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Executive Summary
Out of 391 assessment questions, Oregon met the Advisory ideal for 159 questions (40.7%), partially met the Advisory ideal for 63 questions (16.1%), and did not meet the Advisory ideal for 169 questions (43.2%).

As Figure 1 illustrates, within each assessment module, Oregon met the criteria outlined in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory 57.9% of the time for Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management, 6.3% of the time for Strategic Planning, 56.8% of the time for Crash, 33.3% of the time for Vehicle, 53.3% of the time for Driver, 57.9% of the time for Roadway, 11.1% of the time for Citation / Adjudication, 44.7% of the time for EMS / Injury Surveillance, and 15.4% of the time for Data Use and Integration.

Figure 1: Rating Distribution by Module
### Figure 2: Assessment Section Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Contents</th>
<th>Crash</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Citation / Adjudication</th>
<th>EMS / Injury Surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Guidelines</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Dictionaries</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures / Process Flow</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaces</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality Control Programs</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall                  | 72.2% | 58.2%   | 70.6%  | 80.0%   | 49.2%                    | 68.5%                     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for the Traffic Records System</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Use and Integration</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

Figure 2 shows the aggregate ratings by data system and assessment module. Each question’s score is derived by multiplying its rank and rating (very important = 3, somewhat important = 2, and less important = 1; meets = 3, partially meets = 2, and does not meet = 1). The sum total for each module section is calculated based upon the individual question scores. Then, the percentage is calculated for each module section as follows:

\[
\text{Section average (\%)} = \frac{\text{Section sum total}}{\text{Section total possible}}
\]

The cells highlighted in red indicate the module sub-sections that scored below that data system’s weighted average. The following priority recommendations are based on improving those module subsections with scores below the overall system score.

According to 23 CFR Part 1200, §1200.22, applicants for State traffic safety information system improvements grants are required to maintain a State traffic records strategic plan that—
“(3) Includes a list of all recommendations from its most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment; (4) Identifies which such recommendations the State intends to implement and the performance measures to be used to demonstrate quantifiable and measurable progress; and (5) For recommendations that the State does not intend to implement, provides an explanation.”

Oregon can address the recommendations below by implementing changes to improve the ratings for the questions in those section modules with lower than average scores. Oregon can also apply for a NHTSA Traffic Records GO Team, for targeted technical assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the TRCC’s abilities for strategic planning to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the procedures/ process flows for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the interfaces with the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data quality control program for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the applicable guidelines for the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data quality control program for the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data dictionary for the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data quality control program for the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the applicable guidelines for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data quality control program for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation / Adjudication Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data dictionary for the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the interfaces with the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data quality control program for the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMS / Injury Surveillance Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the data quality control program for the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Use and Integration Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the traffic records systems capacity to integrate data to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction
A traffic records system consists of data about a State’s roadway transportation network and the people and vehicles that use it. The six primary components of a State traffic records system are: Crash, Driver, Vehicle, Roadway, Citation/Adjudication, and Injury Surveillance. These components address driver demographics, licensure, behavior and sanctions; vehicle types, configurations, and usage; engineering, education, enforcement measures; crash-related medical issues and actions; and how they affect highway traffic safety.

Quality traffic records data exhibiting the six primary data quality attributes—timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility—is necessary to improve traffic safety and effectively manage the motor vehicle transportation network, at the Federal, State, and local levels. Such data enables problem identification, countermeasure development and application, and outcome evaluation. Continued application of data-driven, science-based management practices can decrease the frequency of traffic crashes and mitigate their substantial negative effects on individuals and society.

State traffic records systems are the culmination of the combined efforts of collectors, managers, and users of data. Collaboration and cooperation between these groups can improve data and ensure that the data is used in ways that provide the greatest benefit to traffic safety efforts. Thoughtful, comprehensive, and uniform data use and governance policies can improve service delivery, link business processes, maximize return on investments, and improve risk management.

Congress has recognized the benefit of independent peer reviews for State traffic records data systems. These assessments help States identify areas of high performance and areas in need of improvement in addition to fostering greater collaboration among data systems. In order to encourage States to undertake such reviews regularly, Congress’ Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) legislation requires States to conduct or update an assessment of its highway safety data and traffic records system every 5 years in order to qualify for §405(c) grant funding. The State’s Governor’s Representative must certify that an appropriate assessment has been completed within five years of the application deadline.

Background
In 2012, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration published an updated Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory (Report No. DOT HS 811 644). This Advisory was drafted by a group of traffic safety experts from a variety of backgrounds and affiliations, including: State highway safety offices, the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) and the Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals (ATSIP), as well as staff from NHTSA, FMCSA, and FHWA. The Advisory provides information on the contents, capabilities, and data quality of effective traffic records systems by describing an ideal that supports quality data driven decisions and improves highway safety. In addition, the Advisory describes in detail the importance of quality data in the identification of crash causes and outcomes, the development of effective interventions, implementation of countermeasures that prevent crashes and improve crash outcomes, updating traffic safety programs, systems, and policies, and evaluating progress in
reducing crash frequency and severity.

The Advisory is based upon a uniform set of questions derived from the ideal model traffic records data system. This model and suite of questions is designed to be used by independent subject matter experts in their assessment of the systems and processes that govern the collection, management, and analysis of traffic records data in a given State.

Methodology
A State initiates the assessment process by submitting a formal request to its NHTSA Regional Administrator. Once that request is passed onto the NHTSA National Center for Statistics and Analysis Traffic Records Team, it appoints an assessment facilitator to work with the State Governor’s Representative to identify a State assessment coordinator and appropriate State respondents for each assessment question. Respondents enter the data into NHTSA’s State Traffic Records Assessment Program (STRAP), the Web-based application for the assessment. The assessment facilitator works with the State assessment coordinator to prepare for the assessment and establish a schedule consistent with the example outlined in Figure 3. Actual schedules can vary as dates may be altered to accommodate State-specific needs.
### Figure 3: Traffic Records Assessment Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event / Time Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon NHTSA TR Team receipt of request</td>
<td>Initial pre-assessment conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month prior to kickoff meeting</td>
<td>Facilitator introduction pre-assessment conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between facilitator conference call and kickoff</td>
<td>State Coordinator assigns questions, enters contact information into STRAP, and builds initial document library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, Week 1</strong></td>
<td>On-site kickoff meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, Week 1 – 12pm EST, Friday, Week 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Round 1 Data Collection</strong>: State answers standardized assessment questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, Week 3 – Wednesday, Week 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Round 1 Analysis</strong>: Assessors review State answers and rate the responses and, if needed, request necessary clarifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, Week 5 – 12pm EST, Friday, Week 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Round 2 Data Collection</strong>: State responds to the assessors’ initial ratings and requests for more information and clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, Week 7 – Wednesday, Week 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Round 2 Analysis</strong>: Assessors review additional information from the State and, if needed, adjust initial ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, Week 9 – 12pm EST, Friday, Week 11</strong></td>
<td><strong>Round 3 Data Collection</strong>: State provides final response to the assessors’ ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, Week 11 – Monday, Week 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Round 3 Analysis</strong>: make final ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, Week 13 – Monday, Week 14</strong></td>
<td>Facilitator prepares final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 15</strong></td>
<td>NHTSA delivers final report to State and Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(After completion of assessment, date set by State)</strong></td>
<td>NHTSA hosts webinar to debrief State participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(After completion of assessment)</strong></td>
<td>(OPTIONAL) State may request GO Team targeted technical assistance or training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following a kickoff meeting that explains the assessment process, schedule, and confirms question assignments, each respondent is sent an email with a token enabling them to log onto STRAP and answer assessment questions that had been assigned to them. The respondents may (a) answer a question, (b) answer the question and refer that question to another person to answer it as well, (c) refer the question—decline the question and send the question to someone else to answer—or (d) decline the question.

The traffic records assessment is an iterative process that includes three question-answer cycles. In each, State respondents have the opportunity to answer each question assigned to them before the assessors examine their answers and supporting evidence, at which point the
assessors rate each response. The second and third question and answer cycles are used to clarify responses and provide the most accurate rating for each question. In an attempt to prioritize the capabilities of each system being assessed, each question is ranked as “very important,” “somewhat important” or “less important.” To assist the State in responding to each question, the Advisory also provides State respondents with standards of evidence that identify the specific information necessary to answer each assessment question.

A group of qualified independent assessors rates the responses and determines how closely a State’s capabilities match those of the ideal system outlined in the Advisory. Each system component is evaluated independently by two or more assessors, who reach a consensus on the ratings. Specifically, the assessors rate each response and determine if a State (a) meets the description of the ideal traffic records system, (b) partially meets the ideal description, or (c) does not meet the ideal description. The assessors write a brief narrative to explain their rating for each question.

In order for NHTSA to accept and approve an assessment each question must have an answer. When appropriate, however, a State may answer questions with “no, we do not have this capability/use this practice” etc. These responses constitute an acceptable answer and will receive a “does not meet” rating. An assessment with unanswered or blank questions will not be acceptable and cannot be used to qualify for §405 grant funds.

The complete traffic records assessment process is outlined in Figure 5 below.

States are encouraged to use the conclusions of this report as a basis for the State data improvement program strategic planning process, and are encouraged to review the conclusions at least annually to gauge how the State is addressing the items in this report. NHTSA can provide support in addressing these conclusions by means of GO Teams. NHTSA's Traffic Records GO Team program helps States improve their traffic records systems by deploying teams of subject matter experts to deliver tailored technical assistance and training based on States' actual needs.
Figure 4: State Schedule for the Traffic Records Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kickoff</td>
<td>September 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin first Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>September 29, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End first Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>October 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin second Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>October 29, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End second Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>November 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin third Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>November 26, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End third Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>December 11, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors’ Final Results Complete</td>
<td>December 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report Due</td>
<td>January 04, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief</td>
<td>January 11, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: State Traffic Records Assessment Process
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Results

For each question, a rating was assigned based on the answers and supporting documentation provided by the State. The ratings are shown as three icons, depicting ‘meets’, ‘partially meets’, or ‘does not meet’.
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Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management

Oregon’s Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) is comprised of a single membership tier composing a technical level committee. All traffic records funding is authorized and allocated by the Oregon TRCC. The Oregon Transportation Safety Committee (OTSC) is a volunteer citizen-led committee established by the Governor, which provides an oversight and advisory role to the TRCC and for all Transportation Safety matters as a whole. The TRCC chair regularly reports to the OTSC regarding all TRCC projects and actions. The Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory recommends that executive group members hold positions within their agencies that enable them to establish policy and direct resources within their areas of responsibility. The OTSC certainly plays a positive and important role in traffic records in Oregon and there is an opportunity to perhaps expand the OTSC to include additional members with executive roles in State agencies that house components of the traffic records system. This can only serve to improve communication and sharing of knowledge, and would allow the OTSC to better meet the ideals set forth in the Advisory.

The majority of the core component areas have representation on the TRCC including members from Law Enforcement, both State and local, as well as representatives from Health, Department of Motor Vehicles, and State and local Transportation officials. While there are State and local law enforcement officials representing the citation issuance component, it does not appear that there is representation from the managers of citation and adjudication traffic records system components. There is an opportunity for greater involvement and participation from Citation / Adjudication systems. As many states have significantly improved their crash systems, focus is beginning to shift to eCitation and adjudication efforts. Strong representation from Citation / Adjudication system owners will be crucial to statewide efforts in this area. Active participation from all core component areas will increase collaboration and communication and can only benefit traffic records system stakeholders.

The technical TRCC in Oregon is fully responsible for the development, implementation, and monitoring of the TRCC Strategic Plan and all core component areas are represented in the plan. However, there is an opportunity in this area to make oversight, tracking, and reporting of progress more streamlined. Improvement and expansion of performance measures in the strategic plan can be accomplished by making use of NHTSA resources and the FHWA CDIP program, for example. While the plan contains performance measures representing the core component areas, many lack goals and baselines, which are crucial to monitoring progress over time and providing a mechanism to judge improvements that are being made. Listing measures without taking the measurements misses the mark. The NHTSA Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems document is a good resource for considering and implementing measures for all the traffic records datasets and can be found at http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/811441.pdf.

Performance measure reporting and oversight on a regular basis at quarterly TRCC meetings, as well as discussions of problems, successes, and solutions, benefit the entire traffic safety community. Performance measures should be developed by individual component system representatives and should be designed to provide important actionable information to data system managers. This will assist the TRCC with its decision-making and allocation of funding to ensure it has the greatest impact on traffic safety.
A more robust quality control program also can be beneficial. The TRCC should consider implementing a program which would allow committee members to receive more routine information regarding data quality. This would allow the TRCC to have some oversight and monitoring of quality across all of the State's traffic records component systems.

The generation of project ideas and the coordination of efforts are two important functions of the TRCC. The TRCC in Oregon provides an environment for meaningful coordination and discussion among traffic records system stakeholders. TRCC Meeting minutes and agendas indicate discussion of many different projects and traffic records initiatives amongst a wide variety of parties. Discussions regarding the State's investment in traffic records projects and potential project funding are routine. Oregon's TRCC meetings are well run, enabling meaningful coordination, review, and discussion regarding traffic records projects across agencies. The TRCC meeting notes provided establish that many important topics are discussed by members and that these discussions are helpful to participants. It appears that Oregon provides a great example of the proper items and topics that should be routinely discussed at TRCC meetings. The TRCC has a designated chair and vice chair who carry out the mandates as established by the Charter. A member from the Oregon Governor's Highway Safety Office serves as the TRCC Coordinator and represents the State’s traffic records system interests across the State regularly.

Oregon does not have a single statewide traffic records inventory. This is not uncommon as many states and their state agencies hold and maintain their data dictionaries and documentation for traffic safety systems independently from one another. It appears that some progress is being made towards compiling a more complete inventory. It would be beneficial for Oregon to continue to pursue a traffic records inventory moving forward--complete with data elements, attributes, definitions, and other components that would be helpful to traffic records professionals in the State. A comprehensive traffic records inventory is a useful and pragmatic document to ensure that efforts are not duplicated and data is accessible to those who need it to make good decisions. It can also help traffic records systems owners identify areas where there are opportunities for data integration. The State of Oregon is to be commended for its work in this area and encouraged to continue these efforts. As traffic systems data becomes more widely used, this will assist in streamlining processes and allow the data to be more fully utilized to make roadways safer.

The Oregon TRCC was proactive in assessing and providing training in conjunction with EMS data improvement initiatives. The example provided was a project authorized by the TRCC which included NEMSIS training. Consideration should be given to conducting a training needs assessment which would be utilized to identify the overall needs of traffic records system users across all core component areas. All TRCC members would benefit from a meeting to discuss the technical and training needs of traffic records system users. Front line users, including local law enforcement, should be included in this discussion so that their needs can be documented and examined. Users of the various traffic records component systems from State agencies should also be included. Active participation in the TRCC from system end-users is equally as important as participation from the system owners. In addition, adding a topic to each meeting to discuss training needs would help ensure monitoring of this important element.

Oregon utilizes federal 408 funding in addition to 405(c) funding for traffic records improvement projects and cited several projects spanning across several core component areas which utilized both federal funding sources. There are a number of other federal funding sources that are
available which can be utilized for traffic records improvement efforts including funds from FHWA and FMCSA. Consideration should be given to exploring these and other potential funding sources for traffic records projects in addition to the NHTSA funding which is traditionally available. These funding sources should be explored and oftentimes there can be opportunities for State funding to be utilized as well. State representatives from FMCSA and FHWA, if not already participating, should be included in TRCC meetings as they often have insight into other federal funding which may be available to the State, and can brief the committee regarding decisions that are being made at the federal level which may impact traffic records at the State level.

Overall, the Oregon TRCC seems to be functioning well under its current structure. Opportunities for TRCC growth in the coming years include: expanding the role and membership of the OTSC and TRCC, use of performance measures and regular performance measure and quality control reporting, development of a formal traffic records inventory, and organization of a training and technical needs assessment.

**Question 1:**

Does the State have both an executive and a technical TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide a charter and/or MOU. Also provide a roster with all members’ names, affiliations, and titles for both the executive and technical TRCC.

**Assessor conclusions:**

Oregon has a single working-level technical TRCC structure with oversight provided by the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee (OTSC). The technical or working-level TRCC is made up of managers and professionals representing the Traffic Records core component areas. The Transportation Safety Committee oversees all TRCC projects and functions in an oversight and advisory role, but does not quite meet the standard of serving as an executive TRCC based on the Advisory ideal.

The Advisory recommends that executive group members hold positions within their agencies that enable them to establish policy and direct resources within their areas of responsibility. Based on the evidence provided, a volunteer citizen-led committee falls short of meeting the Advisory ideal for an executive-level TRCC. However, the OTSC certainly plays a positive and important role in traffic records in Oregon. Perhaps the OTSC can be expanded to include additional members with executive roles in traffic records at the State level, which would help to meet this ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 2:
Do the executive TRCC members have the power to direct the agencies’ resources for their respective areas of responsibility?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a charter and/or memorandum of understanding (MOU). Also provide a roster with all members’ names, affiliations, and titles for the executive TRCC.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Some TRCC members have the ability to direct and influence resources within their respective agencies and traffic records systems. In addition, the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee which functions in an oversight or executive role, includes executive membership with resource allocation abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 3:
Does the executive TRCC review and approve actions proposed by the technical TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative example of recent actions or programs approved by the executive TRCC (e.g., an approved project or funding proposal).

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Oregon Transportation Safety Committee reviews and approves actions by the technical TRCC. Proposed projects are reviewed by both the TRCC and the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee. The TRCC members work together to coordinate systems and identify projects which are then presented to TRCC membership for consideration. Project recommendations are then made and forwarded to the OTSC for final approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4:
Does the TRCC include representation from the core data systems at both the executive and technical levels?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the executive and technical TRCC members that represent the core data systems: crash, driver, vehicle, roadway, citation and adjudication, and injury surveillance.

Assessor conclusions:
All core data systems are represented by executive and technical members on both the TRCC and OTSC. The TRCC consists of members from Law Enforcement, both State and local, as well as representatives from Health and Motor Vehicles agencies, and State and local transportation officials.

Respondents assigned: 1  
Responses received: 1  
Response rate: 100%

Question 5:
Does the TRCC consult with the appropriate State IT agency or offices when planning and implementing technology projects?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative example of the TRCC’s process of consulting the appropriate IT agency or offices. Identify the appropriate agency or offices and their responsibilities.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon TRCC has representatives from IT who participate on the committee. All projects are vetted through each agency's respective IT groups as appropriate. Having an IT member of the TRCC helps the group make better and more informed decisions.

Respondents assigned: 1  
Responses received: 1  
Response rate: 100%
**Question 6:**
Is there a formal document authorizing the TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the authorizing document (e.g. MOU, charter).

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon has a TRCC charter that authorizes the committee, details its responsibilities and duties, and defines its role and mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 7:**
Does the TRCC provide the leadership and coordination necessary to develop, implement, and monitor the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing the TRCC’s role in developing the TRCC strategic plan as well as implementation of a project detailed in the plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State’s strategic plan includes the processes for development and implementation of the plan. Oregon may wish to consider developing more formal methods of monitoring the plan’s implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 8:**
Does the TRCC influence policy decisions that impact the State's traffic records system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing a specific example of how the TRCC is engaged by component agencies in the course of their decision-making processes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While system owners participate in the TRCC quarterly and members from all systems are represented, the examples provided don't meet the Advisory ideal.

Instances where the TRCC membership issued recommendations or guidance which led to implementation of legislation impacting traffic records systems, or led to changes in a department's official "policies" regarding traffic records systems or traffic records data would help to meet the ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 9:**
Does the TRCC allocate federal traffic records improvement grant funds?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Specify what funds the TRCC is responsible for allocating (e.g., §405(c)) and provide a narrative describing how the TRCC allocated the most recent program year's funding.

**Assessor conclusions:**
All federal traffic records funding is allocated through the TRCC by consensus or popular vote as indicated in the meeting agendas and meeting minutes, with oversight provided by the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 10:**
Does the TRCC identify core system performance measures and monitor progress?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide at least one performance measure for each of the six core systems and describe how the TRCC identified it and has tracked its progress over time.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Performance measures for all core areas are included in the strategic plan but do not appear to include goals or baselines. The Oregon DOT Traffic Safety Performance Plan also contains traffic records performance measures which do include goals and baselines. However, it is unclear how often progress is measured or reported to the TRCC. The question specifies that the TRCC identify and track performance measures over time, and provide evidence of the tracking of at least one performance measure for each of the six core systems. There has been no documentation provided which demonstrates the tracking or ongoing monitoring of performance measure data for either plan.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |

**Question 11:**
Does the TRCC enable meaningful coordination among stakeholders and serve as a forum for the discussion of the State's traffic records programs, challenges, and investments?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the charter or MOU and minutes from the two most recent technical TRCC meetings.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The generation of project ideas and the coordination of efforts are two important functions of the TRCC. The TRCC in Oregon provides an environment for meaningful coordination and discussion among traffic records system stakeholders. TRCC Meeting minutes and agendas indicate discussion of many different projects and traffic records initiatives among a wide variety of parties. Discussions regarding the State's investment in traffic records projects and potential project funding are routine.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |
### Question 12: Does the TRCC have a traffic records inventory?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide the traffic records inventory.

