

State of Kansas Traffic Records Coordinating Committee

Traffic Records Strategic Plan Implementation

Performance Measurement Program Reference Guide

May 30, 2007



MTG Management Consultants, L.L.C.

1111 Third Avenue, Suite 3010

Seattle, Washington 98101-3292

206.442.5010 206.442.5011

www.mtgmc.com

Albany Austin Denver Seattle Topeka Washington D.C.



Document Purpose

The Kansas Traffic Records System (TRS) Reference Guide is a definition of each performance measurement and a detailed description of the measurement components.

Version	Date	Description/Changes
1.0	5/9/07	Initial version.
2.0	5/15/07	Updates based on performance measurement owner feedback.
3.0	5/30/07	Updates based on feedback and recommendations from the National Highway Traffic Safety Association (NHTSA) review.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	2
A. Performance Measurement Categories.....	2
B. Measurement Layout.....	3
II. Model Data Elements Measurements.....	6
A. MMUCC.....	6
B. NEMSIS.....	8
C. NTDB.....	10
III. TRS Data and Systems Measurements.....	13
A. Crash Information Quality – Completeness.....	13
B. Crash Information Quality – Timeliness.....	15
C. Vehicle Information Quality – Completeness.....	17
D. Injury Surveillance Systems Information Quality – Integration.....	19
IV. TRS Strategic Plan Measurements.....	22
A. Crash Information Quality – Agency Electronic Submittal ..	23
B. Crash Information Quality – Crash Report Electronic Submittal.....	25

I. Introduction

I. Introduction

The Kansas Traffic Records System (TRS) Performance Measurement Reference Guide provides a detailed definition of each measurement, its performance target, and its source of data. The Reference Guide is designed as an accompanying reference text to the Kansas Performance Measurement Program Guidebook and the Kansas TRS Measurement Report (KTMR).

The Kansas project manager or his/her designated team member maintains this reference manual.

A. Performance Measurement Categories

Measurements are organized by category and listed in the order of appearance in the KTMR by measurement name. Kansas TRS performance measurements are targeted at three different organizational classifications. The classifications are:

- *Model Data Elements* – These performance measurements are required as part of the 408 grant program and reflect the usage of the Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) and National Emergency Medical Services Information System (NEMSIS) data elements. They also include TRS compliance with other national data sets, such as the National Trauma Data Bank (NTDB).
- *TRS Data and Systems* – These performance measurements are also required as part of the 408 grant program and demonstrate measurable progress towards the National Highway Traffic Safety Association’s (NHTSA’s) goals of:
 - » Timeliness.
 - » Consistency.
 - » Completeness.
 - » Accuracy.
 - » Accessibility.
 - » Integration.
- *Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) Strategic Plan* – These performance measurements reflect the organization’s progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the strategic plan.

Additional categories of performance measurements may be added in the future in the operational areas of the TRS agencies.

B. Measurement Layout

The layout of each performance measurement is designed to increase accuracy and develop a common understanding of the measurement and its benefits. The key areas of each measurement are described below.

1. The Measurement

This section discusses the concept of the measurement and how it is computed. The data captured about the performance measurement is:

- *Name* – Lists the official name of the measurement.
- *Classification* – Identifies the “category” that the measurement falls within. Three classifications have been defined and incorporated into the Kansas TRS performance measurements framework:
 - » Model Data Elements.
 - » TRS Data and Systems.
 - » Strategic Plan.
- *Division or Agency* – Lists each division or agency that is a primary user of this measurement.
- *Measurement Owner* – Lists the owner or owners that are responsible for collecting the measurement results.
- *Definition* – Defines the measurement and its characteristics in qualitative and quantitative terms.
- *Benefits* – Identifies the value that will come from improved performance.
- *Performance Target* – Signifies the desired performance level of the measurement, as evaluated on the basis of output or outcome.
- *Annual Target* – Documents the multiple annual improvement targets of the performance measurement.
- *Algorithm* – Depicts the formulas and variables used to compute the measurement.
- *Strategic Plan Link* – Lists the links to specific projects within the Kansas Records Strategic Plan.
- *Issues* – Discusses limitations and concerns that could impact the measurement’s effectiveness.
- *Other Notes* – Includes additional pertinent information that does not fall into the above categories.
- *Related Measurements* – Provides a cross-reference to related measurements.

