIRE fundamental data elements data are available through the UDOT data portal at- https://data-uplan.opendata.arcgis.com/. The data can be accessed by anyone with the link to the data portal site.

Which agency/office/individual/committee(s) have authority and responsibility for determining the improvements needed to achieve compliance with the MIRE fundamental data elements requirement?

The Traffic and Safety group has the authority and responsibility This is a joint effort with the Asset Management, Maintenance, Pavement, HPMS, GIS, and Traffic & Safety groups.

6.1.2 Data Collection Methodology

For the MIRE fundamental data elements that are already being collected:

- *What methods are being used to collect the MIRE fundamental data elements?*
    - Bi-annual asset inventory is used for state roads.
    - usRAP safety protocol is used for non-state roads, this has been completed once and is planned for updates every 3 – 5 years.
    - ARNOLD protocols and requirements are used for base data such as segment ID's, begin/end points, and route names. This is collected and updated on a continuous basis.
- *How often do they collect the data?*
    - See answers above.
- *What Quality Control/Quality Assurance processes are performed before the data is entered into the database.*
    - Analysts and other data users review data for acceptance. Contractors providing data also perform rigorous quality checks. UDOT requires that data have no more

than 10% field-level error and no more than 5% missing data for point assets and discrete linear assets. For continuous linear assets missing data is not acceptable.

6.1.3 Coordination with Other Agencies

For MIRE fundamental data elements that are NOT currently being collected:

- *Who owns the roads where the elements are not being collected (e.g., State, local government agencies, Trial Governments, Federal Land Management Agencies, etc.)?*
    - Access control is incomplete for all roads of all ownership, the department has established a plan for creating this data based on a set of assumptions.
    - For federal aid roads we are missing unique approach identifiers for intersection, these will be derived from the intersection data.
    - For roads owned by local governments we are missing surface type, through lanes, and AADT. The department is planning to make a series of assumptions to populate these data.
- *Do the agencies that own those roads collect any of the MIRE fundamental data elements?*
    - Many are collected or can be derived from other datasets.
- *What mechanisms are needed to share data among those agencies that collect, store, maintain, and use the MIRE fundamental data elements?*
    - Data is already publicly available and publicized to users via local outreach programs and other interactions.

6.1.4 Prioritization of MIRE Fundamental Data Elements Collection

For additional data that needs to be collected to meet the MIRE fundamental data element requirement:

- *What data elements will be collected in the short (1-3 years), medium (4-6 years), and long (7-9 years) term?*
    - All data has been collected recently or will be within the next year.
- *What collection technologies and/or methodologies are anticipated to be used?*

- LiDAR asset inventory and usRAP data collection via streetview. Also statewide GIS data collaboration processes.

- *Who is responsible for collecting the data?*
  - UDOT and UGRC.
- *How will it be made available to the State DOT?*
  - In asset databases and publicly available data portals.
- *What will be the update cycle for the collection of the data?*
  - Every other year for state roads, every 3-5 years for non-state roads, on a continuous basis for core data such as centerline information.

6.1.5 Costs and Resources for MIRE FDE Data Collection

What are the estimated costs, staffing, and other resource requirements to collect and maintain the MIRE fundamental data elements?

Who will incur those costs?

Total costs are approximately $1 million to $1.5 million annually. Costs are split between the Traffic & Safety, Maintenance, Pavement groups within UDOT, and DPS.

6.2 Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) Compliance

Utah's crash repository is currently 72.87% MMUCC V6 compliant at the Crash data element level.

6.3 National Emergency Medical Services Information System (NEMSIS) Compliance

The Utah EMS Run Reporting System (ELITE) is currently at NEMSIS 3.4 compliant.

6.4 National Trauma Data Standard (NTDS) Compliance

The Utah Statewide Trauma Registry is maintained by the University of Utah, Intermountain Injury Control & Research Center and is National Trauma Data Standard (NTDS) compliant.

6.5 National Information Exchange Model (MIEM) Compliance

Utah's eCitation web services are National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) compliant.

7. Technical Assistance and Data System Training

7.1 Data System Training

7.1.1 Roadway

The UTRANS dataset is updated monthly (many counties provide updates less frequently) and a public version can be found on the Open Data page, with additional details on the UGRC website. For UDOT/UGRC, editors that work directly in the shared statewide database (UTRANS) are trained within their agency by peers and colleagues that have previously performed road data editing tasks. Editors keep an open dialog and are available to help resolve questions.

For local municipalities and counties, no formal training is passed down from the state-level UTRANS editors, however, local governments train their personnel internally and UGRC offers assistance when needed, or if specific questions/issues arise. All data aggregated from the counties is run through an automated change detection process (road geometry and specific attribute changes). All road segments that are flagged with changes are then reviewed and accepted by UGRC personnel before they are included in the UTRANS database.

7.1.2 Driver

The Utah Department of Public Safety, Driver License Division is responsible for providing training and training materials for the Driver data system. The Division uses Articulate training management and a new learning management system that allows for up to date training and monitoring employee training.

7.1.3 EMS

The Bureau of Emergency Medical Services provides training to Utah EMS services and includes training webinars on the https:\\ems.utah.gov website.

Although there are different software platforms used in the State to collect EMS Run reports and there is vendor specific training provided by each, the reports are uploaded to the State. Once received, there are data validation and consistency checks performed and the results are used to provide additional focused training to correct deficiencies.

7.1.4 Crash

Utah Highway Patrol and The Highway Safety Office are responsible for crash report training in the State. They provide Intermediate and Advanced training to municipal, county, and state law enforcement.

7.1.5 Citation

There is no specific training for completing citations since citations are relatively straightforward to complete in the electronic citation modules in use within the State. Additionally, the citation data collection modules enforce edit checks and data validation rules to guide the officer to completing error-free citations.

7.1.6 Vehicle

The Utah Motor Vehicle Division of the Utah State Tax Commission provides on-the-job training to personnel entering data into the Vehicle data system. This training consists of knowledge transfer sessions and other types of peer-to-peer informal training.

7.2 Technical Assistance

7.2.1 Crash Data Improvement Program (CDIP)

The Crash Data Improvement Program was developed to provide States with a means to assess and measure the data quality of their crash databases. In 2011, Utah participated in this program and the FHWA Office of Safety conducted a review of the State's crash reporting data systems. This review resulted in recommendations that Utah has implemented to improve the State's Crash Data Production Process, the Crash Location Process, and to develop and improve data system performance monitoring.

7.2.2 NHTSA MMUCC Mapping

The State of Utah requested for NHTSA to perform a MMUCC V6 data standard mapping analysis in 2024. In 2024, Utah requested a follow-up mapping analysis after updating the State's crash report to increase MMUCC V6 compliance. The results of the mapping analysis shows that Utah is aligned by 73.62%.