**Assessor conclusions:**

Oregon does not have a statewide traffic records inventory. It appears that some progress is being made towards compiling a more complete inventory. It would be beneficial for Oregon to continue to pursue a traffic records inventory moving forward—complete with data elements, attributes, definitions, and other components that would be helpful to traffic records professionals in the State. A comprehensive traffic records inventory is a useful and pragmatic document to ensure that efforts are not duplicated and data is accessible to those who need it to make good decisions. The State is to be commended for its work in this area and encouraged to continue these efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 13: Does the technical TRCC have a designated chair?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide a position description, identify the individual, and describe the chair's responsibilities.

**Assessor conclusions:**

Oregon has a designated TRCC chair and vice chair. Their duties and responsibilities are to ensure the TRCC carries out its necessary functions which include the mandates as established in the TRCC Charter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 14:
Does the TRCC have a designated coordinator?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a position description, identify the individual, and describe the coordinator's responsibilities.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon has a designated TRCC traffic records program coordinator from the State Highway Safety Office who functions to facilitate data quality improvements through a variety of duties. The coordinator has many responsibilities including representing the State’s traffic records interests in regional and national highway safety meetings and activities, as well as facilitating data sharing and providing technical assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 15:
Does the executive TRCC meet at least once annually?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a schedule of executive meeting dates from the past two program years.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon Transportation Safety Committee (OTSC) receives quarterly updates regarding TRCC proceedings and activities. However, only one agenda and no history of meeting dates have been provided so it is unclear how often the committee meets. As the OTSC only partially meets the Advisory ideal for an executive-level TRCC, it was determined that partial credit should be awarded here. If in the future, the OTSC is expanded to include membership to help it meet the Advisory ideal as an executive TRCC, then this rating would follow suit and improve accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 16:
Does the technical TRCC meet at least quarterly?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a schedule of technical TRCC meeting dates for the past program year. If the TRCC has topical sub-committees, identify these groups, their purposes, and meeting dates as well.

Assessor conclusions:
The State TRCC meets quarterly or more often as needed. Subcommittee groups are handled on an ad hoc basis without the formality of the TRCC meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 17:
Does the TRCC oversee quality control and quality improvement programs impacting the core data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide meeting minutes or reports that document the quality control activities that the TRCC undertakes regularly.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC does not oversee quality control or quality improvement programs impacting the core data systems in Oregon. While the TRCC Strategic Plan does contain some performance measures regarding quality control for core component systems, there is no regular monitoring or formal reporting of quality performance measures to the TRCC. The TRCC should consider implementing a program which would allow committee members to receive more routine information regarding data quality. This would allow the TRCC to have some oversight and monitoring of data quality across the State's traffic records systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important
**Question 18:**
Does the TRCC address technical assistance and training needs?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document TRCC discussion of technical assistance and training needs with meeting agendas or minutes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State TRCC was proactive in assessing and providing training in conjunction with EMS data improvement initiatives. The example provided was a project authorized by the TRCC which included NEMSIS training. Consideration should be given to conducting a training needs assessment which would be utilized to identify the overall needs of traffic records system users across all core component areas. In addition, adding a topic to each meeting to discuss training needs would assist in satisfying this Advisory ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 19:**
Does the TRCC use a variety of federal funds to strategically allocate resources for traffic records improvement projects?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an inventory of federal funds used to support traffic records improvement projects in the last program year.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon utilizes federal 408 funding in addition to 405(c) funding for traffic records improvement projects and cited several projects spanning across several core component areas which utilized both federal funding sources. There are a number of other federal funding sources that are available which can be utilized for traffic records improvement efforts including funds from FHWA and FMCSA. Consideration should be given to exploring these, and other potential funding sources for traffic records projects in addition to the NHTSA funding which is traditionally available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Planning

The Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) is responsible for the development and maintenance of a strategic plan. Following the delivery of the last traffic records assessment, the TRCC, in 2013, created Oregon’s Strategic Plan document (hereafter referenced as the Plan).

The Plan included a comprehensive listing of all of the recommendations from the assessment and other areas needing attention or improvement. Organized by the various system components, the Plan’s listing was designed to enable a tracking system that could quickly identify actions being taken to address the recommendations. Those normally would be named projects with details such as when the project would start, who would be responsible, what specific actions will be taken, and when to expect the project would be completed. At a glance the Plan could always serve as a status report on all of the listed projects.

Other details would also be associated with the individual projects and their relationships with the projects. Essential factors of those relationships should also be evident, such as the priority of each of the projects, resources to be applied, funding required and/or available.

Such a plan would begin with the TRCC’s stated intentions, and it would be continually updated with each accomplishment and the progress made. Then at TRCC meetings, the review of the Plan would show basically what has been done, what remains, and what to expect for project completion. The TRCC review would present the opportunity for reallocating funds and other resources as needed or to introduce any new activities for inclusions or other adjustments.

In this manner, the plan would be a monitoring tool, and a yearly update would become the archival record of progress toward the stated objectives and goals.

The Oregon Plan does not include a strategy for each of the items that were listed in the 2013 initial version. In actuality, there are no projects that could be expressed in specific actions. Thus there are no strategies detailed. Having no projects specified, prioritizing is a non-issue.

The Oregon Plan updates have essentially consisted of changing of dates from 2013 to 2014 and again to 2015; some pagination changes were applied. The substantive changes were in updating the financial information for the two projects listed in the end of the document.

Strategic goals are used as a basis for funding decisions, and progress is measured in comparison with those goals. Those are the bases for establishing and maintaining a functional strategic plan.

The Oregon Plan, revised following this assessment, could present a framework that would identify the necessary projects for improvement, enable them to be prioritized, detail the resources and funding required to execute the planned projects, and then monitor the progress for the TRCC during the steps to bring the projects to completion. Doing that would transform Oregon’s Plan—which is now only a document—into a workable Strategic Plan.
**Question 20:**
Does the TRCC develop the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document the process undertaken by the TRCC in developing the strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The TRCC appears to develop the State’s strategic plan for traffic records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 21:**
Does the TRCC strategic plan address existing data and data systems deficiencies and document how these deficiencies are identified?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the strategic plan addresses existing data and data systems deficiencies and documents how they were identified.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The strategic plan includes a comprehensive list of deficiencies by data system component, presumably pulled directly from the 2010 traffic records assessment. However, the plan does not provide any details for addressing the deficiencies listed in the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 22:
Does the TRCC strategic plan identify strategies that address the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the six core data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the strategic plan identifies strategies that address the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the six core data systems.

Assessor conclusions:
The "Phases of the Strategic Plan" section outlines a series of strategies for realizing improvements to the State’s traffic records system. Nevertheless, these strategies do not link the underlying deficiencies and the performance attributes intended to be impacted. The State would be well-served creating a seamless link from deficiencies, to strategies, to projects, to intended impact. This would allow the TRCC to more clearly define problems and connect the performance solutions intended to address those problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 23:
Does the TRCC strategic plan indicate what funds are used to undertake efforts detailed in the plan and describe how these allocations contribute to the plan’s stated goals?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how efforts detailed in the plan are funded and explain how these allocations address the plan's stated goals as specified in the strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
The strategic plan does not contain project-level information, precluding the ability to determine how funding decisions contribute to the identified strategies. The utility of the strategic plan would increase substantially with the inclusion of a 'projects' section detailing items such as the purpose, anticipated costs, and planned funding sources. The State should include federal funding and, to the extent feasible, State funding attributed to improvement projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Question 24:**
Does the TRCC have a process for prioritizing traffic records improvement projects in the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC prioritizes traffic records improvement projects as specified in the strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While the plan distinguishes some items of action as either immediate, near term, or long term, these categories are not synonymous with priority. For instance, some long term action plans may actually be of greater value; thus, they would be prioritized higher than many near term actions. In light of this, it appears that the strategic plan does not contain a priority structure based on an approach agreed upon by the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 25:**
Does the TRCC have a process for identifying performance measures and corresponding metrics for the six core data systems in the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC identifies performance measures and any corresponding metrics for each of the six core data systems as specified in the strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The plan lists numerous traffic records system performance measures, including all 61 measures from Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems. However, none of the measures include baselines or targets, nor does the plan include a description of the TRCC's performance management efforts. Consequently, it does not appear that the TRCC has a process for identifying performance measures and monitoring corresponding metrics over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 26:

Does the TRCC have a process for identifying and addressing technical assistance and training needs in the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC identifies and addresses technical assistance and training needs as specified in the strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**

The strategic plan document does not account for technical assistance and training needs. Although action plans would necessarily require training, none explicitly list those underlying needs. As a result, it appears the TRCC does not have a defined process for addressing traffic records-related technical assistance and training needs. Additional focus on technical resources at both the State and federal level, as well as training for TRCC participants and stakeholders, will add an important component to Oregon's overall strategy in traffic records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 27:

Does the TRCC have a process for leveraging federal funds and assistance programs in the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC leverages federal funds and assistance programs as specified in the strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**

The traffic records strategic plan does not currently include fiscal details for prioritized improvement projects. As a result, there is no clear description of how the TRCC leverages federal funding and other technical assistance programs. While the Oregon Traffic Safety Performance Plan indicates the State receives NHTSA Section 405(c) funding and invests that funding in improvement projects, the traffic records strategic plan should clearly describe the projects the State is investing in to improve traffic records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 28:
Does the TRCC have a process for establishing timelines and responsibilities for projects in the TRCC strategic plan?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC establishes timelines and responsibilities for projects in the plan.

Assessor conclusions:
Because the plan does not include project-level information, no details around timelines and responsibilities are listed. Ultimately, the State will benefit from a concerted effort to include project development in its planning process and describe selected projects within the strategic plan. This will allow the TRCC to establish a more structured process for identifying candidate projects and their associated timelines and responsibilities.

Respondents assigned: 1  
Responses received: 1  
Response rate: 100%

Question 29:
Does the TRCC have a process for integrating State and local data needs and goals into the TRCC strategic plan?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC integrates State and local data needs and goals into the TRCC strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC does not have a well-defined process for vetting stakeholder needs and integrating those needs into the strategic plan. State responses indicated that the TRCC relies on a series of public input meetings used in the development of the State's Traffic Safety Performance Plan to integrate State and local data needs. While some value for traffic records may result from this process, the TRCC would benefit from a more concerted effort to solicit and incorporate stakeholder input. Methods might include formal planning meetings to solicit specific needs or scheduled comment periods for stakeholders to influence the State’s strategic direction in traffic records. Project descriptions in the strategic plan can serve to effectively document how State and local data needs are accounted for within prioritized projects.

Respondents assigned: 1  
Responses received: 1  
Response rate: 100%
Question 30:
Does the TRCC consider the use of new technology when developing and managing traffic records projects in the strategic plan?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, a project or projects in the strategic plan whose development included the application or consideration of new technology.

Assessor conclusions:
While the strategic plan briefly mentions technology as a general consideration, no express discussion of how new technologies are leveraged in data system improvements exists within the strategic plan. The absence of project-level information in the plan is ultimately what leads to the lack of discussion concerning the use of technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 31:
Does the TRCC consider lifecycle costs in implementing improvement projects?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, a project or projects in the strategic plan whose development included consideration of lifecycle costs.

Assessor conclusions:
Because the strategic plan does not currently contain project-level information, there is no indication that lifecycle costs are a prominent consideration in the vetting and prioritization process. Once Oregon builds out project-level information in the strategic plan, one of the descriptors for each candidate project should be lifecycle costs anticipated beyond initial development and implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 32:
Is the strategic plan responsive to the needs of all stakeholders, including local users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, specific instances demonstrating that local stakeholder needs are incorporated into the TRCC’s strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While the assumption could be made that based on TRCC membership the plan responds to the needs of stakeholders, the plan itself does not explicitly discuss how these needs are being met. However, it is clear that the phases and steps outlined in the plan address at least some stakeholder needs, including local users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 33:
Does the strategic plan make provisions for coordination with key federal traffic records data systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative demonstrating how the strategic plan coordinates with key federal traffic records data systems. Provide citations from the strategic plan if appropriate.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nothing in the Plan document addresses how the strategic plan coordinates with key federal traffic records data systems such as FARS and MCMIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 34:**
Does the TRCC have a process for identifying and addressing impediments to coordination with key Federal traffic records data systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative detailing the processes used by the TRCC to identify and address impediments to coordination with key Federal traffic records data systems. Provide citations from the strategic plan if appropriate.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The TRCC does not have a process in place for identifying and addressing impediments to coordination with key Federal data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 35:**
Is the TRCC's strategic plan reviewed and updated annually?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative detailing the frequency and depth of strategic plan reviews and updates. Identify the stakeholder agencies represented in the review process. Provide a schedule or cite the plan itself if appropriate.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While it appears the TRCC makes some updates to the traffic records strategic plan on an annual basis, these changes are not substantive and likely do not reflect the changing environment and any progress made year-to-year. For the most part, the plan itself suggests that changes are primarily for purposes of compliance with NHTSA Section 405(c) requirements. The State seems to lack a structured process for both developing and updating the strategic plan, precluding the ability to benefit from the significant results that naturally follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crash

Within Oregon, the Transportation Development Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is primary custodian of the State’s crash data. The Crash Data System database is an SQL database and houses all crash data whether collected electronically or on paper. Oregon’s Revised Statute 811.720 specifies the requirements for submitting Fatal, Injury, and Property Damage Only (PDO—damages to property in excess of $1,500) crashes to the State. The State requires crash reports for crashes occurring in non-trafficways where: (1) the first harmful event occurred in the trafficway, or (2) the crash results in death, injury, meets the established property damage threshold of $1,500.

Oregon does a good job of utilizing crash data to identify crash risk factors, guide engineering projects, prioritize law enforcement activities, and evaluate safety countermeasure programs. The crash data is used extensively to help identify roadway segments in need of improvements. This can be seen in system-wide screening, spot location analysis, comparing actual to expected crash rates, and identifying intersections which are trending higher than the State’s safety priority system list. The data is also used to calculate cost / benefit ratios, perform yearly before-and-after crash data analysis for safety projects, and guide overall efforts related to roadway improvements. Another excellent example utilizing their crash data is the State’s crash rate and annual “Police Book” produced by ODOT for State Police and local law enforcement agencies. This information is used by law enforcement personnel to identify areas in need of strategic traffic patrols.

Oregon’s Motor Vehicle Services considers both MMUCC and ANSI standards when evaluating their crash data report and crash system data dictionary. Their current data dictionary does a good job of providing definitions for each data element and identifying those elements populated through data linkages with other systems. Having a single source document containing all crash data elements is extremely beneficial and confirms stakeholders’ understanding of each data element. The State’s Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Analysis and Code Manual is well-documented and clearly describes each validation rule, the date it was added to the system, the circumstances under which the rule is applied, and the fields highlighted and messages displayed when a rule is triggered. This document is also updated yearly to reflect any modifications made to the crash data collection process. The State is commended for creating such an excellent document and for developing processes to keep the document up-to-date.

Not all law enforcement agencies are submitting crash data electronically. As of December 2015, Oregon’s State Police (OSP) and 25% of law enforcement agencies utilize electronic submission of crash data. While OSP submits their crash data electronically to the data warehouse, ODOT does not receive the data in an electronic format. Paper reports are still sent to ODOT. It is strongly recommended the State strive to increase the number of crash reports submitted and collected electronically. To help accomplish this, a survey may be conducted through the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) to determine why agencies are not moving to electronic submission of crash data. The results of this survey can aid in identifying roadblocks for agencies and the State. Identifying these issues and assisting these agencies, will pave the way for improved data collection within the areas of timeliness, completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of Oregon’s crash data. ODOT should strive for collecting all crash data electronically. This is an excellent project for TRCC funding and would also aid in improving all aspects of crash
data performance.

At the present time, the State only has data linkage between the crash and roadway systems. The crash data system has an interface with a custom GIS application developed for crash coding. This interface provides a number of updated roadway data attributes when a coder clicks on a point on the roadway. The State has also developed some groundwork to assist with crash system integration with the driver, citation and adjudication, and injury surveillance systems. Having these systems integrated will allow for more accurate data and enhanced robust data analysis. Continuation of crash data integration with other systems would benefit all stakeholders. The TRCC can be an effective resource in pushing data linkage forward by identifying the appropriate personnel, assisting with resources, and explaining the importance and benefits of data integration.

Oregon does not have any crash data performance measures at this time. It is highly recommended that the State review the NHTSA proposed performance measures and consider the creation of multiple performance measures. Without system-wide measurements of performance, there is no goal for data custodians to strive for and no means of measuring success / failure of projects. Since ODOT houses the crash data, they could create timeliness performance measures such as overall reporting days or percentage of reports received within 30 days. This should be performed at the State level for all reports. As the State increases electronic reporting, these performance measures will help document and demonstrate the State's success. Completeness and uniformity performance measures should also be created. Examples of possible completeness measures could be percentage of reports with no missing driver or vehicle information. Likewise, a uniformity measure could evaluate the number of reports using the E-Crash program. As more agencies begin to utilize electronic reporting, these measures should also improve.

Data quality is a very important aspect of crash data collection, evaluation, and reporting. While Oregon’s main focus is on timeliness, other aspects of data quality should still be considered. The State has three levels of data correction to amend obvious errors. These levels consist of crash technicians evaluating crash reports, system-generated validation rules, and routine quality assurance scripts. The State seems to have a good foundation for the development of robust crash data quality processes and should try to capitalize more in this area. By capturing and documenting the errors, the State could easily create accuracy performance measures and document the outcome of all their efforts.

Another possible data quality project which should be considered is performing independent random quality review audits at an agency basis. Random quality review audits could be implemented by randomly selecting X% of fatal reports, Y% of injury reports, and Z% of PDO reports at an agency level and reviewing the selected reports for data quality issues. This process would help Oregon increase data quality and should assist the State with improving training content and manuals, by focusing on common issues. It will also help the State distribute error reports and develop tailored data quality training at an agency level. These projects will assist in decreasing agency errors over time.

Lastly, data quality information should continue to be shared and discussed with key stakeholders; however, the State should strongly consider getting the TRCC involved in data quality management. Having data quality discussions at TRCC meetings provides the opportunity for the TRCC to fulfill its role in overseeing and advising on data quality improvement projects and
fulfilling its role in Strategic Planning.

**Question 36:**
Is statewide crash data consolidated into one database?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a description of the statewide database and specify how the data is consolidated.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The statewide “coded” crash data resides in the Crash Data System (CDS) database. This SQL database contains statewide crash data since 1985.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

**Question 37:**
Is the statewide crash system's organizational custodian clearly defined?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify what agency has the custodial responsibility for the statewide crash system, detail the extent of the agency's role, and provide all relevant statutes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) sections 802, 810, and 811 lay out the State's crash reporting structure and requirements. Responsibilities are divided between ODOT's Driver and Motor Vehicle Services (DMV) Division and the Transportation Development Division (TDD). The DMV carries the responsibility of developing, collecting, and otherwise regulating the crash reports. As a result, citizen and officer reports are sent to the DMV. All other tasks related to the CDS are the responsibility of the TDD. This Division in ODOT operates the Crash Analysis and Reporting (CAR) program and is responsible for coding crash reports, conducting analyses, creating summary reports, and otherwise administering the database and related processes. As a result, the TDD is considered the primary custodian of the State's crash data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
### Question 38:
Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of fatal crashes to the statewide crash system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the fatal crash inclusion criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 811.720 requires that a crash report be completed for "any accident occurring on a highway or upon premises open to the public resulting in injury or death to any person."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 39:
Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of injury crashes to the statewide crash system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the injury crash inclusion criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
ORS 811.720 mandates the completion of a crash report for "any accident occurring on a highway or upon premises open to the public resulting in injury."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 40:
Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of PDO crashes to the statewide crash system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the PDO crash submission criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
ORS 811.720 requires the completion of a report for any crash in which a vehicle sustains more than $1,500 in damage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 41:**
Does the statewide crash system record crashes occurring in non-trafficway areas (e.g., parking lots, driveways)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the non-trafficway reporting criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Crashes occurring in non-trafficways are reported to Oregon's CDS in cases where the first harmful event occurred in the trafficway. Additionally, the Oregon DMV requires that citizens submit reports for crashes occurring on non-trafficways if the crash results in death or injury or meets the established property damage threshold of $1,500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 42:**
Is data from the crash system used to identify crash risk factors?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide example reports and/or analyses that examine locations, roadway features, behaviors, driver characteristics, or vehicle characteristics as they relate to crash risk. If referencing large documents like the SHSP, please cite relevant page numbers.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State utilizes data from the crash system to identify crash risk factors. The following are examples of how the crash data is used: (1) system-wide screening and spot location analysis, (2) comparison of data from the crash system to the expected crash rates, (3) identification of intersections that are trending higher on the Safety Priority Index System list, and (4) investigation of citizen complaints, areas of concern and high crash locations.