2. The Data

This section introduces the performance measurement underlying data, its sources and any limitations of the data. This section ensures that the performance measurement results are consistent for each reporting period. The specific data elements documented here are:

- *Source* – Identifies the source of the data.
- *Availability* – Describes any constraints on the availability of the data from the source.
- *Data Issues* – Lists known issues that affect the quality of the data.

3. The Future

This section introduces potential future directions for the measurement. This includes ways in which the measurement could evolve or expand as changes are made to the underlying applications or systems.

II. Model Data Elements Measurements

II. Model Data Elements Measurements

The Classification I Kansas TRS performance measurements will consist of the benchmark measurements that certify the State of Kansas' adoption and use of the model data elements. These measurements will demonstrate measurable progress toward full implementation of the model data elements.

A. MMUCC

<i>The Measurement</i>	MMUCC Data Elements
Classification	Model data elements.
Division or Agency	Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT).
Measurement Owner	Mr. Rex McCommon – KDOT 785-296-5169 <i>rex@ksdot.org</i>
Definition	The State of Kansas certifies that it will adopt and use the MMUCC data elements.
Benefits	MMUCC represents a voluntary and collaborative effort to generate uniform crash data that is accurate, reliable, and credible for data-driven highway safety decisions within a state, between states, and at the national level.
Performance Target	The State of Kansas will use 86% of the 111 MMUCC data elements and 83% of the 785 MMUCC data attributes in the Kansas Accident Records System (KARS) database by December 31, 2009.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – 50% of the data elements/41% of the data attributes. 2006 Target – 50% of the data elements/41% of the data attributes. 2007 Target – 50% of the data elements/41% of the data attributes. 2008 Target – 50% of the data elements/41% of the data attributes. 2009 Target – 86% of the data Elements/83% of the data attributes.
Algorithm	Divide the number of MMUCC data elements and attributes in the current KARS database and the new codes in the new crash form by the number of MMUCC available data elements and attributes.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project A – <i>Forms and Specifications – Redesign 850, 851, and 852 Forms</i> Initiative 1 – Project C – <i>Forms and Specifications – Adopt MMUCC Data Standards for Crash Reporting</i> Initiative 2 – Project B – <i>Data Capture Applications – Develop and Implement Field-Based Reporting (FBR) System</i> Initiative 3 – Project B – <i>Data Repositories – Update KARS Data and Reports</i> Initiative 6 – Project A – <i>Develop MMUCC Reporting Capabilities</i> Initiative 6 – Project B – <i>Develop/Update Standard Statistical Reports</i>
Issues	Implementation of the new MMUCC fields is dependent on the implementation of the new KHP FBR application.

<i>The Measurement</i>	MMUCC Data Elements
Other Notes	<p>As of May 1, 2007, the data dictionary has been updated, and the Kansas Motor Vehicle Accident forms have been redesigned to include the expanded MMUCC data elements and attributes.</p> <p>The MMUCC data elements and attributes will be implemented in the FBR application. Implementation of the FBR application will be completed in 2009.</p>
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The data will be derived from the current KARS data model and the future FBR data model.
Availability	The performance owner will report on an annual basis.
Data Issues	There are no known data issues for this measurement.

The Future	There are no known planned changes to this measurement.
-------------------	---

B. NEMSIS

<i>The Measurement</i>	NEMSIS Data Elements
Classification	Model data elements.
Division or Agency	Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services (KBEMS).
Measurement Owner	Mr. Joe Moreland 785-296-7296 <i>emsjm@ink.org</i>
Definition	The State of Kansas certifies that it will adopt and use the essential NEMSIS data elements.
Benefits	The NEMSIS project will help states collect more standardized elements and submit the data into the national EMS database.
Performance Target	The State of Kansas will use 125, or 29%, of the 425 possible NEMSIS data elements in the EMS applications or system by December 31, 2008.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – 0% of the data elements. 2006 Target – 0% of the data elements. 2007 Target – 0% of the data elements. 2008 Target – 29% of the data elements. 2009 Target – 29% of the data elements.
Algorithm	Divide the NEMSIS data elements in the EMS registry system by the number of NEMSIS (425) available data elements.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project B – <i>Forms and Specifications – Select NEMSIS Data Elements for EMS Reporting</i> Initiative 2 – Project C – <i>Data Capture Applications – Develop/Implement EMS Registry System</i> Initiative 6 – Project B – <i>Develop/Update Standard Statistical Reports</i>
Issues	KBEMS does not currently have a mechanized system to collect the NEMSIS data. KBEMS is currently building an EMS system. It has established milestones for the procurement and implementation of the system and will build new performance measurements in the implementation phase.
Other Notes	Initiative 3 of the TRCC Strategic Plan involves the procurement, selection, and implementation of a vendor product which meets gold/silver compliance for EMS data collection. The NEMSIS data standards and further performance measurements will be a requirement of the system procurement. The NEMSIS data elements will be implemented in the EMS application. Implementation of the EMS system will be completed by December 31, 2008.
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The data will be derived from the EMS registry system data model.
Availability	The performance owner will report on an annual basis after implementation of the new system.
Data Issues	There are no known data issues for this measurement.