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 50% |
Question 43:
Is data from the crash system used to guide engineering and construction projects?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the State's network screening and countermeasure selection processes. Describe how construction projects are funded based on the analysis of crash data. If referencing large documents like the SHSP, please cite relevant page numbers.

Assessor conclusions:
Crash data is used to guide the selection of major and minor engineering and construction projects. Crash data has been used extensively to help identify roadway segments and intersections in need of safety improvements. The crash data is also used to calculate cost/benefit ratios allowing for appropriate prioritization of projects.

It is clear that both State and local transportation stakeholders rely extensively on crash data to determine the risk of segments, identify appropriate countermeasures, and guide overall efforts related to roadway improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 44:
Is data from the crash system regularly used to prioritize law enforcement activity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample location-based analysis and any associated law enforcement activities. If a State DDACTS program exists, provide details.

Assessor conclusions:
Crash data is routinely analyzed within some law enforcement agencies in an effort to identify high crash segments to effectively program the limited enhanced enforcement funding where the highest crash risks exist.

Some law enforcement agencies in the State appear to utilize crash data to identify high crash locations and plan patrol activity accordingly. ODOT produces a crash rate book for the Oregon State Police (OSP) in order to identify areas for strategic traffic patrols. ODOT also produces an annual "Police Book" for local law enforcement agencies that have requested it for their patrolling purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 45:
Is data from the crash system used to evaluate safety countermeasure programs?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe how crash data is used to evaluate safety countermeasure programs. If referencing large documents like the SHSP, HSP, or Crash Facts, please cite relevant page numbers.

Assessor conclusions:
Crash data is used as one of several evaluation criteria after physical or operational improvements have been made to an intersection or corridor. Oregon also evaluates before-and-after crash data for safety projects every year. The data from this effort is used in Oregon’s Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) report to Federal Highway Administration each year. The State also uses crash data to analyze before-and-after safety projects for future and past countermeasures related to the transportation system infrastructure. Transportation Safety Division’s programs that manage the behavioral safety and educational grants and activities use data for enacting legislative rules or actions such as banning digital device use while driving, helmet use, etc. All of this information is all derived from analyzing crash data, including law enforcement analyzing crash data to locate areas involving DUI crashes, speed, aging and young drivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 46:
Is MMUCC a primary source for identifying what crash data elements and attributes the State collects?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the process by which MMUCC was used to identify what crash data elements and attributes are included in the crash database and on the Police Accident Report (PAR).

Assessor conclusions:
DMV considers MMUCC in the report development. They use a stakeholder process to determine what elements should be on the crash reports by having all the major stakeholders review, provide feedback, and approve the element to be collected in the crash reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 47:
Are the ANSI D-16 and ANSI D-20 used as sources for the definitions in the crash system data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the process by which ANSI D-16 and ANSI D-20 were used to define data elements in the crash system's data dictionary and user manual.

Assessor conclusions:
The ODOT Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Analysis and Code Manual includes numerous references to the ANSI definitions, substantiating the standard as a primary source in deriving crash system definitions.

Question 48:
Does the data dictionary provide a definition for each data element and define that data element's allowable values?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the crash system data dictionary.

Assessor conclusions:
The State's data dictionary provides a definition for each data element and defines that data element's allowable values.
Question 49:
Does the data dictionary document the system edit checks and validation rules?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the crash system data dictionary. If the crash system edit checks and validation rules are documented elsewhere, provide the appropriate document.

Assessor conclusions:
The ODOT Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Analysis and Code Manual provides a detailed list of the edit checks and validation rules within the Crash Data System. The State has done well to clearly describe each validation rule, when it was added to the system, the circumstances under which the rule is applied, and the fields highlighted and messages displayed when a rule is triggered.

Question 50:
Is the data dictionary up to date and consistent with the field data collection manual, coding manual, crash report, and any training materials?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the processes to update the crash system’s data dictionary, field data collection manual, coding manual, crash report, and training manuals. Specify which of the documents exist and describe processes to keep them consistent with each other.

Assessor conclusions:
ODOT updates the Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Analysis and Code Manual each year. Any corresponding changes are reflected both in the field data collection manuals and training materials. The State is commended for the processes that have been established to keep these documents up-to-date and consistent.
Question 51:
Does the crash system data dictionary indicate the data elements populated through links to other traffic records system components?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of data elements that are populated in the crash system through linkages to other traffic records system components (e.g., the driver file, the vehicle file, the roadway inventory, or statewide mapping system).

Assessor conclusions:
The Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Analysis and Code Manual indicates which elements are system-generated. The manual also indicates that a small number of elements are derived from sources outside the crash system, including Segment Marker ID imported from the Crash Locator Tool and Segment Point LRS supplied by a GIS analyst. As the State progressively includes more elements in the crash system derived through system linkages, more overt indicators in the data dictionary of these linked elements will be of value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 52:
Do all law enforcement agencies collect crash data electronically?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of all reporting agencies and specify their data collection methods. Specify any State plans for achieving 100% electronic in-field data collection.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has been evaluating 100% electronic reporting as a future project for several years. Oregon's DMV is modernizing their efforts to move electronically and once completed, they should be able to accept the PAR's electronically and that will enable the Crash Data System to do the same. Currently, only about 25% of Oregon Law Enforcement was provided eCitation and eCrash software via grants and Oregon's State Police are at 100% eCite/eCrash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 53:
Do all law enforcement agencies submit their data to the statewide crash system electronically?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe—using a narrative or flow diagram—all data submission processes used to transmit data from collecting agencies to the statewide crash data system. Include the percentage of total data submitted for each specified method.

Assessor conclusions:
While Oregon State Police (OSP) submits all of their crash data to the data warehouse electronically, Oregon’s Department of Transportation (ODOT) does not get an electronic copy or data stream. It is the State’s belief that OSP still prints hard copies of the reports to send to ODOT.

Respondents assigned 2  Responses received 1  Response rate 50%

Question 54:
Do all law enforcement agencies collecting crash data electronically apply validation rules that are consistent with those in the statewide crash system prior to submission?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the validation processes used by the collecting agencies. Specify if the validation rules are applied to the data prior to submission to the statewide crash system. Include, in the description, how the validation rules are distributed to the collecting agencies and how the State checks the submitted data for consistency to rules in the statewide crash system.

Assessor conclusions:
The crash reporting software application does not apply validation rules consistent with those in the statewide repository. There are indications that the State has plans to incorporate these validation rules at some point in the future.

Respondents assigned 2  Responses received 1  Response rate 50%
Question 55:
Does the State maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the policies and procedures for key processes governing the collection, reporting, and posting of crash data—including the submission of fatal crash data to the State FARS unit and commercial vehicle crash data to SafetyNet?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a process flow diagram (preferred) or narrative description documenting key processes governing the collection, reporting, and posting of crash data—including the submission of fatal crashes to the State FARS unit and commercial vehicle crashes to SafetyNet.

Assessor conclusions:
The State maintains process flows and related documentation detailing crash system processes. This documentation includes flowcharts outlining how fatality data is provided to FARS and how commercial vehicle crash data is provided to SafetyNet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 56:
Are the processes for managing errors and incomplete data documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a process flow diagram (preferred) or narrative description documenting the processes for managing errors and incomplete data.

Assessor conclusions:
The processes for managing errors and incomplete data are documented by the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 57:**
Do the document retention and archival storage policies meet the needs of safety engineers and other users with a legitimate need for long-term access to the crash data reports?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the retention policy.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon has an established retention policy for various data in the CAR system. Data for analysis is available to safety engineers and other users dating back to 1985.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 58:**
Does the crash system interface with the driver system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide narrative description of the crash-to-driver system interfaces that enable: verification and validation of the driver's personal information, access to driver records, identification of inconsistencies between the crash and driver records, and/or identification of the driver's prior crash involvement?

**Assessor conclusions:**
While the crash and driver systems are not integrated, the State has the capability to link information through the use of a common accident record number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 59:
Does the crash system interface with the vehicle system?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-vehicle system interfaces that enable: verification and validation of the vehicle information, access to vehicle records, and/or identification of inconsistencies between the crash and vehicle records.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon's crash system does not currently interface with the State's vehicle system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 60:
Does the crash system interface with the roadway system?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-roadway interfaces that enable: verification and validation of the roadway information, and/or identification of inconsistencies between the crash and roadway records.

Assessor conclusions:
The crash and roadway system interface updates a variety of roadway elements in the CDS database. The integration process includes system validations that issue warnings when inconsistencies are found during the update process. This functionality indicates a relatively high level of sophistication in the integration of the two systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
**Question 61:**
Does the crash system interface with the citation and adjudication systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-citation and -adjudication interfaces that enable: verification and validation of citations and/or alcohol or drug test information in the crash record; identification of any inconsistencies between crash and citation records; and access to criminal history, contact history, and location history.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The crash and citation systems are not currently integrated; however, there are E-Citation and E-Crash programs in use by numerous law enforcement agencies that could provide a linkage in the near future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

---

**Question 62:**
Does the crash system interface with the injury surveillance system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-injury surveillance interfaces that enable: verification and validation of EMS information, and identification of inconsistencies between crash and EMS records.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The crash and injury surveillance systems are not currently integrated. However, the State is providing raw crash data to the injury surveillance system users for the purpose of integration and evaluation with an ongoing goal to establish the necessary links.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important
Question 63:
Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks or validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent between fields.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements.

The Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Analysis and Code Manual provides a detailed list of these rules, clearly describes each validation rule, when it was added to the system, the circumstances under which the rule is applied, and the fields highlighted and messages displayed when a rule is triggered.

Question 64:
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide crash database to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating officer?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide crash database.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon has three levels of data correction for their crash data. First, police reports are evaluated by crash technicians and when the data is inconsistent with location or the evidence within the narratives, the data is corrected. Second, system-generated validations identify data entry errors or business rule errors which are then reviewed and corrected. Third, routine QA scripts are run against data to identify trends that need evaluation or other data errors which are then reviewed against the original reports and corrections are made.
**Question 65:**
Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected crash reports to the originating officer and tracking resubmission of the report in place?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected crash reports are returned to the originating officer and then resubmitted to the statewide crash database.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Neither ODOT or law enforcement agencies have the resources or time for returning rejected crash reports to the originating officer and tracking resubmission of the reports. This is a process which should be automated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 66:**
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of crash system timeliness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although Oregon's Traffic Records Strategic Plan lists the crash timeliness measures recommended in Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems, the plan does not list any baselines or targets for these measures. As a result, it does not appear that the State has crash timeliness measures tailored to the needs of managers and users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 67:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of crash system accuracy measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have accuracy performance measures. While the State says the data accuracy goals are tailored to meet the agencies' and other data users' needs, no performance measures were supplied.

Question 68:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of crash system completeness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have completeness performance measures. While the State says the data completeness goals are tailored to meet the agencies' and other data users' needs, no performance measures were supplied.
**Question 69:**
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of crash system uniformity measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not have uniformity performance measures. While the State says the data uniformity goals are tailored to meet the agencies' and other data users' needs, no performance measures were supplied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

---

**Question 70:**
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of crash system integration measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not have integration performance measures. While the State says the data integration goals are tailored to meet the agencies' and other data users' needs, no performance measures were supplied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
Question 71:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of crash system accessibility measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have accessibility performance measures. While the State says the data accessibility goals are tailored to meet the agencies' and other data users' needs, no performance measures were supplied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 72:
Has the state established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the specific, State-determined numeric goals associated with each performance measure in use.

Assessor conclusions:
While Oregon's Traffic Records Strategic Plan lists all of the performance measures recommended in Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems, the plan does not establish numeric goals for any of the measures. The TRCC would be well-served to establish numeric goals for traffic records performance measures similar to those established for broader traffic safety performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 73:
Is there performance reporting that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each law enforcement agency?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report, list of receiving law enforcement agencies, and specify the frequency of issuance.

Assessor conclusions:
While the State does report annually on their observation of the weaknesses and strengths of law enforcement agency reporting, no performance reporting that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback at an agency level was provided.

Question 74:
Is the detection of high frequency errors used to generate updates to training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to generate new training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions.

Assessor conclusions:
ODOT monitors CDS validation processes to identify common errors and subsequently update training content and manuals when appropriate.

The State has monthly training sessions where coding errors are highlighted and training is provided to correct any issues.
**Question 75:**
Are quality control reviews comparing the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the report considered part of the statewide crash database's data acceptance process?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which quality control reviews comparing the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the report are considered part of the statewide crash database's data acceptance process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
TDD staff members do not currently engage in quality control analysis comparing the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the crash report.

The State’s primary challenge is keeping up with the completion of the coding and reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 76:**
Are independent sample-based audits periodically conducted for crash reports and related database contents?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the formal audit methodology, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the audits' frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While the State does not periodically perform independent sample-based audits, they do perform data audits as needed to monitor coder performance and data quality. However, this process was not described and no documentation was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 77:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the analyses' frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Each year in the final annual file data QA process, several SQL scripts are run against the full year’s data to look for anomalies and clean up known problem areas. During this process, any unusual trends are investigated by going back to the source data and reviewing it against the coding of the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 78:
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
It appears that the State does have a process for both soliciting from and providing feedback to external crash data users. ODOT recently established a data users group that meets quarterly to discuss a variety of topics related to crash data quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 79:**
Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality management report and specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC.

**Assessor conclusions:**
ODOT does not currently provide the TRCC with any data quality management reports for their review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Vehicle**

The Driver and Motor Vehicle Services (DMV) Division in the Oregon Department of Transportation is the agency responsible for motor vehicle identification, ownership and registration. The DMV is in the initial stages of planning a multi-year project to upgrade its vehicle data system. This assessment should provide guidance on areas that may need attention.

Barcodes are not used on vehicle registration documents. Barcodes support electronic citations and crash reporting, ensure vehicle information accuracy and improve law enforcement’s efficiency in completing these forms. Barcodes should be placed on the vehicle registration card at a minimum.

The DMV, currently, does not interact with the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System or participate in the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management program. Both programs are designed to improve highway safety, prevent fraud and protect consumers. Participation in these programs should be a high priority for the DMV.

A documented data dictionary for the vehicle system has not been created. The DMV has developed detailed flow charts and procedure manuals to define the system. As the upgrade project is completed, the State is encouraged to develop and document a formal data dictionary for the vehicle system. This data dictionary will help identify problems and expedite revisions to the system. Data dictionaries are invaluable to collectors and users of data and help to facilitate uniform and accurate data capture.

There is no process flow or narrative for purging vehicle information. Vehicle information is purged annually according to the date of the record and Oregon’s data retention plan. The DMV needs to review this data purging process and determine if it meets its needs or if a new vehicle data purging process should be implemented. The goal would be to ensure critical vehicle information is saved and accessible by consumers and data users.

Daily Service Level Reports are used to measure productivity and complete internal audits, but the vehicle data system has not established a formal data quality management program as described in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory. The DMV is encouraged to review the Advisory and the Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Record Systems (Report No. DOT HS 811 441 available at www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/811441.pdf) as part of its upgrade project to help develop and implement a comprehensive vehicle system data quality management program. The DMV is also encouraged to partner and collaborate with Oregon’s Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. This collaboration will support the collection and exchange of quality information that can be used to improve Oregon’s highway safety efforts.
**Question 80:**
Does custodial responsibility of the identification and ownership of vehicles registered in the State—including vehicle make, model, year of manufacture, body type, and adverse vehicle history (title brands)—reside in a single location?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the custodial agency’s name.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon Driver and Motor Vehicle Services (DMV) has custodial authority for vehicle ownership, identification and registration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 81:**
Does the State or its agents validate every VIN with a verification software application?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the circumstances in which the VIN is validated and used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
VINs are validated during the titling process (real-time) using software provided by VINA (IIHS Automotive). Due to VINA software limitations, some information for nonconforming VINs and some off-road vehicles is not available during the title issuance process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 82:**
Are vehicle registration documents barcoded—using at a minimum the 2D standard—to allow for rapid, accurate collection of vehicle information by law enforcement officers in the field using barcode readers or scanners?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample document, and identify the information encoded.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Registration documents are not barcoded at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 83:
Does the vehicle system provide title information data to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) at least daily?

Standard of Evidence:
Explain how and how often the State uploads data to NMVTIS, specifying the manner of transmittal and its frequency (e.g., real-time, nightly, weekly).

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon DMV is not providing vehicle information to the National Motor Vehicle Titling Information System (NMVTIS). Oregon is going through a revision of its data systems and could include this function as a future project.

Respondents assigned 3
Responses received 1
Response rate 33.3%

Question 84:
Does the vehicle system query the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) before issuing new titles?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the NMVTIS query processing instructions or provide a screen print of the query tool.

Question Rank: Very Important

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon DMV currently does not query the National Motor Vehicle Titling Information System for vehicle information prior to issuing a title.

Respondents assigned 3
Responses received 1
Response rate 33.3%
Question 85:
Does the State incorporate brand information on the vehicle record that are recommended by AAMVA and/or received through NMVTIS, whether or not the brand description matches the State's brand descriptions?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the list of the State's title brands and their definitions.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon has established its own title brands and does not currently use the AAMVA- or NMVTIS-recommended brands. Out-of-state brands are recorded and carried over to Oregon when the vehicle is titled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 86:
Does the State participate in the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) program?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the PRISM processing instructions or a screen print.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon currently does not participate in the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 87:
Does the vehicle system have a documented definition for each data field?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the data dictionary and provide an extract.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon's vehicle system has not been documented within a single, comprehensive data dictionary that contains data definitions for each field. However, definitions for each data entry field and the associated key are included in documented procedures. The State has provided representative samples of data entry procedures that include data definitions matched to corresponding fields on a line-by-line, field-by-field basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 88:
Does the vehicle system include edit check and data collection guidelines that correspond to the data definitions?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the data dictionary's edit check and data collection guidelines and provide an extract.

Assessor conclusions:
The vehicle data system verifies information through data tables and field data type constraints built into the system. Formal definitions do not exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 89:
Are the collection, reporting, and posting procedures for registration, title, and title brand information formally documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the data dictionary's procedure for applying title brands and provide a copy of the brands applied.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon DMV has established change management procedures and processing procedure manuals that cover the titling and registration of a motor vehicle. DMV also has training manuals and distributes information on changes to the stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 90:
Is there a process flow diagram describing the vehicle data system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the process flow diagram.

Assessor conclusions:
A detailed process flow diagram that describes the vehicle data system was provided.

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 33.3% |
Question 91:
Does the vehicle system flag or identify vehicles reported as stolen to law enforcement authorities?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the procedures for flagging and identifying vehicles reported as stolen. Provide the appropriate excerpt from the instruction manual.

Assessor conclusions:
The Vehicle data system does not automatically flag stolen vehicles. After normal DMV operating hours, vehicle information is checked against the Law Enforcement Data System and the National Crime Information Center through batch files. The flag for a stolen vehicle is manually placed on the record by the DMV Vehicle Policy Unit and the vehicle is reported to local law enforcement. This process is detailed in ORS 803.103.

Respondents assigned 3 Responses received 1 Response rate 33.3%

Question 92:
If the vehicle system does flag or identify vehicles reported as stolen to law enforcement authorities, are these flags removed when a stolen vehicle has been recovered or junked?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of how the flags are removed. Provide the appropriate excerpt from the instruction or procedures manual.

Assessor conclusions:
Stolen vehicle flags are removed manually by staff in the Vehicle Policy Unit when the vehicle is recovered or "junked".

Respondents assigned 3 Responses received 1 Response rate 33.3%
Question 93:
Does the State record and maintain the title brand history (previously applied to vehicles by other States)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of how title brand information is applied.

Assessor conclusions:
The ODOT DMV records and maintains title brand history previously applied to vehicles by other states. A procedural document was provided that describes how title brand information is applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 94:
Are the steps from initial event (titling, registration) to final entry into the statewide vehicle system documented in a process flow diagram?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the process flow diagram. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

Assessor conclusions:
State-provided supporting documents described the flow for each process in the vehicle titling system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 95:
Is the process flow diagram or narrative annotated to show the time required to complete each step?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the process flow diagram. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

Assessor conclusions:
An annotated process flow diagram showing times for each step does not exist, but the response provided times required to complete steps in the titling and registration process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 96:**
Does the process flow diagram or narrative show alternative data flows and timelines?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the process flow diagram that specifies alternative data flows and timelines. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

**Assessor conclusions:**
A process flow diagram depicting alternative data flows was provided, but it does not show timelines. Although the State indicates that the times for the alternative business process flows (Assessment Query 94) are recorded in a separate document, no document or narrative describing the process in detail has been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 97:**
Does the process flow diagram or narrative include processes for error correction and error handling?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the process flow diagram that specified the processes for error correction and error handling. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The provided process flow diagrams include the steps for error correction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 98:
Does the process flow diagram or narrative explain the timing, conditions, and procedures for purging records from the vehicle system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the process flow diagram that specifies the schedule and process for purging records. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon reports that ODOT DMV does not have a process flow or business level narrative that describes purging records. Vehicle system records are purged annually in accordance with the date of the record.

Respondents assigned: 3  Responses received: 1  Response rate: 33.3%

Question 99:
Are the driver and vehicle files unified in one system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the unified system's main components and identify the variables that link the vehicle and driver files.

Assessor conclusions:
The driver and vehicle files are not unified in one system.

Respondents assigned: 3  Responses received: 1  Response rate: 33.3%
**Question 100:**
If the driver and vehicle files are separate, is personal information entered into the vehicle system using the same conventions used in the driver system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
When the driver and vehicle systems are separate, provide extracts from the driver and vehicle system manuals detailing the data entry conventions for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Customer driver license and vehicle ownership information are linked by the Common Customer Information System (CIS). Driver and vehicle information are linked by the customer number and date of birth.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 101:**
Can vehicle system data be used to verify and validate the vehicle information during initial creation of a citation or crash report?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the procedures governing the use of vehicle system data to verify and validate vehicle information during initial creation of a citation or crash report. ALTERNATIVE EVIDENCE: Describe how the vehicle system is accessed, if it is, to validate and verify vehicle information during crash report creation.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Law enforcement can access DMV vehicle information through the Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS). The response implied that vehicle information could "potentially" be validated to create a citation. No information was provided to indicate this was standard operating procedure for law enforcement.

**Question Rank:**
Somewhat Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 102:
When discrepancies are identified during data entry in the crash data system, are vehicle records flagged for possible updating?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an appropriate extract from the vehicle system manual that details the process for addressing a record flagged by the crash system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon does not record vehicle information from a crash report at the DMV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 105:
Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks or validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent between fields.

Assessor conclusions:
Data entry is verified through table look-ups, but the process was not explained.

Respondents assigned 3
Responses received 1
Response rate 33.3%

Question 106:
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide vehicle system to amend obvious errors and omissions?

Standard of Evidence:
Name the authority that allows quality control staff to correct the statewide vehicle database.

Assessor conclusions:
Limited correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the vehicle system to amend obvious errors and omissions.

Respondents assigned 3
Responses received 1
Response rate 33.3%
### Question 107:
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system timeliness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Daily Service Level Report provided was more like a productivity report. The document identifies the expected time to complete a process and the actual time it took to complete a process, but does not satisfy the expectation for a data quality performance measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 108:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system accuracy measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has no accuracy performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 109:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system completeness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no completeness performance measures for the vehicle system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 110:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of vehicle system uniformity measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no uniformity performance measures for the vehicle data system.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 111:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of vehicle system integration measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has no integration performance measures for the vehicle system.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 112:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of vehicle system accessibility measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
The vehicle system has no accessibility performance measures.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 113:
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the specific, State-determined numeric goals associated with each performance measure in use.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no metrics for performance, as there are no performance measures or stated goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3                    | 1                 | 33.3%        

Question 114:
Is the detection of high frequency errors used to generate updates to training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to generate new training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions.

Assessor conclusions:
Feedback is provided to employees when errors occur and system enhancements are sometimes based on frequent errors. However, no formal methodology or process is described by which high frequency errors are detected and subsequently utilized to generate new training content and data collection manuals, update validation rules, or prompt form revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3                    | 1                 | 33.3%        
Question 115:
Are independent sample-based audits conducted periodically for vehicle reports and related database contents for that record?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the formal audit methodology, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the audits' frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Independent sample-based audits of the vehicle system are not performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 116:**
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the analyses' frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon uses no comparative or trend analyses, which are helpful for locating data errors, but also provide valuable information for traffic safety changes. Having more registered motorcycles could indicate the need to update motorcycle safety efforts, for example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 117:**
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State response of "somewhat" to the question about data quality feedback is not sufficiently indicative of how such feedback is generated or delivered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 118:
Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
No data quality management reports are provided to the TRCC for the vehicle data system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 3 Responses received 1 Response rate 33.3%
Driver

The Driver and Motor Vehicle Services (DMV) Division in the Oregon Department of Transportation is the designated agency for issuing driver's licenses and maintaining driver records. All driver information is stored in one computer system that contains several files and tables that are linked. Each part of the driver system can be accessed and queried independently. The DMV is in the initial stages of a multi-year project to review and upgrade the driver license system.

The DMV driver system interacts with the Problem Driver Pointer System, the Social Security Online Verification system, the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements, the Commercial Driver License Information System, and the Transportation Safety Administration's background checks for commercial drivers. To prevent driver license fraud, the DMV uses facial recognition software, has created an Anti-Fraud Policy, verifies documents and has created a Fraud Emergency Warning System to prevent applicants from traveling to other offices to obtain a license. The DMV has also established policies, procedures and employee training to control access and privacy of driver information.

Opportunities:
The DMV, currently, does not have a documented data dictionary for its driver system. It does have extensive documentation, detailed flow charts and procedures for using the system. Creating and documenting a data dictionary for the system is included in the planned review and upgrade project, as are real-time electronic transfer of conviction information from the courts and electronic submission of crash information.

Completion of driver education or motorcycle rider training can serve to waive a portion of the licensing process. The DMV records the portion of the licensing process that is waived, but does not capture course completion information. The DMV can run ad hoc reports to identify individuals completing the courses based on the portion of the licensing process that was waived. The DMV should study the value and impact of capturing course completion information on the driving record. This would eliminate the need to create ad hoc reports and would support research to determine the benefit and value of these courses.

Completion of a driver improvement course is not a requirement in Oregon's driver licensing process. The DMV records restrictions and suspensions that are the result of citations. Oregon courts may direct individuals to complete driver improvement, but the DMV does not record this completion information on the driving record. As part of the DMV's review of the driver licensing system, it should consider the feasibility of capturing the completion of a court-assigned driver improvement course. If courts are using the course to improve driver behavior and safety, capturing this information could support research to determine the impact of course completion.

The DMV has established several reports and tools to measure operations and productivity; however, it has not established a formal data quality management program for the driver system as described in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory regarding timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration and accessibility of driver data. The DMV is encouraged to review the Advisory and the Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Record
Systems (Report No. DOT HS 811 441 available at www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/811441.pdf) as part of its upgrade project to help develop and implement a comprehensive driver system data quality management program.

The DMV is also encouraged to partner and collaborate with Oregon’s Traffic Records Coordinating Committee and its members. This collaboration will support the collection and the exchange of information that can be used to improve Oregon’s highway and driver safety efforts.

**Question 119:**
Does custodial responsibility for the driver system—including commercially-licensed drivers—reside in a single location?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative identifying the custodial agency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Oregon Driver and Motor Vehicle Services (DMV) Division in the Department of Transportation is the designated custodial agency for maintaining the driver system, driving records and issuing licenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
Question 120:
Can the State's DUIs data system be linked electronically to the driver system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative explanation of a State's linking protocols that demonstrated how a citation on the DUI data system is linked to a record on the driver system. Include identification of the linkage portal and organizations responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon does not have a separate DUI (in Oregon this is DUII) data system. All driver information is stored in one computer system. This computer system has several files and tables to store information, but all are linked in the DMV mainframe production (LPAR). Each resource in the data system can be operated independently. Citations for DUII are stored with all other citations. Information regarding DUII citations, convictions and sanctions can be viewed on a driving record. Most of the DUII citation and conviction information is currently submitted to the DMV on paper and manually entered. Oregon is in the process of converting to electronic submission of information. Information sent electronically is done by FTP protocols and added to the computer system as batch files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 121:
Does the driver system capture novice drivers' training histories, including provider names and types of education (classroom or behind-the-wheel)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative documenting the availability of novice driver training history (including motorcycle and commercial license training), and specify the pertinent data fields and audit checks in the data dictionary or provide a sample system report.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon driver system does not collect any driver training history information. A special ad hoc report is used to determine if an individual completed driver education or motorcycle rider training. The report only identifies what portion of the licensing requirements are waived if an individual completes driver education or rider training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 122:
Does the driver system capture drivers’ traffic violation and/or driver improvement training histories, including provider names and types of education (classroom or behind-the-wheel)?

**Standard of Evidence:**  
Provide a narrative documenting the availability of traffic violation and/or driver improvement training history, including motorcycle and commercial license training, by specifying the pertinent data fields and audit checks in the data dictionary or provide a sample report.

**Assessor conclusions:**  
Oregon’s driver system captures and stores traffic convictions. Driver improvement training history is not captured. There is no requirement for driver improvement courses for traffic violations. Restrictions and suspensions are placed on the driving record for traffic violation convictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 123:
Does the driver system capture and retain the dates of original issuance for all permits, licensing, and endorsements (e.g., learner’s permit, provisional license, commercial driver’s license, motorcycle license)?

**Standard of Evidence:**  
Provide a narrative documenting the availability of original issuance dates for all permits, licensing, and endorsements by specifying the pertinent data fields and audit checks in the data dictionary or provide a sample report.

**Assessor conclusions:**  
The Oregon driver system captures and retains the issuance dates for all permits, endorsements and licenses and maintains this information for at least nine years. The issuance segment of the data system purges information nine years after the original date of issuance. This purge process can delete references to the original issue date and actual status of previously issued permits or license endorsements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 124:
Is driver information maintained in a manner that accommodates interaction with the National Driver Register’s Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) and the Commercial Driver’s License Information System (CDLIS)?

Standard of Evidence:
Demonstrate functional integration with the PDPS and CDLIS. AAMVA audit reports can be provided as supporting documentation.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon’s DMV driver system accommodates interaction with the National Driver Register’s Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) and the Commercial Driver’s License Information System (CDLIS). Functional integration is confirmed via screenshots provided by the State for the annual CD31 process, CDLIS Capture and PDPS Capture.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 125:
Are the contents of the driver system documented with data definitions for each field?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide, at a minimum, a table of contents and sample elements from the data dictionary or a sample data dictionary report.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon DMV does not have an official data dictionary for the driver system. There are procedure manuals and other documentation, but no data dictionary.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 126:**
Are all valid field values—including null codes—documented in the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide sample valid data field values from the data dictionary.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon DMV does not maintain an official data dictionary, and the content of the driver system has not been documented with data definitions for all valid field values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 127:**
Are there edit checks and data collection guidelines for each data element?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an example edit check and data collection guideline.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is no official data dictionary nor guidelines for edit checks and data collection. There are plans to develop such guidelines, but no timetable for completion has been established. There are procedure manuals and documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 128:**
Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative explanation of the controls and procedures that ensure the data dictionary is kept up to date.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon DMV does not have an official data dictionary for the driver system or guidance for when a data dictionary should be updated. There are plans to create guidelines, but there is no timeline for completion of this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 129:
Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the licensing, permitting, and endorsement issuance procedures (manual and electronic, where applicable)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon DMV provided a copy of the Business Process Flow for Driver Licenses and Identification Cards. This document describes all the processes and flows for issuing all classes of licenses and the renewal of each one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 130:
Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the reporting and recording of relevant citations and convictions (manual and electronic, where applicable)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

Assessor conclusions:
The Business Process Flow for Convictions was provided. Currently, most convictions are manually recorded. Oregon is moving to electronic citations and the Business Process includes the procedures for processing electronically-submitted convictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 131:
Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the reporting and recording of driver education and improvement course (manual and electronic, where applicable)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon does not record the completion of driver improvement or driver education courses on the driving record. Courses mandated by courts during the adjudication phase are not recorded on the driving record because it is a court action and process.

Question 132:
Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the reporting and recording of other information that may result in a change of license status (manual and electronic, where applicable)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

Assessor conclusions:
The DMV has two manuals that address reporting and recording actions that may result in a change of license status. Both the Driver Programs Manual and Field License Procedures Manual are available in hardcopy and electronically. Both documents identify policy and procedures for issuing a license and record actions that change the status of a license.
**Question 133:**
Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing any change in license status (e.g., sanctions, withdrawals, reinstatement, revocations, and restrictions)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative or flow diagram describing the processes and procedures governing the actual change to the license status, including timelines for each type of change.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV identified the flow processes for Convictions, Suspensions, Cancellations and Revocations. Supporting documentation was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

**Question 134:**
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the driver data system's key data process flows, including inputs from other data systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the process flow diagram.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon provided several flow charts regarding the driver license system that outline the driver data system's key data process flows and many of the inputs from other data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 135:
Are the processes for error correction and error handling documented for: license, permit, and endorsement issuance; reporting and recording of relevant citations and convictions; reporting and recording of driver education and improvement courses; and reporting and recording of other information that may result in a change of license status?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation or flow diagram that describes the processes and procedures for error correction and error handling in each of the listed process areas.

Assessor conclusions:
Errors that occur during the license application process normally are caught and corrected immediately or the application process cannot be completed. The process for correcting errors is identified in the Field Office Procedures Manual. Documentation on proofreading and manually updating records for suspensions and convictions was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 136:
Are there processes and procedures for purging data from the driver system documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation or flow diagram that describes the processes and procedures for purging data and the timelines for these actions.

Assessor conclusions:
The State reports that there are processes and procedures for purging data from the driver system and has provided corroborating documentation (last published 11 page "file split" report) that describes the processes and procedures for purging data and the timelines for these actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 137:
In States that have the administrative authority to suspend licenses based on a DUI arrest independent of adjudication, are these processes documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation or flow diagram that describes the processes and procedures for administrative license suspension.

Assessor conclusions:
The business process flows for Administrative License Sanctions were provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 138:
Are there established processes to detect false identity licensure fraud?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative describing the systems or processes used to detect individuals attempting licensure under a new identity.

Assessor conclusions:
There are two business process flows to help prevent fraud - False Application Process and Processing False Applicants. Both were provided. Oregon also uses facial recognition software and has established a Fraud Emergency Warning System to prevent applicants from traveling to other field offices to obtain fraudulent licenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important
### Question 139:
Are there established processes to detect internal fraud by individual users or examiners?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing the systems or processes used to detect internal fraud by individual users or examiners.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV provided its Anti-Fraud Policy as supporting documentation. A proofreading and internal employee auditing process has been established. In addition, the DMV Accounting Section runs auditing programs to check accuracy. DMV has an investigation section to investigate fraud and a fraud working group to identify and evaluate potential fraud risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 140:
Are the established processes to detect CDL fraud (including hazmat endorsements)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing the systems or processes used to detect commercial driver's license fraud, including for hazmat endorsements.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV fraud detection process is used on all license applications, including photo comparison and verification of required documents. For CDL licenses the DMV uses SAVE, SSOLV, PDPS, CDLIS and, for CDL hazmat endorsements, TSA verification and background checks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 141:
Are there policies and procedures for maintaining appropriate system and information security?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide copies of the relevant policies and procedure manuals.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The comprehensive, 45-page policy document provided by the State, DMV Systems and Information Security, confirms that there are policies and procedures for maintaining appropriate system and information security. The policy emphasizes information security but also addresses system security by including aspects such as the DMV Data Breach Policy and references to the Privacy Training Module Class for newly-hired employees.

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 33.3% |

### Question 142:
Are there procedures in place to ensure that driver system custodians track access and release of driver information adequately?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide copies of the relevant procedures or manuals.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The documents provided confirm that procedures are in place to track access and the release of driver information.

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 33.3% |
**Question 143:**
Can the State's crash system be linked to the driver system electronically?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative explanation of a State's linkage protocols that demonstrates how records in the crash system are linked to the driver record. Include identification of the linkage portal and the organization responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Currently, the driver system and the crash system are not linked electronically. Oregon is in a 10-year process to update the driver system and hopes to establish such an electronic link. All reportable crashes are manually entered onto the driving record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 144:**
Can the State's citation system be linked to the driver system electronically?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative explanation of a State's linkage protocols that demonstrates how records in the citation system are linked to the driver record. Include identification of the linkage portal and the organization responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Chargeable citations are entered onto the driving record and maintained by the DMV. Most citation and conviction information is manually added to the driver license system. Oregon is working on a process to electronically update all the records. A limited number of agencies have the capability to electronically transfer citation information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 145:
Can the State's adjudication system be linked to the driver system electronically?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative explanation of a State's linkage protocols that demonstrates how records in the adjudication system are linked to the driver record. Include identification of the linkage portal and the organization responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

Assessor conclusions:
All reportable adjudications are entered onto the customer's driving record and maintained in the DMV computer system and linked to the issued citation. Some courts submit conviction information through the State Police-managed Law Enforcement Data System and others have established a direct link to the DMV to report convictions.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%

Question 146:
Is there an interface link between the driver system and: the Problem Driver Pointer System, the Commercial Driver Licensing System, the Social Security Online Verification system, and the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlement system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the policy for checking the PDPS, CDLIS, SSOLV, and SAVE for licensing commercial and non-commercial drivers (both original issuances and renewals).

Assessor conclusions:
The DMV is electronically connected to PDPS, CDLIS, SSOLV and SAVE. These systems are checked immediately during the license application process. A license may not be issued until all issues are resolved.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%
Question 147:
Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the protocols granting authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system.

Assessor conclusions:
Law enforcement is linked to the DMV through Oregon’s LEDS/NLETS which is housed by the Oregon State Police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important

Question 148:
Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized court personnel access to information in the driver system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the protocols granting authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system.

Assessor conclusions:
Most Oregon courts may access driver information through the State Police’s Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) or by direct access portal managed by the ODOT. Oregon is currently in the process of updating its DMV computer system and direct access by the courts is one of the expected outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important
Question 149:
Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized personnel from other States access to information in the driver system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the protocols granting authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system.

Assessor conclusions:
Other states’ law enforcement may apply for driver record information. This is a paper application process and the other states are required to pay for this service. Local law enforcement may obtain information through the State Police's LEDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 150:
Is there a formal, comprehensive data quality management program for the driver system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the driver system's data quality management programs and the most recent data quality reports issued.

Assessor conclusions:
The response identified the DMV's audit process but did not address a formal data quality management program.

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 33.3% |
**Question 151:**
Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks or validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent between fields.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV has several automated verification and edit checks built into the system and has established a proofreading process to ensure the accuracy and completeness of entered information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 152:**
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system timeliness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The response addresses service performance, not timeliness performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 153:**
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system accuracy measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Each DMV location establishes its own accuracy standards. The response stated there are no official accuracy performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 154:**
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system completeness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Completeness performance measures have not been established. The DMV has established productivity measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 155:**
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system uniformity measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The response does not address uniformity performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 156:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of driver system integration measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
Integration performance measures have not been established.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%

Question 157:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of driver system accessibility measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
Accessibility performance measures have not been established.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%

Question 158:
Has the state established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the specific, State-determined numeric goals associated with each performance measure in use.

Assessor conclusions:
Performance measures and performance metrics have not been established.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%
Question 159:
Is the detection of high frequency errors used to generate updates to training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to generate new training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt revisions.

Assessor conclusions:
High frequency errors by staff are addressed immediately. These errors are also incorporated into training sessions and procedure manuals. Procedures are reviewed and updated every three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 160:
Are independent sample-based audits conducted periodically for the driver reports and related database contents for that record?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the formal audit methodology, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the audits' frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
State auditors may do some independent periodic reviews. Individual DMV units also audit their work. Formal independent sample audits are not being done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 161: Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the analyses, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the analyses' frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
Comparative and trend analyses are done annually during Oregon's FTE analysis and for budget reasons. It is unclear how this analysis identifies unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions.

Question 162: Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users' data quality feedback to inform changes.

Assessor conclusions:
Data quality feedback is given to DMV employees, supervisors and lead workers.

Question 163: Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
Data quality reporting is done for the DMV units. This information is not shared with the TRCC.
Roadway

Overall, Oregon is very strong in the use of online technology to house, maintain, and present their roadway data to the users. The State does an excellent job of maintaining and documenting all their State roadway data under the Oregon Roadway Location Reference System (OrTrans). All referencing systems used at the State data systems are compatible and HPMS data variable quality checks are made before sending the data to the Federal office. The State collects many of the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements for the State roadway data and has an active study to address which new data elements will be collected and how this could be done for all local agencies and custodians.