<i>The Future</i>	There are no known planned changes to this measurement.
--------------------------	---

C. NTDB

<i>The Measurement</i>	NTDB Data Elements
Classification	Model data elements.
Division or Agency	Kansas Department of Health and Environment.
Measurement Owner	Ms. Rosanne Rutkowski 785-296-1210 <i>rrutkows@kdhe.state.ks.us</i>
Definition	The State of Kansas certifies that it will adopt 91% of the elements in the National Trauma Data Standard Data Dictionary.
Benefits	The National Trauma Data Standard Data Dictionary has been developed by the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma to standardize hospital-based data collection to create a nationwide data bank of comparable data from trauma centers. All Kansas hospitals that receive trauma patients contribute data to the NTDB through the Kansas Trauma Registry central site.
Performance Target	The State of Kansas will use 69, or 91%, of the 76 National Trauma Data Standard Data Dictionary elements in the Trauma Registry by December 31, 2008.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – 0% of the data elements (standard not yet available). 2006 Target – 0% of the data elements (standard not yet available). 2007 Target – 74% of the data elements. 2008 Target – 91% of the data elements. 2009 Target – 91% of the data elements.
Algorithm	Divide the number of data elements common to both the Kansas Trauma Registry Data Dictionary and the National Trauma Data Standard Data Dictionary by the total number of elements in the National Trauma Data Standard Data Dictionary.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project G – <i>Forms and Specifications – Adopt Data Elements from the National Trauma Data Standard Data Dictionary</i> Initiative 6 – Project B – <i>Develop/Update Standard Statistical Reports</i>
Issues	Data element attributes (i.e., “pick lists”) may not match the National Standard Data Set, but are mapped before inclusion in the NTDB.
Other Notes	A number of data elements are collected in the Kansas Trauma Registry are not included in the National Standard Data Set.
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The data will be derived from the Kansas Trauma Registry Data Dictionary and National Trauma Data Standard Data Dictionary.
Availability	The performance owner will report on an annual basis.
Data Issues	There are no known data issues for this measurement.
<i>The Future</i>	There are no known planned changes to this measurement.

III. TRS Data and Systems Measurements

III. TRS Data and Systems Measurements

The Classification II Kansas TRCC performance measurements will focus on the TRS data and systems and are required under the 408 grant program measurements.

A. Crash Information Quality – Completeness

<i>The Measurement</i>	Blood Alcohol Content Unknown Results
Classification	TRS data and systems – completeness.
Division or Agency	KDOT.
Measurement Owner	Ms. Theresa Havenstein 785-296-4511 <i>Theresa@ksdot.org</i>
Definition	Kansas will accurately reflect the number of alcohol-related crashes by reducing the number of blank or unknown blood alcohol content (BAC) fields on the crash form submitted to the Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS) database.
Benefits	Complete reporting of BAC data will provide more accurate alcohol-related fatality statistical data for the State of Kansas and other interested parties.
Performance Target	The number of BAC fields with an entry of unknown in the FARS database will be reduced from 55% to 35% by December 31, 2008.
Annual Target	2004 Benchmark – 50.1% of the BAC data elements in FARS database contain a blank or unknown entry. 2005 Target – 49% of the BAC data elements in FARS database contain a blank or unknown entry. 2006 Target – 45% of the BAC data elements in FARS database contain a blank or unknown entry. 2007 Target – 40% of the BAC data elements in FARS database contain a blank or unknown entry. 2008 Target – 35% of the BAC data elements in FARS database contain a blank or unknown entry.
Algorithm	Divide the number of unknown BAC fields (fields that are blank or filled with unknown) by the total number of BAC fields.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project E – <i>Forms and Specifications – Adopt/Update Traffic Data Dictionary</i> Initiative 4 – Project J – <i>Data Exchanges and Information – Develop KARS/KBI BAC Data Access</i> Initiative 6 – Project B – <i>Internal and External Reporting – Develop/Update Standard Statistical Reports</i> Initiative 3 – Project K – <i>Data Capture Applications – Law Enforcement Liaison (LEL) BAC Information Gathering</i>

<i>The Measurement</i>	
Blood Alcohol Content Unknown Results	
Issues	The LELs work with the NHTSA FARS analyst to identify and gather missing BAC data for drivers involved in fatal crashes from the investigating officers. The data closes and is initially reported in the month of February for the previous calendar year. Law enforcement has until the following June (18 months) to make final BAC updates to the FARS database. The final report is produced after the final updates.
Other Notes	None.
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The FARS database.
Availability	The BAC data is available and reported on an annual basis.
Data Issues	The performance measurement data benchmark, targets, and actual results are based on the final June report in the FARS database.

<i>The Future</i>	After Kansas achieves the established targets for this measurement using the final version of the reporting data, it will establish a new performance measurement to focus on improving the BAC unknown results, using the data at the February closing or the initial reporting period.
--------------------------	--

B. Crash Information Quality – Timeliness

<i>The Measurement</i>	Crash Report Processing
Classification	TRS data and systems – timeliness.
Division or Agency	KDOT.
Measurement Owner	Mr. Rex McCommon – KDOT 785-296-5169 <i>rex@ksdot.org</i>
Definition	Kansas will improve the timeliness of the reporting and processing of the state-reportable motor vehicle crash data.
Benefits	Increased timeliness will reduce the number of days required to report and process crash report data and will enable faster analysis of the results of TRCC programs and goals.
Performance Target	Sixty percent of the state-reported motor vehicle crashes will be processed within 60 days by December 31, 2010.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – 32% will be processed within 60 days. 2006 Target – 37% will be processed within 60 days. 2007 Target – 45% will be processed within 60 days. 2008 Target – 52% will be processed within 60 days. 2009 Target – 60% will be processed within 60 days.
Algorithm	For the total number of crash reports in the reporting period, the KARS load date – accident date = # of days.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project A – <i>Forms and Specifications – Redesign 850, 851, and 852 Forms</i> Initiative 2 – Project B – <i>Data Capture Applications – Develop and Implement FBR System</i> Initiative 3 – Project B – <i>Data Repositories – Update KARS Data and Reports</i> Initiative 7 – Project C – <i>Management and Operations – Develop/Implement Communications Plan</i>
Issues	Pursuant to Kansas state law, law enforcement agencies have 10 days after the completion of the investigation to submit crash reports.
Other Notes	For this performance measurement, processing of the crash reports refers to the submission of the crash report, initial validation and coding of the data, and the data input into KARS. When processing is complete, the crash report data is available to the users of KARS.
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The KARS database.
Availability	The crash report data is available on a monthly basis from the KARS application and is reported annually.
Data Issues	The data is accurate and of good quality. There are delays in the receipt of the crash report data due to law enforcement delays in submitting crash reports.

<i>The Future</i>	New benchmarks and annual targets will be established after implementation of the FBR application.
--------------------------	--