The State has solid data descriptions and well-defined data processes in place to provide the necessary information and documentation on their roadway data and systems. Oregon is very strong in the area of roadway data procedures and processes. There is a need to have local agencies use the same procedures and processes in the collection and maintenance of their local roadway data.

The State does an excellent job overseeing the quality of all the roadway data on all State roads and any local agency roadway data used by the State (not widely done).

While the State roadway system has many positive qualities, there are several ways in which it could be improved: Data use and usefulness would be improved by building a statewide working relationship with all local roadway data agencies and custodians to work on sharing information, data, and standards. Further, a committee--perhaps a subcommittee of the TRCC--should be established to define performance measures for all key data areas for the State roadway data system. When this is accomplished, the State can use its working relationship with all local agencies to share the newly defined State performance measures in all areas with all local roadway agencies and custodians.

Addressing data quality control and strengthening the State / local working relationships would go a long way in addressing the roadway data system issues that need to be strengthened. Otherwise, the State has done an excellent job of building their roadway data information systems.
Question 164:
Are all public roadways within the State located using a compatible location referencing system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a map displaying all public roads that represents the system’s statewide capabilities. Identify what percentage of the public road system is State owned or maintained. Explain whether the State uses a single compatible location referencing system for all public roads or if it has a set of compatible location referencing systems. Prior reports are acceptable.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has the ability to locate all public roadways utilizing a compatible location referencing system. The State has created a transportation framework layer called OrTrans. OrTrans is a compilation of data from all of Oregon’s road authorities in one layer with one LRS. This network is interfaced with HPMS non-state road data, and is used to meet Oregon’s HPMS, ARNOLD, Crash, and FMIS data collection and submittal processes. Supporting documents from the State showed the percentages of different roadway types covered, but a statewide map would be too detailed to provide.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 2 Responses received 1 Response rate 50%

Question 165:
Are the roadway and traffic data elements located using a compatible location referencing system (e.g., LRS, GIS)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a map displaying roadway features and traffic volume (FDEs) for all public roads (State and non-State routes) that is representative of the system’s statewide capabilities. Explain whether the State uses a single compatible location referencing system for all public roads or if it has a set of compatible location referencing systems. Prior reports are acceptable.

Assessor conclusions:
State notes they have their roadway data elements located through their main LRS or through the GIS coordinates which can be converted as needed. Other LRS systems being used are compatible, allowing the data to be used by multiple users. ODOT has processes in place to ensure that all databases are in sync. The State provided a screenshot of a map with Average Daily Traffic detailed and other structure layers available.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 2 Responses received 1 Response rate 50%
### Question 166:
Is there an enterprise roadway information system containing roadway and traffic data elements for all public roads?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the enterprise roadway information system, which should enable linking between the various roadway information systems including: roadway, traffic, location reference, bridge, and pavement data.

**Assessor conclusions:**
ODOT has a transportation framework, OrTrans, which contains all data from Oregon's road authorities in one layer with one LRS. This network is interfaced with HPMS non-state roadway data. Other than the data required for HPMS, ODOT has very little traffic and roadway data for local roads, thus receiving a "partially meets the standard" rating. Oregon should consider expanding the roadway data coverage to include all local roads in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 167:
Does the State have the ability to identify crash locations using a referencing system compatible with the one(s) used for roadways?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a map displaying crash locations on all public roads that is representative of the system's statewide capabilities. Explain whether the State uses a single compatible location referencing system for crash, roadway features, and traffic volume on all public roads or if it has a set of compatible location referencing systems. Prior reports are acceptable.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State described in detail the OrTrans and other compatible LRS systems which can locate crashes interactively. The State places special emphasis on developing and maintaining a consistent referencing system in order to analyze crashes in relation to roadway attributes. An example of a cluster of fatal crashes was noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 168:
Is crash data incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system for safety analysis and management use?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe how the crash data is incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system and provide an example of how it is used for safety analysis.

Assessor conclusions:
The State incorporates crash data into the roadway information system for analysis. Network screening is accomplished through ODOT's Safety Priority Index System (SPIS). The SPIS incorporates network screening for both on-state roadways and off-state roadways and identifies locations for further analysis. Systemic plans were also developed to implement countermeasures for roadway departures, intersections, bicycles and pedestrians.

Respondents assigned: 2  Responses received: 1  Response rate: 50%

Question 169:
Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements collected for all public roads?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of FDEs collected and their definitions. Specify if the data collected is for all public roads or State roads only. If the State wishes to cite the data dictionary directly, please identify the FDEs.

Assessor conclusions:
The State currently collects or can generate the majority of the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements (FDEs) on the State highway system, but not on all public roads. A study has been performed to determine the required elements to run SafetyAnalyst and a plan is being developed to collect or obtain the data elements from local agencies. Oregon should consider viewing the full MIRE FDE list to determine if it should add and collect any or all of these FDE data elements on a statewide basis for all public roads in the future.

Respondents assigned: 2  Responses received: 1  Response rate: 50%
Question 170:
Do all additional collected data elements for any public roads conform to the data elements included in MIRE?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of additional MIRE data elements collected beyond the FDEs. Specify if the data elements are collected for all public roads or State roads only.

Assessor conclusions:
The State focuses most of its efforts on collecting federally-required data unless it is needed for a specific project or study. The State has identified some discrepancies between the HPMS definition of data elements and the MIRE definition. The additional data elements collected conform to the data elements included in MIRE with the exception of the identified discrepancies. Oregon should consider reviewing these data elements and whether to conform to the MIRE standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 171:
Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements for all public roads documented in the enterprise system's data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, the MIRE FDE-related contents of the enterprise system's data dictionary. Specify if the data dictionary applies to all public roads or to State roads only.

Assessor conclusions:
The MIRE FDEs collected by the State are documented in the data dictionary. The State has initiated a project to merge the local road databases into TransInfo. As part of this project, more robust data dictionaries will be developed for non-state data. All State and local roadway data collected is or will be documented in the data dictionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 172:**
Are all additional (non-Fundamental Data Element) MIRE data elements for all public roads documented in the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, the additional (non-FDE) MIRE data elements included in the data dictionary. Specify if the data dictionary applies to all public roads or to State roads only.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State data dictionary provided includes the additional (non-FDE) MIRE data elements that are collected by the State and applies to all public roads. All MIRE data elements that are collected are included in the various GIS layers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 173:**
Does roadway data imported from local or municipal sources comply with the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement explaining, how and if any roadway data are accepted and included in the statewide roadway database from local or municipal sources. Describe if the data from local or municipal sources meet the data dictionary standards.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State collects the majority of the roadway data; however, the data obtained from local governments complies with the data dictionary and is verified by the appropriate ODOT data manager prior to incorporation into the State's system. The most common roadway data element obtained from local sources is the AADT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 174:**
Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative explanation of the controls and procedures that ensure the data dictionary is kept up to date.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has a formal and documented process for data collection, management, storage and maintenance. The State also has standards in place to ensure that the data dictionary is updated; however, there is no formal mechanism to monitor compliance with the data dictionary standards. IT personnel follow the IT professional standard of maintaining documentation, which includes keeping the data dictionaries up to date. To ensure a high level of compliance with the standards, a Database Analyst will not approve database changes unless an updated data dictionary is provided.

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 50% |

**Question 175:**
Are the steps for incorporating new elements into the roadway information system (e.g., a new MIRE element) documented to show the flow of information?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the process for adding new data elements (e.g., a new MIRE element) to the roadway system. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon has a number of groups and steering committees overseeing the different aspects of the collection of data and the maintenance of standards. The State has a well-documented process for incorporating new data elements into the roadway information system. Documents provided define who is responsible for the collection, management, storage and maintenance of data. Several internal committees, sub-committees and teams ensure that the standards, updates, and organizational priorities are maintained.

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 50% |
**Question 176:**
Are the steps for updating roadway information documented to show the flow of information?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the process for updating data elements in the roadway system. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon has detailed documentation for collecting and updating information and those collecting and loading the data are responsible for checking it before it goes into the roadway system. TRANSINFO_MANUAL_3_15 notes specific groups responsible for different aspects of changes (e.g., ramps as noted on page 37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 177:**
Are the steps for archiving and accessing historical roadway inventory documented?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the process of archiving and accessing historical roadway data. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has a very well-documented and detailed process for incorporating changes to the roadway inventory along with a retention schedule for maintaining the historical information. The State takes annual snapshots of the GIS data layers. Additionally, the TransInfo roadway data is captured annually in a report database. Users can query the history tables from 2002-present. Users of the TransInfo database can view historical data by selecting a date from 2011-present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 178:**
Are the procedures that local agencies (e.g., county, MPO, municipality) use to collect, manage, and submit roadway data to the statewide inventory documented?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the local agency procedures for collecting, managing, and submitting data to the State roadway inventory. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon DOT receives minimal data from local agencies, but when they do, ODOT works with the local agency to ensure that the appropriate data management practices are in place. The ODOT data owners are responsible for the methodologies used to collect the data as well as the integrity of the data submitted by local agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

---

**Question 179:**
Are local agency procedures for collecting and managing the roadway data compatible with the State's enterprise roadway inventory?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide official documentation or a narrative explanation of how compatibility between local data systems and the State roadway inventory is achieved. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State (ODOT) receives minimal data from local agencies. Local agency line-work may have some minor differences, adding complexity to the HPMS submittal. All HPMS data on local roads is collected by the State ensuring that State practices are used. Traffic count data appears to be primarily the data the State receives from local sources. Prior to accepting the data, the State works with the local agency to ensure data collection and management practices are in place. Local agencies not providing any roadway data to the State may not be using a roadway data system which is compatible with the State. The State should consider working with all these local agencies to advise them to use the same compatible standard as the State enterprise roadway inventory system in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---
Question 180: Are there guidelines for collection of data elements as they are described in the State roadway inventory data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence: Provide the guidelines and cite an example of data collection pursuant to the data dictionary.

Assessor conclusions: The State has provided detailed documentation on the guidelines for collecting roadway data of all types (see TRANSINFO_MANUAL_3_15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 181: Are the location coding methodologies for all State roadway information systems compatible?

Standard of Evidence: Describe the location referencing system and the information systems that use it. If there is more than one location referencing system in use, list each and the associated systems.

Assessor conclusions: The State created a transportation framework layer called OrTrans, that is a compilation of data from all of Oregon’s road authorities in one layer with one LRS. This network is interfaced with the HPMS non-state road data, and is used to meet HPMS, ARNOLD, Crash, and FMIS data collection and submittal processes. The State also has some other compatible LRS systems, including coordinate-based, which allows data to be combined and layered for multiple uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 182:
Are there interface linkages connecting the State's discrete roadway information systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative that describes the interface links connecting the State's roadway information systems. Provide the result of a single query (e.g., table, view) that includes both roadway features and traffic data for a segment of road.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have a "real time" integrated linkage between systems per se, but the State achieves integration/links through periodic snapshots of the different data sources. Each program area ensures the data is appropriate for sharing and integrating. The State also provides various tools to its customers which allows combining disparate data into purpose-built reporting tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 183:
Are the location coding methodologies for all regional and local roadway systems compatible?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative describing the location referencing system and the associated regional and local roadway systems. If there is more than one location referencing system in use, list each and the associated regional and local systems.

Assessor conclusions:
Location data is compatible where the regional or local agency is utilizing GIS. For State highways, ODOT uses the TransInfo database which is the parent system for the official LRS. For non-state highways, ODOT uses the HGIS15 database which is the parent system for functionally-classified roads not on the State system. ODOT has recently initiated a project to merge the HGIS15 data into TransInfo. The State should consider contacting all local agencies to ensure they are all using GIS location data systems. It is not clear that they all are; thus, a "partially meets" rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 184:
Do roadway data systems maintained by regional and local custodians (e.g., MPOs, municipalities) interface with the State enterprise roadway information system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative that describes the interface links connecting the regional or local roadway information systems to the State’s enterprise roadway information system. Provide the result of a single query (e.g., table, view) that includes both roadway features and traffic data for a local road segment.

Assessor conclusions:
The State notes that local / regional agencies can link to the State system if they use GIS and are associated with the ODOT OrTrans framework layer. Outside of GIS, linkage has been done for special research or specific analyses, but not without manual effort. ODOT provides resources to allow the data to be linked and used together. The State should consider working with all local agencies to ensure they upgrade their roadway systems to a GIS-based roadway system compatible with the State system. Thus, the State receives a "partially meets" rating at this time.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 50% |

Question 185:
Does the State enterprise roadway information system allow MPOs and local transportation agencies on-demand access to data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative that describes the system or process that enables localities to query the data system.

Assessor conclusions:
The State provides tools to customers to combine disparate data for on-demand reporting. Real-time access to the data is limited for security reasons; however, the State does allow MPOs access to the ODOT network after obtaining security clearance.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 50% |
Question 186:
Do Roadway system data managers regularly produce and analyze data quality reports?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report and specify the release schedule for the reports.

Assessor conclusions:
The State performs an extensive series of data checks and quality assessments. Some are: computer checks, duplicate record checks, variable value consistency checks, statistical regression checks, and some comparisons of different reports such as monthly versus annual totals. Depending on the report, they are produced as often as weekly up to annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 187:
Is the overall quality of information in the Roadway system dependent on a formal program of error/edit checking as data is entered into the statewide system?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the formal program of error/edit checking, to include specific procedures for both automated and manual processes.

Assessor conclusions:
The State uses the computer to edit-check and consistency-check data variables as they are entered into the State system. Other computer reports check totals monthly and annually which are reviewed by ODOT staff. ODOT staff cross-checks data across different ODOT systems. HPMS validation checks are done and checked by FHWA staff. All these different checking processes constitute a formal error checking program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 188:
Are there procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors in both automated and manual processes. Please specify where these procedures are formally documented.

Assessor conclusions:
The State described a procedure for making corrections to errors depending on the type of error. Priority is given to serious errors (fatal error to the system or the data in error is needed ASAP) which need to be urgently corrected, important errors though not urgent, or incidental errors which are logged, corrected in the order in which they are received and corrected when they can be. Documentation for these procedures was not provided resulting in a partial rating. The State should consider creating a procedure description for reconciling detected data errors in their roadway data system.

Question 189:
Are there procedures for sharing quality control information with data collectors through individual and agency-level feedback and training?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe all the procedures used for sharing quality control information with data collectors.

Assessor conclusions:
The State notes that data collectors are trained, given tools to help them collect specific data, manuals and instructions detailing the data collection procedures to ensure consistency and accuracy. QA/QC reports are run on the data and error reports are shared with the data collectors to minimize errors regarding the collection of the data. If needed, additional training is conducted with the collectors to ensure the data is collected in a consistent manner. ODOT also hosts FHWA and other training courses which local agencies may attend for free.
**Question 190:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the State enterprise roadway information system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State provided a detailed spreadsheet of the timeliness requirements of the roadway system data for key data sources, special reports, maps, and charts. This report indicates if the process is on-time, behind schedule, or ahead of schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 191:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The only performance measure for timeliness of roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians is the annual HPMS submittal to FHWA. The State should consider working with all the local agencies to encourage them to meet the State timeliness requirements in a formal manner. A performance measure calculated for the update timeliness (e.g., the median or mean number of days from (a) roadway project completion to (b) the date the updated critical data elements are entered into the roadway inventory file) might work for local agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 192:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the State enterprise roadway information system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have performance measures for the accuracy of the State enterprise roadway information system. It appears that the State could easily measure accuracy as they are currently assessing accuracy based on field verification of sample sections. From the FHWA Performance Measures for Roadway Data, one metric is, "The percentage of all road segment records with no errors in critical data elements. (The State selects one or more roadway data elements it considers critical and assesses the accuracy of that element or elements in all of the roadway records within a period defined by the State.) An additional metric identified in the same document is, "Percentage of critical roadway inventory elements whose attribute values are within reasonable ranges and/or are consistent with related variables". The State should consider adopting a performance measure like this to evaluate their enterprise system data accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 193:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have performance measures for the accuracy of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians. If and when the State defines and creates a State performance measure for accuracy of the State roadway data, then the State should consider recommending that same performance measure to the local and regional roadway data custodians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 194:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the State enterprise roadway information system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have performance measures for the completeness of the State enterprise roadway information system. It appears that the State collects the necessary data to establish a performance measure for completeness. One measure of completeness is, "The percentage of public road miles or jurisdictions identified on the State’s base-map or roadway inventory file." It appears that the State may be doing this in an informal manner. The State makes every effort to capture all the State roadway data. Oregon depends on the various road owners to keep the State database complete and up-to-date. Different definitions of jurisdiction affect the issue of road ownership -- crashes can occur on public vehicular areas which are not owned by the State or local authorities. This issue would have to be resolved; thus, the State receives a partially meets rating. The State should consider resolving this issue to make it easier to create a formal measure of completeness to meet this ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 195:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon does not have an official performance measure for the completeness of the roadway data maintained by local agencies. The State does query local road agencies annually and uses quality assurance steps to monitor them. Crash coders sometimes find that a crash has occurred on an unknown road. In addition, public vehicular areas are hard to deal with because they are not State-controlled roadways (private sub-divisions, mall parking lots, etc.). These issues would have to be resolved. If the State defines and creates a State performance measure for State roadway data completeness, the State should consider recommending a similar performance measure to the local and regional roadway data custodians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Question 196:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the uniformity of the State enterprise roadway information system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not have performance measures for the uniformity of the State enterprise roadway information system. HPMS requirements do not act as a substitute for actual performance measures. The State should be commended for the job they do and the fact they are considered to have one of the best HPMS programs in the nation. The State should consider developing an official State performance measure or measures for uniformity of all the State enterprise roadway data beyond what is required for HPMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 197:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the uniformity of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not have performance measures for the uniformity of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians. The State uses the FHWA certification of the HPMS data. HPMS requirements do not act as a substitute for actual performance measures. If the State defines and creates a State performance measure for the uniformity of the enterprise State data, the State should consider recommending the same or a similar performance measure to the local and regional agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 198:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accessibility of State enterprise roadway information systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does have general performance measures for the accessibility of the State enterprise roadway system. Specific statistics were provided in monthly reports showing that data is being updated and available. The State also tracks the number of requests received requiring information from the State roadway inventory file that were filled within the State's defined timeline. However, the State cannot determine who is actually accessing the data so the State should consider developing a way to identify those accessing their roadway data systems. This would enhance their understanding of those who are using their enterprise roadway data systems and possibly help create an additional new performance measure for accessibility.

Respondents assigned: 2  Responses received: 1  Response rate: 50%

Question 199:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accessibility of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have performance measures for the accessibility of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians. The State should consider working with the local agencies to help them develop performance measures of accessibility.

Respondents assigned: 2  Responses received: 1  Response rate: 50%
Question 200:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of State enterprise roadway information systems and other critical data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does have performance measures for the integration of the enterprise roadway data with other critical data systems. Numerous examples of integration were detailed in reports -- like fatalities per 100M VMT combining crash data total fatalities per 100M VMT from the roadway data for the State. The State tracks a number of monthly performance measures related to data collection and the roadway information system. Several of the measures track the integration for the State.

Respondents assigned 2  Responses received 1  Response rate 50%

Question 201:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.) and other critical data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the metrics used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have performance measures for integration of roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians. The State should consider recommending integration performance measures similar to the State performance measures to all local and regional roadway data custodians.

Respondents assigned 2  Responses received 1  Response rate 50%
Citation / Adjudication

The State of Oregon's traffic records for citation and adjudication have some excellent strengths and some serious weaknesses. The rating of the records may not reflect the work underway to improve the records in the adjudication systems. The Circuit Courts are improving their record-keeping to a state of the art level. The planning takes into account a number of national records standards and, overall, has promise to greatly improve the record-keeping when fully implemented.

The State's strengths and the potential for a strong traffic records system is in the work being done on behalf of the Circuit Courts. The equally strong failures for the systems are the lack of a unique single-issue citation system, the lack of any DUII tracking system and the apparent exclusion of or lack of participation by the local courts from any planning for improved records.

While the records managed by the Circuit Courts are likely to meet some of the national standards for the records, such as the standards from the National Center for State Courts, there are other standards which were not recognized by any of the respondents. The lack of inter-operable systems is detrimental to the records functionality and the utility of the records to the justice system as a statewide whole.