C. Vehicle Information Quality – Completeness

<i>The Measurement</i>	Commercial Motor Vehicle Reporting
Classification	TRS data and systems – completeness.
Division or Agency	KDOT.
Measurement Owner	Mr. Rex McCommon – KDOT 785-296-5169 <i>rex@ksdot.org</i>
Definition	Ensuring that a Truck/Bus Supplement (KDOT Form 852) has been completed and submitted will improve the completeness of the commercial motor vehicle (CMV) crash reports.
Benefits	Submitting a Form 852 with a CMV crash report will ensure that Kansas has met the state and federal reporting and monitoring requirements for crash reports.
Performance Target	Ninety-two percent of the CMV crash reports will contain a Form 852 by December 31, 2009.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – 81.4% of CMV crash reports are complete. 2006 Target – 83.0% of CMV crash reports are complete. 2007 Target – 85.0% of CMV crash reports are complete. 2008 Target – 87.0% of CMV crash reports are complete. 2009 Target – 90.0% of CMV crash reports are complete.
Algorithm	For each crash report with a vehicle body type of 10 through 15, verify that the trucks table in the KARS database has a record entry.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project A – <i>Forms and Specifications – Redesign 850, 851, and 852 Forms</i> Initiative 1 – Project C – <i>Forms and Specifications – Adopt MMUCC Data Standards for Crash Reporting</i> Initiative 3 – Project B – <i>Data Repositories – Update KARS Data and Reports</i> Initiative 7 – Project C – <i>Management and Operations – Develop/Implement Communications Plan</i>
Issues	Ongoing law enforcement training and education is being conducted to increase the understanding of the Kansas CMV reporting requirements.
Other Notes	The KDOT Form 852 is a supplemental form that is required for: 1. Accidents involving trucks with at least two axles and six tires. 2. Buses with a seat capacity of 15 or more. 3. Any vehicle transporting hazardous material. Incomplete or missing Kansas Truck/Bus Supplements (852 forms) result in insufficient data for reporting.
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The KARS database.
Availability	The CMV crash report data is available on a monthly basis from the KARS application and is reported annually.
Data Issues	Electronic data capture requires submission of the KDOT Form 852. As additional agencies implement electronic data capture, the completeness of the CMV crash reports will improve.

<i>The Future</i>	New benchmarks and annual targets will be established after implementation of the FBR application.
--------------------------	--

D. Injury Surveillance Systems Information Quality – Integration

The Measurement	Linked Trauma Records
Classification	TRS data and systems – integration.
Division or Agency	Kansas Department of Health and Environment.
Measurement Owner	Ms. Rosanne Rutkowski 785-296-1210 <i>rrutkows@kdhe.state.ks.us</i>
Definition	Kansas will improve the integration of records for single patients transferred between facilities in the trauma system.
Benefits	Linked records will enable monitoring and improvement of triage and transfer processes that affect patient outcome. A decentralized linkage solution developed within the trauma system can be used to integrate the EMS and Trauma Registry central databases.
Performance Target	Kansas will link 90% of the records of care for a patient transferred between facilities.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – 0% of trauma records for transfers linked. 2006 Target – 0% of trauma records for transfers linked. 2007 Target – 90% of trauma records for transfers linked in pilot region. If the pilot method is adopted: 2008 Target – 50% of trauma records for transfers linked in state. 2009 Target – 80% of trauma records for transfers linked. 2010 Target – 90% of trauma records for transfers linked.
Algorithm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Divide the number of records for which an outbound EMS transfer is indicated and a matching trauma tag number is identified in a receiving facility by the total number of records for which an outbound EMS transfer is indicated. 2. Divide the number of records for which an inbound EMS transfer is indicated and a matching trauma tag number is identified in a transferring facility by the total number of records for which an inbound EMS transfer is indicated.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 4 – Project N – <i>Data Exchanges and Integration – Conduct Trauma Tag Pilot Project</i>
Issues	The method for linking records must retain anonymity of patient identity in accordance with current statutes and regulations.
Other Notes	<p>During 2006 and 2007, this measurement is focused on the Trauma Tag pilot project.</p> <p>During the Triage Tag pilot project, each patient is given a trauma tag with a unique number that is tracked through the EMS, Hospital and Trauma forms, or databases. The triage tag number is used to link the patient data between the hospital, EMS, and Trauma units.</p>
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	Pilot – Kansas Trauma Registry.
Availability	Data will be reported to stakeholder groups on an aggregate level. Hospitals will be provided with specific reports on linked records from their facility.
Data Issues	The Trauma team has limited oversight over the Triage Tag pilot data collection and cannot control the data accuracy. The EMS or hospital may not correctly classify 100% of patients for inclusion in the Trauma Registry.

<i>The Future</i>	Future performance measurements in this area are dependent on the outcome of the Trauma Tag pilot results.
--------------------------	--

IV. TRS Strategic Plan Measurements

IV. TRS Strategic Plan Measurements

The Classification III Kansas TRS performance measurements will focus on the State of Kansas TRCC Strategic Plan projects. The results of the strategic plan performance measurements will track the Kansas TRCC's progress in achieving its strategic goals. The strategic plan performance measurements will adopt a balanced scorecard type of approach to ensure all aspects of the plan and organization are covered.