It seems that the various stakeholders of the State might benefit from some training about the national records standards and systems communications. The local courts may need a great deal more intervention by the State. The information available about the local courts was so limited and unclear that an individual assessment of that system may be needed. It is clear that the local courts handle traffic cases including DUII so the records from those courts should be assessed. Local control and autonomy of the local courts can result in failures of the adjudication system, particularly with repeat offenders that may have cases pending in several courts simultaneously. Even within home rule states, it is possible for local courts to work together and with the State toward maximal functionality of record systems and record sharing, which can sometimes be addressed by a citation tracking system, managed by a volunteer agency.

The respondents for the citation and adjudication section took a great deal of time and effort to answer the questions from their perspectives. That fact is noted with appreciation. It appears however, that they do not have access to the information about the local courts and should strive to develop communication and collaboration.
Question 202:
Is there a statewide system that provides real-time information on individuals’ driving and criminal histories?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the statewide system that provides real-time information on individuals’ driving and criminal histories.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has described two separate systems for providing real-time information. "Law Enforcement Data Systems" (LEDs) provides real time information on an individual's criminal history to police and authorized users, while the Department of Transportation's Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Division (DMV) maintains information on a person's driving history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 203:
Do all law enforcement agencies, parole agencies, probation agencies, and courts within the State participate in and have access to a system providing real-time information on individuals driving and criminal histories?

Standard of Evidence:
Name the groups that have real time access and describe the system that these agencies use to access driver or criminal histories, i.e., police dispatch, direct system access, telephone help desk.

Assessor conclusions:
All law enforcement agencies, parole and probation agencies, and courts within the State are able to access the Judicial Department's case management system as well as the Law Enforcement Data Systems (LEDS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 204:
Is there a statewide authority that assigns unique citation numbers?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the agency responsible and describe the protocols used to generate and assign unique citation numbers. Provide a copy of the relevant statute or gubernatorial order.

Assessor conclusions:
There is no statewide system that generates unique citation numbers. The State court case management assigns unique court case numbers upon filing, but that system does not assign numbers for the local courts. Each law enforcement agency assigns its own citation numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 205:
Are all citation dispositions—both within and outside the judicial branch—tracked by the statewide data system?

Standard of Evidence:
If a statewide data tracking system exists, describe the means by which citation dispositions are transmitted and posted. If the system is the driver history file, note if deferrals or dismissals are posted. If the statewide system is managed through the courts, indicate whether all courts that handle traffic violations report to the same tracking system.

Assessor conclusions:
Any and all citations issued by law enforcement in Oregon by law must be filed with a court by law enforcement. No pre-court filing administrative process to dispose of citations is approved. All citations filed in circuit courts are entered into the Judicial Department's case management system. Court staff members complete the record by entering the disposition of the case. The record will include whether the charges were dismissed or whether the defendant was convicted. In cases where a defendant is convicted of a traffic offense, the court submits an abstract of judgment to ODOT's Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Division (DMV). DMV adds the conviction information to the person's driver history. No information is provided about how cases are processed in justice and municipal courts. Municipal and justice courts are "local" courts outside the State-funded court system with jurisdiction limited to violations, lesser crimes, and some other less serious cases. Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 153.800 allows any court in Oregon including municipal and justice courts to establish a Violations Bureau. ORS 810.370 mandates all courts (including municipal and justice courts) to forward all convictions related to the operation of motor vehicles on streets and highways to the Department of Transportation within 24 hours of the time the defendant was sentenced by the court. The information provided does not indicate whether the State has any requirements for dismissals or other dispositions to be sent to the Department of Transportation. The answer is incomplete because it does not explain if the dismissals and deferrals are included in the definition of the required "convictions" and, therefore, reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 206:
Are final dispositions (up to and including the resolution of any appeals) posted to the driver data system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a flow chart or audit report documenting how all types of dispositions are posted to the driver file.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon statute requires courts (includes circuit, justice, and municipal courts) to notify the Department of Transportation’s Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Division (DMV) within 24 hours of sentencing a defendant for a traffic offense. No requirement is stated about the reporting of dismissals, not guilty findings or any type of deferral action. Circuit Courts submit an abstract of judgment to DMV, and DMV posts information about the conviction to the defendant’s driving record. Courts do not notify DMV if the violation is appealed. A flow chart for the different courts would complete the answer.

| Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 3 | Response rate | 75% |

Question 207:
Are the courts’ case management systems interoperable among all jurisdictions within the State (including local, municipal and State)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the number of case management systems in use in the State and detail which are interoperable. Indicate if the State has a unified judicial system and if municipal or other local level courts share the same case management system.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the State has described a system where information is accessible to authorized individuals, not all court management systems are inter-operable among the Circuit, municipal and justice courts.

| Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 2 | Response rate | 50% |
Question 208:
Is citation and adjudication data used for traffic safety analysis to identify problem locations, areas, problem drivers, and issues related to the issuance of citations, prosecution of offenders, and adjudication of cases by courts?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide an example analysis and describe the policy or enforcement actions taken as a result.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has described how citation and adjudication data is used in the prosecution and adjudication of cases; however, it has not indicated if the data referred to is used for other aspects of traffic safety analysis as referred to in the question. No example analysis and description of the policy or enforcement actions taken as a result are provided.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 4  Responses received 3  Response rate 75%

Question 209:
Do the appropriate components of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) data guidelines?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NCIC guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has indicated adherence to NCIC data guidelines but has not provided the required narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NCIC guidelines.

Question Rank: Less Important

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 3  Response rate 100%
Question 210:
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program guidelines?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the UCR program guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has indicated adherence to the UCR program guidelines. The required narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence was not provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 211:
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) guidelines?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NIBRS guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State is adherent as to crime reporting of citation data--some at the UCR level and others at the NIBRS level. Still others report at O-NIBRS level, a superset of data. Without the requested narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NIBRS guidelines, status is unclear as to all State and local agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 212:**
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS) guidelines?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NLETS guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon believes that it meets this standard for citation and adjudication systems adhering to the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS) guidelines. No narrative or other description was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

---

**Question 213:**
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) guidelines?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the LEIN guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
No information or documentation of how the records might adhere to the National Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) guidelines is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important
**Question 214:**
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the Functional Requirement Standards for Traffic Court Case Management?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the Functional Requirement Standards for Traffic Court Case Management. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The new Oregon eCourt system includes all of the functions identified in NCSC's Functional Requirement Standards for Traffic Court Case Management Systems. Currently, 26 out of the 36 Circuit Courts are on the new system. All Circuit Courts will convert to Oregon eCourt by June 2016. However, no information is provided about the local court records and whether the local courts will be on the eCourt system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 215:**
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the NIEM Justice domain guidelines?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NIEM Justice domain guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has indicated that data sent from the Judicial Department to the State Police is not NIEM compliant; however, code is currently being updated contemplating the NIEM standards. The State did not provide a narrative statement detailing the other systems (local courts) and their adherence to the NIEM Justice domain guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 216:**
Does the State use the National Center for State Courts guidelines for court records?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to NCSC guidelines for court records. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Circuit Courts have deployed or will deploy the eCourt system which meets the guidelines by June 2016. There is no narrative explanation about the local court record-keeping and their adherence to NCSC guidelines for court records or if a comparable guideline is being used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 217:**
Does the State use the Global Justice Reference Architecture (GRA)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to GRA guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not use the Global Justice Reference Architecture (GRA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 218:
Does the State have an impaired driving data tracking system that meets the specifications of NHTSA's Model Impaired Driving Records Information System (MIDRIS)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to MIDRIS guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon eCourt system does have several MIDRIS components. Law enforcement agencies from around the State, including some of the largest agencies (Oregon State Police and Portland Police Bureau) electronically file citations with circuit courts. The citing agency transmits the citation information (including an image of the citation) to circuit courts on a daily basis. Additionally, district attorney offices, law enforcement agencies, and members of the State Bar are able to access case information (i.e., view case docketing information and documents filed in the case) online. It is not clear whether the local courts handle traffic cases and how the records are integrated into the State record system. In summary: The State does not have a single statewide impaired driving data tracking system that meets the specifications of NHTSA's Model Impaired Driving Records Information System (MIDRIS).

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 3 | Response rate | 100% |

Question 219:
Does the citation system have a data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:

Assessor conclusions:
The State has provided conflicting information in response to the data dictionary question and has not provided the dictionary for review.

| Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 2 | Response rate | 50% |
Question 220:
Do the citation data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?

Standard of Evidence:

If a statewide citation tracking system exists, does its data dictionary clearly define all data fields. If there are two or more repositories of citation data, provide data dictionaries for the two largest. NOTE: This response does not require data dictionaries from individual law enforcement agencies that track their own citations—it refers to a statewide system or one used by multiple agencies.

Assessor conclusions:
The State response of yes to this question is in conflict with the answer provided in the previous question. As there was no evidence provided, it is impossible to determine whether the State meets or partially meets the Advisory ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 221:
Are the citation system data dictionaries up to date and consistent with the field data collection manual, training materials, coding manuals, and corresponding reports?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a narrative describing the process—including timelines and the summary of changes—used to ensure uniformity in the field data collection manuals, training materials, coding manuals, and corresponding reports.

Assessor conclusions:
The State reports that the data dictionaries are frequently updated. However, the requested narrative describing the process—including timelines and the summary of changes—used to ensure uniformity in the field data collection manuals, training materials, coding manuals, and corresponding reports has not been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 222:
Do the citation data dictionaries indicate the data fields that are populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components.

Assessor conclusions:
A list of data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components is not provided. The State indicates that the citation data dictionaries do not indicate the interfaced fields.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned: 5  Responses received: 2  Response rate: 40%

Question 223:
Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries provide a definition for each data field?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of Case Management Systems used by both State and local level courts and note if a data dictionary is available for each one. Provide a data dictionary for one State, one county/district, and one local (municipal) court if they do not use the same case management systems.

Assessor conclusions:
A list and data dictionary for one State, one county/district, and one local (municipal) court if they do not use the same case management systems has not been provided as requested.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned: 3  Responses received: 2  Response rate: 66.7%
Question 224:
Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?

Standard of Evidence:
Use the data dictionaries provided in response to Question 223.

Assessor conclusions:
A sample of the data dictionary used by the Department's case management system is provided. No information is given as to what the local (justice and municipal) courts use to process their cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 225:
Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries indicate the data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components.

Assessor conclusions:
The Judicial Department’s Enterprise Technology and Services Division in the Office of the State Court Administrator indicates two data dictionary integrations – one with the State Police and one with the City of Portland which supplies traffic citation data to Odyssey (the Department's case management system) to create traffic violation cases only. However, the courts' case management system data dictionaries do not indicate the data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 226:**
Do the prosecutors’ information systems have data dictionaries?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a data dictionary for the State prosecutors’ office (State level courts that handle the most traffic violations). Indicate whether local prosecutors (cities, counties) have one or numerous types of data systems.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State reports a dictionary of sorts from Law Enforcement Data System, and provided a sample from the Oregon Judicial Information system. No information about the types or number of prosecutor data systems are in use and no data dictionary was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 227:**
Can the State track citations from point of issuance to posting on the driver file?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a flow diagram documenting citation lifecycle process that identifies key stakeholders. Ensure that alternative flows are included (e.g., manual and electronic submission).

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has described a system whereby citations filed by law enforcement in the Circuit Courts can be traced throughout the process, including posting on the driver file. The State is unable to track citations that are adjudicated by the local (municipal and justice) courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 228:
Does the State measure compliance with the process outlined in the citation lifecycle flow chart?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative describing how the State measures compliance with the citation lifecycle process specified in the flow chart. If there are official guidance documents, provide them.

Assessor conclusions:
The narrative describes how the State measures compliance with the citation lifecycle process specified in the flow chart in the Circuit Courts and some law enforcement agencies. This is not statewide nor are all courts included.

Although the State has acknowledged that there is no single agency that measures compliance for all stages of the lifecycle of a citation, the State has described a system whereby responsible agencies are connected (either electronically or through manual process) and provide checks against one another to ensure compliance with the citation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 229:
Is the State able to track DUI citations?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a flow chart that documents the criminal and administrative DUI processes, identifies all key stakeholders, and includes disposition per the criminal and administrative charges.

Assessor conclusions:
The narrative and flowchart provided document the criminal and administrative DUI processes, identify all key stakeholders, and include dispositions per the criminal and administrative charges for Circuit Court processing of DUII diversion cases. DUII charges are filed in local courts in addition to Circuit Courts. Local courts use the same process illustrated in the attached diagram of the process for Circuit Courts. The flowchart shows no reporting to the DMV on two instances—No reporting to the DMV as to completion or non-completion is shown when the defendant is participating in the diversion program. Neither are not guilty findings reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Question 230:**
Does the DUI tracking system include BAC and any drug testing results?

**Standard of Evidence:**

If no statewide DUI tracking system is in place, indicate whether the driver history record contains the BAC test results.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is no statewide DUI tracking system. The case management system does not include a field to enter the BAC or any drug testing results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

---

**Question 231:**
Does the State have a system for tracking administrative driver penalties and sanctions?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide a narrative describing the protocol for reporting (posting) the penalty and/or sanction to the driver and/or vehicle file.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has indicated that there is a system for tracking administrative driver penalties and sanctions; however, no evidence (narrative description) was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
Question 232:
Does the State have a system for tracking traffic citations for juvenile offenders?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a flow chart that documents the processing of juvenile offenders’ traffic citations, specifying any charges or circumstances that cause juveniles to be processed as adult offenders.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has described a system in Circuit Courts for tracking traffic citations for juvenile offenders, and has provided statutory authority for situations where a juvenile case can be "waived into adult court." The State is unable to provide information for juvenile cases from local courts outside the State-funded court system. There is no information about how traffic citations for juvenile offenders are processed in justice and municipal courts. Municipal and justice courts are "local" courts outside the State-funded court system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 233:
Does the State distinguish between the administrative handling of court payments in lieu of court appearances (mail-ins) and court appearances?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a flow chart documenting the processing of administrative handling of court payments (mail-ins).

Assessor conclusions:
The Circuit Courts appear to meet the ideal. A written business process, which documents that the Department's system tracks how the case was resolved, is provided. No information is provided as to the local courts. A fair rating for the State cannot be provided without information about the local courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 234:
Does the State track deferral and dismissal of citations?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a flow chart documenting the deferral and the dismissal of citations.

Assessor conclusions:

The business process chart that documents the deferral and the dismissal of citations is provided for the Circuit Courts. The Circuit Courts have the ability to track the deferral and the dismissal of citations. The response explains that at the conclusion of a case, court staff enter information about the disposition of the case, which could include whether the charges were dismissed, the defendant entered a DUlI diversion program, or the defendant was convicted. The Department's business process for violation cases includes direction to court staff to enter information into the case management system when a charge is dismissed. The Judicial Department tracks dismissal of citations. This is done on a regular basis for accounting purposes. Additionally, individual Circuit Courts may track the number of diversion cases (i.e., deferral) as those particular cases require some court oversight and follow-up. The Department does not routinely compile statewide statistics on the number of diversions; however, the Department does have the capability to produce this data. All courts (circuit, justice, and municipal courts) are required by statute (ORS 813.230(2)) to notify the Department of Transportation when the court issues an order permitting a defendant to participate in diversion. Additional information regarding the local courts is needed. The local courts are important. It is even more important to understand their volume and practices if they are a place where citations go to die.

Question 235:
Are there State and/or local criteria for deferring or dismissing traffic citations and charges?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide the criteria for deferring or dismissing traffic citations and charges.

Assessor conclusions:

The State has provided the requested criteria for deferring or dismissing traffic citations and charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 236:**
If the State purges its records, are the timing conditions and procedures documented?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative documenting whether or not the State purges records. If so, list the types of records the State purges and provide the criteria for doing so.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The narrative provided documents how the Circuit Courts purge records. It lists the types of records the State purges and provides the criteria for doing so. Records retention standards for documents filed in cases in local courts (justice and municipal courts) are established by Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 166-200-0290 and OAR 166-150-0130. A copy of the rules was provided. Municipal courts are required to keep records in traffic violation cases and DUII diversion cases for 5 years, records in DUII (non-diversion) cases for 10 years. Justice courts are required to keep records in traffic violation cases for a minimum of 3 years and records in criminal cases for 6 years. The OARs also established the conditions under which local courts may destroy records. Local agencies shall submit a record of all public records (paper only) destroyed on the authority of the approved records retention schedules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 237:**
Are the security protocols governing data access, modification, and release officially documented?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the official security protocols governing data access, modification, and release.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The answer is quite extensive as to the Circuit Court official security protocols governing data access, modification, and release. The protocols are being updated and it is likely that they will meet the Advisory ideal. The information provided for the local courts or other agencies is that they are governed by Oregon public records law. The information as to the local courts is incomplete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 238:
Is citation data linked with the driver system to collect driver information, to carry out administrative actions (e.g., suspension, revocation, cancellation, interlock) and determine the applicable charges?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe how citation, adjudication and driver data are linked and by what means administrative actions are carried out or posted using these linkages.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has indicated that the citation data is linked with the driver system to determine applicable charges, namely whether the driver is eligible for a fine reduction or increase in penalty. The State has further stated that the courts do not determine applicable charges but has not indicated if the appropriate authority utilizes linked data to do so. The citation data that is passed is utilized by the DMV for administrative sanctions. The State has not elaborated on the use of citation data for the named functions in the municipal and justice courts.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 5
Responses received 3
Response rate 60%

Question 239:
Is adjudication data linked with the driver system to collect certified driver records and administrative actions (e.g., suspension, revocation, cancellation, interlock) to determine the applicable charges and to post the dispositions to the driver file?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to collect certified driver records and administrative charges and to post dispositions to the driver file.

Assessor conclusions:
The adjudication data from State courts is not linked with the driver system to post dispositions to the driver file.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 4
Responses received 2
Response rate 50%
**Question 240:**
Is citation data linked with the vehicle file to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Citation data is not linked with the vehicle file to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 241:**
Is adjudication data linked with the vehicle file to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock mandates and supervision)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Adjudication data is not linked with the vehicle file to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock mandates and supervision).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 242:
Is citation data linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to document violations and charges related to the crash.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has indicated that citation data is linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash; however, the State did not provide the requested evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 243:
Is adjudication data linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to document violations and charges related to the crash.

**Assessor conclusions:**
No results of a sample query and/or description of how the adjudication or linked information is used to document violations and charges related to the crash is provided. The State has indicated that the adjudication data is not linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 244:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
If there is a statewide citation tracking system in the State, provide timeliness measures used. If there are two or more centralized citation tracking systems, provide timeliness measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has not described a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the citation systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 245:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide accuracy measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide accuracy measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no accuracy measures nor is there a statewide citation tracking system. The State has not described a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the citation systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important
Question 246:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide completeness measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide completeness measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has not described a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the citation systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 247:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the uniformity of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide uniformity measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide uniformity measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has not described a set of established performance measures for the uniformity of the citation systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
**Question 248:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of the citation systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide integration measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide integration measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are several citation tracking systems, but no integration measures for one of them were provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 249:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accessibility of the citation systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide accessibility measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide accessibility measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has not described a set of established performance measures for the accessibility of the citation systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 250:

**Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the adjudication systems?**

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide timeliness measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide timeliness measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**

The Circuit Courts have timeliness measures for their tracking system. No information is provided for the local courts or other systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 251:

**Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the adjudication systems?**

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide accuracy measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide accuracy measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**

Oregon does not have a specific set of performance measures for the accuracy of the adjudication systems. However, they are working on Oregon eCourt to reduce the number of data entry errors. Oregon eCourt’s Strategic Plan and Program Charter proposes several quantifiable measures for the overall goals of the program. No information is available regarding the local courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 252:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the adjudication systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide completeness measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide completeness measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not currently have a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the adjudication systems; however, development of exception reporting is underway to identify common errors at case disposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 253:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of the adjudication systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide integration measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide integration measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not have an established set of performance measures for the integration of the adjudication systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 254:
In States that have an agency responsible for issuing unique citation numbers, is information on intermediate dispositions (e.g., deferrals, dismissals) captured?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide documentation detailing the numbers of citations issued from the 10 largest law enforcement agencies and the number of dispositions for those citations that are in the driver file over a three month period.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not have a single agency responsible for issuing a unique citation number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 255:
Do the State's DUI tracking systems have additional quality control procedures to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of the data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the additional quality control measures for the DUI tracking systems and specify which systems use which measures.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has not described quality control procedures to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of the data in the DUI tracking system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMS / Injury Surveillance

An ideal statewide Injury Surveillance System (ISS) is 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 severity, cost, and clinical outcomes of the individuals involved in traffic crashes.

Overall, Oregon collects and maintains information on all five components. EMS, trauma registry, and vital records data is housed in the Oregon Health Authority Public Health Division (PHD); the emergency department and hospital discharge data is maintained by the Oregon Association of Hospitals and Health Systems (OAHHS). Since this data is managed by a non-State agency, the PHD is encouraged to pursue more coordination and collaboration with the OAHHS. The State also maintains and provides some access to rehabilitation, all-payer / all-claim, traumatic brain injury, Medicaid, and Prescription Drug Monitoring Program databases. State confidentiality laws and data use agreements include provisions related to confidential data beyond the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

All Oregon EMS patient care reports are collected electronically, but submission to the State system is voluntary with approximately 70-90% of all PCR captured in the State file. Oregon is transitioning the EMS data collection system so there are currently two files, both collected with the ImageTrend software. One is NEMSIS 2.2.1-compliant and the other is NEMSIS 3.3.4–compliant. Oregon has adopted the NEMSIS data dictionary and utilizes all of the automated edit checks and validation rules built into that software. There is an interface to the hospital databases through the ImageTrend platform. The State has implemented a comprehensive quality control system for the EMS data that includes: utilization of common errors and user feedback to revise training, providing quality control feedback to submitting agencies, conducting trend analyses for problem identification, and sharing all information with the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. Aggregate and raw data is available for research upon request and approval. Although Oregon has several regulations and guidelines related to data quality, no performance measures have been implemented for continual evaluation of the system.

The Oregon Association of Hospitals and Health Systems (OAHHS) maintains hospital discharge and emergency department data from each of the 60 hospitals in the State in the Essence system. Although this information is shared with the PHD, the OAHHS bears primary responsibility for the data quality. Both systems, emergency department and hospital discharge, are managed in the same way and are compliant with the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) standards. Clearly documented data dictionaries and process flows are available from the OAHHS, which is very helpful for current and future partners to understand the data systems. Clinical data is available for research purposes upon approval from the PHD and an interface exists between these systems and the EMS system through ImageTrend. However, some characteristics of a quality control program were not apparent and should be investigated further. Those include: expanding the capture of data to all 60 hospitals (it was reported that 44 currently report), developing performance measures for all six data qualities, formally incorporating high frequency errors and user feedback in the revision of training and documentation, and building a relationship with the State TRCC.
The State's Trauma Registry includes data for all patients admitted for injuries that meet trauma criteria at 44 of the State's 60 hospitals. It was unclear if the other 16 hospitals have the ability to treat traumatic injury, so the system may not be complete. The system is compatible with the National Trauma Data Standard and a data dictionary is available to help any user understand how the system functions. The trauma registry has a comprehensive quality control system that includes: documented feedback systems between users and data managers, the utilization of common errors and user feedback to revise training, providing quality control feedback to submitting agencies through site visits to all trauma hospitals, and conducting trend analyses for problem identification. The only aspects missing are performance measures and communication with the State TRCC, so the State is encouraged to develop measures and metrics against which the system may be evaluated at regular intervals and share that information with other traffic records partners.

The Office of Vital Records in the Public Health Division manages the Oregon Vital Events Registration System (OVERS) which includes death data used in the traffic records system. That data is compliant with National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) standards and all submitting entities must use the United States Standard Certificate of Death. There is a system for data quality review, sharing feedback between system users and data managers, and providing quality reports at the point of record submission. Much of the State’s quality control and management of death certificates are based on NCHS standards and processes, so the State is encouraged to provide oversight and institute quality control measures in addition to the federal ones. OVERS data has been used for traffic safety projects and is available upon approval, but quality information is not shared with the State TRCC.

In addition to those notable achievements, there are several considerations that have been noted above. First, although most EMS provides data quality reports to the TRCC, the other ISS components do not share information or participate in the committee. It is important to have regular, reliable participation from all sections of the ISS. Second, to identify and understand the quality of each data system, performance measures should be developed and implemented. While there are guidelines related to the timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of reports, and metrics have been identified for many parts of the ISS, performance measures include baselines and goals so it is possible to regularly evaluate and identify places for improvement in a system's function, progress, and success. The ‘Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems’ publication provides example performance measures for each metric in each system (six metrics per system). Third, the State should explore the incorporation of other available datasets into traffic records efforts. Access to rehabilitation, all-payer / all-claim, traumatic brain injury, Medicaid, and Prescription Drug Monitoring Program data systems is an asset to the State and should be expanded. As an example, such information may help identify emerging trends related to types of drug impairment that affect motor vehicle drivers.
**Question 256:**
Does the injury surveillance system include EMS data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of EMS data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Assessor conclusions:**
EMS data is available on a large subset of EMS transports in the State and the information collected is submitted to the NEMSIS Technical Assistance Center. However, that data only applies to patients treated at a trauma center, not all motor vehicle crash victims receiving EMS treatment. From this data, there were approximately 6,800 responses related to motor vehicle crashes in 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 257:**
Does the injury surveillance system include emergency department (ED) data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of emergency department (ED) data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Emergency department data is available, but only for patients that presented at a trauma level hospital and not all motor vehicle crash victims treated in any emergency department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 258:**
Does the injury surveillance system include hospital discharge data?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of hospital discharge data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Oregon Health Authority maintains records from all hospitals and the Injury in Oregon report provides information on hospital discharges related to motor vehicle injuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses received</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 259:**
Does the injury surveillance system include trauma registry data?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of trauma registry data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is a State Trauma Registry that includes information about the nature and severity of traumatic injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes and treated at trauma centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses received</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 260:
Does the injury surveillance system include rehabilitation data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of rehabilitation data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon maintains both a limited rehabilitation dataset and an all-pay and all-claims database, but neither dataset has been used for injury surveillance activities. The data is accessible but documentation was not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 261:
Does the injury surveillance system include vital records data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of vital data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Oregon injury surveillance system includes vital records data, which is included in the 'Injury in Oregon' report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 262:
Does the injury surveillance system include other data?

Standard of Evidence:

List any other databases or sources included in the injury surveillance system and provide a sample report using data from each of these sources. Additional data resources may include medical examiner reports, payer-related databases, traumatic brain injury registry, and spinal cord injury registry.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has a Traumatic Brain Injury Registry, Medicaid data, an All-Payer All-Claims database, and a Prescription Drug Monitoring Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important

Question 263:
Does the EMS system track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the EMS system, any injury severity categorizations applied, and the provider’s primary impression (if applicable).

Assessor conclusions:
The State EMS system is able to track frequency, nature, and severity of traffic-related injuries by Glasgow Coma Scores (GCS), but no other indication of severity or nature of injury was provided and GCS scores are missing for about two-thirds of the cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important
Question 264:
Does the emergency department data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the emergency department data, any injury severity categorizations applied (e.g., Abbreviated Injury Score, Injury Severity Scale), and principal diagnosis.

Assessor conclusions:
Emergency department data related to traffic crash victims that are treated at trauma centers is available and tracks injury frequency and severity. Information related to other emergency departments, or if all EDs are designated trauma centers, was not available. While the ED dataset collects ICD9 codes that may be converted to AIS codes (a measure of severity), that is not currently being done.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 7  Responses received 2  Response rate 28.6%

Question 265:
Does the hospital discharge data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the hospital discharge data, any injury severity categorizations applied (e.g., Abbreviated Injury Score, Injury Severity Scale), and principal diagnosis.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon Health Authority collects and manages hospital discharge information for all acute care hospitals in the Essence database.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 7  Responses received 3  Response rate 42.9%
**Question 266:**
Does the trauma registry data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the trauma registry data, any injury severity categorizations applied (e.g., Abbreviated Injury Score, Injury Severity Scale), and principal diagnosis.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Oregon Trauma Registry does include information about the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 267:**
Does the vital records data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts from the vital records data and the cause of death.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The vital records information provided demonstrates the ability to track a variety of transportation-related fatalities. Tables detailing deaths by mode of transport, traffic status, and passenger status by patient demographics are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 268:**
Is the EMS data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized EMS data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

**Assessor conclusions:**
EMS data is used to support planning efforts within the State; it can be queried and extracted for specific analysis. Unfortunately, only 70-90% of the State's annual patient care reports are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 269:**
Is the emergency department data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized emergency department data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Emergency department data is available for all 60 hospitals and is used to identify existing and emerging problems and to help allocate resources; however, the documentation provided does not relate directly to traffic-related injuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 270:
Is the hospital discharge data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized hospital discharge data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

Assessor conclusions:
Hospital discharge data is available for analysis both internally and to external parties. A process has been implemented to obtain access for use by outside parties; however, no examples of its use for highway safety projects were available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 271:
Is the trauma registry data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized trauma registry data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

Assessor conclusions:
The trauma registry data can be used for analysis and problem identification. An analysis of pedestrian injuries was provided and the trauma registry was listed as a potential data source; however, how it was used in the development of the program was unclear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 272:
Is the vital records data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized vital records data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources (e.g., research in support of helmet or GDL legislation).

Assessor conclusions:
Vital records data relating to motor vehicle crashes is available for analysis. This data is also shared with the Oregon Department of Transportation's Fatal Accident Review System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 273:
Does the State have a NEMSIS-compliant statewide database?

Standard of Evidence:
Demonstrate submission to the nationwide NEMSIS database and provide any relevant State statutes or regulations. If not compliant, provide narrative detailing the State’s efforts to achieve NEMSIS compliance.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon has both NEMSIS 2.2.1 and NEMSIS 3.3.4 Statewide databases, both of which are hosted by ImageTrend. Depending on the month, between 70% and over 90% of all State-licensed transport providers report to the statewide system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 274:
Does the State’s emergency department and hospital discharge data conform to the most recent uniform billing standard?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the data dictionaries for both the emergency department and hospital discharge data as appropriate as well as any relevant State statutes or regulations.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon conforms to the Health Care Cost and Utilization Project standards for the clinical databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 275:
Does the State's trauma registry database adhere to the National Trauma Data Standards?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the trauma registry data dictionary and any relevant State statutes or regulations.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon Trauma Registry is compliant with National Trauma Data Bank standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 276:**
Are Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and Injury Severity Scores (ISS) derived from the State emergency department and hospital discharge data for motor vehicle crash patients?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a distribution of AIS and ISS scores for the most recent year available.

**Assessor conclusions:**
AIS and ISS are derived from the clinical databases as evidenced by the trauma center report which includes information from 44 of the State's 60 hospitals that used ISS scores to define severity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 277:**
Are Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and Injury Severity Scores (ISS) derived from the State trauma registry for motor vehicle crash patients?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a distribution of AIS and ISS scores for the most recent year available.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The trauma report provides data from 44 of the State's 60 hospitals based on injury severity, but does not include distributions of AIS and ISS values. Although not included in the report explicitly, the values were used to define severity categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 278:**
Does the State EMS database collect the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) data for motor vehicle crash patients?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a distribution of GCS scores for motor vehicle crash patients for the most recent year available.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State collects Glasgow Coma Scores for motor vehicle patients as part of their patient care report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 279:**
Does the State trauma registry collect the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) data for motor vehicle crash patients?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a distribution of GCS scores for motor vehicle crash patients for the most recent year available.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Glasgow Coma Score is captured in the State Trauma Registry and was analyzed in the 'Urban/rural disparities in Oregon pediatric traumatic brain injury' manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 280:
Are there State privacy and confidentiality laws that supersede HIPAA?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide the applicable State laws and describe how they are interpreted—including the identification of situations that may impede data sharing within the State and among public health authorities.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The data-use agreements provide additional restrictions on the data that were set by the State to support HIPAA requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

---

### Question 281:
Does the EMS system have a formal data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State maintains both a data dictionary following NEMSIS 3.3.4 and a published schematron file for data quality assurance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
Question 282:
Does the EMS system have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a user's manual or other form of documentation of the EMS data collection system. Such documentation should include a list of the dataset's variables and a description of how the data is collected, managed and maintained.

Assessor conclusions:
The NEMSIS data dictionaries maintained by the State describe the data elements and attributes in detail. Additionally, training presentations that include information about data collection, process flow, and other functions of the EMS system are available.

Question 283:
Does the emergency department dataset have a formal data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon ESSENCE HL7 Messaging Guide for Syndromic Surveillance: Emergency Department and Urgent Care Data is the data dictionary.
**Question 284:**
Does the emergency department dataset have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the documentation.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State maintains formal documentation (characteristics, values, where and how data is collected) in the ESSENCE Messaging Guide. The ESSENCE User Guide provides additional information about who can access the various datasets that contribute to ESSENCE (Orpheus, Poison Control, etc.) and how the data is collected and managed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 285:**
Does the hospital discharge dataset have a formal data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State maintains a data dictionary for the hospital discharge data system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 286:
Does the hospital discharge dataset have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation.

Assessor conclusions:
Only a data dictionary is available, the Oregon Health Authority does not maintain documentation with additional characteristics of the hospital discharge data system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>14.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 287:
Does the trauma registry have a formal data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

Assessor conclusions:
The State maintains a data dictionary for the trauma system and it is being rewritten to bring Oregon into compliance with current American College of Surgeons 2016, National Trauma Data Bank, and NEMSIS 3.4 standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>14.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Question 288:
Does the trauma registry dataset have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the documentation.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The data dictionary includes additional information related to the inclusion criteria and reporting requirements. The State also has presentations that address characteristics of the dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 289:
Does the vital records system have a formal data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State maintains a data dictionary for the Electronic Death Reporting System (EDRS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 290:
Does the vital records system have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation.

Assessor conclusions:
The vital records data layout includes information about elements and attributes, but is more of a data dictionary than summary documentation which would also include data collection and management information.

Respondents assigned 7  Responses received 2  Response rate 28.6%

Question 291:
Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data from the local EMS agencies?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the State agency or third party to which the EMS data is initially submitted.

Assessor conclusions:
The Injury and Violence Prevention Program within the Oregon Health Authority partners with the EMS regulatory group for a central repository hosted by ImageTrend.

Respondents assigned 7  Responses received 1  Response rate 14.3%
**Question 292:**
Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on emergency department visits from individual hospitals?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the State agency or third party to which the data on emergency department visits is initially submitted.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Acute and Communicable Disease Program at the Oregon Public Health Division is responsible for collecting and maintaining the Emergency Department data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 293:**
Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on hospital discharges from individual hospitals?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the State agency or third party to which the data on hospital discharges is initially submitted.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Oregon Association of Hospitals and Health Systems collects and compiles data on discharges from individual hospitals and subsequently contracts with a third party for QA/QC efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 294:
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the EMS system’s key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the EMS data process flows from dispatch to submission of the report to the State EMS repository.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon EMS Information System April 2015 Update contains a process flow diagram and information about future linkages for a data exchange.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 7
Responses received 1
Response rate 14.3%

Question 295:
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the emergency department data’s key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the emergency department data process flows from patient arrival to submission of the uniform billing data to the State repository.

Assessor conclusions:
The Public Health Messaging Guide for Syndromic Surveillance includes several process flow diagrams for the Emergency Department data.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 7
Responses received 1
Response rate 14.3%
**Question 296:**
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the hospital discharge data's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the hospital discharge data process flows from patient arrival to submission of the uniform billing data to the State repository.

**Assessor conclusions:**
No process flow diagram is available for the collection and use of the State's hospital discharge data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 297:**
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the trauma registry's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the hospital discharge data process flows, from trauma activation to submission of the trauma data to the State registry.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Process flow diagrams may be included in the documentation on the State's Trauma Registry website, but it was not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 298:
Are there separate procedures for paper and electronic filing of EMS patient care reports?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures for paper and electronic filing or a narrative describing the procedures.

Assessor conclusions:
The State only accepts electronic patient care reports. Any agencies collecting the information on paper enter it into the electronic system prior to submission.

Respondents assigned 7  Responses received 1  Response rate 14.3%

Question 299:
Are there procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting emergency department and hospital discharge data to the statewide repository?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process of collecting, editing and submitting emergency department and hospital discharge data to the statewide repository.

Assessor conclusions:
The Essence data system and messaging guides describe the process of editing and error-checking the data. Raw data is housed within the State and data cleaning is done through a web interface by the system developer.

Respondents assigned 7  Responses received 1  Response rate 14.3%
**Question 300:**
Does the trauma registry have documented procedures for collecting, editing, error checking, and submitting data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for collecting, error-checking and submitting trauma registry data.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Documentation for supervisory responsibilities (controlling user access, system contents, etc.) is available, but information related to the collection, submission, and error-checking of the trauma data was not available. Training videos are available on YouTube but not provided in this Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 301:**
Are there procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting data to the statewide vital records repository?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for collecting, error-checking and submitting data to the vital records repository.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Oregon Vital Records follows the US Standard Certificate of Death required by the National Center for Health Statistics, including the edit and error-check procedures. The State has implemented additional edits specific to Oregon which are built into the web-based Oregon Vital Events Registration System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 302:
Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting EMS agencies for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting EMS agencies for correction and resubmission.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Processes are in place to provide feedback and return data that fails the initial screening process to the reporting agency. These processes are automated as part of the ImageTrend data system and happen at the point of submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 303:
Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting emergency departments for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative that describes the process for returning data to the reporting emergency departments for correction and resubmission.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no documented quality control procedures for returning data to the reporting agency outside of timeliness (late submissions trigger an automated message). However, ad-hoc quality control queries are conducted by the State epidemiologist and emergency departments are contacted when decreased visit counts or other data aberrations occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 304:**
Are there documented procedures for returning hospital discharge data to the reporting hospitals for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting hospitals for correction and resubmission.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no documented procedures for returning error records to the submitting agency and that process is the responsibility of the Oregon Hospital Association and its contracted vendor. State epidemiologists monitor and provide data quality feedback to hospitals, but it is not a formal documented process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 305:**
Are there documented procedures for returning trauma data to the reporting trauma center for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting trauma center for correction and resubmission.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Quality assurance of the trauma data is done through a series of training sessions, software checks, and other documented procedures. Processes for correcting and resubmitting records are via a Chalkboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 306:**
Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting vital records agency for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting vital records agency for correction and resubmission.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is a daily edit report generated by NCHS to allow for correction of errors. The Oregon Vital Records agency edits the records and resubmits them to NCHS. It is unclear if the original submitting agency is involved or provides the correct information to the State during this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 307:**
Is aggregate EMS data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the EMS data for analytical purposes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
EMS data is available to outside agencies for research through a documented process for reviewing access requests, IRB review, and annual monitoring of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 308:**
Is aggregate emergency department data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the emergency department data for analytical purposes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
ESSENCE has a data use agreement that allows outside parties to obtain access to aggregate Emergency Department data for analytical purposes after complying with stated restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Question 309:**
Is aggregate hospital discharge data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the hospital discharge data for analytical purposes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is a review process for outside parties to access hospital discharge data and, if necessary, the Public Health IRB will be involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 310:
Is aggregate trauma registry data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the trauma registry data for analytical purposes.

Assessor conclusions:
There is a process for outside parties to access trauma registry data, including forms to be completed. There is clear documentation of that process including the need for IRB review or a data use agreement.

Respondents assigned: 7
Responses received: 1
Response rate: 14.3%

Question 311:
Is aggregate vital records data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the vital records data for analytical purposes.

Assessor conclusions:
Aggregate vital records data is available to outside parties for analytical purposes once a data use agreement is signed.

Respondents assigned: 7
Responses received: 2
Response rate: 28.6%
**Question 312:**
Is there an interface among the EMS data and emergency department and hospital discharge data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the interface link between the EMS data and the emergency department and hospital discharge data. If available provide the applicable data exchange agreement.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The EMS Bridge application can be used to allow hospitals to retrieve EMS information on patients who have been transported to their facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 313:**
Is there an interface between the EMS data and the trauma registry data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the interface link between the EMS data and the trauma registry data. If available provide the applicable data exchange agreement.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The EMS bridge application can be used to allow staff of the receiving trauma center to retrieve information from the patient care report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 314:**
Is there an interface between the vital statistics and hospital discharge data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the interface link between the vital statistics and hospital discharge data. If available provide the applicable data exchange agreement.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Hospital discharge data and vital statistics data are linked in other Public Health Division programs, but there is no interface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 315:**
Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The ImageTrend software runs automated checks on each record submitted and provides a validation report using a schematron system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 316:**
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide EMS database in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide EMS database.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Submission of EMS data is strictly voluntary, but agencies typically make corrections when errors are detected by the system or other analysts. Subsequently, there is no State-level correction authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 317:**
Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected EMS patient care reports to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide EMS database?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected EMS patient care reports are returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to the statewide EMS database.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is no documented process; returning patient care reports for correction is done on an informal basis. The ImageTrend software provides a process for tracking of reports through the system and quality control processes are included in the training modules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 318:
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no timeliness performance measures in place for the EMS data although submissions are tracked by agency staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 319:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no accuracy performance measures in place for the EMS system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 320:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no completeness performance measures for the EMS system. Performance measures are used to measure the health and progress of the system. Although 100% completeness is required for successful submission, performance measures should be implemented for continual evaluation of the system despite automated standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 321:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no uniformity performance measures for all EMS reports in the State. Performance measures provide a gauge that allows a state to measure the improvement of their data systems. Although all records must conform to NEMSIS requirements, uniformity measures should be implemented for State-specific elements and continual evaluation of the system as NEMSIS evolves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 322:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no integration performance measures for the EMS system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 323:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no accessibility performance measures for the EMS system. Accessibility performance measures track the ability of principal users of the data to obtain the data or other services and their satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 324:
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each EMS system performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

Assessor conclusions:
Numeric goals are available and tracked for a limited number of performance measures (i.e. completeness).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 325:
Is there performance reporting for the EMS system that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

Assessor conclusions:
Data quality feedback is provided on a State-level and EMS providers receive a validation report when data is submitted to the State. Timeliness and completeness are addressed in these reports, but not accuracy.