NOTE: Additional TRS strategic plan performance measurements will be identified by the TRCC no later than December 2007. Each of these measurements will be fully documented in this section by December 31, 2007.

A. Crash Information Quality – Agency Electronic Submittal

<i>The Measurement</i>	<i>Agency Electronic Reporting</i>
Classification	TRS data and systems – electronic submittal.
Division or Agency	KDOT.
Measurement Owner	Mr. Rex McCommon – KDOT 785-296-5169 <i>rex@ksdot.org</i>
Definition	Kansas will improve the accessibility of the crash data within the KARS database through an increased number of agencies submitting crash reports electronically.
Benefits	Crash report data is fully accessible from the KARS database, and duplicate data entry is eliminated.
Performance Target	The number of agencies submitting crash reports electronically will increase to 12% by 2009.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – 1% of agencies submitted crash reports electronically. 2006 Target – 3% of agencies submit crash reports electronically. 2007 Target – 5% of agencies submit crash reports electronically. 2008 Target – 6% of agencies submit crash reports electronically. 2009 Target – 12% of agencies submit crash reports electronically.
Algorithm	Divide the number of agencies submitting crash reports electronically by the total number of Kansas agencies (515).
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project A – <i>Forms and Specifications – Redesign 850, 851, and 852 Forms</i> Initiative 2 – Project B – <i>Data Capture Applications – Develop and Implement FBR System</i> Initiative 3 – Project B – <i>Data Repositories – Update KARS Data and Reports</i> Initiative 7 – Project C – <i>Management and Operations – Develop/Implement Communications Plan</i>
Issues	In the current application environment, it may be unrealistic for small or rural law enforcement agencies to report crash data electronically. This is due to limited agency resources and the low number of crashes.
Other Notes	None.
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The KARS database.
Availability	The crash reports from agencies reporting electronically are available on a monthly basis from the KARS application and are reported annually.
Data Issues	None.

<i>The Future</i>	<p>As the TRCC Strategic Plan systems are implemented, the number of agencies submitting crash reports electronically and the accessibility of the electronic crash reports are expected to increase significantly.</p> <p>New benchmarks and annual targets will be established after implementation of the FBR application.</p>
--------------------------	---

B. Crash Information Quality – Crash Report Electronic Submittal

<i>The Measurement</i>	Electronic Crash Reports
Classification	TRS data and systems – electronic submittal.
Division or Agency	KDOT.
Measurement Owner	Mr. Rex McCommon – KDOT 785-296-5169 <i>rex@ksdot.org</i>
Definition	Increasing the number of crash reports submitted electronically will improve the accessibility of the crash data within the KARS database.
Benefits	Crash report data is fully accessible from the KARS database, and duplicate data entry is eliminated.
Performance Target	The percentage of crash reports submitted electronically will increase to 15% by 2009.
Annual Target	2005 Benchmark – less than 1% of crash reports were submitted electronically. 2006 Target – 2% of crash reports are submitted electronically. 2007 Target – 5% of crash reports are submitted electronically. 2008 Target – 10% of crash reports are submitted electronically. 2009 Target – 15% of crash reports are submitted electronically.
Algorithm	Divide the number of crash reports submitted electronically by the total number of crash reports submitted.
Strategic Plan Link	Initiative 1 – Project A – <i>Forms and Specifications – Redesign 850, 851, and 852 Forms</i> Initiative 2 – Project B – <i>Data Capture Applications – Develop and Implement FBR System</i> Initiative 3 – Project B – <i>Data Repositories – Update KARS Data and Reports</i> Initiative 7 – Project C – <i>Management and Operations – Develop/Implement Communications Plan</i>
Issues	In the current application environment, it may be unrealistic for small or rural law enforcement agencies to report crash data electronically. This is due to limited agency resources and the low number of crashes.
Other Notes	None.
Related Measurements	None.

<i>The Data</i>	
Source	The KARS database.
Availability	The electronic crash report data is available on a monthly basis from the KARS application and is reported annually.
Data Issues	Some crash reports were transmitted more than once to the KARS database due to corrections or amendments by law enforcement.

<i>The Future</i>	<p>As the TRCC Strategic Plan systems are implemented, the number of agencies submitting crash reports electronically and the accessibility of the electronic crash reports are expected to increase significantly.</p> <p>New benchmarks and annual targets will be established after implementation of the FBR application.</p>
--------------------------	---