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 50% |
### Question 326:
Are high frequency errors used to update EMS system training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update EMS system training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

**Assessor conclusions:**
High frequency errors are not used to update training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules. However, common lessons learned from the data and feedback from EMS providers is used to revise those materials. This feedback is not data-based, but informal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 327:
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the EMS system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system's data completeness.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Quality control reviews of the EMS data are conducted and presentations are used to relay those findings to the agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 328:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the EMS data across years and agencies?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The EMS data collection system is fairly new but the EMS data has the potential to identify unexplained differences across years and agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 329:
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to EMS data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform program changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Quarterly meetings are hosted at the Public Health Division to solicit feedback from users across the State, including county health departments, EMS medical directors, and staff that attend the meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 330:
Are EMS data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
EMS data quality reports are routinely provided to the TRCC through presentations and training opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 331:
Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

Assessor conclusions:
Information related to the emergency department and hospital discharge data systems was not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important
Question 332:
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases.

Assessor conclusions:
The hospital datasets (ED and inpatient) are managed by the Oregon Hospital Association and the State is not involved in the submission and data correction processes. Although the State notes erroneous information and passes that information along to analysts, there seems to be no State-level correction authority.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Respondents assigned 4  Responses received 1  Response rate 25%

Question 333:
Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected emergency department and hospital discharge records to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected emergency department and hospital discharge records are returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases.

Assessor conclusions:
The hospital datasets (ED and inpatient) are managed by the Oregon Hospital Association and the State is not involved in the submission and data correction processes. Although the State notes an informal process used to identify errors in the Emergency Department data, no further information was available about either data system.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 4  Responses received 1  Response rate 25%
**Question 334:**
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While there are reporting requirements, there are no timeliness performance measures for Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 335:**
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no accuracy performance measures for Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge databases. There are examples of the State measuring accuracy and using that to inform program changes, but no performance measures were developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 336:**
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no completeness performance measures for Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge databases. The completeness of E-codes has been measured over time, but performance measures with baseline and goal metrics have not been developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 337:**
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no uniformity performance measures for Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge databases. Efforts have been made to compare State and national data, but performance measures are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 338:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no integration performance measures for Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 339:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge database and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no accessibility performance measures for Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge databases. Accessibility performance measures track the ability of principal users to obtain the data or other services and their satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 340:
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each emergency department and hospital discharge database performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no performance metrics because there are no performance measures. With the implementation of the ESSENCE program, there is an opportunity to establish several numeric performance goals for the hospital databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 341:
Is there performance reporting for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

Assessor conclusions:
The hospital datasets (ED and inpatient) are managed by the Oregon Hospital Association and the State is not involved in the quality performance reporting processes. It is unclear if the Hospital Association provides information back to reporting hospitals for quality improvement efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 342:
Are high frequency errors used to update emergency department and hospital discharge database training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update emergency department and hospital discharge database training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The hospital datasets (ED and inpatient) are managed by the Oregon Hospital Association. Although errors may be observed by analysts through their normal use of the data, there is no process by which the State uses those errors to update training materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 343:
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the emergency department and hospital discharge databases?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system's data completeness.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State conducts quality control reviews on the completeness of many elements in the Emergency Department data. It is also able to track the completeness of E-codes for persons with an injury diagnosis at the point of submission to the CDC, but there is no information about State-conducted quality control reviews of the accuracy and uniformity of the hospital databases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 344:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the emergency department and hospital discharge data across years and agencies?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
The State utilizes a Query Wizard that enables them to conduct analyses, but the frequency and details of how those analyses are done to identify the unexplained differences were unclear.

Respondents assigned 4  Responses received 1  Response rate 25%

Question 345:
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to emergency department and hospital discharge data collectors and data managers?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users' data quality feedback to inform program changes.

Assessor conclusions:
It was reported that feedback on the quality of the Emergency Department data is provided back to the facility's IT department, but no details were available. Also, it is unclear if the same process is used for Hospital Discharge data or whether this information is relayed to the data collectors. This process is probably conducted by the Oregon Hospital Association.

Respondents assigned 4  Responses received 1  Response rate 25%
Question 346:
Are emergency department and hospital discharge data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
Data quality management reports for the ED and Hospital Discharge data are not regularly provided to the TRCC.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 347:
Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

Assessor conclusions:
The State reportedly uses SAS code to conduct edit checks of the data, but it is unclear if this process is automated and occurs as data is being entered or if it is done on the back end.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 348:
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide trauma registry in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide trauma registry.

Assessor conclusions:
Correction authority is reportedly given to the State staff maintaining the trauma registry, but no information was provided with regards to the procedures that are in place to allow this activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 349:
Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected data to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide trauma registry?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected data is returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to the statewide trauma registry.

Assessor conclusions:
The State utilizes a tracking application to identify records that need correction and returns them to the appropriate facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 350:
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no timeliness performance measures for the trauma registry. Performance measures are established to help a State or agency track progress in their data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 351:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no accuracy performance measures for the trauma registry. Performance measures are established to help a State or agency track progress in their data systems. The Oregon Trauma Registry Performance Report includes comparative trends over time, but it is not clear how that information is used to evaluate system accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 352:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no completeness performance measures for the trauma registry. Performance measures are established to help a State or agency track progress in their data systems.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 353:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no uniformity performance measures for the trauma registry. Performance measures are established to help a State or agency track progress in their data systems.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 354:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no integration performance measures for the trauma registry. Performance measures are established to help a State or agency track progress in their data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 355:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no accessibility performance measures for the trauma registry. Accessibility performance measures track the ability of principal users to obtain the data or other services and their satisfaction. The State collects such feedback during trauma center visits, but it is not clear how that information is used to evaluate the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 356:
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each trauma registry performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no numeric goals because there are no established performance measures. Even though timely reporting and complete records were reported as performance measures, the associated numeric goals were not provided.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%

Question 357:
Is there performance reporting for the trauma registry that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

Assessor conclusions:
It was reported that quarterly performance reports are provided to each hospital, but the only available information about the content of those reports related to timeliness of data submission from trauma discharge; accuracy and completeness feedback was not included.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%
Question 358:
Are high frequency errors used to update trauma registry training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update trauma registry training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

Assessor conclusions:
Data errors are reportedly used to update training and documentation. Based on user feedback, Cheat Sheets are developed and disseminated to key users as a form of training. The State's process for incorporating feedback into training and edit check revisions is unclear beyond the Cheat Sheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 359:
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the trauma registry?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system's data completeness.

Assessor conclusions:
Site visits are made to each trauma center once every two years. Quality control reviews of the data are provided to the hospitals and reviewed during these visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 360:**
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the trauma registry data across years and agencies?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Periodic comparative and trend analyses are presented in the Oregon Trauma Registry 2003-2012 Report. In addition to the traditional comparisons across years for a number of variables, the analyses identified deficiencies in the data and recommendations were made based on the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 361:**
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to trauma registry data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform program changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data quality feedback from key users is regularly communicated through quarterly reports, regional trauma center reports, and annual reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 362:**
Are trauma registry data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Trauma registry data quality management reports are not regularly produced and made available to the State TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 363:**
Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Edit and error checks are built into the Oregon Vital Events Registration System in accordance with NCHS standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 364:**
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with vital records in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with vital records.

**Assessor conclusions:**
It was stated that Oregon vital records is the originating agency of the vital records and all changes to records are completed following law and administrative rules and are completed and approved by the Oregon vital records. It is unclear, but seems that there is no correction authority granted to State quality control staff and corrections are made to a vital record by the submitting agency which is also a State entity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 365:**
Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected data to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to vital records?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected data is returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to vital records.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State follows the procedures established by the NCHS for editing, error-checking and submitting death records. All edits, including those specific to the State, are built into the Oregon Vital Events Registration System. All changes to records are tracked and documented in the State system; edits are also tracked by NCHS to ensure all records are corrected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 366:
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
Oregon Law requires submission of the record to the State within 5 days of the death and the contract with NCHS requires 85% of the records to be sent within 10 days of the registration date. However, these are not performance measures, which include baseline and goal metrics and are used to evaluate progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 367:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the State follows all NCHS requirements, there are no accuracy performance measures for the vital records system. Performance measures include a goal against which a system may be evaluated regularly to determine success or need for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 368:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the State follows all NCHS requirements, there are no completeness performance measures for the vital records system. Performance measures include a goal against which a system may be evaluated regularly to determine success or need for improvement.

| Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 25% |

Question 369:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the State follows all NCHS requirements, there are no uniformity performance measures for the vital records system. Performance measures include a goal against which a system may be evaluated regularly to determine success or need for improvement.

| Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 25% |
### Question 370:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although the State follows all NCHS requirements, there are no integration performance measures for the vital records system. Performance measures include a goal against which a system may be evaluated regularly to determine success or need for improvement. It is unclear if vital records data is integrated with any other traffic records system components.

| Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 25% |

### Question 371:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although the State follows all NCHS requirements, there are no accessibility performance measures for the vital records system. Performance measures include a goal against which a system may be evaluated regularly to determine success or need for improvement.

| Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 25% |
**Question 372:**
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each vital records performance measure?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Metrics for timeliness and completeness performance measures were provided, but the State does not have performance measures. Although metrics are tracked regularly, they should be used to implement formal measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 373:**
Is there performance reporting for vital records that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

**Assessor conclusions:**
A quality review report that includes timeliness, accuracy, and completeness measures is provided to all funeral homes. It is unclear if other submitting entities also receive performance reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 374:
Are high frequency errors used to update vital records training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update vital records training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State uses high frequency errors to update training materials. Several methods of communication are used for this purpose, including funeral home reports, newsletters, and presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 375:
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the vital records?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system’s data completeness.

**Assessor conclusions:**
NCHS and State-specific edits have been implemented in the system, but it is unclear if these are reviewed regularly and compiled in the form of quality control reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 376:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the vital records data across years and agencies?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
Periodic trend analyses are conducted by NCHS that identify 'unknown' levels in order to revise tolerance levels. The State conducts quarterly and annual edits of 'unknown' levels as well, but it is unclear if other values are also evaluated or if differences are identified across agencies.

Question Rank: Less Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 377:
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to vital records data collectors and data managers?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users' data quality feedback to inform program changes.

Assessor conclusions:
The Oregon Health Authority disseminates monthly funeral home reports and newsletters that address data quality issues and other topics of interest.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 378:
Are vital records data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
Data is provided to the FARS analyst, but no data quality management reports are provided to the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
Data Use and Integration

Integration combines data from multiple systems to form a new, more robust dataset that is capable of answering a wide variety of safety-related questions. These integrations occur both within the core systems and between them. There have been some successful integration projects in Oregon, but comprehensive integration of the traffic records component systems remains an ideal to strive toward.

The State’s TRCC values data integration as evidenced by the Traffic Records Strategic Plan. Although there is little current integration across systems, the TRCC strategic plan promotes data integration, including performance measures, and linking crash data with other data systems or files.

Linkages that have occurred include a study of crash risk of unlicensed drivers and a month-long study linking crash and injury surveillance data. By linking the datasets on a more regular basis, these types of analyses occur more efficiently. Although citation and crash data linkages are not currently present, the State is moving toward that possibility by incorporating electronic crash and citation applications.

The State’s roadway system consists of many individually-maintained datasets in one. The addition of crash data gives decision makers a more complete picture. The DOT maintains an inventory for the systems under its responsibility and has data governance in place. The TRCC may want to look at the DOT’s examples and incorporate them for all of the traffic records system components.

State decision-makers and the public have access to data and personnel to help them, but with the exception of the linked crash and roadway data, this access is limited to the individual data systems. Creation of, and access to, integrated databases would help planners to better understand the overall traffic safety picture. Oregon should continue to build upon the strengths of the individual systems and analytical resources while moving toward more integration.
**Question 379:**
Do behavioral program managers have access to traffic records data and analytic resources for problem identification, priority setting, and program evaluation?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the data source(s), (crash, roadway, driver, vehicle, citation adjudication, injury surveillance), discuss and provide examples of program specific analysis (e.g., reports, fact sheets, web pages, ad hoc analyses).

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has used traffic records data for problem identification including unintentional deaths and hospitalizations for children used by SAFE KIDS of Oregon. Also Oregon traffic crashes quick facts have aggregated information on bikes, pedestrians, and motorcyclists. The State also has DUI enrollment and conviction by count.

The State has done an excellent job of providing the behavioral program managers and other stakeholders data and analyses to help problem identification, priority setting, and program evaluation to be data driven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 380:**
Does the State have a data governance process?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative detailing the State's data governance process, identifying the personnel involved and describing how it supports traffic safety data integration and formal data quality management.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not have a governance process specifically for traffic records. The State's DOT has several data governance structures in place but little was mentioned of the other traffic safety systems, nor is there an overall structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 381:**
Does the State have a formal traffic records system inventory that identifies linkages useful to the State and data access policies?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the system inventory specifying all traffic records data sources, system custodians, data elements and attributes, linkage variables, linkages useful to the State, and data access policies.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although the State’s DOT maintains an inventory for the systems under their responsibility, the State does not have a formal traffic records systems inventory. A 2016 release to external customers of the DOT is planned. The TRCC should consider using this as a basis to expand and include inventories of other traffic records system components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 382:**
Does the TRCC promote data integration by aiding in the development of data governance, access, and security policies for integrated data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, the TRCC strategic plan sections that demonstrate the promotion of data integration.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although there is little current integration across systems, the TRCC strategic plan promotes data integration, including performance measures, and linking crash data with other data systems or files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 383:
Is driver data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative crash-driver link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of graduated drivers' license (GDL) law effectiveness or of crash risk associated with motorcycle rider training, licensing, and behavior.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not link crash and driver license data on a regular basis but has done so in the past to analyze crash involvement of unlicensed drivers. Further such linkages are encouraged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

### Question 384:
Is vehicle data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative crash-vehicle link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include crash trends among vehicle types or vehicle weight restriction by road classification.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not link vehicle data with crash data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
**Question 385:**
Is roadway data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative crash-roadway link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include the identification of high crash locations and locations with similar roadway attributes or an assessment of engineering countermeasures' effectiveness.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Crash data is linked with roadway data in several of the implementation plans developed by the State DOT, including the Intersection Safety Implementation Plan as well as the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Implementation Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 386:**
Is citation and adjudication data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative crash-citation or adjudication link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of the relationship between illegal actions and crashes for specific driver subpopulations (e.g., older drivers) or of crash-involved DUI offenders' adjudications.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although citation and crash data are not currently linked, the State is moving toward that possibility by incorporating electronic crash and citation applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 387:
Is injury surveillance data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

Standard of Evidence:
Document an integrative crash-injury surveillance link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include injury outcomes by specific crash type or injuries associated with occupant protection.

Assessor conclusions:
The State performed a one-month integration study linking EMS data to three statewide outcome databases: Hospital Discharge Database, Trauma Registry, and Department of Transportation Crash File. They were matched using probabilistic linkage software. The State is strongly encouraged to continue to pursue the linkage of crash and injury data.

Question 388:
Are there examples of data integration among crash and two or more of the other component systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Document an integrative link among crash and multiple data systems, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of the safety impact of differential speed limits for different vehicle types.

Assessor conclusions:
The State example of crash, roadway, and guardrail inventory linkage is a good example of data linkages among multiple systems. This question, however, asks about the core six traffic records component systems: citation/adjudication, crash, driver license, injury surveillance, roadway, and vehicle. If this example also included corresponding EMS times, or driver license status, for example, it would fully meet the ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 389:**
Is data from traffic records component systems—excluding crash—integrated for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative link using at least two traffic record component systems excluding the crash system. Include the systems, their linkage variables, example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of recidivism among specific driver populations.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While the State has a robust roadway records system that consists of multiple layers that can be linked, this does not constitute linkage of two or more of the component traffic safety systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 390:**
Do decision-makers have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for the use and analysis of integrated datasets?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the analytical resources available: personnel, software, or online resources. Specify the decision-makers who have access to these resources.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has developed an online safety analysis tool that combines crash and roadway data. This tool is made available through an interactive portal for staff and business partners to access maps and data. Therefore, yes for integrated crash and roadway data but not for any other. The question is specific to integrated datasets; although decision makers have access to numerous datasets, these are not linked datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 391:
Does the public have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for the use and analysis of integrated datasets?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the analytical resources available to the public: personnel, software, or online resources. Specify how the public has access to these resources.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has developed an online safety analysis tool that uses crash and roadway integration. This tool is made available through an interactive portal for staff and business partners to access maps and data. No other integrated datasets exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
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Appendix B

National Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>Average Annual Daily Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMVA</td>
<td>American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>American College of Surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>Abbreviated Injury Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSI</td>
<td>American National Standards Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSIP</td>
<td>Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Blood Alcohol Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Center for Disease Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDIP</td>
<td>NHTSA's Crash Data Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Commercial Driver License Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODES</td>
<td>Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDACTS</td>
<td>Data Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Department of Motor Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPPA</td>
<td>Drivers Privacy Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT-TRCC</td>
<td>The US DOT Traffic Records Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Administrator (NHTSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUIID</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence of Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI</td>
<td>Driving While Intoxicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Emergency Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>Fatality Analysis Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDEs</td>
<td>Fundamental Data Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMCSA</td>
<td>Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>Glasgow Coma Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDL</td>
<td>Graduated Driver Licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GES</td>
<td>General Estimates System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHSA</td>
<td>Governors Highway Safety Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXDM</td>
<td>Global Justice XML Data Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA</td>
<td>Government Reference Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>Health Information Privacy and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMS</td>
<td>Highway Performance Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD-10</td>
<td>International Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Injury Severity Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIEM</td>
<td>Justice Information Exchange Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEIN</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADD</td>
<td>Mothers Against Drunk Driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMIIS</td>
<td>Motor Carrier Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDRIS</td>
<td>Model Impaired Driving Records Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRE</td>
<td>Model Inventory of Roadway Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMUCC</td>
<td>Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPHSIS</td>
<td>National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHIP</td>
<td>National Criminal History Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHS</td>
<td>National Center for Health Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>National Crime Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSC</td>
<td>National Center for State Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDR</td>
<td>National Driver Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMSIS</td>
<td>National Emergency Medical Service Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>National Governor’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>National Highway Traffic Safety Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIBRS</td>
<td>National Incident-Based Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEM</td>
<td>National Information Exchange Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLETIS</td>
<td>National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMVTIS</td>
<td>National Motor Vehicle Title Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTDS</td>
<td>National Trauma Data Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>Police Accident Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDPS</td>
<td>Problem Driver Pointer System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PII</td>
<td>Personally Identifiable Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Regional Administrator (NHTSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDIP</td>
<td>FHWA’s Roadway Data Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPM</td>
<td>Regional Program Manager (NHTSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS</td>
<td>Revised Trauma Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Records Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC</td>
<td>Regional Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaDIP</td>
<td>FMCSA’s Safety Data Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVE</td>
<td>Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHSP</td>
<td>Strategic Highway Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Subject Matter Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSOLV</td>
<td>Social Security Online Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAP</td>
<td>State Traffic Records Assessment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWISS</td>
<td>Statewide Injury Surveillance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCD</td>
<td>Traffic Control Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>Traffic Records Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPRS</td>
<td>Traffic Records Improvement Program Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCC</td>
<td>Traffic Records Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS</td>
<td>Traffic Records System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>Uniform Crime Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIN</td>
<td>Vehicle Identification Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML</td>
<td>Extensible Markup Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State-Specific Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>All Roads Transportation Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Crash Analysis Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Crash Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Common Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Crash Locator Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Driver and Motor Vehicle Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRS</td>
<td>Electronic Death Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDS</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Database System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAHHS</td>
<td>Oregon Association of Hospitals and Health Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>Oregon State Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTSC</td>
<td>Oregon Transportation Safety Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERS</td>
<td>Oregon Vital Events Registration System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Public Health Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIS</td>
<td>Safety Priority Index System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDD</td>
<td>Transportation Development Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>